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Abstract

With Germany’s unconditional surrender on May 8, 1945, the Office of Military Government, United States (OMGUS) prepared to implement the most ambitious cultural re-education program it had ever undertaken. An examination of classical music culture in West Berlin reveals how the American Military Government used classical music as a tool for re-education and re-orientation. Between the years 1945 and 1949, the American agenda evolved from combating Nazism to containing Communism, as alterations in music control policies reflected the incipient Cold War. An analysis of concert repertoires, interviews, musical scores, photographs, program notes, radio broadcasts, and governmental correspondence, exposes how American authorities altered the performance context of German classical music. The early postwar experience of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, under American cultural officer John Bitter’s guidance, exemplifies the irony of encouraging greater artistic freedom through increased censorship and control, providing an illuminating case study with regard to American cultural re-education efforts. As the primary ensemble residing in the American sector, the Philharmonic would be complicit in its own symbolic domination, to borrow Pierre Bourdieu’s term, by acquiescing to certain American Military Government requirements in order to resume concertizing, such as performing for American troops and agreeing to certain alterations in personnel.
By the end of 1947, as tensions increased between American and Soviet forces, Berlin’s cultural life became a new battleground as each occupier vied for the support of German artists and audiences. The evolving role of American occupying forces within Berlin’s political culture was paralleled by their treatment of German arts organizations, as the agenda shifted from a punitive position to one of patronage in the span of a few short years. Although much scholarship on postwar Berlin has rendered its ruins simply as allegories for the moral depravity of a nation, I believe we can instead locate a productive tension within the city’s destruction. Berlin’s cultural Wiederaufbau occurred not over but rather within the ruins of the cityscape, transforming the ruin from a passive space to a site of negotiation, renegotiation, and even transgression.
Introduction

By the conclusion of World War II, Germany had been reduced to a pre-modern society. The aerial bombing of the Allies, as well as the brutality of the Nazi Regime, exacted an inconceivable material and human toll.\(^1\) In Berlin, the former *Hauptstadt* of the Third Reich, the population starved and huddled in cellars hoping to survive the city’s brutal Soviet take-over at the end of April 1945. Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels’s “One-Thousand Year Reich” had come to an end nine hundred and eighty-eight years early. Although survivors, perpetrators, and historians have extensively documented the events of 1933 to 1945, the immediate aftermath of National Socialism requires further attention. Many scholars have used the fall of the Third Reich as simply a starting point for discussions of Soviet-American Cold War hegemony, in which little room is left for the Germans themselves.\(^2\)

But what are we to make of the particular events that took place in postwar Berlin, as the city was carved into four sectors and each Ally embarked on separate plans for

---


German reconstruction, both in the physical and cultural sense? Rubble could be cleared away and homes rebuilt, but how would the Allies monitor German culture to ensure there would not be a revival of Nazism? The Americans occupiers, in particular, believed that music, as “the most German of the arts,”\(^3\) needed vigilant monitoring to ensure it remained devoid of any unwanted political subtexts. This dissertation explores how the Americans perceived their role as cultural re-educators in a city whose musical culture had been the most highly politicized in all of the Third Reich.

In May of 1945, the United States believed that only through extensive control of all forms of German media (radio, music, literature, film, and theater) could all traces of National Socialism be eradicated. Because the Nazis had particularly mobilized Germany’s classical musicians for propaganda purposes, the American Military Government, known as the Office of Military Government, United States (OMGUS), made special provisions for the treatment of music in the postwar era, as

Only a few people outside of Germany were familiar with political leaders like Hess, Ley, Ribbentrop, etc., but artists like Richard Strauss, Gerhard Hauptmann, and Wilhelm Furtwängler were internationally known and recognized. Today it may be said that Hitler’s success in using these prominent cultural figures has decisively contributed to the prestige of the Nazi Regime.\(^4\)

The Americans, more than any other Ally, considered the German musical establishment’s relationship to fascism a dangerous problem and designed their cultural re-education programs with this in mind. Significantly, authorities ultimately wanted to re-educate through the medium of classical music, not American jazz or popular music,

\(^4\) Benno Frank, “Theater and Music as a Principle Part of Re-orientation in Germany,” 16 September 1947, RG 260, Box 241, Slide 29, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division (E&CR): Records Relating to Music and Theater, National Archives and Records Administration II. Hereafter abbreviated NARA II.
as the Military Government felt it was absolutely necessary to prove that American high culture was as refined as Germany’s.

Seemingly without pause, cultural life in Berlin thrived in the summer of 1945 as the Allies settled into their respective zones. Even if hundreds of instruments, scores, and opera costumes were still hidden in salt mines outside the city, performances resumed within weeks of Germany’s surrender. Because Berlin had been bombed into a pockmarked moonscape, with three in every four concert venues destroyed, performances took place in any remaining movie theaters, churches, parks, town hall buildings, and over the radio.5 As one British audience member mused after hearing the Berlin Philharmonic in July, “In the midst of such shambles only the Germans could produce a magnificent full orchestra and a crowded house of music lovers.”6 But the Fall of 1945 gave way to the start of denazification, a process that would use many valuable American resources and personnel, and one that would not come to an end until 1947, coinciding with the deterioration of the Soviet-American relationship. American music control policies shifted in light of the incipient Cold War, as the agenda in postwar Germany evolved from combating Nazism to containing Communism.

By analyzing concert repertoires, interviews, musical scores, photographs, program notes, radio broadcasts, and governmental correspondence, this dissertation demonstrates how American authorities re-appropriated the performance context of German classical music to play a symbolic role in Cold War politics. As tensions increased between American and Soviet forces, Berlin’s cultural life became a new battleground as each occupier vied for the support of German artists and audiences. The

5 For a more nihilistic viewpoint on postwar German culture, see Schivelbusch, In a Cold Crater, x, 20-24.
evolving role of American occupying forces within Berlin’s political culture was paralleled by their treatment of German arts organizations, as the agenda shifted from a punitive position to one of patronage in the span of a few short years.

This study represents a departure from earlier work in that it focuses primarily on West Berlin and considers both denazification and re-education efforts of the American Military Government. The leading musical ensemble residing in the American sector was the Berlin Philharmonic, and consequently, much of the re-education efforts were based around the Orchestra’s activities, rather than encouraging new music ensembles or sponsoring the avant-garde. This contrast is all the more apparent when compared with American initiatives in Darmstadt, where the Military Government generously funded the city’s Internationale Ferienkurse für Neue Musik (Darmstadt International Summer Courses for New Music) providing some 20% of the budget.7

**Classical Music and National Identity**

In order to examine how and why the American Military Government was concerned with German musical culture, one must first consider the role of music within German history. Classical music had been a vital force in the creation of a distinctly German national identity since the early nineteenth century. As Pamela Potter, Celia Applegate, and Karen Painter note, the perception of Germans as “the people of music”8

---

7 For more on the avant-garde in West Germany, see Amy Beal, *New Music, New Allies: American Experimental Music in West Germany From the Zero Hour to Reunification* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 1-105; and Gesa Kordes, “Darmstadt, Postwar Experimentation, and the West German Search for a New Musical Identity,” in *Music and German National Identity*, edited by Pamela Potter and Celia Applegate (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 205-17. For the first session of the Darmstadt school in 1946, American soldiers loaded a grand piano into a Jeep and drove the instrument to the top of the hill to a castle where the school was held.

was not formed solely by German composers, but in tandem with the work of German
statesmen, writers, critics, impresarios, demagogues, and audiences.\(^9\) Although Germany
was not unified as a modern nation-state until 1871, the compositions and writings of
Richard Wagner (1813-83) became synonymous with a German national style of music.
His festival at Bayreuth was considered the crowning achievement in German musical
culture.\(^10\) As Historian Neil Gregor astutely contends:

> As scholars have never tired of observing, the Bayreuth festival has
> become a potent symbol of the vicissitudes of German history since the
> late nineteenth century, a palimpsest upon which successive iterations of
> what it means to be German have been repeatedly inscribed and re-
> inscribed.\(^11\)

Unfortunately for Wagner’s legacy, an Austrian who also had an interest in what
it meant to be German found his music dramas appealing. Seeing himself as a Siegfried-
like figure, Hitler began to take interest in Bayreuth after visiting the Wagner family
home in 1923. The festival re-opened in 1924 after a ten-year hiatus, and by 1936 Hitler
insisted the festival take place annually instead of biannually, pledging 500,000
Reichsmarks for each new staging.\(^12\) One need only reflect upon the 1935 Nuremberg
Rally, framed by Wilhelm Furtwängler conducting *Die Meistersinger*, the same rally at
which Hitler promulgated the Nuremberg Race Laws, formally excluding Jewish citizens
from German public life, to realize how highly politicized Wagner’s music became under
the National Socialists.

---

9 Ibid., 3-27. See also Karen Painter, *Symphonic Aspirations: German Music and Politics, 1900-1945*
Identity*, 11-12.
Twisted Muse: Musicians and Their Music in the Third Reich* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 35-
38; and Pamela Potter, *The Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to
the end of Hitler’s Reich* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 27.
It was not only Wagner’s music that received this treatment; the entire German classical music establishment was re-organized to serve the interests of the regime. With their ascent to power in 1933, the Nazis consolidated cultural organizations under the umbrella of the Reichskulturkammer (Reich Chamber of Culture, or RKK), to regulate all forms of artistic expression in Germany. Under the direction of Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels, the Nazis planned to use the RKK’s seven branches to monitor Fine Arts, Film, Literature, Music, Press, Theater, and Radio. Richard Strauss agreed to serve as President of the Reichsmusikkammer (RMK), the RKK section devoted to the development of Germany’s professional musicians. Strauss held the position until 1935, when the Gestapo intercepted a letter to Stefan Zweig, his Jewish librettist, in which Strauss claimed to be merely “playacting” as RMK president. He was forced to resign by Goebbels for insubordination.

By 1937, the RMK had nearly 100,000 members, as the organization stabilized wages for classical musicians and saved several musical institutions and ensembles, including the Wagner Festival at Bayreuth and the Berlin Philharmonic, from bankruptcy. During the 1930s and early 1940s, the Reich’s orchestras, conductors, and soloists disseminated propaganda by concertizing throughout Germany and occupied territories. (The Berlin Philharmonic alone travelled extensively throughout occupied Europe, concertizing in Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, France, Holland, Italy, Poland,

---

Romania, Serbia, and Spain.)\(^{15}\) At home in Germany, the performance of works by Beethoven, Bruckner, and Wagner at Nazi party functions only underlined the grisly paradox of German *Kultur* and Nazi racist ideology. Throughout 1943-44, concerts and performances continued even as opera houses in Berlin, Munich, Dresden, Leipzig, Frankfurt, and Hamburg were destroyed; the pace of concert life began to slow only with Goebbels’ August 1944 declaration of “total war.”\(^{16}\)

By the time of Germany’s unconditional surrender on May 8, 1945, the country had been reduced to a mountain of rubble; its infrastructure decimated and population starving. The famed Weimar Republic writer Erich Kästner noted in his diary, “The Third Reich kills itself. Its corpse, however, is Germany.”\(^{17}\) Berlin was divided into four sectors ruled by the Allied Kommandatura and the Allied Control Council, consisting of representatives from the Soviet Union, America, France, and Great Britain.\(^{18}\)

Although it was advantageous not only for the Allies, but also for the postwar intellectual elite, to maintain that the surrender was a *Stunde Null* (Zero Hour) that marked an entirely new chapter in German history, as more recent scholarship has shown, there were far more continuities than previously acknowledged.\(^{19}\) In particular,


\(^{17}\) Erich Kästner, *Gesammelte Schriften für Erwachsene, Notabene 45*, vol. 6 (Zurich: Atrium Verlag, 1969), 82. “Das Dritte Reich bringt sich um. Doch die Leiche heißt Deutschland.”

