

Erik Levi

Resisting Nazism – Hartmann, Blacher and von Einem

We are all too familiar with the extreme climate of fear perpetrated by the Nazi regime. The repressive measures unleashed by the totalitarian state were designed to muzzle opposition, making it all but impossible to defy the status quo. Indeed, those that engaged in non-compliance were perfectly aware of the risks they were taking, and that the consequences of being found out could be severe. Nevertheless, charting the extent to which individuals might be regarded as being actively engaged in non-compliance or resistance during this period is by no means a straightforward process. It can prove particularly challenging in the case of cultural issues. The task of evaluating the often bewildering degree of responses by creative artists to the sequence of official directives that evolved during the “Third Reich” is invariably complex. It requires a certain degree of sensitivity in relating private thoughts, committed through diary entries and personal letters, or recounted in memoirs often published years later, with public action at the time. The question therefore arises as to whether it is possible to reconcile the inner recesses of the mind, that perhaps presented a stance of personal resistance, with day-to-day behaviour, which, to all intents and purposes, suggested obeisance and absolute political loyalty?

This tension between the internal and external continues to be one of the major issues confronting scholars researching musical life in Nazi Germany. It begs a number of questions with regard to the position of some of the most prominent personalities. Yet tempting though it might be to classify their activities as being specifically in either the complicit or resistance categories, such binary divisions prove far too blunt a tool to serve a useful purpose. Even where there is hard evidence of complicity, the yardsticks that might be employed in support of such an argument remain problematical. For example, the fact that a musician occupied a leading position in the Reichsmusikkammer, or any other Nazi cultural organisation, did not necessarily mean they were fully complicit. The much discussed role of conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler exemplifies this problem. On the one hand, Furtwängler accepted the post of Vice-President of the Reichsmusikkammer in November 1933, conducted concerts sponsored by the NS-Gemeinschaft “Kraft durch Freude”, and directed a performance of Wagner’s *Die Meistersinger* in September 1935 at the same party rally at which the Nuremberg Race Laws were unveiled. However, there is also evidence that on several occasions, the conductor appears to have fought valiantly to try and protect German musical life from political interference. This was certainly the case with his very public defence of Paul Hindemith in late 1934.¹

1 Michael H. Kater: *The Twisted Muse. Musicians and Their Music in the Third Reich*, New York 1997, pp. 195–203.

A similarly problematic issue concerns the position of German musicians that appeared frequently in concerts abroad. Many could be deemed to have been acting effectively as musical ambassadors for the “Third Reich”, either in the occupied territories or in countries that were in political alliance with the regime. No doubt, some individuals were knowingly prepared to behave as political pawns for the Nazis in the area of cultural diplomacy. But others are likely to have viewed concertising in a non-political context, merely seeking to enhance their incomes, advance their careers and secure international reputations.

If scrutinising the degree of complicity attached to the examples cited above raises many problems, how should we view the position of those musicians that joined the NSDAP? A brief glance at the appendix to Fred Prieberg’s monumental *Handbuch Deutsche Musiker 1933–1945* could make for somewhat depressing reading. In this section, Prieberg lists nearly 2,200 musicians, detailing their respective NSDAP membership numbers and the dates when they joined the Party.² Yet being a card-carrying member of the NSDAP did not necessarily signify rabid loyalty to the cause. For many musicians, party membership was simply a necessary step towards protecting their means of employment. This explains, for example, the position of the Baltic-German pianist and composer Eduard Erdmann. As an ardent modernist, Erdmann’s music enjoyed a good degree of exposure, particularly during the early years of the Weimar Republic. When the Nazis came to power, Erdmann did not follow the stampede of musicians that joined the NSDAP early in 1933, his membership being dated 1 May 1937 (Partei-Nummer 4,424.050).³ Yet all the surviving documentary evidence suggests that Erdmann was neither an opportunist turncoat nor a Nazi sympathizer. Depressed at the increasingly reactionary direction in which the Nazis were steering musical life, his creativity had been so curtailed by the turn of events that he only managed to complete one work between 1933 and 1945. This was a String Quartet, notably dedicated to his friend the painter Emil Nolde, who had himself been very publicly proscribed by the regime.⁴ Yet with no prospect of securing performances of his own music, and having voluntarily resigned from a teaching post at the Cologne Academy of Music, Erdmann saw little alternative than to pursue a career as an itinerant soloist, rightly or wrongly deeming that party membership would help secure him the necessary engagements in order to survive. Significantly, once the war ended,

- 2 Fred K. Prieberg: Anhänge: NSDAP-Mitglieder, in: *Handbuch Deutsche Musiker 1933–1945*, CD-ROM 2004, pp. 9416–9462.
- 3 Erdmann joined the NSDAP on the same date as the conductor Hermann Abendroth, his former colleague at the Cologne Academy of Music, the President of the Reichsmusikkammer, Peter Raabe, and the composers Hermann Schroeder and Fritz Büchtger.
- 4 For further details of the relationship between Erdmann and Nolde, see Volker Scherliess: *Erdmann und Nolde*, Neukirchen 2009.

Erdmann resumed composing, producing a steady, if not exactly prolific stream of works from 1946 until his death in 1958.⁵

On the opposite side of the fence, it is equally problematic dealing with the issue of resistance. We can dispense at this juncture with discussing the much-rehearsed extent to which opposition to the regime that may, or may not have been manifested in the activities of non-party musicians such as Richard Strauss and Hans Pfitzner.⁶ But what should we make of a recently published article which claims that despite joining the NSDAP Peter Raabe, Strauss's successor as President of the Reichsmusikkammer, was not necessarily fully supportive of Nazi music policy?⁷ Moreover, is it possible to exonerate the composer Paul Graener, a founding member of the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur, from complicity if, as a recent biographer has argued, he was eventually discredited by the Nazi regime for retaining close links with Jewish publishers?⁸ And there's the decidedly ambiguous position of composer Werner Egk, who maintained in his memoirs that he was openly defying the regime in his opera *Peer Gynt*, but nonetheless garnered approval for the same work from some members of the Nazi hierarchy including, most notably, Adolf Hitler.⁹