\(^{18}\) The Federal Republic of Germany was not created until May of 1949; even then it was not a sovereign republic. The Allied High Commission (composed of representatives from the Western Allies) reserved the right to revoke German governance, and largely controlled the economy, legislation, and foreign trade. For more information on German Foreign Policy, see Helga Heftendorn, *Coming of Age: German Foreign Policy Since 1945* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006), 9-48.

continuity of personnel was a massive concern as the Allies embarked on their respective denazification programs.

**A Reading of the Secondary Literature**

While historians Elizabeth Janik, David Monod, and Toby Thacker have developed valuable and insightful approaches to analyzing postwar musical culture, there has yet to be a musicological study of classical music in Berlin’s postwar period.  

While Thacker focuses primarily on denazification in a thorough study of East and West Germany from 1945 to 1955, Janik’s monograph details Berlin’s musical institutions from 1855 until 1990 and gives less weight to the political ramifications of the occupiers’ cultural policies. Monod’s work targets music and theater officers at the region levels, presenting a compelling picture of the Information Control Division’s influence in the immediate postwar era. (The Information Control Division (ICD) was created by the American Military Government in order to monitor postwar German cultural life from 1945 until 1949.)

Several scholars have also undertaken thorough studies of visual and media culture as propaganda during 1945 to 1955. Cora Sol Goldstein examines the American Military’s usage of atrocity propaganda to combat fascism through the creation of *Die Todesmühlen* (The Death Mills), an American-produced documentary film about the death camps, shown throughout Germany during the Fall of 1945. On the other end of


21 Photographic evidence of the death camps, gathered by U.S. Signal Corp photographers, was used by the American Military Government as part of its “atrocity propaganda” campaign. *Die Todesmühlen* (The
the spectrum, Goldstein also explores the importation of Hollywood films into West Germany, as the Military Government sought to project “an exportable image of America.”

Dagmar Barnouw also explores the interaction between the Allies and the German people through visual mediums, analyzing the work of *Life Magazine* and American Signal Corp photographers as they documented Germany’s destruction.

Larry Hartenian’s work deals with the OMGUS effort to control radio and press in postwar Germany and the irony “that flowed from the modern use of propaganda to create a democratic public sphere in postwar Germany.” Similarly, Jessica C.E. Gienow-Hecht writes of the pervasive American influence on German *Hochkultur* (high culture) through the OMGUS-supported, Munich-based paper, *Neue Zeitung* (1945-55). The paper’s editors (including German émigré Hans Habe) hoped that *Kultur* would be the key to building a democratic German society.

*Neue Zeitung* aimed to attract a wide German readership by publishing articles that covered postwar cultural developments. Whether pertaining to the media or music branch, by emphasizing the American support of German *Kultur*, authorities hoped to win the hearts and minds of the German people.

Death Mills), the most notorious documentary film made by the Americans for German re-education purposes, featured grisly shots of human hair piles, teeth, bones, and corpses. Director Billy Wilder, serving as Berlin’s ICD film officer in August 1945, cut the documentary down to twenty-two minutes, and the film was released in October of 1945. By screening the film in public movie theaters throughout Germany, Military Officials hoped to extinguish any lingering allegiance to Nazism, and to awaken a sense of collective guilt in German audiences. Unsurprisingly, the film was staggeringly unpopular with the German public, as American authorities concluded with chilling detachment that *Die Todesmühlen*, “was decidedly not a box office success.” Cora Sol Goldstein, *Capturing the German Eye: American Visual Propaganda in Occupied Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 54-57.

Ibid., 4-5.


Only recently have scholars turned to examining the complicated political relationships between the Allies and the implementation of their respective cultural agendas. A major component of earlier scholarship focused on the blacklisting of famous musicians for their Nazi party affiliations, and as a result, the literature discussing controversial figures like Wilhelm Furtwängler, Herbert von Karajan, and Richard Strauss is exhaustive. As more about the political and cultural relationships between the Allies and the Germans is uncovered, however, one must also be wary of misleading interpretations about musical culture in the Third Reich. One often encounters the misleading claim that at the end of the War, “Music of composers such as Igor Stravinsky, Paul Hindemith and Carl Orff was played again.” In actuality, the music of all three of these composers was played in Nazi Germany during the 1930s. Orff, in particular, was a favorite of the Nazis between the years of 1940 and 1944. Stravinsky was a savvy businessman, and as late as 1938 he was still trying to secure an invitation from his publisher (Schott & Sons) to conduct his music in Germany. Finally, although Hindemith left Nazi Germany in 1938, it was not for his lack of trying that the National Socialists were dismissive of his compositions.

Ultimately, the gap that emerges most clearly in earlier monographs about

---


postwar music is a lack of engagement with the repertoire. Although compositions are mentioned in passing, there remains to be a more nuanced discussion concerning why particular composers or works were promoted by the Americans in postwar Germany. While Aaron Copland and Samuel Barber were among the most frequently performed American classical composers, why were their works chosen as appropriate for German re-education? Were they well received by a Berlin populace, or merely dismissed as American cultural propaganda? And how were the younger generation of Berlin composers, like Boris Blacher and Gottfried von Einem, influenced by the American occupation?

Furthermore, a theoretical framework in which to analyze the emergent postwar German-American discourse is necessary. Given the American Military Government’s literal and cultural occupation of West Germany in the postwar period, Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic violence is useful in this context. According to Bourdieu, “Symbolic violence is the coercion which is set up only through the consent that the dominated cannot fail to give to the dominator”; it is precisely this consent that makes symbolic domination possible. Symbolic capital is the currency through which submission is “purchased.”29 In the postwar period, classical concerts, regulated by OMGUS, serve as sites for symbolic domination, with classical music acting as the symbolic capital. Furthermore, as Foucault has noted, “What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn’t only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge,

produces discourse.”30 The power the Americans possessed in the postwar period was the ability to reframe the context occupied by classical music under the National Socialists. In choosing classical music as a tool for rehabilitation and re-education, OMGUS and the State Department hoped to display the United States’ cultural competence, for, as Bourdieu writes in Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste, “taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier.”31

This dissertation consists of five chapters organized according to various cultural facets of the American occupation in Berlin. The first two chapters deal with the American denazification (1945-47) and re-education (1947-49) programs. Chapter I, “The American Military and Classical Music Culture in Berlin, 1945-47,” explores the early American cultural agenda in occupied Berlin, interrogating how authorities implemented an intensive plan of music control through denazification and censorship. Of primary concern is how and why the Information Control Division (ICD) was created to oversee German musical culture. American music officers, employed by the ICD, were responsible for monitoring musical life, registering performers, and licensing all venues in postwar Germany. Berlin, in particular, was assigned special status in the re-education project as music officers sought to promote American classical music among West Berlin ensembles.

The second chapter, “The Germans as a Kulturvolk?: German Musical Reorientation (1947-49),” is concerned with the ICD shift in policy from combating Nazism to containing Communism. Recognizing they needed a more visible presence in

Berlin, the ICD created the Visiting Artist Program, approved in March of 1948, which allowed American musicians to concertize throughout Germany “to prove that life in the United States is conductive to American musical authorship.”\(^{32}\) The Visiting Artist Program was meant as a rebuttal to Soviet propaganda, although the outcome of the concerts was generally counter to the ICD’s re-educational aims. In particular, Chapter II considers the varied Jewish responses to American violinist Yehudi Menuhin’s 1947 Berlin visit, an angle that has been largely omitted in the *Rezeptionsgeschichte* (History of Reception). Ultimately, the Visiting Artist Program met with limited success as few leading American artists (with the exception of Menuhin) wanted to concertize in postwar Germany because of its recent Nazi past.

Chapter III, “From *Horst Wessel Lied* to *Stars and Stripes Forever*: The Berlin Philharmonic and the American Military Government,” is a case study of the relationship between the Philharmonic and ICD cultural officers. The early postwar experience of the orchestra, supervised by officer John Bitter, exemplifies the irony of encouraging greater artistic freedom through increased censorship and control. Acquiescing to the will of the American Military Government, the Philharmonic frequently performed American music for Allied troops with American officers conducting. Personal and professional boundaries blurred, as the Philharmonic became the Military Government’s most valuable pawn in their re-education efforts.

The fourth chapter, “The Ruin as an Artistic Catalyst in the Compositions of Blacher, Hartmann, and Strauss,” takes a theoretical approach, investigating the postwar ruin of Germany and how it influenced the creation of new musical and visual artworks.

Boris Blacher, a West Berlin composer who had weathered the city’s destruction, used this experience to compose music for *Die letzten Tage von Berlin* (The Last Days of Berlin) a *Hörspiel* (radio play) about the city’s fall to Soviet troops. Munich’s Karl Amadeus Hartmann wrote his final work for piano, *Sonate 27. April 1945* after watching Dachau prisoners on a death march to evade American liberation. His sonata combines Jewish liturgical music with Beethoven’s *Lebewohl* (Farewell) motive from Piano Sonata no. 26 in E-Flat Major op. 81 to convey the resilience of the first culture and the ruin of the later. Lastly, the chapter will examine how the destruction of Germany was foremost on Richard Strauss’s mind in his final years, and how his late works represent the attempt to normalize the ruin by composing in rich strains of Neo-classicism, especially evident in his study for twenty-three strings, *Metamorphosen* (1945). Whether through the denazification process, patronage, or simply discussions with American officers, the occupation influenced the compositions of Blacher, Hartmann, and Strauss in unexpected ways. Although much scholarship on postwar Berlin has rendered the ruins simply as allegories for the moral depravity of a nation33, I believe we can instead locate a productive tension within Germany’s destruction.

The fifth and final chapter, “Radio in the American Sector (RIAS) and Re-educational Musical Programming,” explores the American control of Berlin’s airwaves. Apart from RIAS, the Military Government also founded Armed Forces Network (AFN) to compete with the Soviet’s Radio Berlin. RIAS defined its policies largely in opposition to the Russians, becoming the primary station for OMGUS to disseminate propaganda by featuring a variety of musical broadcasts, news programs, and reports. Throughout 1946, the ICD began expanding classical music’s role in Berlin’s radio

programming, as there was “a strong radio competition and the necessity for the Drahtfunk (wired radio) to stand out as a cultural instrument.”34 Through German musicologist Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt’s RIAS broadcasts, Berliners were reintroduced to the music of Hindemith, Schoenberg, Webern, and Weill.

Ultimately, this dissertation explores not only the American military and political interventions in Berlin but also the American occupation of the city’s resilient artistic culture. Much as a phoenix rising from the ashes, Berlin’s cultural Wiederaufbau (reconstruction) occurred not over but rather within the ruins of the cityscape, transforming the ruin from a passive space to a site of negotiation, renegotiation, and even transgression. By controlling all facets of cultural life in “their” sector of West Berlin, the Military Government re-politicized classical music culture between the years of 1945 and 1949.

Chapter I

The American Military and Classical Music Culture in Berlin (1945-47)

In August of 1945, Nicolas Nabokov returned to Berlin, wedged in the backseat of a dusty Military Government-issued Jeep. As he entered the city, Nabokov found little left to recognize from his time studying at the Hochschule für Musik some twenty-three years earlier; the Berlin of Nabokov’s memory had been obliterated, crushed completely under forty-five thousand tons of Allied bombs.¹ Recruited by the American Military Government to be an intelligence officer, Nabokov was among those charged with overseeing the Wiederaufbau (reconstruction) of music, theater, and film in postwar Berlin. By assisting in the denazification of actors, artists, and musicians, Nabokov and the American Military Government hoped to purge Germany of all traces of pro-Nazi sentiment. At one postwar party, an over-served American General even introduced Nabokov to a colleague by whispering, “He’s hep on music and tells the Krauts how to go about it”²; what the General failed to establish was if “the Krauts” were, in fact, listening.