- 5 These works included a *Konzertstück* for piano and orchestra, the 3rd and 4th Symphonies, *Capricci* ("Ein kleines Kaleidoskop für Orchester") and *Monogramme für Orchester*. For a detailed consideration of Erdmann's career, see Volker Scherliess: *Eduard Erdmann – ein deutscher Musiker vor und nach 1945*, in: "Stunde Null" – zur Musik um 1945, ed. by Volker Scherliess, Kassel 2014, pp. 197–238, Marek Bobéth: *Eduard Erdmann (1896–1958). Leben und Wirken eines deutschbaltischen Künstlers*, in: *Mūzikas Akadēmijas raksti* 6 (2009), pp. 131–166, and *Begegnungen mit Eduard Erdmann*, ed. by Christof Bitter and Manfred Schlösser, Darmstadt 1968.
- 6 See, for example, various articles underlining these composers' anti-Nazi stance, for example Michael H. Kater: *Hans Pfitzner. Magister Teutonicus Miser*, in: *Composers of the Nazi Era. Eight Portraits*, Oxford 2000, pp. 144–182, and Pamela M. Potter: *Strauss's Friedenstag. A Pacifist Attempt at Political Resistance*, in: *Musical Quarterly* 69 (1983), pp. 408–424.
- 7 See Albrecht Dümling: *What is Internal Exile in Music?*, in: *The Impact of Nazism on Twentieth-Century Music*, ed. by Erik Levi, Wien 2014, pp. 9–25, here p. 21. Dümling argues that Raabe frequently conducted Mahler and Schoenberg before 1933, and had refused to endorse the *Entartete Musik* Exhibition, when it moved from Düsseldorf to Weimar. For a comprehensive appraisal of Raabe's controversial career, see Nina Okrassa: *Peter Raabe. Dirigent, Musikschriftsteller und Präsident der Reichsmusikkammer*, Wien 2004.
- 8 Knut Andreas: *Zwischen Musik und Politik. Der Komponist Paul Graener (1872–1944)*, Berlin 2008.
- 9 See the composer's own recollections of the reception of *Peer Gynt* in: Werner Egk: *Die Zeit wartet nicht. Künstlerisches, Zeitgeschichtliches, Privates aus meinem Leben*, München 1981, pp. 302–312, and the critical re-evaluation of this work in Michael Walter: *Der "Führer" und Werner Egks Peer Gynt*, in: *Hitler in der Oper. Deutsches Musikleben 1919–1945*, Stuttgart 1995, pp. 175–212. For a more nuanced and wide-ranging appraisal of Egk's career during the Nazi era, see Robert Braummüller: *Aktiv im kulturellen Wiederaufbau. Werner Egks verschwiegene Werke nach 1933*, in: *Werner Egk. Eine Debatte zwischen Ästhetik und Politik*, ed. by Jürgen Schläder, München 2008, pp. 33–69.

Perhaps some home truths should be stated at this juncture. The notion that the Nazi take-over represented a dark moment in German musical history was not one necessarily felt by all of the musicians that were living in the country during that time. Drawing a sharp contrast between what purports to be the immensely rich cultural life of the Weimar Republic and the supposedly restricted and reduced musical landscapes arising thereafter, particularly from the loss of a great number of musicians that felt the necessity to leave the country, might seem persuasive. But it provides a rather misleading and excessively simplistic overview. For composers, many of whom regarded themselves as essentially apolitical, the promise of increased state subsidies and a concomitant rise in performing opportunities and commissions for new music was a very seductive ploy for ensuring that they would almost certainly remain on board with the Nazi programme.

This explains to a certain degree why there are relatively few composers, remaining in Germany between 1933 and 1945, that could be regarded as working unequivocally against the regime. Indeed, out of the few composers worthy of further scrutiny in this regard, only the Bavarian-born Karl Amadeus Hartmann (1905–1963) stands out as having openly presented himself as an opponent.¹⁰ Closely aligned with the prominent anti-Nazi conductor Hermann Scherchen, who left Germany for Switzerland in 1933, Hartmann was politically active in Munich in the early 1930s as a supporter of the Social Democrats.¹¹ In November 1932, he had already been singled out in the journal *Melos* by critic Ludwig Lade as the one up-and-coming composer making waves in the Bavarian

- 10 For more detailed biographical information on the composer, see Andrew D. McCredie: *Karl Amadeus Hartmann. Sein Leben und Werk*, Wilhelmshaven 1980, and Ulrich Dibelius: *Karl Amadeus Hartmann*, Tutzing 1995.
- 11 During the final years of the Weimar Republic, Scherchen was one of many prominent musicians to have been subjected to harsh criticism by the conservative nationalist journal *Zeitschrift für Musik*. Initially, the focus of this hostility was targeted towards his promotion of radical new music as, for example, in the scathing review by the journal's editor, Alfred Heuß, of his musical contribution to the 1930 ADMV Festival in Königsberg. See Alfred Heuß: *Vom 60. Tonkünstlerfest des Allgemeinen Deutschen Musikvereins in Königsberg i. Pr.*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 97/7 (July 1930), pp. 533–538, here p. 537. Two years later, however, the critic Fritz Stege attacked Scherchen on primarily political grounds. See, for example, his comment in a review of musical life in Berlin: "Zum Schluß legte Scherchen sein kommunistisches Musikbekenntnis bei der Leitung eines 'Solidaritätsliedes' von Hans [sic] Eisler ab." Fritz Stege: *Berliner Musik*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 99/3 (March 1932), pp. 210–212, here p. 211. Further political attacks on Scherchen ensued from the same author, see Fritz Stege: *Hermann Scherchen als politischer Agitator*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 99/11 (November 1932), pp. 998 f., Fritz Stege: *Hermann Scherchen – ein Sozialdemokrat*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 100/1 (January 1933), pp. 64 f., and Fritz Stege: *Verdiente Maßregelung eines parteipolitischen Dirigenten*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 100/4 (April 1933), p. 378. For a detailed analysis of Scherchen's political outlook, see Joachim Lucchesi: "Doch wie's da drin aussieht, geht niemand was an." *Musikausübung und Politikverständnis bei Hermann Scherchen*, in: *Muzikologija* 19 (2015), pp. 67–82.

capital, boldly taking on the local culturally conservative music establishment by writing works in a radical modernist style that owed much to Stravinsky, Hindemith, Milhaud and Krenek. Lade concluded that it was only a matter of time before he would gain widespread recognition throughout the country as one of Germany's most promising newcomers.¹²

But time was not on Hartmann's side. Barely three months after Lade's article appeared, Adolf Hitler had swept to power, and the democratic Weimar Republic was dissolved. In the following months, Hitler and the Nazis unleashed a proscriptive and xenophobic cultural programme designed to consign most of the leading proponents of "Weimar culture" to the margins. Musical life in Germany was turned upside down as many prominent figures that had prospered in the 1920s, were ostracised and eventually forced out, often to be replaced by those deemed to be more openly compliant to the new political environment.

Hartmann was profoundly affected by these purges. Early in 1933, anti-Semitism forced his Jewish publisher Benno Balan to leave Germany for good. Since Balan's catalogue was focused almost exclusively on works by avant-garde composers, no Aryan music publisher was eager to take over his business. This meant that the compositions Hartmann had already written in the previous years were no longer readily available. A further setback was the cancellation by Bavarian Radio of a proposed broadcast of his *Burleske Musik* for piano, wind instruments and percussion. The radio authorities, now under Nazi control, were under strict instructions not to sponsor any music that was believed to be stylistically tainted.

Humiliated by this snub and becoming increasingly outraged at the way the Nazis were muzzling any opposition to their policies, Hartmann saw no alternative but to try, as best he could, to take a stand against the regime. Henceforth, he would deliberately isolate himself from musical life in Germany, expressly forbidding any public performance of his compositions within the "Third Reich". A number of the confessional works he composed in the 1930s were only performed abroad, mainly at contemporary music festivals. Hartmann maintained this position throughout the period, with one sole exception in 1942, when he accepted a commission to write incidental music to Shakespeare's *Macbeth* for Munich's Residenztheater.¹³

12 Ludwig Lade: *Musikleben*. Die Kunststadt München, in: *Melos* 11 (November 1932), pp. 374–377, here p. 376.

13 In a detailed and engaging article on this practically unknown work, Marie-Therese Hommes suggests that Hartmann's music to *Macbeth* represents a more overt case of his resistance to the Nazi regime than the works from this period that were performed abroad. See Marie-Therese Hommes: "Wider das Vergessen". Chiffrierte Botschaften in Karl Amadeus Hartmanns wiederentdeckter Schauspiel-musik zu "Macbeth" von 1942, in: *Die Musikforschung* 58/2 (April–June 2005), pp. 151–174.

Hartmann recalled his state of mind at this time, and the stand that he took against the regime, in an autobiographical sketch written in 1955, but only published two years after his death:

“Dann kam das Jahr 1933, mit seinem Elend und seiner Hoffnungslosigkeit, mit ihm dasjenige, was sich folgerichtig aus der Idee der Gewaltherrschaft entwickeln mußte, das furchtbarste aller Verbrechen – der Krieg. In diesem Jahr erkannte ich, dass es notwendig sei, ein Bekenntnis abzulegen, nicht aus Verzweiflung und Angst vor jener Macht, sondern als Gegenaktion. Ich sagte mir, daß die Freiheit siegt, auch dann, wenn wir vernichtet werden – das glaubte ich jedenfalls damals.”¹⁴

Post-war commentators single out Hartmann as the one of the very few composers to remain in Nazi Germany that entered into a kind of “inner emigration” – a term that has frequently and sometimes controversially been applied to writers that did not leave the country, but chose to challenge the regime from within.¹⁵ Yet Hartmann’s position was somewhat different to such writers, since his role appears on the surface to have been far more passive. Inevitably, Hartmann’s relationship with the “Third Reich” raises a number of questions which cannot be easily resolved. Perhaps the most puzzling is his refusal to follow many other prominent anti-Nazi musicians and leave Germany after 1933. Although there is little doubt that he could have easily crossed the border to a new life in Switzerland, where he could at least have continued to work with Scherchen, he was not prepared to be uprooted from his beloved Munich. Perhaps he feared that his relative inexperience as a practical musician at that time would have made it difficult for him to earn a living abroad. Undoubtedly, he was not sufficiently established by 1933 to be confident of securing a teaching post at a foreign music conservatoire. More crucially, he was married into a relatively prosperous Munich family, and maybe feared that a decision to leave could easily have jeopardised his personal and financial security.

Even more surprising, however, is the seemingly lax attitude of Nazi officialdom towards Hartmann. One might have expected the composer to have been severely censured for daring to promote works abroad whose underlying message appears to have

¹⁴ Karl Amadeus Hartmann: *Autobiographische Skizze*, 1955, in: *Karl Amadeus Hartmann. Kleine Schriften*, ed. by Ernst Thomas, Mainz 1965, pp. 9–16, here p. 12.

¹⁵ See in particular Hanns-Werner Heister: “Innere Emigration”, “verdeckte Schreibweise”, kompositorischer Widerstand. K. A. Hartmanns Schaffen nach 1933, in: *Die dunkle Last. Musik und Nationalsozialismus*, ed. by Brunhilde Sonntag, Hans-Werner Boresch and Detlef Gojowy, Cologne 1999, pp. 237–250; Jost Hermand: *Culture in Dark Times. Nazi Fascism, Inner Emigration and Exile*, New York 2013, pp. 162–168; Stephen Hinton: *Germany 1918–1945*, in: *Man & Music. Modern Times From World War I to the Present*, ed. by Robert P. Morgan, Basingstoke 1993, pp. 83–110, here p. 108; Michael H. Kater: *Composers of the Nazi Era. Eight Portraits*, New York 2000, p. 97, and Richard Taruskin: *Music and Totalitarian Society*, in: *Music in the Early Twentieth Century. The Oxford History of Western Music*, Oxford 2010, pp. 743–796, here pp. 771f.

been so critical of the regime. After all, one of the first compositions he completed during this period was the symphonic poem *Miseræ*, ostensibly written in protest against the establishment of a Nazi concentration camp in Dachau. Indeed, Hartmann inscribed the autograph to the score with the words “Meinen Freunden, die hundertfach sterben mußten, die für die Ewigkeit schlafen – wir vergessen Euch nicht. (Dachau 1933–34).”¹⁶ Yet the composer only divulged this information after 1945, leaving us to wonder whether listeners experiencing *Miseræ* for the first time at the International Society for Contemporary Music Festival in Prague in 1935 were aware of the specific background to the work.¹⁷ Certainly, the limited number of reviews of *Miseræ* to have appeared in the German press make no mention whatsoever of this extra-musical dimension. For example, the critic in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* focused exclusively on Hartmann’s score:

“Unter den vielen, die zu ‘Wort’ kamen, gab es einen Neuen, auf den man besonders aufmerksam wurde. Karl Amadeus Hartmann hat ein Orchesterwerk ‘Miseræ’ zur Diskussion gestellt, das technisch ausgezeichnet genannt werden darf, aber vor allem durch seine Ausdruckskraft und seine geistige Potenz viele andere Kompositionen dieser Zeit weit übertraf.”¹⁸

Likewise, Kurt Oppens, writing in the *Allgemeine Musikzeitung*, lavished considerable praise on Hartmann’s achievement:

“Als ein Werk ganz eigener Prägung erschien die symphonische Dichtung ‘Miseræ’ des Münchners Karl Amadeus Hartmann. Das von Scherchen im 1. Konzert dirigierte Werk vermittelte den Eindruck einer ungewöhnlichen Ausdrucksbegabung, die im Religiösen verwurzelt sein mag und den Hörer unmittelbar anpackt und erschüttert.”¹⁹

It is possible that the German critics that were present in Prague refrained from highlighting the potentially inflammatory anti-Nazi nature of Hartmann’s work. Yet reviews of *Miseræ* that appeared in the British press, though perhaps less fulsome in their praise than the German ones cited above, hardly shed further light on this matter. The most

- 16 Constantin Grun: Richard Strauss und Karl Amadeus Hartmann – Zwei Münchner zwischen Krieg und Frieden, in: *Die Musikforschung* 62/3 (2009), pp. 251–261, here p. 252.
- 17 For an exhaustive article on *Miseræ*, see Lauriejean Reinhardt: Karl Amadeus Hartmann’s *Miseræ* (1933–1934), in: *Music History from Primary Sources. A Guide to the Moldenhauer Archives*, ed. by Jon Newsom and Alfred Mann, Washington D.C. 2000, pp. 239–248.
- 18 *Frankfurter Zeitung*, September 1935, quoted in McCredie: Karl Amadeus Hartmann. Sein Leben und Werk, p. 42.
- 19 Kurt Oppens: Das internationale Musikfest in Prag, in: *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 62/38 (20 September 1935), p. 566, quoted in Reinhardt: Karl Amadeus Hartmann’s *Miseræ* (1933–1934), p. 242. It should be noted that despite writing reviews for the *Allgemeine Musikzeitung*, the German-born Kurt Oppens was actually Jewish and fled Europe for the United States in 1938, see Heiko Morisse: Kurt Oppens, in: *Lexikon verfolgter Musiker und Musikerinnen der NS-Zeit*, ed. by Claudia Maurer Zenck and Peter Petersen, Hamburg 2010, www.lexm.uni-hamburg.de/object/lexm_lexmperson_00004459 (accessed 16 May 2017).