This chapter will explore the early cultural agenda of the American Military Government (1945-47) in occupied Berlin, and how American authorities attempted to implement an intensive plan of music control through denazification and censorship. In considering the broader cultural agenda of American authorities in postwar Germany, this

¹ Today, the school is known as the Hochschule für Musik Hanns Eisler Berlin.
² Nicolas Nabokov, Old Friends and New Music (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1951), 258. Nicolas was a first cousin of writer Vladimir Nabokov.
chapter investigates how cultural officers, American civilians with military privileges, were charged with eradicating any lingering traces of Nazism in the cultural sphere. In discussing music control policies put forth by the American Military Government, this chapter interrogates how and why authorities took such care with the close supervision of classical music. Although America might have defeated Nazi Germany militarily, there was a lingering fear that when it came to Hochkultur, the Americans would always be second, or worse yet, third best when compared to the Germans or to the Soviets.

With Germany’s unconditional surrender on May 8, 1945, the Office of Military Government, United States (OMGUS) embarked on its first cultural re-education program. Military Government control policies sought to alter the postwar performative context of German classical music and to promote American classical music to the German public. Perceiving German music as deeply tainted by Nazi ideology, American authorities wanted to reformat classical music as a deeply humanistic art and one that espoused the ideals of democracy instead of fascism. (Political Scientist Cora Sol Goldstein’s term “Democratization by force” underscores the irony of encouraging greater artistic freedom through increased censorship and control.) But in attempting to rehabilitate the Germans, American authorities struggled to define their role in German cultural politics. In the summer of 1945, as American troops staged variety shows in Wagner’s Festspielhaus, to whom did the country’s classical music tradition belong?

---

3 OMGUS was officially created on October 1, 1945. As the peacetime equivalent to its predecessor, Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Forces (SHAEF), OMGUS was responsible for the governance of postwar West Germany and the American sector of Berlin.
The initial phase of the American re-education plan was to simply monitor all forms of German *Kultur*, and OMGUS pegged the city of Berlin, as the former *Hauptstadt* of the Third Reich, to play a vital role in the cultural rebirth of Germany. In a July 12 press conference, Secretary of War Robert Patterson outlined that all forms of communication and public entertainment, including radio broadcasts, films, concerts, operas, and theater performances would be carefully watched, as “Those agencies were used by the Nazis to impress their ideas on the German people. Without the most careful supervision, they might again be employed by die-hard Nazis to continue the struggle against us.” The Military Government sought to reframe the performance context of German classical music by censoring all concert repertoires, approving music personnel, promoting American music, and licensing all ensembles.

Still, in May of 1945, American planners were uncertain what to do with Germany. As decreed by Joint Chiefs of Staff directive 1067 (JCS 1067), the end of the war signaled the beginning of the four D’s: denazification, democratization (which would involve re-education and then reorientation), demilitarization, and decentralization. Beyond that, however, the practical aspects of how to proceed were fraught with difficulties and uncertainty. Postwar planners clashed on what path to take in Germany’s

---

6 There were, of course, varying opinions on how German musical re-education should proceed. One cultural officer, W. Phillips Davison, believed that re-orientation could only occur through the musical stylings of Gilbert and Sullivan, writing, “I am convinced that once the German people hear and understand these chef d’œuvres the world will no longer be troubled with thoughts of Nazism and militarism.” Davison also proposes that the English text should be translated into German. His suggestions were not taken. W. Phillips Davison, “Re-orientation of Germany through Medium of Gilbert and Sullivan,” 5 August 1946, RG 260, Box 134, Slide 116, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Central Decimal File of the Executive Office, 1944-49, NARA II.

7 “Abstract from the Acting Secretary of War’s Press Conference,” 12 July 1945, RG 260, Box 63, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Records of Information Services Division Staff advisor, 1945-49, NARA II.

rehabilitation, fluctuating between the desire for “hard peace,” that is, the return of the
country to an agrarian society, as advocated by Secretary of the Treasury, Henry
Morgenthau, and “soft peace,” or a more lenient approach advocated by the War and
State Departments and one which permitted the speedy reconstruction of the German
economy.9 Above all, there was a pervasive fear of a German uprising, and the anxiety
over a possible Nazi revival led the American Military Government to create the
Information Control Division (ICD).10 As the peacetime equivalent of the Psychological
Warfare Division11, the ICD considered it of paramount importance to “establish sound
psychological and cultural weapons with which to destroy the Nazi philosophy and
promote a genuine desire for a democratic Germany through theater and music.”12

The Information Control Division was to conduct an entirely new and seemingly
contradictory experiment. It would attempt to control all forms of mass media presented
to the conquered civilian population in order to promote a democratic political ideology.
Considering its branched organizational structure, the ICD was not wholly unlike the
Nazi Reichskulturkammer (Reich Chamber of Culture), which, according to Heinz
Roemheld, an early chief of the ICD’s Film, Theater and Music section, actually served
as its basis.13 The ICD consisted of six branches in total, five of which monitored radio,

---

also Cora Sol Goldstein, Capturing the German Eye: American Visual Propaganda in Occupied Germany
10 Judt, Postwar, 1-40, 112.
11 During the early 1940s, the Psychological Warfare Division tried to undermine support for war effort by
dropping information pamphlets over Germany that advocated local resistance to the Nazis.
12 “For Immediate Release,” 3 July 1947, RG 260, Box 43, Records of the Information Control Division
(ICD): Records of Division Headquarters, 1945-49, NARA II.
/goldstein.html. It is important to note, however, that while the organization of the ICD and RKK were
similar, their aims greatly differed. In a memorandum to Robert McClure, head of the ICD, Heinz
Roemheld wrote that the long-term objectives of theater and music reorientation were to “Devise plans to
expand repertoire, especially the performance of works by composers and authors of other nations, to bring
film, theater and music, press, and publications, while the sixth branch, intelligence, was responsible for denazification.  

Brigadier General Robert McClure, as head of the ICD and former leader of the Psychological Warfare Division, cautioned, “Again I want to say that our policy has been to go slowly at first, bearing in mind that the Germans are still a conquered and discredited nation, and that it lies with us, not them, to call both the key and pace of the tune.” The ever-methodical McClure decided to implement a three step approach to denazification and re-education in postwar Germany: first, a complete halt to all forms of communication and public performance; second, an OMGUS seizure of these mediums and the re-starting of concert life; and third, a gradual return of these outlets to German control. McClure took a hardline stance in regard to German re-education, which can best be seen in his attitude toward Die Neue Zeitung, an OMGUS sponsored newspaper printed especially for German civilians. McClure’s journalistic sensibilities were outweighed by what he considered to be the American military duty: to introduce democracy to the German people. In correspondence with Die Neue Zeitung’s editor, German émigré Hans Habe, who wanted to create a cosmopolitan newspaper for a Kulturvolk (People of culture), McClure retorted, “The Germans have ceased to be a civilized people…The Germans do not have to form their own opinion—the Germans have to be told.” McClure’s unyielding views on re-education clashed with General Lucius D. Clay, who was the American Military Governor of occupied Germany. Clay believed

home to the Germans the realization of the fact that music and theater are international arts," 12 September 1945, RG 260, Box 134, Slide 41-42, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Central Decimal File of the Executive Office, 1944-49, NARA II.


15 “Director of Information Control Services,” 2 August 1945, RG 260, Box 133, Records of the Information Control Division: Central Decimal File of the Executive Office, 1944-1949, NARA II.

the German civilian population would have to take responsibility for its actions and should be allowed a limited measure of autonomy.

Despite the restructuring of cultural life, the ICD believed “only free competition of art in Germany will open the minds of the Germans to the fact that they are but a member in the family of nations.” The “free competition” is a reference to the structural organization of the Nazi Reichskulturkammer; under National Socialism, each nomination in theater and music had to approved by the RKK, ensuring control over every appointment from the director to the stagehands. Theater and music in postwar Germany were especially seen as “a medium of re-education and reorientation…In order to accomplish this end, it will, of course, be necessary to make available all those foreign works which have been banned for the last 12 years.” The cultural and intelligence officers, whose task it was to promote previously forbidden music and regulate German musical institutions, were stationed throughout the German Länder (federal states). Experts in their respective fields, often officers were European émigrés or Americans who had lived extensively abroad; all had been selected due to their exposure to prewar German culture. Especially in Berlin, the ICD vetted theater and music officers to ensure that “top ranking experts” would be placed in the city “to guarantee the best representation of U.S. interests in this field toward the German public and toward the other Allied powers.”

19 Music and Theater Officer appointment files can be found in RG 260, Box 243, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Records of the Division Headquarters, 1945-49, NARA II.
As one of the foremost intelligence officers in Berlin, Nicolas Nabokov (discussed at the opening of this chapter) possessed a compelling life narrative. Born into White Russian nobility, he fled the country during the Revolution, moving first to Greece, then to Germany, France, and America. Along the way, he worked as a composer for Diaghilev’s Parisian Ballet Russes, lived with photographer Henri Cartier-Bresson in New York, and embarked on a lifelong friendship with Igor Stravinsky and Sergei Prokofiev. In 1939, he became a United States citizen, having moved to America to teach at Wells College and St. John’s College in Annapolis.20

Also stationed in Berlin from 1945-47, Theater and Music officer Frederick Mellinger was a Berlin-born émigré who had been a respected Weimar playwright and theater owner, managing the Schaubühne in Munich and the Tribüne in Berlin.21 Walter Hinrichsen, stationed in Berlin from 1946-47, had been born in Leipzig, and as a Verlag Peters employee and a Jew, Hinrichsen left Germany in the 1930s to open Verlag offices in New York and London.22 John Evarts, a music officer first in Munich and then Berlin from 1947-49, had studied in Germany before the Nazis rose to power, while Film, Music, and Theater officer Eric Clarke had worked as the administrative secretary of the Metropolitan Opera in New York City. Lastly, the Chief of the Theater and Music Section, Benno Frank, had worked with Berlin’s Volksbühne during the Weimar era, the


21 “CAF Rating Mr. Mellinger,” 15 August 1946, RG 260, Box 243, Music and Theater Officer appointment files can be found in the Records of the Information Control Division (ICD); Records of the Division Headquarters, 1945-49, NARA II.

same theater that would later serve as the premier venue of the Soviet sector. Although based in Berlin, Frank was responsible for coordinating the ICD’s regional offices.

The officer most instrumental in the city’s cultural Wiederaufbau was John Bitter, head of Berlin’s Theater and Music section from 1945-48. After graduating from the Curtis Institute in the 1930s with a degree in conducting, he lived for a year in Vienna, freelancing as a saxophonist and learning German. He led various Florida orchestras before becoming an Intelligence Officer with the 9th Army in 1942, and at the war’s conclusion, he decided to remain in postwar Germany as a Music Officer. His first and last assignment was in Berlin.

Though the pairing of Kultur and military rule would seem to be an odd one, at the height of the re-education project, the ICD employed thirty-five cultural officers and 150 German employees to monitor culture in Berlin. Although massively understaffed, the klein, aber fein (small but fine) music officers were entrusted with an ambitious plan: to re-educate and reorient the local population by altering the performative context around German classical music. Effectively, this meant there would no longer be musical performances to commemorate former Nazi Holidays, and no marches or songs with patriotic themes would be performed at any time. Horst Wessel Lied, the Nazi party anthem, would no longer open concerts; and music that had been particularly favored by the Regime would be carefully monitored to ensure it was not misappropriated.