enthusiastic, by Gerth Baruch in *The Chesterian*, described the work as “gripping [...] distinguished by impressive writing for wind instruments, dramatic gradations and melodic substance.”²⁰ Somewhat more lukewarm, however, was the response of composer Alan Bush, reviewing the ISCM Festival for *The Musical Times*:

“An intensely serious work in an atonal idiom. It begins with a slow and brooding introduction, which is followed by a rapid movement. On the whole one felt that, while the work in all probability expressed the composer’s intentions entirely, it yet lacks control. The moods are all of the most drastic kind, the depths and heights of the orchestra used almost exclusively, brass is always muted and the strings, when not playing in harmonics, are rushing about so violently that they add nothing melodically at all. In short, it all seemed rather too melodramatic.”²¹

Given that Bush had joined the Communist Party of Great Britain in the same year as this article was published, and that he openly dedicated himself to fighting fascism, it is perhaps even more noteworthy that he did not intimate to British readers that any message of protest against the Nazis might have inspired the music.

Whether or not Bush and his fellow reviewers deliberately suppressed any incriminating information regarding the programmatic background to *Miseræ*, there can be little doubt that Hartmann remained especially careful not to divulge too much about his music, except possibly to his closest friends, for fear of reprisals against him and his family. For their part, Nazi bureaucrats seemed to have turned a blind eye to Hartmann’s activities, ignoring or overlooking such obvious gestures of defiance as his claim, as presented at the International Society of Contemporary Music Festival that took place in June 1938 in London, to be the representative of an “independent Germany”.²² Once again, Hartmann might have been spared censure, since the mainly British critics reviewing his First String Quartet (1933) failed to recognise the obviously Hebraic intonation of the opening motif in the viola which quotes directly from the Jewish melody *Elijahu ha-navi* – a musical gesture that Hartmann later explained as expressing his utter dismay at the rampant anti-Semitism that ravaged Germany in the year the work was composed.²³

20 Gerth Baruch: The International Music Festival in Prague, in: *The Chesterian* 17 (November/December 1935), No. 24, p. 55.

21 Alan Bush: The I. s. c. M. Festival at Prague, in: *The Musical Times* 76 (1935), No. 1112, pp. 940–942, here p. 940.

22 See Eric Blom: Thoughts on Contemporary Music – II, in: *The Listener* (4 August 1938), pp. 256 f., here p. 256. Blom remarks that “the qualification ‘independent’ behind the German names – Paul Hindemith and Karl Amadeus Hartmann – somehow struck a sinister note, though one could not quite make out all it implies. It suggests that a German composer may be attached officially and artistically (it is the same thing) to his country, or else to the I.S.C.M., but not to both, the latter no doubt regarded in Germany as a hotbed for the cultivation of ‘entartete Musik’.”

23 Most reviews of Hartmann’s First String Quartet that were published in the British press focused

Perhaps, like many anti-Nazis that decided not to emigrate, Hartmann was playing a double game, cautiously resisting the regime abroad, whilst appearing to be passively compliant at home. Certainly, his relationship with Nazi organisations appears to have been ambiguous. Take, for example, his dealings with the Reichsmusikkammer, which he was obliged to join, irrespective of the fact that his professional activities as a musician almost entirely took place outside Germany. No documentary evidence has emerged to suggest that the relationship was problematic. Admittedly, like many fellow musicians, Hartmann resisted for as long as possible to supply interfering bureaucrats with the requisite proof of his Aryan identity. Only on one occasion did he receive a mild rebuke from an official for having attended a contemporary music festival that, according to Nazi propagandists, was dominated by Jews and Bolsheviks. Yet at no time was Hartmann prevented from travelling abroad to hear his music performed. The only travel restrictions placed on Hartmann came during the Second World War, when plans to perform the opera *Des Simplicius Simplicissimus Jugend* (1934/35) and the *Sinfonia tragica* (1940–1943) in Belgium proved impossible, since so much of Europe was under German occupation. Yet even with this restriction, Hartmann was able to travel to St. Gallen in neutral Switzerland in 1940 to attend the first performance of his best-known work, the *Concerto funebre* for violin and string orchestra.

There are two possible reasons why the Nazi regime did not place restrictions on Hartmann's activity abroad. First, since Hartmann was careful not to disclose too much about the political background to his work, Nazi officialdom did not feel unduly threatened by his presence at international festivals. Indeed, the Nazis were even prepared to tolerate mild forms of dissent in the cultural arena, as long as they were not deemed to be too subversive. Here one can draw parallels with the situation regarding writers and poets that also entered into a kind of "inner emigration". As John Klapper has argued, "provided writers and publishers did not overstep the mark, works of non-conformist content that did not focus on Nazi ideals or the achievements of the regime were condoned, though this was motivated more by political calculation than benign tolerance."²⁴

The second reason relates to Hartmann's relative obscurity at home. By the time the Nazis came to power, he was insufficiently established a figure to prove much of a

exclusively on the score and its workmanship. Only in passing did Edwin Evans reflect on Hartmann's unusual status as a representative of a country that had officially withdrawn from the ISCM in 1933: "The Festival included Germany, Austria and Russia whose composers are either domiciled or un-affiliated." See Edwin Evans: I.S.C.M., in: *The Chesterian* 19 (July/August 1938), No. 140, p. 171.

24 John Klapper: *Nonconformist Writing in Nazi Germany. The Literature of Inner Emigration*, Rochester/New York 2015, p. 32.

problem for the authorities. Furthermore, even allowing for Hartmann's own refusal to allow his music to be performed in Germany, let alone his inability to secure a publishing contract after 1933, there was little chance of his work experiencing any kind of dissemination within the German music establishment. Given that German press coverage of Hartmann's work abroad evaporated after 1936, he was sidelined and ultimately deemed unimportant.

If Hartmann's musical voice was effectively silenced in Nazi Germany as a result of his voluntary decision to enter into a kind of "inner emigration", where does this leave some of his composing contemporaries who were also politically and aesthetically opposed to the Nazis? Perhaps the most prominent example of a composer working within the system, but remaining resolutely independent in outlook, is Boris Blacher.²⁵

Born two years earlier than Hartmann in China, and from a German-Estonian Russian-speaking background, Blacher came to Berlin in 1922, and quickly engaged in the vibrant and experimental cultural atmosphere of the Weimar Republic, which had a lasting impact on his own compositional development. Prior to 1933, he was relatively unknown. However, it is worth noting that amongst the works he wrote in the early 1930s were a set of *Jazz Coloraturas* for soprano, alto saxophone and bassoon and the *Suite for String Trio* based on Jewish themes, both compositions signalling the breadth of his musical sympathies.

Relatively little is known about Blacher's musical activities in the immediate aftermath of the Nazi takeover. Suffice it to say, he seems to have played a clever waiting game, unlike a good number of his immediate contemporaries, who saw the departure from Germany and proscription of many leading contemporary composers as the green light to advance their own careers as swiftly as possible. What remains beyond doubt is that Blacher was not prepared in any way to adapt his musical outlook to the new anti-modernist zeitgeist, and continued along the stylistic path that he had already established in his earliest works. The strategy was effectively to play the system to his advantage. In this respect, the enthusiastic and committed support he gained from influential conductors, such as Karl Böhm, Carl Schuricht and Johannes Schüller, was far more important than currying favour with party administrators.

Blacher was also able to accomplish this objective more effectively in the first years of the Nazi regime because of the divergent opinions amongst Germany's leading music critics as to the acceptable limits of musical modernism that could be adopted by young composers. This explains, for example, the contradictory reception accorded to Blacher's first major orchestral work, the *Orchester-Capriccio über ein Volkslied*. Indeed, the very title

25 For detailed biographical information on Blacher, see Boris Blacher, 1903–1975. *Dokumente zu Leben und Werk*, ed. by Heribert Henrich, Berlin 1985.

of the work suggests a deliberate ploy on Blacher's part to deceive concert organisers into thinking he was composing a work with a strong folkloric or proto-nationalist tendency. On the contrary, as David Drew convincingly argues, the folksong in question is deliberately eclectic "with roots in many cultures from the Urals to the Baltic, from Palestine to Hungary, from Provence to Rio de Janeiro."²⁶

The *Capriccio* was given its first German performance on Hamburg Radio on 14 May 1935, where it featured somewhat inconspicuously alongside a programme of music by Baltic and Scandinavian composers. Exactly two months later, it was broadcast from Berlin on the *Deutscher Kurzwellensender* in a programme featuring other works by Blacher. A review of the transmission, published in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* on 19 July, was favourably disposed towards the *Capriccio*, pronouncing it to be a "ungemein geistvolle[s] Werk [...], das in blitzartigen Wendungen verblüffend gekonnt das Thema in allen Farben eines großen Orchesters abwandelt".²⁷

Presumably such a positive press review played no small part in securing a more high-profile performance of the work in Berlin, early in October 1935. This time, however, the unlikely sponsors of the concert were Alfred Rosenberg's NS-Kulturgemeinde, whose musical outlook was deeply reactionary. In view of the intense rivalry that existed between the NSKG and the critic Fritz Stege, who was not normally sympathetic to the organisation, it is somewhat ironic that Stege published a savagely hostile review of the work in the *Zeitschrift für Musik*. Stege castigated Blacher for succumbing to the influence of modernist composers unwelcome in Nazi Germany, echoing the rhetoric fanatically pursued by the NSKG:

"Wie sich in den Rahmen deutscher Musik ein derart undeutsches Werk einschleichen konnte, ist verwunderlich. Denn dieses von Geräuscheffekten und rhythmischen Roheiten erfüllte Tonstück tritt das geistige Erbe eines Strawinsky, eines Kurt Weill und anderer überwindener Tonsetzer einer entschwundenen Zeit an, nur mit dem Unterschied, daß den Genannten immerhin noch etwas mehr eingefallen ist als Boris Blacher."²⁸

Such vitriol, emanating from one of the most influential critics working in Nazi Germany, could have wreaked long-term damage to Blacher's career. But his music continued to gather admirers and more performances. Only a few months later, the same journal published a very favourable review of his recent Piano Concerto, which had

²⁶ David Drew: *After 1933. Blacher, Music-Politics, and the Postwar Management of Historical Evidence*, in: Boris Blacher, ed. by Herbert Henrich and Thomas Eickhoff, Hofheim 2003 (*Archiv zur Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Vol. 7), pp. 125–212, here p. 138.

²⁷ Cited in Thomas Eickhoff: *Politische Dimensionen einer Komponisten-Biographie im 20. Jahrhundert – Gottfried von Einem*, Stuttgart 1998 (Beihefte zum *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, Vol. 43), p. 46.

²⁸ Fritz Stege: *Berliner Musik*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 102/11 (November 1935), pp. 1245f., here p. 1246.

been performed on radio stations in both Frankfurt and Stuttgart by soloist Hermann Hoppe.²⁹

In February 1937, Blacher appeared in the spotlight in another Berlin concert. This time, he had accepted a commission from the Luftwaffe to compose a *Divertimento* for their wind orchestra. The new work was to be performed alongside other contemporary compositions. Yet the pretext for Blacher taking on such a job had nothing whatsoever to do with him making any compromises to the political establishment. Rather, he was excited by the possibility of writing music involving saxophones, since their use in conventional orchestral composition was largely frowned upon by this stage, presumably because of the instrument's inevitable connection to jazz. So enthusiastic was he about the commission that he drafted an essay on the creative challenges facing a contemporary composer in writing for such an ensemble. It was published early the same year in the state-subsidised journal *Deutsche Musikkultur*. Significantly, Blacher's essay focuses exclusively on musical matters, and he pays no lip service at all to the expected demonstration of political loyalty, which is so readily confirmed in other pages of this journal.³⁰

Yet the major breakthrough for Blacher came at the end of the same year, when the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra under Carl Schuricht premiered his *Concertante Musik*. This direct and accessible work employs similar musical ingredients to the *Capriccio*, an acerbic bitonal idiom whose rhythmic dislocations and obvious allusions to jazz, not to mention the pervasive influence of Stravinsky, should have consigned it to the scrapheap of so-called degenerate music. However, *Concertante Musik* proved to be such an immediate success that it was to be one of the few pieces of contemporary music which was commercially recorded at the time.³¹ Furthermore, orchestras throughout Germany took it into their repertory, and it was programmed regularly over the next three or so years.

It was the previously hostile Fritz Stege who seemed to change course in his reception both of Blacher and this work. In stark contrast to his dismissal of the *Capriccio*, Stege lavished extravagant praise on *Concertante Musik*. His positive review published in the *Zeitschrift für Musik*, is notable for analysing the music in some detail, and including quotations of all the work's main thematic ideas.³² Stege was just as effusive in his appraisal of Blacher's *Symphony*, which was first performed by the Berliner Staatskapelle in February 1939. Here, he went even further in commending Blacher and declared:

29 Hermann L. Mayer: *Musik im Rundfunk. Reichssender Frankfurt und Stuttgart*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103/2 (February 1936), pp. 239 f.

30 Boris Blacher: *Musik für Blasorchester*, in: *Deutsche Musikkultur* 2/1 (1937), pp. 18 f.

31 Boris Blacher: *Concertante Musik*, Berliner Philharmoniker/Johannes Schüler, Electrola DB 4618, recorded 7 March 1939.

32 Fritz Stege: *Berliner Musik*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 105 (January 1938), pp. 43–48, here pp. 43–46.