Music officers took music control seriously because the ICD’s perception in 1945 was that musical life in Germany from 1933-45 had been culturally barren, its very

---

23 Monod, Settling Scores, 102.
24 Ibid., 13, 38. In the 1930s, Bitter conducted the Jacksonville Orchestra, the Florida Federal Orchestra, and the Miami Symphony Orchestra.
25 “Application for Employment, John Bitter,” 25 June 1949, RG 260, Box 18, Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, NARA II.
essence tainted and manipulated by Nazism. But despite the ICD’s certainty that the Third Reich had successfully eradicated all music by unsuitable composers, i.e. Jewish, foreign or modernist composers like Hindemith and Webern, the Third Reich’s policies were uneven and inconsistent. Historian Alan Steinweis has observed that the Reichskulturkammer, with its competing factions and frequent conflicts between Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels, Staatsoper oberster Dienstherr (chief officer) Hermann Göring, and Chief Ideologue Alfred Rosenberg, was not able to censor all aspects of cultural production; consequently, there was a greater freedom within musical circles than previously thought.

In Pamela Potter’s seminal essay, “What is ‘Nazi Music’?,” she dispels the conception that modern music was widely banned during the Third Reich, instead illustrating that a panoply of styles prevailed with no unified doctrine about what constituted “Nazi music.” Particularly shocking are her findings that there was no official effort to eradicate twelve-tone and atonal music. She contends the myth that no modern music was performed during the Third Reich was a fiction born of the postwar period, a creation of the German intellectual elite and cultural officers who found this interpretation better suited to their respective agendas as victims or liberators. Although it was advantageous for the Allies to maintain that the Stunde Null (Zero Hour) marked a radical break from the cultural climate of 1933-1945, there were far more continuities

---

26 For more on this misconception, see Pamela Potter, “What is ‘Nazi Music’?,” in Musical Quarterly 88 (Fall 2005), 428-55.
27 Göring was also Commander-in-Chief of the Luftwaffe (Air Force).
28 For example, although Reichsmusikkammer (Reich Chamber of Music) President Peter Raabe decreed in 1939 that the music of all enemy nations was now banned in Germany, as late as February and March of 1944, the Berlin Philharmonic was still performing works by Chopin, Dvořák, and Ravel.
than discontinuities. Ultimately, the contemporary conception of what “Nazi music” was would greatly misinform ICD policy. In Adorno’s March 1945 essay, “What National Socialism has done to the Arts,” he contends,

> It would be erroneous to assume that there ever sprung into life a specific musical Nazi culture. What was profoundly changed by the system was the function of music which now openly became a means to an end, a propagandistic device or an ideological export article among many others.

Although Adorno’s essay concerns music from 1933 to 1945, one could argue that he is presciently anticipating the control of classical music in postwar Germany as a thinly disguised re-education tool.

---


On June 8th, exactly one month after the alleged Stunde Null (Zero Hour), a document entitled “Draft Guidance on the Control of Music” outlined the ICD’s stance concerning classical music:

The principles governing our control policy are simple. It is above all essential that we should not give the impression of trying to regiment culture in the Nazi manner. Such an

---

The flyer announces the American Military Government take-over of printed materials, radio, theater, and music, ordering anyone involved in these enterprises to register with American authorities by August 30.

attempt would in any case be doomed to failure. German musical life must be influenced by positive rather than negative means, i.e. by encouraging what we think beneficial and crowding out what we think dangerous…\textsuperscript{33}

The irony of this statement is that the ICD \textit{did} intend to greatly influence musical life, and required every performer to be registered with the Allied authorities, every concert program screened, and each venue to be licensed from September 1945 until May 31, 1947.\textsuperscript{34} Furthermore, the ICD banned all Nazi and German Imperial Army marches and songs of the Nazis and former German Imperial Army with the passage of Law no. 191.

“Draft Guidance” also stipulated that “the performance of particular pieces, otherwise harmless, should however be prohibited on certain occasions.”\textsuperscript{35} The document forbid performances on Hitler’s birthday of Beethoven’s \textit{Eroica Symphony}, Strauss’s \textit{Ein Heldenleben}, and Wagner’s \textit{Siegfried Idyll}; “solemn music” on the \textit{Heldengedenktag} (Heroes Commemoration Day) was also banned.\textsuperscript{36} (Although the document does not specify what is meant by “solemn music,” the \textit{Heldengedenktag} was often celebrated with radio broadcasts of marches.)\textsuperscript{37} The singling out of these works is significant as later ICD documents rarely reference concrete examples. Not only were these pieces performed on Hitler’s birthday, but the slow movement of Beethoven’s \textit{Eroica Symphony} was also broadcast over the radio when Hitler’s suicide was announced on April 30, 1945. (His birthday only ten days prior had been celebrated with broadcasts

\textsuperscript{33} “Draft Guidance on the Control of Music,” 8 June 1945, RG 260, Box 134, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Central Decimal File of the Executive Office, 1944-49, NARA II.
\textsuperscript{34} “Scrutiny of Music and Theater Programs,” 24 November 1945, Ibid.
\textsuperscript{35} “Draft Guidance on the Control of Music,” 8 June 1945, Ibid.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
of Beethoven’s Seventh Symphony.)\textsuperscript{38} When played within a certain context, the American Military Government feared Beethoven would once again evoke associations with Hitler.

General concerns about the works of Beethoven, Strauss, and Wagner were not unfounded ones, as the performance of their compositions at Nazi party functions only underlined the grisly paradox of German \textit{Kultur} and Nazi racist ideology.\textsuperscript{39} Historian Alan Steinweis, who has extensively researched Nazi cultural policy, writes, “Whether working for their own sakes, for the sake of the \textit{Volk}, or purely for the sake of art, German artists reassured their countrymen that the land of Hitler could indeed still be the land of Goethe, Schiller, and Beethoven.”\textsuperscript{40} The ICD also cautioned that even non-German music could be used as militarist propaganda, and instructed music officers to remain vigilant to prevent “musical sabotage.” According to the ICD, Chopin’s Etude op. 10 no. 12, nicknamed the “Revolutionary Study” (1830-32) and Sibelius’s \textit{Finlandia} (1899) could evoke anti-Russian sentiment.\textsuperscript{41} The document continues:

Our main endeavour must be to introduce or re-introduce the German public to the large musical world from which they have been cut off for so long. We should encourage as soon as possible the performance of operatic, instrumental and vocal works by:

\textsuperscript{40} Steinweis, \textit{Art, Ideology, and Economics}, 176.
\textsuperscript{41} Though never substantiated, classical music lore has it that Chopin composed op. 10 no. 12 as a response to the Russian takeover of Warsaw. Similarly, Sibelius’s \textit{Finlandia} is also widely regarded as a resistance work written by the Finnish composer against Russian oppression.
a. German composers prohibited under the Nazi regime for racial or political reasons (e.g. Mendelssohn, Hindemith, Meyerbeer, and Offenbach);
b. Composers from outside Germany.42

Consequently, many of the first concerts in occupied Germany featured Mendelssohn, including the first Berlin Philharmonic concert on May 26th.43 (In Munich especially, musicians were so eager to proclaim their anti-fascism by playing Mendelssohn that one cultural officer complained, “The Mendelssohn situation has become critical, ridiculous, and urgent,”44 as nearly every Philharmonic concert opened with an overture from the composer.) One could view the rapid return of Mendelssohn’s music across Germany as either an opportunistic attempt by ensembles to curry favor with the Allies, or simply a sign that musicians were eager to once again perform his works.

Apart from formerly Entartete Musik (degenerate music), the ICD also planned to promote American music in Germany. A list including 35 American composers was attached to “Draft Guidance on the Control of Music,” including Samuel Barber, Aaron Copland, Cole Porter, and Duke Ellington.45 The incorporation of jazz and popular composers on the list would prove to be in striking contrast to the ICD’s later policies concerning American music promotion. By 1946, the sound of the reorientation project would be primarily tonal, accessible American classical music like Barber and Copland.46

The ICD’s policies on what German repertoire they sought to encourage, from

43 Thacker, Music After Hitler, 34.
44 Quoted in Ibid., 76.
46 Monod, Settling Scores, 118.
their inception, were far more specific than even the Reichskulturkammer concerning what music it sought to promote. The music branch felt that artistic freedoms could be maintained only through such rigidity. Among the selections the ICD considered suitable were “Sonatinas by Schubert, trios and quartets by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Brahms, Dvořák, and so on.” As the ICD explained, these works, “have not been accepted as part of the Nazi canon of German culture.” The emphasis on chamber music leads one to ponder if the ICD was rejecting the idea of musical monumentality, battling against the monolithic works of Beethoven and Wagner that the National Socialists had so readily mobilized as propaganda. Furthermore, the reduced performing forces of quartets and trios made these works a more feasible option in a time of scarce resources.

The Americans and Russians Vie for Berlin

By the time American forces arrived in Berlin on July 11, nearly 75 percent of the city’s buildings had sustained major damage from Allied bombing. As the occupiers entered the city, carving it into four sectors, the popular saying “Enjoy the war, the peace will be awful,” seemed especially apt. Despite the destruction of the cityscape, the Soviets, who had already occupied Berlin for two months, had done much to rebuild musical life. The Staatskapelle had given a radio performance only days after Germany’s

---

48 Ibid.
surrender, the Staatsoper had been performing since June\textsuperscript{51} and the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, as discussed further in Chapter III, had already resumed concertizing under Leo Borchard, newly appointed by the Soviets as \textit{Generalmusikdirektor}.\textsuperscript{52} Given the current situation in the Soviet Union, where culture was used a method of social control, the Russians recognized immediately its importance in postwar Germany. Berlin’s musical community quickly accepted Russian cultural officers as equals, as the Russian conservatory tradition had literally developed from the German model. Furthermore, the fact that the Soviets had an established tradition of performance and composition placed them in good standing with German cultural figures.

While the Russians focused their attention on the East Berlin districts of Friedrichshain, Köpenick, Lichtenberg, Mitte, Pankow, Prenzlauer Berg, Treptow, and Weißensee, the Americans took up residence in the southwest-lying districts of Neukölln, Kreuzberg, Tempelhof, Schöneberg, Steglitz, and Zehlendorf.\textsuperscript{53} The French were given Reinickendorf and Wedding, while the British occupied Charlottenburg, Spandau, Tiergarten, and Wilmersdorf.

\textsuperscript{51} The first postwar opera in the American Sector, Rossini’s \textit{Barber of Seville}, was staged at Rathaus Friedenau on August 12, 1945. The opera was scaled down and performed as a chamber opera without full chorus, in an arrangement by Cornelis Bronsgeest. Bronsgeest directed the opera and sang the role of Count Almaviva. Of the performance, critic Christian Weickert wrote, “The attempt was an adventure, but the success justified him (Bronsgeest).” The opera was performed before a full house, which also featured representatives from American Military Government and the \textit{Kammer der Künstschaffenden}. “Die erste Opernaufführung,” August 12, 1945, Rep. 280 LAZ 5501-5800, Landesarchiv, Berlin.  
\textsuperscript{52} Monod, \textit{Settling Scores}, 70-75.  
\textsuperscript{53} Although Berlin was divided into four sectors, in the early years of the occupation it was still possible to pass from sector to sector with the correct documentation.
It could not have been an accident that the Soviets would acquire most of the city’s theaters and concert halls. (In fact, the imbalance caused ICD Theater and Music Officer Frederick Mellinger to lament, “The lack of equilibrium, or lack of fair play is deplorable.”) Although it may seem unusual that *Kultur* was regarded so highly at a time that 80 percent of Germans would later consider the worst years of their lives (1945-48), it was often the only escape from the harsh realities of postwar life in Berlin, where

---

“goods, not culture, were in short supply.”

Table 1.1: Berlin’s Theaters and Concert Venues (1945-55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Theater Name</th>
<th>Bezirk (District)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soviet</td>
<td>Admiralspalast</td>
<td>Mitte (At Friedrichstrasse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deutsches Theater / Kammerspiele des deutschen Theaters</td>
<td>Mitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haus des Rundfunks, (Until 1956, when it was ceded to the Western Allies)</td>
<td>Charlottenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haus der Kultur der Sowjetunion (Former Singakademie location)</td>
<td>Mitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolosseum</td>
<td>Prenzlauer Berg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Märchen Theater</td>
<td>Mitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropol Theater (Renamed Komische Oper in 1947)</td>
<td>Mitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prater (Affiliated with the Volksbühne)</td>
<td>Prenzlauer Berg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staatstoper (Not reopened until 1955; concertized in the Admiralspalast)</td>
<td>Mitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theater am Schiffbauerdamm (Today the Berliner Ensemble)</td>
<td>Mitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volksbühne</td>
<td>Mitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Haus am Waldsee</td>
<td>Zehlendorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hebbel Theater</td>
<td>Kreuzberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rathaus Friedenau</td>
<td>Friedenau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schlosspark Theater</td>
<td>Steglitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thalia Theater</td>
<td>Kreuzberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Titania Palast</td>
<td>Steglitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>Kammerspiel Charlottenburg</td>
<td>Charlottenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kammerspiel Spandau</td>
<td>Spandau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Komödie</td>
<td>Charlottenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neues Theater</td>
<td>Spandau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renaissance Theater</td>
<td>Charlottenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rheingauttheater</td>
<td>Wilmersdorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schiller Theater</td>
<td>Charlottenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schaubühne</td>
<td>Charlottenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Städtische Oper (Today renamed Deutsche Oper)</td>
<td>Charlottenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theater des Westens</td>
<td>Charlottenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theater in der Kaiserallee</td>
<td>Wilmersdorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theater Wilmersdorf</td>
<td>Wilmersdorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theater in der Witzlebenstrasse</td>
<td>Charlottenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribüne</td>
<td>Charlottenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Corso Theater</td>
<td>Wedding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


57 Information on Berlin’s music and theater venues is held in RG 260, Box 239, Records of the Education and Cultural Resources Branch: Records Relating to Music and Theater, NARA II.

58 The theater’s license was withdrawn for a breach of denazification policy and reverted to a Catholic Parish in August of 1946. J.D.A. Lamont, “Berlin Information Control Unit,” 16-31 August 1946, RG 260 Box 238, Slide 313, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division: Records Relating to Music and Theater, NARA II.
By 1946, the Russians still controlled seven municipal theaters, the Americans two, and the British only one; the other theaters were privately run although personnel and repertoire still had to be Allied-approved. The Soviet equivalent to the ICD was the cultural section of the Soviet Military Administration of Germany (SMAD), spearheaded by Lieutenant Colonel Alexander L. Dymschitz. SMAD’s Music Specialist was Sergei Barsky, assisted by General Nikolai Bersarin.\(^59\) Theater and Music officer Henry Alter recalled in an interview the Janus-faced approach the Russians took to governing Berlin:

Actually the Russians were in many respects, if one does not take into account the violent first weeks, quite humane as administrators of the occupied city…Especially in the cultural domain, because at the same time, in other respects, they actually left the city to starve and also freeze to death.\(^60\)

The Soviets, along with German communists, founded the *Kulturbund zur demokratischen Erneuerung Deutschlands* (Cultural League for the Democratic Renewal of Germany) on July 3, 1945.\(^61\) The *Kulturbund*, whose clubhouse was a located at 2-3 Jägerstrasse, became the premier meeting place of musicians and intellectuals in the postwar years. The Soviets immediately began to cultivate the idea of the German-Soviet Community of artists; the ICD created no such corresponding organization. Members of the *Kulturbund* received coupons for food and drink, an immeasurable perk

---

\(^59\) Bersarin was killed in a motorcycle accident in June 1945. The Friedrichshain location of the incident is named after him in tribute, *Bersarinplatz.*

\(^60\) Henry Alter, interview by Brewster Chamberlain and Jürgen Wetzel, May 11, 1981, B Rep. 037, Nr. 79-82, Landesarchiv, Berlin. “Überhaupt waren die Russen in mancher Beziehung, wenn man einmal von den Gewalttaten der ersten Wochen absieht, recht human als Verwalter einer besetzten Stadt…Besonders auf kulturellem Gebiet, denn sie haben ja tatsächlich auf anderer Ebene zu derselben Zeit die Stadt verhungern und auch erfrieren lassen.” For a brief period Alter also reported to Nicolas Nabokov, of whom he admitted, “Wir sind nicht sehr gut miteinander ausgekommen.” (We did not get along with each other very well.) All translations are by the present author unless otherwise noted.

when the average Berliner was subsisting on roughly eight hundred calories per day.62 (The coupons were redeemable at Kulturbund cafe, attached to the venue at Jägerstrasse.)

Although the American Military Government sought to match the offerings of the Soviets, they were usually a few steps behind as theater and music officers found Soviet generosity hard to match.63 ICD music control policies were, from the start, doomed as they came from a defensive rather than an offensive mindset. Where the Soviets viewed art and culture as a way to cement their partnership with the Germans, the ICD felt high art should be monitored because of its misappropriation during the Third Reich.

The progress of the Soviet re-education program was undoubtedly a source of competition for American cultural officers, who scrambled to recover their lost ground. Henry Alter, the first theater and music officer in Berlin, arrived on July 6th. (The previous day, Alter had been in Halle, where he was over-whelmed by the number of civilians who wanted to come with them to Berlin and escape Halle’s imminent Russian take-over.) Following orders, Alter left Halle early the next morning, driving his jeep on what was left of the Autobahn. He arrived late in the evening to Berlin’s Zehlendorf, a residential, south-west lying district that was in the American sector. Because there was not a facility with a roof large enough to accommodate them, Alter and the other officers ate outside in an army field kitchen.64

Along with Davidson Taylor, Alter was assigned to lead the music branch until John Bitter arrived in August. (In civilian life, Taylor was CBS’s head of classical music

---

broadcasting.) Viennese by birth, Alter thought he would remember Berlin from his
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childhood, believing his knowledge of the city would make him a valuable asset. But,
much like Nabokov, he found that the Berlin of his memories no longer existed. He
began screening German musicians for work permits, ordering music, and searching for
venues and instruments. Fortunately, Alter found his work with the Germans quite
friendly from beginning, recalling, “The Germans were like a discovered feast for the
Americans. There was always an affinity between us.” 66

Apart from their efforts to monitor postwar German cultural life, the Military
Government was also responsible for the redistribution of materials like scores, costumes,
art, and instruments. During the war, salt mines had become common repositories for
these items to protect them from Allied bombings. 67 Although they may have been safe
from aerial attacks, the goods were far more susceptible to pillaging, and many of these
caches were depleted once discovered. In August of 1945, J.H. Hills, an Assistant
Colonel with the Adjutant General’s Department, reported to the Berlin ICD office:

After a recent visit to the salt mine near Heimboldshausen, Lt. Colonel
Warren F. Munsell reported on the storage there of thousands of
orchestra scores of operas, symphonies, and other musical compositions.
These scores in part have been rifled by DP’s (Displaced Persons) and
others and it is possible they will undergo further depletions unless
measures are taken to inventory them, and place them in locked mine
galleries which are available. 68

65 Monod, Settling Scores, 18, 22.
Apart from seven tons of scores, the *Vereinigte Kaliwerke* Salt mine also housed some 120,000 costumes.\(^6\) By November, unable to locate the persons who had originally placed these items in storage, the ICD removed three truckloads of scores to become “the nucleus of a zonal lending library” in Frankfurt,\(^7\) and thirteen authorized German civilians organized the costumes. American cultural officers decided to give some of the costumes to the Soviet-controlled Staatsoper and British-controlled Deutsche Oper to stage *Eugen Onegin, Don Giovanni, Fidelio, La Boheme, Madame Butterfly, Orpheus, Tales of Hoffmann*, and *Rigoletto*.\(^7\) The performances of *Tales of Hoffmann*, written by Jewish composer Jacques Offenbach, and Mozart’s *Don Giovanni*, with a text by Jewish-Italian librettist Lorenzo Da Ponte, were particularly significant re-introductions for Berlin’s cultural life in 1946.\(^7\)
Questions were still lingering into the Winter of 1946, however, as to whom the remainder of the scores and costumes legally belonged. When Colonel Tjulpanov, the Soviet Chief of Berlin’s Propaganda Division, requested that the ICD return thousands of additional costumes to the Soviet-controlled Staatsoper and related theaters, his request was denied on the grounds that over 2,000 opera costumes had already been returned to

---

73 “Vorankündigungen des Deutschen Opernhauses,” September 1945, Slide 0033, Rep F280, 305-1384, Landesarchiv, Berlin. Note the scheduled performance of Beethoven’s *Eroica* on September 15, 1945. Although in Music Control Document no. 1 the ICD pegged the *Eroica* as a piece not to be played on Hitler’s birthday, the Americans were not opposed to its performance in general.
the Staatsoper, thus meeting the theater’s needs. Subsequently, the ICD maintained that because the costumes were discovered in the American zone, they were technically property of the United States. By the Spring of 1946, the remaining costumes and scores were distributed to theaters and opera houses under American control.

Apart from the return and redistribution of costumes, the musical scores of various Berlin institutions were also scattered across the countryside. Berlin’s Staatsbibliothek (state library) had evacuated most of its music manuscripts, hiding them in various castles throughout Germany. Cultural officers from the ICD’s Restitution Section compiled a memorandum listing the Staatsbibliothek’s hidden manuscripts and their current locations:

**Schloss Banz (Franken)**

Bach
- Various Cantatas
- Piano book of Anna Magdalena Bach
- Violin Sonatas, Inventions
- Christmas Oratorios

Beethoven
- Symphony no. 4
- Symphony no. 8, mvt. I
- Sketches for Symphony no. 10
- String Quartet op. 59 no. 1 in E-minor
- String Quartet op. 130 in B-major

---

Brahms
Violin Concerto

Busoni
Countless Autographs

Haydn
String Quartets and other compositions

Mendelssohn
Symphony no. 4

Mozart
Idomeneo, one act

Schumann
Symphony in D Minor
Violin Concerto

**Kloster Arnsburg (Oberhessen)**
Copies of various manuscripts

**Schloss Laubach (Hessen)**
The compositional sketches of Johann Sebastian Bach’s students

**I.G. Farben Plant at Offenbach/Main**
Manuscripts, first editions, and newly printed music

**Salt mine at Huttdorf (Hessen)**
Newly printed music

Although these scores were eventually returned to the Staatsbibliothek, not all Berlin institutions were so lucky. Countless scores burned or were looted from destroyed buildings and concert halls. The return of existing scores was so important because printed music was exceedingly difficult to replace. In the American zone, the only music publishers with music remaining at the end of the war were Kassel’s Bärenreiter and two Heidelberg firms, Hochstein and Süddeutscher Musikverlag. Although Bärenreiter’s building burned down two weeks before the end of the war, the publishers had already
moved much of their stock to a vault nearby where it survived the fire intact. The firms in Heidelberg had retained their music because the city was spared Allied bombing.\textsuperscript{78}

Without the aid of American cultural officers and their networks of communication between the various \textit{Länder} (federal states), many of the manuscripts, musical scores, costumes, instruments, and works of art would have been lost to posterity. Furthermore, the Americans cracked down on looting of German goods, a practice that was openly employed by the Soviets who took many instruments and works of art back to Russia.\textsuperscript{79}

While ICD cultural officers stationed in Germany were responsible rebuilding and enforcing directives, the War Department also had a field office in New York headed by composer and administrator Harrison Kerr. Although Kerr was supposed to order and ship the materials requested by officers in Germany, his own predilections often got in the way. When cultural officers requested non-American music, or even the music of Paul Hindemith or Ernst Krenek, Kerr refused, preferring to send Copland, Barber, and occasionally own scores to postwar Germany. As a result, officers in Berlin attempted to navigate control policies by ordering music from Switzerland or England, often paying out of their own pockets.\textsuperscript{80} But apart from the ordering of new materials and the return of old, the American Military Government still had one massive bureaucratic stalemate that lay in waiting under Berlin’s rubble: denazification.