“Diese Sinfonie verdient, in allen deutschen Konzertsälen zu erklingen, wo sie sicherlich mit ähnlichen Erfolgen rechnen darf wie in der Staatsoper.”³³ This critical volte-face needs further explanation, and should be interpreted in the context of a greater accommodation to the music of Stravinsky in Germany in the late 1930s – the most obvious manifestation being the Telefunken commercial recording of his most recent ballet, *Jeu de Cartes*, with the composer conducting the Berliner Philharmoniker.³⁴ Blacher’s evident devotion to Stravinsky in *Concertante Musik* and the *Symphony* therefore would have not have been regarded with the same disdain as was the case with his earlier *Capriccio*.

Although Stege’s critiques carried considerable weight, not least because he was also the press officer for the Reichsmusikkammer, some of his colleagues remained far less convinced about Blacher. The much-performed *Concertante Musik* aroused strong disapproval in some quarters, even in the same journal that had previously published Stege’s detailed analysis of the work. Hermann Unger, for example, condemned its inclusion in a concert given by the Gürzenich Orchestra in Cologne alongside music by Mozart:

“Hier [herrscht] nicht jener überzeitlich verklärte Klang- und Spieltrieb des Klassikers, sondern die an Strawinsky und Hindemith geschulte Willkür des Rhythmus und die gewollte Seelenlosigkeit der Tonsprache.”³⁵

Equally dismissive was Reinhold Zimmermann. Reviewing a performance in 1940, given in Aachen under Herbert von Karajan, Zimmermann emphatically declared that *Concertante Musik* was “leider keine gute Empfehlung für die schaffenden Zeitgenossen: ein im Bizarr-Rhythmischen noch überbotener Strawinsky hat für uns Heutige nichts mehr mit Musik zu tun.”³⁶

These negative responses towards Blacher were echoed to a certain extent by Stege’s severe disappointment at what he deemed to be excessive use of “jazztechnischer Effekte” and “volksfremde[r] Stilmerkmale” in his ballet *Kaleidoskop*. This work, premiered at the Berliner Staatsoper in 1940, was received somewhat coolly, and coincided with a significant downturn in Blacher’s reputation.³⁷ The first serious setback was the loss of a teaching job in composition at the Landeskonservatorium in Dresden. The post had been secured for him by the conductor Karl Böhm in 1938. However, Blacher’s teaching involved the analysis of works by contemporary composers such as Hindemith and

33 Fritz Stege: *Berliner Musik*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 106 (March 1939), pp. 266–274, here p. 273.

34 Igor Strawinsky: *Jeu de Cartes*, Berliner Philharmoniker/Igor Strawinsky, Telefunken SK 2460, recorded 19 February 1938.

35 Hermann Unger: *Musik in Köln*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 106 (February 1939), pp. 156–159, here p. 158.

36 Reinhold Zimmermann: *Konzert und Oper. Aachen*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 107 (December 1940), p. 792.

37 Fritz Stege: *Berliner Musik*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 107 (September 1940), pp. 534 f., here p. 535.

Milhaud, both of whom had been banned by the regime. Presumably such seditious behaviour was brought to the attention of the Nazi authorities, causing him to be sacked after only one year. The second and far more fatal blow was the discovery in 1940 that Blacher's grandmother was of Jewish extraction. Such information provided Blacher's opponents with sufficient justification to condemn him on both musical and racial grounds. Amongst his most powerful enemies was Herbert Gerigk, the editor of the journal *Die Musik* and music representative of the Amt Rosenberg, who saw fit to add Blacher's name to the foreword to the second 1943 edition of the notorious *Lexikon der Juden in der Musik*. Also directly connected with this revelation about Blacher's racial heritage was the withdrawal on 28 May 1942 of a proposed 2,000 RM financial subsidy, which had been agreed on the previous day at a meeting of the *Vergabeausschuss für Staatszuschüsse zur Verteilung an Komponisten*.³⁸

Yet despite these setbacks, Blacher continued to accept commissions in the early years of the war. Undoubtedly, the most high-profile of these was his opera *Fürstin Tarakanowa*, which was premiered in Wuppertal in February 1941. Blacher's decision to base an opera upon a Russian subject matter would certainly have been deemed timely in view of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. Furthermore, the libretto, which tackled the theme of patriotic self-sacrifice, was deemed ideologically irreproachable, as it chimed in with the war effort. The music, on the other hand, works in far more subversive ways, embracing a freely bitonal idiom that veers between the cool neo-classicism of Stravinsky and the more highly-charged expressionism of Berg. Indeed, Blacher must have felt sufficiently empowered to invoke the composer of *Wozzeck* in a programme note he wrote for the Wuppertal performance. In fact, the programme note reflected more generally on the challenges facing a composer writing opera in the middle of the twentieth century:

“Wenn wir uns heute entschließen, eine Oper zu schreiben, so glauben wir, gleichzeitig zwei Stile des musikalischen Theaters berücksichtigen und in einer gewissen Weise verschmelzen zu müssen: einerseits die aus Nummern (Arien, Ensembles) zusammengesetzte Form der Oper, andererseits die Erscheinung des musikalisch bestimmten Dramas, die in ihren heiteren und tragischen Extremen im ‘Rosenkavalier’ und im ‘Wozzeck’ [sic] ihren Ausdruck gefunden hat. [...] Die Musik zur ‘Fürstin Tarakanowa’ versucht nun, eine uns heute geläufige, musikalische, aus rhythmisch-melodischen Impulsen erwachsende Gestaltungsweise im Sinne der Formen der Oper anzuwenden, dabei aber sowohl den dramaturgischen Bau des Ganzen, als auch den theatralischen Wert der einzelnen Situationen und Szenen zu berücksichtigen. Musikalisches und Theatralisches sollten sich so durchdringen, daß der Zuhörer und Zuschauer die dramatische Begebenheit auf musikalischem Wege vermittelt bekommt.”³⁹

38 The document is reproduced in Eickhoff: *Politische Dimensionen*, pp. 67 f.

39 *Blätter des Stadttheaters Wuppertal 1940/41*, No. 8, p. 5, cited in Jürgen Hunkemöller: *Boris Blacher – Eigenanalysen und Werkkommentare Edition*, in: *International Journal of Musicology* 8 (1999), pp. 347–382, here p. 355.