\textsuperscript{79} For more on the Soviet practice of looting, see Erich Hartmann, \textit{Die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null: Erinnerungen an die Zeit des Untergangs der alten Philharmonie vor 50 Jahren} (Berlin: Werner Feja, 1996), 29-36, and Nicholas, \textit{The Rape of Europa}, 327-406. Soviet troops were infamous for their looting of Germany’s art treasures, and vice versa. It was not until 1990, when Russia and Germany made the General Relations Treaty, that there were provisions for how each country would return the looted art. Konstantin Akinsha, “A Soviet-German Exchange of War Treasures?,” \textit{ARTnews} 9/5 (May 1991): 134-139.

\textsuperscript{80} Monod, \textit{Settling Scores}, 119.
Denazification

Intelligence officer John Backer was furious. After wading through a pool of German applicants to select a secretary, he was told his choice would not receive American Military clearance. He retorted to the junior officer, I asked who can be hired? He said you can only hire people who were actively engaged in the resistance. Then, I said, I will have to do my recruiting in the cemetery…What I know now of the denazification program: it was a catastrophe of the first order.81

The process of denazification in postwar Germany was fraught with ambiguities and contradictions, as OMGUS struggled to categorize those who had been complicit with the fascist regime.82 Beginning in August of 1945, the Intelligence Section of the ICD began screening civilians for denazification in Berlin’s American sector. Any German applying for a performing arts job was required to fill out four personal questionnaires, four business or career questionnaires, three Military Government questionnaires, and four work form applications; paperwork could take anywhere from three weeks to six months to process. Complicating the OMGUS denazification effort in the arts sector were fundamentally different organizational principles between the United States and Germany. In America, while many musical institutions were privately funded, German arts organizations generally depended on public subsidies to survive. Furthermore, the German government had traditionally appointed upper-level arts administrators, a practice that during the Nazi era became even more complex as the

81 "Interview with John Backer, Intelligence Officer, 82nd Airborne Division,” MG Officer Import/Export Branch, Economic Division, OMGUS, B Rep. 037, Nr. 79-82, Landesarchiv, Berlin.
82 For information about the denazification process in Austria, see Thomas Eickhoff, „Mit Sozialismus und Sachertorte…“–Entnazifizierung und musikpolitische Verhaltensmuster nach 1945 in Österreich,” in Riehmüller, Deutsche Leitkultur Musik?, 85-100. Herbert von Karajan was denazified in Vienna on October 25, 1947.
Ministry of Propaganda had to approve each nomination. Convinced that Nazism had tainted the arts, OMGUS hoped to encourage greater autonomy in the German cultural sphere and less reliance on government support. There was, of course, a certain amount of irony in that the ICD planned to accomplish this through an extensive, military-run education program.

Only one year after the ICD had begun denazification efforts, U.S. Intelligence had information on ten thousand Germans in the arts and media sector alone. Control Council no. 24, signed by all four Allies in Berlin, barred civilians who had held an office under the Nazis from working until they passed their denazification screening. Those who had undergone denazification were grouped into four categories: white, grey acceptable, grey unacceptable, and black. Those on the white list were allowed to hold any position, and those classified as grey acceptable could hold any job except an executive post. A placement on the black or grey unacceptable list meant that one could only perform manual labor. Membership in the Reichskulturkammer was categorized as gray unacceptable by the American Military Government, and treated as equivalent to having been a nominal member of the Nazi Party.

If a musician had been a soloist or conductor and worked under the Nazis, however, their denazification became immediately more complicated. Since OMGUS was the only one of the four Allied powers that felt denazification should be stringently pursued, enforcing the blacklist across all four sectors of Berlin was nearly impossible.

83 Monod, Settling Scores, 29, 47-57, 102-17.
85 Monod, Settling Scores, 23-32, 100-02.
Furthermore, there were even disagreements among intelligence and music officers within the ICD as to how to proceed with denazification. On occasion, those who had been blacklisted in one region of the U.S. zone could continue to work in another, as in the case of conductor Hans Knappertsbusch. (Although blacklisted by Berlin’s Intelligence Section in October of 1945, he continued conducting Munich’s Staatsoper until this error was brought to the attention of John Evarts, the city’s commanding music officer.)

But despite temporary blacklisting, there were few lasting consequences for those musicians who had participated in musical life under the Nazis. By and large, musicians returned to the same positions they occupied during the Third Reich. By March of 1947, the Military Government decided to end the blacklisting started by the ICD. As a result, musicians like Knappertsbusch, who had been removed from their positions, were able to return to work. Deeply dissatisfied, Davidson Taylor, the first head of the ICD’s radio branch, admitted in 1947, “When I see the possibility of Gieseking returning…and hear about Furtwängler having great triumphs in Berlin, I wonder what role music can fulfill in the political re-education of the German people.” (Pianist Walter Gieseking and conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler were among the most sought-after musicians in all of the Third Reich.) Similarly, when Leonard Bernstein visited Munich in 1948 to give a series of concerts, he recalled an American officer joking that the denazification process

---

88 Ibid., 359-60.
89 Quoted in Monod, Settling Scores, 214.
was actually a “re-nazification.”

Meanwhile, the Soviet Military Government Propaganda and Censorship division lost no time in establishing its own denazification organization, Kammer der Kunstschaftenden (Chamber of Artistic Creation) on May 30, 1945. Located at 45 Schlüterstrasse, the same building that housed the former headquarters of the Reichskulturkammer, the Kammer der Kunstschaftenden registered artists, performers, musicians, and technicians to perform in the Soviet sector. The Americans, however, were disturbed by the lax Soviet denazification policies, as the Kammer der Kunstschaftenden employed Germans to denazify other Germans, a practice that would not be allowed in the American zone until 1946. As one ICD Music Officer complained, “it reflects a very real tendency on the part of the Germans, even those who were beaten and persecuted to within an inch of their lives by the Nazis, to let by-gones be by-gones, if ART is served.” It was widely known that it was easier to receive a work permit in the Soviet rather than in the American zone, thus planting the seeds of discontent that would bloom between American and Soviet forces in 1947.

The pace of the ICD denazification efforts began to slow by the summer of 1946. The occupation was already growing too costly and, as a result, OMGUS realized that it would have to employ what the organization deemed “politically reliable” Germans in the denazification process “to enable the German people to carry the burden of responsibility

---

92 Janik, Recomposing German Music, 99-106.
for its own future.”94 Prüfungsausschüsse (German examination boards) would now be responsible for recommending the musicians for registration, while ICD-approved Spruchkammern (civilian-handled denazification court) acted as localized denazification boards. Whereas the Prüfungsausschüsse employed German specialists in music and theater, the Spruchkammern comprised Germans from different professional backgrounds. In Berlin, the decisions of the Spruchkammern were still subject to approval by the Allied Kommandatura, the governing body of Berlin with representatives from all four Allies.95

While the denazification of personnel represented one challenge, what about performances of German music? Could music favored by the Nazis be purged of its associations with National Socialism? While music with militarist themes and the Horst Wessel Lied were banned outright, what did it now mean to perform Richard Strauss, Beethoven, Bruckner, or Wagner, composers whose work had become conflated with the monumentality of the Nazi project? Strauss and Hans Pfitzner were the most frequently performed 20th-century composers of the Third Reich,96 a fact acknowledged by the ICD in its “Draft Guidance for Music Control”:

We cannot ban performances containing works by Richard Strauss or Hans Pfitzner. We should, however, not allow such composers to be “built up” by special concerts devoted entirely to their works or conducted by them.97

Strauss’s music returned to the Berlin Philharmonic relatively quickly; on August 15, Borchard conducted Strauss’s Freundliche Vision, Morgen op. 27 no. 4, and Heimliche

---

95 Monod, Settling Scores, 44-95.
Aufforderung Nr. 3 with Tenor Peter Anders as the soloist. On December 10, 1945 under the baton of John Bitter, the Philharmonic performed a waltz from Strauss’s *Der Rosenkavalier*. Note that all of these selected works, however, are from Strauss’s early period, composed before his dealings with the National Socialists.

Wagner was also frequently performed by the Philharmonic in the postwar period. By the Fall of 1946, the Orchestra was again performing the *Tannhäuser* and *Der fliegende Holländer* Overtures. American guest artist soprano Marjorie Lawrence even performed the immolation scene from *Götterdämmerung* with the Philharmonic on December 30, 1946. The rapid return to composers whose music was idolized by the National Socialists was probably for pragmatic rather than dogmatic reasons. When “Draft Guidance” was written in early June, the document did not take into account the utter destruction of German cities. Consequently, all surviving musical scores were exceedingly valuable, making it even more difficult for cultural officers to limit repertoire. Furthermore, under a 1946 initiative of the Library of Congress, several American librarians were dispatched to postwar Germany to locate German musical scores that had not been available in the States during the war. In Berlin, they purchased primarily scores by Pfitzner and Strauss.

---

**Bitter Reports from Berlin**

John Bitter’s reports, submitted every two weeks to Chief Benno Frank, are invaluable in understanding the desperate living conditions that faced performers and cultural officers, especially in light of increasing Soviet-American tension. Apart from stating the performance location and the repertoire performed, they are dotted with anecdotes that reveal much about the cultural climate and the relationship between American authorities and Berlin's artists. On September 12, 1946, Bitter reported, “During the week, ration cards were requested by two elephants and two opera singers,” in a nod to the food shortages that plagued Berlin until conditions improved in 1949. Bitter often bemoaned that the Russians would give their artists extra rations, a practice not typically reciprocated in the American Sector.\textsuperscript{102}

As a sign of material shortage, Bitter recalled that at a December 1946 performance of the Thornton Wilder’s “Skin of our Teeth,” an audience member brought scissors and stole fabric that decorated the center box. He wrote in his report: “Warning, any person seen wearing a purple damask suit will be arrested on sight.”\textsuperscript{103} When a concert of 250 orchestral players at the German Rundfunkhaus was cancelled, according to Bitter, it was beneficial, for “Schubert's innocent 8\textsuperscript{th} Symphony certainly deserves a better fate.”\textsuperscript{104} And, when describing the opening of *Salome* at the British-controlled Städtische Oper, Bitter contended, “The original and colorful score is rather obliterated


\textsuperscript{104} John Bitter, “Theater and Music Report,” 4 December 1946, RG 260, Box 239, Records of the Education and Cultural Resources Branch, Records Relating to Music and Theater, NARA II.
by the distasteful subject matter,” and as for the staging, he compared the “Dance of the Seven Veils,” to “one of Minsky’s finer efforts on 14th Street,” alluding to an infamous New York City burlesque establishment.105

His flippant attitude toward these works reveals the skepticism with which he regarded Berlin’s institutions, revealing the inconsistencies of the American re-education program as a whole. If the re-education effort was predicated on mutual understanding and the fostering of ideas, than how could this be accomplished by an officer who referred to opera singers as elephants and the most famous section of Strauss’s *Salome* as resembling a burlesque show?

**Importation of American Music**

Perhaps Bitter’s prejudices toward the German opera tradition also reflect the growing ICD push to import American classical music. Bringing American music to postwar Germany was first suggested on May 23, 1945 by radio section head Davidson Taylor.106 An inordinately pragmatic man, Taylor recognized the host of difficulties in importing music to Germany, raising issues in his letter of how to secure rights and how to distribute American music in postwar Germany. Unfortunately, before a composition could be shipped, the State Department had to approve each work, costing the ICD valuable and irrecoverable time.107

As a result, the first bulk shipment of American classical music did not arrive in
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106 Davidson Taylor, “We are all grateful,” 23 May 1945, RG 260, Box 237, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division (E&CR): Records Relating to Music and Theater, NARA II.
Berlin until nearly a year after Davidson’s request, in April of 1946. Further complicating the process was that much of the music was shipped as microfilm and had to be reproduced once in Germany, a nearly impossible task given the severe paper shortage and lack of music publishers who had survived the war. Though importing music certainly posed logistical challenges, the ICD felt it was a vital step in their plans for German re-education.

The selected American music was meant to convey the homespun values the ICD sought to promote: freedom, self-determination, and most importantly, democracy. Furthermore, American music and theater offerings in Berlin were not only for the Germans; as political tensions escalated, they were also meant to convey American accomplishments to the other Allies in order to prove the United States was not a “primitive, vulgar, trashy Massenkultur; which was in effect an Unkultur (Non-culture) whose importation into postwar Europe had to be resisted.” As Benno Frank, Chief of the Theater and Music section, wrote:

Theater and Music in the U.S. Sector of Berlin is not only a media for re-orientation of the German people, but it seems the most effective means to inform our Allies of U.S. accomplishments in drama and music. It is a fact, confirmed by many Allied officers, that dramatists like Thornton Wilder, Sherwood, Saroyan, and composers like Copland, Schuman, etc., had not been known to them before they attended performances of works by these authors and actors in Germany.

---


The American classical music the music branch wished to promote by 1946 was generally tonal, accessible, and populist in style.\textsuperscript{111} The composers at the core of the reorientation project for Germany were Barber and Copland, followed by Gershwin, Harris, Ives, Piston, William Schuman, and Sessions.\textsuperscript{112}

On August 8, 1946, ninety-five works by American composers, including Barber, Copland, Harris, Ives, Piston, Quincy Porter, Schuman, and Thompson, arrived for use at the Inter-Allied Music Lending Library at Berlin’s Staatsbibliothek, which opened on September 28, 1946. The scores were available to any German ensemble, professional or amateur, that wished to rent the parts.\textsuperscript{113} Rental fees were assessed not only by the length of the work, but also by the size of the ensemble, and prices were separated into the following categories: 7 minutes, 15 minutes, 30 minutes, and upwards of 45 minutes. Copland’s Orchestral Suite \textit{Appalachian Spring} (1945), was the most popular rental in the first month of the library’s opening, rented a total of two times and earning 120 Reichsmarks; Barber’s \textit{Adagio for Strings} (1938) was rented once.\textsuperscript{114} For each American composition performed, ten percent of the concert revenue would be saved and placed in an Information Control Music bank account in order to ensure continued funds for the purchase of American music.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{111} Monod, “Americanizing the Patron State?,” in Riethmüller, \textit{Deutsche Leitkultur Musik?}, 53.
\textsuperscript{112} Howard Pollack, \textit{Aaron Copland: The Life and Work of an Uncommon Man} (New York: H.H. Holt, 1999), 455-60. Both Copland and Piston had studied with Nadia Boulanger in Paris, adding to their credibility with European audiences.
\textsuperscript{113} Eric Clarke, Benno Frank, and Walter Hinrichsen, “Review of Activities for Period 1 April 1947 to 31 August 1947,” RG 260, Box 241, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division (E&CR): Records Relating to Music and Theater, NARA II.
Conspicuously absent from Berlin’s lending library were works by Weill, Cole Porter, and Ellington; nearly any composer with jazz-influenced works was overlooked.\(^{116}\) Gershwin was the notable exception as his classical chops meant the ICD still approved of his music for re-education purposes.

The ICD’s reluctance to promote jazz, contrary to their initial plans, was most likely due to two reasons: first, American authorities did not want to call attention to the segregation of blacks and their disturbing treatment at home, a social issue the Soviets had already propagated among the German population. Secondly, it was a question of taste. The ICD wanted to beat the Germans at their own game, not with American jazz.\(^{117}\) The Americans sought to “destroy the existing belief among the Germans that all American music consists mainly of ‘hot’ jazz.”\(^{118}\)

But what effects did American classical music have upon the German population? Although the ICD’s efforts were undertaken in earnest to introduce American music, in a recent interview with Dr. Gottfried Eberle, former Musikredakteur (music editor) of RIAS, he admitted that contemporary American classical music “spielt keine Rolle” (Was not relevant) upon West Berlin’s young composers.\(^ {119}\) While the idea that the ICD could reeducate the “People of Music” by introducing an entirely new repertoire is at best naïve

---


\(^{117}\) Part of the shift in agenda also resulted in a change in personnel; Harrison Kerr, as the newly music administrator for the Civil Affairs Division, was responsible for shipping scores. He had the final word in all decisions, and also a very narrow view of what American music should be included. Monod, Setting Scores, 119.

\(^{118}\) The popularity of jazz music in Europe during this period is debatable, as it was favored only by a small group of intellectuals. A 1946 survey conducted by RIAS (Rundfunk im amerikanischen Sektor), the OMGUS sponsored radio station for West Berliners, revealed some 14% of Berliners polled complained there was actually too much jazz being broadcast. (Italics added by the present author). Radio survey results from October 1946 are held in, “Radio Usage Report, ISD,” RG 260, Box 34, Radio Control, Radio Policy File, 1945-1949, NARA II. See also Judt, Postwar, 384.

\(^{119}\) Interview with Dr. Gottfried Eberle conducted by the author. 27 January 2011, Berlin, Germany.
and at worst unbelievably arrogant, ultimately, the American Military Government actually did a great deal of harm to the ICD’s cause by fatally wounding Anton Webern.\(^{120}\) While visiting his daughter outside Salzburg, Webern stepped outside to have a cigar where, in the words of H.H. Stuckenschmidt, “he meets the deadly bullet of an occupation solider.”\(^{121}\) Though Stuckenschmidt’s verb choice seems innocuous enough, the bullet killed Webern upon impact. The shooter, an alcoholic Army cook named Raymond Norwood Bell, fired on Webern as the composer smoked outside his daughter’s cottage. Mistaking Webern for a witness who would expose his own blackmarket dealings, Bell was never charged and died deeply remorseful ten years later. Webern’s death was all the more poignant given he could have functioned as a valuable re-education ally for American authorities; as a composer whose works had been forbidden under the regime and one who wrote in a modernist idiom, Webern was exactly the kind of composer the Americans needed to start an effective re-education program.

The ICD also made several glaring errors in music promotion. Absent from the ICD’s 1945-47 re-education planning were two of musical modernism’s giants, Arnold Schoenberg and Paul Hindemith, both of whom had become United States citizens in 1946 and 1941, respectively. In the ICD’s zeal to proselytize the achievements of native-born American composers, it conveniently overlooked the works of émigrés who had

---

\(^{120}\) Though Webern had appealed to Nazi authorities, imploring them to see the merit in the twelve-tone method, the composer was unsuccessful in securing the support of the regime and his music was eventually banned. Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 73.

sought refuge in the United States. Chief Benno Frank feared the German public would perceive the work of any contemporary German artist as German, not American, protesting, “In my opinion, we should clearly distinguish between U.S. citizens appearing as U.S. artists, and former German citizens whose art is definitely German.”

This stance is especially odd, given that the initial plan for postwar German music, as outlined in “Draft Guidance on the Control of Music,” included Hindemith on a short list of composers to “re-introduce to the German public.”

The ICD missed an excellent chance to underscore that the United States had given many composers and performers a safe haven from Nazi Germany, and although Hindemith’s relationship to National Socialism was less than one of staunch resistance (“I have been asked to co-operate, and have not declined,” he wrote to Ernst Toch in 1933), in 1945 this was not widely known. Only in 1948, as discussed in Chapter II, was the ICD finally able to engage Hindemith in a series of lectures throughout Germany; this later victory again points to oversights in re-education efforts throughout the early occupation period.

In a report summarizing the ICD’s re-education progress through German music and theater, Benno Frank, Chief of the ICD contended:

With the rise of Nazism, theater and music guilds were abolished and theater and music as a whole came under the strict jurisdiction of the Reichskulturkammer, headed by Goebbels. This meant the end of a democratic theater in Germany, because every person employed in the fields of theater and music, starting from the Director down through every artist, to the last stagehand, had to be approved by the Reichstheaterkammer or the Reichsmusikkammer. Despite this, it can now be said that the Nazi regime did not

---

123 While the War Department suspected Hindemith had been more compliant with the Nazi regime than he admitted, music officers were unaware of this fact. Monod, Settling Scores, 115-26.
succeed in molding the media of theater and music to a successful propaganda instrument, because the German public, accustomed to the high standards and integrity of these media, did not respond to propagandistic performances unless they were of immediate dramatic value (which they, in general, were not). The main accomplishment of the Nazi regime thus was to eliminate from the leadership in the fields of theater and music the most prominent, articulate, and liberal personalities and the aryanization of the German theater as a whole.124

But if the Nazis had indeed failed to make “theater and music…a successful propaganda instrument,” then why did the American Military Government continue to invest in personnel and supplies to monitor German musical culture, denazifying artists and promoting American classical music? The answer was undoubtedly the shift in agenda from combating Nazism to containing Communism. From the swastika to the stars and scythe, German music was once again politicized and made, in Adorno’s words, “an ideological export article.”125 Although music officers like Nabokov may have been “hep on music,” the primary cultural goal of American occupational authorities was eventually to re-appropriate German classical music in the service of Cold War politics.

The following chapter will detail the American Visiting Artists Program, an initiative founded by the ICD to prove to the German population the quality of American musical achievement. By bringing American artists to concertize in postwar Germany, the ICD embarked on the second phase of German re-education. In actively engaging German musicians to perform with the Americans, however, there would be unexpected political consequences for both.

Chapter II

The Germans as a *Kulturvolk*: The Visiting Artists Program and German Musical Reorientation (1947-49)

This chapter concerns the Visiting American Artists Program sponsored by the ICD and the complicated cultural politics of the postwar period as the American agenda shifted from combating a resurgence of Nazism to containing Communism. As 1947 drew to a close and tensions only increased between American and Soviet forces, Berlin’s cultural life became the battleground as each occupier vied for the support of German artists and audiences. Recognizing it needed a more visible presence in Germany, the ICD created the Visiting Artist Program, officially approved in March of 1948. The program allowed American musicians to concertize throughout Germany in order “to prove that life in the United States is conductive [sic] to American musical authorship.”¹

The American occupiers’ evolving role within Berlin’s political culture was paralleled by their treatment of German arts organizations, as the agenda shifted from a punitive position to one of patronage. Just as Jane Fulcher has uncovered the impregnation of musical culture by political culture in *Fin-de-siècle* France², so too was Berlin’s cultural

---

life highly politicized in the years between 1947 and 1949.\(^3\) But the Visiting Artist Program was plagued from the beginning by various organizational and financial problems. Rather than a dazzling array of established American musicians willing to come to postwar Germany, the ICD had to settle for second-rate performers or younger, unknown artists who were hoping to embark on international careers. Despite the hope that “Each [artist] must be top-caliber indeed to appeal to musically well-educated German audiences,”\(^4\) the program fell far short of its primary aim: to display the strength of the American musical establishment to a skeptical German audience.