The reviews of the premiere of *Fürstin Tarakanowa* were almost uniformly positive. Writing in the *Neues Wiener Tageblatt*, Alfred Burgartz noted the unfolding enthusiasm for the work from the audience, which increased from three to four curtain calls for the first act to thirty for the third. He claimed that Blacher had subsumed his enthusiasm for Stravinsky in the score by adopting a “dramatisches Parlando” style with an “absolut mozartechte Technik”. The originality of his approach was praised, Burgartz concluding that “die interessante Partitur [sic] wird allem Anschein nach einen Markstein in der Geschichte neuester Opernkunst bedeuten.”⁴⁰

Notwithstanding this evident praise for *Fürstin Tarakanowa*, any possibility of another German opera house mounting a production of the work was effectively removed in the summer of 1941. Following the German invasion of the Soviet Union, theatrical representation of Russian topics was strictly forbidden, and Blacher’s effort now fell foul of the censors. The next year, however, Blacher was still able to enjoy a modicum of exposure in the theatre with the premiere of his ballet *Das Zauberbuch von Erzeum*, based on the music of Friedrich von Flotow, and first heard in Stuttgart on 17 October 1942. On the following day, Eugen Jochum conducted the first performance of the *Konzert für Streichorchester* in Hamburg. Yet thereafter, Blacher’s name effectively disappeared from the German concert and operatic platform. On the rare exceptions when his music surfaced, as in a piano recital given early in 1943 in Berlin by Helmut Roloff, the response was negative, with Erwin Völsing scornfully lambasting the composer on racial grounds in the journal *Musik im Kriege*: “Abzulehnen ist die Wahl des allzu schmissigen, unserem deutschen Musikempfinden zuwiderlaufenden Klangexperimentes der Sonatine op. 14 Nr. 2 des Vierteljuden Boris Blacher.”⁴¹

By the time this review was published, Blacher had effectively entered into his own “inner emigration”, composing confessional music for the drawer. Such overtly critical material, however, would have had to remain secret, in that it posed a real danger to the composer if unearthed by determined interrogators. Amongst his most powerful private acts of musical defiance were the large-scale oratorio *Der Großinquisitor*, based on a text by Dostoevsky, which comments objectively on the fate of the persecuted during the Spanish inquisition, and the deeply personal settings of *Drei Psalmen* for baritone and piano, the first expressions of religious sentiment in Blacher’s output.⁴²

40 Alfred Burgartz: “Fürstin Tarakanowa” auf der Opernbühne, in: *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 9 February 1941, p. 7.

41 Erwin Völsing: *Berliner Konzerte*, in: *Musik im Kriege* 1/3–4 (June/July 1943), pp. 65–67, here p. 65.

42 For a more detailed examination of Blacher’s works of “inner emigration”, see Burkhard Meischein: *Das Ende der Normalität. Ein Blick auf Boris Blacher, seine Situation in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus und sein Oratorium “Der Großinquisitor”*, in: *Die Tonkunst* 3 (2009), pp. 438–443.

In the last years of the war, Blacher and his wife were living as virtual recluses in a house in Berlin owned by the von Einem family. Blacher first became acquainted with the young Austrian composer Gottfried von Einem in Berlin in the late 1930s.⁴³ Fifteen years his junior, von Einem had arrived in the German capital in 1937, his declared intention being to study composition with Paul Hindemith. This plan, however, was thwarted, since Hindemith had that year resigned from his teaching post at the Berlin Hochschule. Instead, von Einem secured a job as a répétiteur at the Berliner Staatsoper, where he came into direct contact with its director Heinz Tietjen. Thanks to Tietjen, von Einem also gained entry to the Bayreuth Festival, where he was able to collaborate with some of the finest singers of the day, and also observe at close quarters Adolf Hitler, a figure who apparently fascinated him at that time.⁴⁴ The allure of the Nazi hierarchy must have been very short-lived, however, after von Einem found himself repeatedly harassed and temporarily imprisoned by the Gestapo on trumped-up charges of offering sanctuary to enemies of the state.

Von Einem was present at the rehearsals and first performance of Blacher's Symphony in early 1939. He was so enamoured by the piece that he implored the older composer to teach him composition. Yet it took a further two years before this relationship could be formally established, when von Einem enrolled as his private pupil. As had been the case when he was working in Dresden, Blacher's teaching amounted to a mixture of strict contrapuntal training with unfettered exposure to the forbidden fruits of modern music, which both men listened to in secret as it was broadcast on enemy radio stations. The close relationship established between the two men solidified in the wake of Blacher's "inner emigration", to the extent that von Einem could be regarded as pursuing similar musical objectives to his teacher. It is perhaps hardly coincidental therefore that the first orchestral piece by von Einem, to have been successfully premiered in Berlin in March 1943, was also designated as a *Capriccio*. The work exhibited a brash and brilliant orchestral style, owing as much to Hindemith and Stravinsky as to Blacher.

It was, however, von Einem's opus 1 ballet *Prinzessin Turandot*, premiered in Dresden in February 1944, that really put the young composer on the musical map, so much so, in fact, that a documentary film about the composer and the production was widely distributed at the time.⁴⁵ Like Blacher, von Einem had learnt the tactical sense in befriending influential conductors. Thanks to his friendship with Karl Elmendorff, whom

43 For further details of Gottfried von Einem's life, see Friedrich Saathen: *Einem Chronik: Dokumentation und Deutung*, Wien 1982.

44 Eickhoff: *Politische Dimensionen*, p. 30.

45 The documentary film is entitled *Premiere der Turandot* (1944). Photos of the film can be viewed at www.deutschefotothek.de/documents/obj/80485470 (accessed 1 September 2016).

he got to know in Bayreuth, he was appointed late in the war to an official position as house composer for the Dresden Opera.

Judging by an advertisement placed by the publishers Bote und Bock in the February/March 1944 issue of *Musik im Kriege*, press reviews for *Prinzessin Turandot* were largely favourable. Karl Laux, writing in the *Dresdner Zeitung*, commented positively on the “starke rhythmische Kraft” of von Einem’s music. Fred Hamel, in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, echoed this view: “Nach diesem Ballett steht fest, daß hier vor allem ein echtes dramatisches Temperament, ein ausgesprochener Bühneninstinkt zur Entfaltung drängt.”⁴⁶ Only Hans Schnoor, writing a critique in the very same issue of *Musik im Kriege* to feature the advertisement, demurred. He pointed out that von Einem had written a score that skirts along the “Spuren eines Schein-Atonalismus”.⁴⁷ Schnoor could have been more explicit in pointing out to readers that some of the music owes much not only to Blacher, but also to the composers that strongly influenced von Einem’s teacher, namely Stravinsky and Weill.

The musical ghosts of Stravinsky and Weill, coupled with the overt influence of jazz, got von Einem into much hotter water in April 1944, after Herbert von Karajan premiered his *Konzert für Orchester op. 4* with the Berlin Staatskapelle. Many of the reviews denounced von Einem for having succumbed to such modernist influences, the critic of the *Berliner Börsenzeitung* leading the charge with complaints about von Einem’s score being riddled with “klangliche Exzesse ... rhythmische Komplizierungen ... Thematik schwach profiliert.”⁴⁸ Von Einem was strongly reprimanded by Heinz Drewes, the music officer in the Propaganda Ministry, for committing such a musical taboo. However, Joseph Goebbels, who was not in the audience of that Berlin concert, wanted to make a decision for himself as to von Einem’s fate. Somewhat surprisingly, the Propaganda Minister sanctioned and financed the making of a commercial gramophone record of the work in order to enable him to assess the work more effectively.⁴⁹ Yet by the time the recording was made available, the debate surrounding von Einem’s musical proclivities had been subsumed by the effective cessation of most musical activity in the last months of the Second World War.

46 Cited in an advertisement for *Prinzessin Turandot* published on the reverse of the front cover in: *Musik im Kriege* 1/11–12 (February/March 1944) [no pagination].

47 Hans Schnoor: Gottfried v. Einem: “Prinzessin Turandot”. Ballett-Uraufführung in der Staatsoper Dresden, in: *Musik im Kriege* 1/11–12 (February/March 1944), pp. 224 f., here p. 225.

48 Cited in Eickhoff: *Politische Dimensionen*, p. 81, Fn. 191.

49 The recording of the von Einem *Konzert für Orchester* was recorded by Deutsche Grammophon on Polydor 68186/8 and performed by the Sächsische Staatskapelle under Karl Elmendorff. It remains unclear whether the recording was ever issued commercially, given that it was made so late in the War.

The three composers discussed in this article all sought to preserve their creative independence, despite the restrictions and repressions of living and working in a totalitarian society. However, each figure approached this issue from a slightly different vantage point. Hartmann remained the most uncompromising figure through his refusal to allow German audiences to hear his music. However, his decision was undoubtedly cushioned by family wealth and possible connections with locally based and influential Nazis. Blacher and von Einem, on the other hand, adopted a more subtle position that proved expedient for their personal survival, taking full advantage of the lack of unanimity that existed within official circles with regard to musical modernism. The system broke down when the discovery of Blacher's partial Jewish ancestry became an important weapon for denouncing the composer. But even then, Blacher's musical principles were still allowed to thrive, owing to his powerful influence on von Einem. To a certain extent, this continuity of musical language triumphantly contradicted the bold claim made by Herbert Gerigk in the foreword to the *Lexikon der Juden in der Musik* in 1940 that "Die Reinigung unseres Kultur- und damit auch unseres Musiklebens von allen jüdischen Elementen ist erfolgt."⁵⁰ It also highlights the considerable difficulty that faced Nazi officialdom in prescribing which elements of musical modernism could, or could not be tolerated. Since music remains an essentially abstract form of artistic communication, there was enormous room for ambiguity in the messages it transmitted to its audience – an ambiguity that enabled principled composers to maintain their personal integrity, despite the turbulent political environment in which they were working.

50 Herbert Gerigk: Vorwort, in: *Lexikon der Juden in der Musik. Mit einem Titelverzeichnis jüdischer Werke*, ed. by Theo Stengel and Herbert Gerigk, Berlin 1940, p. 5.

Inhalt

Vorwort 8

OPER IN BRAUNER ZEIT – DIE SITUATION 1943

Nils Grosch Populäres Musiktheater im ›Dritten Reich‹.
Zum Problem der politischen Deutung musikalischen Stils
und einer stilistischen Deutung von Verfolgung 13

Michael Baumgartner Die Staatsoper Unter den Linden unter
nationalsozialistischer Herrschaft. Repertoireopern,
Opernpremierer und Selbstzensur 23

Christian Mächler Szenen (k)einer Ehe. *Das Schloss Dürande*
am Zürcher Opernhaus und das ›Dritte Reich‹ 51

Erik Levi Resisting Nazism – Hartmann, Blacher and von Einem 78

Roman Brotbeck Zwischen Opportunismus, Bewunderung
und Kritik. Die französischen und schweizerischen
Berichte zum Mozart-Fest 1941 in Wien 96

»BOCKMIST«? – SCHOECKS »DAS SCHLOSS DÜRANDE«

Simeon Thompson Hermann Burte als ›Nazi-Dichter‹.
Zur Auseinandersetzung mit dem Librettisten von *Das Schloss Dürande* 117

Beat Föllmi »Othmar Schoeck wird aufgenordet«.
Schoecks Flirt mit dem nationalsozialistischen
Regime und die Reaktionen in der Schweiz 130

Leo Dick Gegen eine Logik des Fortschreitens. Das ›total
Präsentische‹ in Schoecks Opern als Modell für eine
zeitgemäße Musiktheaterkonzeption 146

Thomas Gartmann »Wenn aber diesen äußerlichen, von Burte verschuldeten
Schönheitsfehlern abgeholfen wäre, so hätten wir gewiß eine der prachtvollsten
Opern der neueren Musik.« Versuch einer Rückdichtung 158

Thomas Gartmann im Gespräch mit Mario Venzago und Francesco Micieli
Zurück zu Eichendorff! Eine poetische Rückdichtung 197

REZEPTION IM WANDEL

Ralf Klausnitzer »Deutscher aller deutschen Dichter«?
Joseph Eichendorff in der NS-Zeit 219

Angela Dedié Die Geschichte des Joseph Süß Oppenheimer, genannt Jud Süß.
Hintergründe der Uraufführung in der Auseinandersetzung mit der
romantischen Novelle Jud Süß und dem gleichnamigen
nationalsozialistischen Propagandafilm 254

Robert Vilain Hofmannsthal und das ›Dritte Reich‹.
Rezeption und fiktive Historie 267

Chris Walton Farbe bekennen. Schweizer Künstler
und der Apartheid-Staat 286

Chris Walton/Ralf Klausnitzer/Ulrike Thiele/Erik Levi/Mario Venzago
Verdammen, vergeben, verdrängen, verfremden? Ein Gespräch
über den Umgang mit Werken der NS-Zeit 312

Namen-, Werk- und Ortsregister 327

Die Autorinnen und Autoren der Beiträge 341

»ALS SCHWEIZER BIN ICH NEUTRAL«
Othmar Schoecks Oper *Das Schloss Dürande*
und ihr Umfeld • Herausgegeben von Thomas
Gartmann mit Simeon Thompson unter
redaktioneller Mitarbeit von Daniel Allenbach

MUSIKFORSCHUNG DER
HOCHSCHULE DER KÜNSTE BERN

Herausgegeben von Martin Skamletz
und Thomas Gartmann

Band 10



Dieses Buch ist im April 2018 in erster Auflage in der Edition Argus in Schliengen/Markgräflerland erschienen. Gestaltet und gesetzt wurde es im Verlag aus der *Seria* und der *SeriaSans*, die von Martin Majoor im Jahre 2000 gezeichnet wurden. Gedruckt wurde es auf Eos, einem holzfreien, säurefreien, chlorfreien und alterungsbeständigen Werkdruckpapier der Papierfabrik Salzer im niederösterreichischen Sankt Pölten. Das Vorsatzpapier *Caribic cherry* wurde von Igepa in Hamburg geliefert. *Rives Tradition*, ein Recyclingpapier mit leichter Filznarbung, das für den Bezug des Umschlags verwendet wurde, stellt die Papierfabrik Arjo Wiggins in Issy-les-Moulineaux bei Paris her. Das Kapitalband mit rot-schwarzer Raupe lieferte die Firma Dr. Günther Kast aus Sonthofen im Oberallgäu, die auf technische Gewebe und Spezialfasererzeugnisse spezialisiert ist. Gedruckt und gebunden wurde das Buch von der Firma Bookstation im bayerischen Anzing. Im Internet finden Sie Informationen über das gesamte Verlagsprogramm unter www.editionargus.de. Zum Forschungsschwerpunkt Interpretation der Hochschule der Künste Bern finden Sie Informationen unter www.hkb.bfh.ch/interpretation und www.hkb-interpretation.ch. Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über www.dnb.de abrufbar.

© Edition Argus, Schliengen 2018. Printed in Germany ISBN 978-3-931264-90-1