Of the three most successful re-education visits to postwar Germany by American artists, none were sponsored directly by Visiting Artists Program. Violinist Yehudi Menuhin’s visit to Berlin in 1947, conductor Leonard Bernstein’s performance with the Munich Philharmonic in 1948, and composer Paul Hindemith’s 1949 lecture tour, all provoked great interest in the German press and were considered extremely fruitful by American occupation authorities. Menuhin’s 1947 visit occurred under the Department of Army, in lieu of a still un-established Visiting Artist Program. Bernstein’s visit was due to a private invitation from Hungarian conductor Georg Solti to lead the Munich Philharmonic.\(^5\) Lastly, Hindemith’s visit was sponsored by the Visiting Experts Program, rather than the Visiting Artists Program, in the hopes the composer would give lectures.

---

\(^3\) The year 1949 marked the official end to the OMGUS occupation of West Germany, at which time the Office of the United States High Commissioner of Germany (HICOG) became responsible for American concerns within the Federal Republic until 1955. Elizabeth Janik, *Recomposing German Music: Politics and Musical Tradition in Cold War Berlin* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2005), 220.

\(^4\) Lucius Clay, “Cable: This Office does not wish to oppose,” 6 May 1947, RG 260, Box 45, Slide 25, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Records of the Director and Deputy Director 1945-49, NARA II.

\(^5\) David Monod, “Internationalism, Regionalism, and National Culture: Music Control in Bavaria, 1945–1948,” *Central European History* 33/3 (2000): 339-68. Solti was hired by the Americans in 1946 as musical director of the Munich Staatsoper. He was an invaluable re-education find; not only an outstanding musician, he was one of the few Jewish conductors willing to work in postwar Germany.
about the richness of America’s musical tradition.\textsuperscript{6} The visits of Menuhin, Hindemith, and Bernstein were instructive not only for the German civilians, but also to ICD cultural officers, who had not anticipated the effect they would have on Jewish survivors. Both Menuhin and Bernstein performed for Jewish Displaced Persons (DPs), Holocaust survivors who were awaiting repatriation or who were hoping to immigrate.\textsuperscript{7}

Although Menuhin hoped that as the first American performer to concertize in postwar Germany, and Jewish at that, he would be received in the spirit of reconciliation, his decision was roundly criticized by the international Jewish community. Due to his support of Furtwängler, whom Erika Mann (Thomas Mann’s daughter) branded, “Hitler’s favorite maestro,”\textsuperscript{8} Menuhin’s series of 1947 Berlin concerts were a particular constellation of events. As the first concert featuring a Jewish soloist with Furtwängler and the Philharmonic since 1935, American authorities hoped Menuhin’s visit would be instructive to the German population. Menuhin, on the other hand, possessed a dual desire to support German musicians and to bring attention to the plight of Jewish survivors.\textsuperscript{9} Although Menuhin may have believed that his music was a bridge between peoples, he had not anticipated its power to divide.\textsuperscript{10}


\textsuperscript{10} For more, please see Humphrey Burton, \textit{Menuhin: A Life} (Faber and Faber, 2000), 251-53, 282-86; and Yehudi Menuhin, \textit{Unfinished Journey} (London: Random House, 1991), 252.
Yehudi Menuhin

Menuhin was born in Brooklyn in 1916, the son of Jewish Russian immigrants. A child prodigy, he began serious study of the violin at age of five, under Sigmund Anker at the San Francisco Conservatory. Banking on their son’s talent, his parents moved the family to Paris in 1927 so that Yehudi could study with famed Romanian violinist George Enescu. By 1929, when he was thirteen, Menuhin made his debut with the Berlin Philharmonic under the baton of Bruno Walter. His last prewar invitation to play with the ensemble came as late as 1934, although Menuhin declined due to the untenable political situation.11

Menuhin was not only concerned with technical perfection and flawless musicality, but also in playing the role of a musical ambassador. During the Second World War he performed over 500 concerts for Allied troops,12 and in July of 1945, he and Benjamin Britten visited several former concentration camps to give performances for Jewish survivors. With Britten at the piano, their most memorable performance took place at Bergen-Belsen, now under the supervision of the British Army.13 Britten and Menuhin performed Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata, a Kreisler transcription of a Bach Prelude and Fugue, a piano reduction of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto, and Debussy’s La fille aux cheveux de lin (The Girl with the Flaxen Hair). They undoubtedly selected the repertoire to strike a careful balance between the German, Jewish, and foreign

11 In 1934 Furtwängler also invited Artur Schnabel and Bronislaw Huberman to appear as soloists, both of whom declined. “Nazi Plea Spurned by Violin Prodigy,” 5 January 1934, New York Times Archive. See also Menuhin, Unfinished Journey, 259.
13 The former Jewish deportees were lodged in what had been the Nazi Officers’ barracks.
composers. The haunting experience led Britten to compose the *John Donne Sonnets* as a tribute to the conditions he witnessed on their short tour.

But Britten’s and Menuhin’s goodwill gesture in the Summer of 1945 was not always perceived as such. After the pair played for 800 Polish Jewish refugees in Bardowiek, in central Germany, they were roundly criticized for their repertoire choice of Bach. In an anonymous report published in the *Jewish Chronicle* five years after the concert, a witness contended that the survivors largely:

> Resented and rejected the unaccompanied Bach he played. They expected and wanted to listen to such melodies as *Eili, Eili* and *Kol nidre* and popular tunes of their native Poland. It is because of this incident that Menuhin was labeled as cold and unsympathetic and his subsequent efforts on their behalf were looked on with disfavor.

The account portrays Menuhin’s choice of Bach as insensitive to the traumatic experiences of the Jewish survivors. In choosing to perform the melodies of the oppressors, Menuhin had inadvertently overlooked the complicated cultural politics of the postwar period, a miscalculation that would prove even more controversial during his 1947 visit to Berlin.

Before Menuhin agreed to the 1947 Berlin concerts, however, he wanted written confirmation from the Military Government assuring him that he could play with

---

15 Paul Francis Kilda, ed., *Britten on Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 230. In a later interview, Britten admitted the piece was written while he was lying in bed with a fever from an inoculation he received to visit the displaced persons camps.
Furtwängler leading the Berlin Philharmonic, and not with any other conductor. The violinist warmly regarded Furtwängler as an old friend in need of international support. Walter Hinrichsen, one of Berlin’s music officers and a Jew himself, flatly denied Menuhin’s request. The Americans were reluctant to promote Furtwängler in any way, as Colonel Kinard admitted, “OMGUS would be glad to sponsor Menuhin as part of the reorientation of Germans but under no circumstances would sponsor Furtwängler.”

Furtwängler, as discussed further in Chapter III, was a highly controversial figure in the postwar period, having led the Berlin and Vienna Philharmonics under National Socialism. Banned by the American occupational authorities in February of 1946 for his musical activities under the Nazis, he was eventually cleared of all charges in April of 1947 after a protracted denazification trial. Despite his re-instatement into German cultural life and his return to Berlin concert stages in May of 1947, Furtwängler’s case remained a highly disputed, despite his never having been a member of the Nazi Party.

American occupation authorities still regarded him with skepticism and had allowed for his denazification only to avoid losing him to the Russians who were eager to have him lead the Staatsoper.

Despite the American criticism leveled at the conductor, Menuhin had always been a staunch advocate for Furtwängler’s denazification, pleading in a December 5, 1945 *New York Times* article:

> If there is one musician who deserves to be reinstated...it is Furtwängler.

In all the time he directed in Berlin, he refused to give the Nazi salute at

---


concerts, as was expected of other conductors. And it is well known that he held on to the Jewish members of his orchestra as long as he possibly could. He never allowed himself to be used as a propaganda vehicle in occupied countries.\textsuperscript{22}

Despite Menuhin’s unabashed support of the conductor, his statement was not factually correct. One need only watch the footage of Furtwängler conducting Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony at a 1942 performance commemorating Hitler’s birthday to realize how closely related high culture and Nazi propaganda were during the Third Reich.\textsuperscript{23} And, although Furtwängler himself maintained he never conducted in occupied territories, he did conduct the Vienna Philharmonic in Paris, Prague, Hungary, and Sweden in the 1940s.\textsuperscript{24} His support of Jewish musicians is another point of contention that has long been disputed; all left four Jewish members of the Berlin Philharmonic had already emigrated by 1935.\textsuperscript{25}

Furtwängler and Menuhin collaborated for their first postwar concert with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra on August 13, 1947, in Salzburg, performing the Brahms Violin Concerto. A few days later, Menuhin played at Munich’s German Museum with conductor Joseph Strobl and the Bavarian State Orchestra in a performance of Violin Concerti by Beethoven, Mendelssohn, and Bach.\textsuperscript{26}

Menuhin returned to postwar Germany at the end of September 1947. He was scheduled to give a series of concerts with the Berlin Philharmonic and the Staatskapelle,

\textsuperscript{22} “Menuhin calls on Allied World to Accept Furtwängler Again; Cites Snubs to Nazis,” 5 December 1945, \textit{New York Times}.

\textsuperscript{23} For a short video clip of Furtwängler conducting at Hitler’s Birthday concert, watch http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YqflF0jln0.

\textsuperscript{24} Kater, \textit{The Twisted Muse}, 201.

\textsuperscript{25} Aster, “\textit{Das Reichsorchester}”: Die Berliner Philharmoniker und der Nationalsozialismus (Munich: Siedler, 2007), 95, 99-104.

\textsuperscript{26} “Ein Leben für die Geige,” \textit{Der Spiegel} 35, 30 August 1947.
and also to play for Jewish survivors on two occasions. The proceeds of Menuhin’s
corresponds were to be donated to various charitable causes, included in the following chart:

**Table 2.1: Menuhin's Concert Schedule, September 27-October 2, 1947**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Repertoire</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>For Whom</th>
<th>Proceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 27</td>
<td>Mendelssohn: A Midsummer Night’s Dream op. 21, Overture Beethoven: Violin Concerto D-Major op. 61 Beethoven: Symphony Nr. 7 A-Major op. 92</td>
<td>Titania Palast Rehearsal</td>
<td>With Furtwängler and the BPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Titania Palast, (1,920 Seats)</td>
<td>American Soldiers</td>
<td>$3,000 ($2,000 donated to victims of Polio $1,000 to the five Berlin Orchestras to buy supplies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Titania Palast,</td>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>Scholarships to Berlin music schools 15,300 Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1 Afternoon</td>
<td>All Bach Program</td>
<td>Tivoli Cinema (Around 400 Seats)</td>
<td>DPs from Düppel Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 1947 Evening</td>
<td>Screening of British Film: “The Magic Bow” 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>Benefited Polio Victims and Berlin Orchestras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2, 1947 Morning</td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td>Düppel Center, Schlachtensee</td>
<td>DPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2, 1947 Afternoon and Evening</td>
<td>Wagner: Prelude and Liebestod from Tristan und Isolde Christoph Willibald Gluck: Alceste, Overture Beethoven: Violin Concerto D-Major op. 61</td>
<td>Admiralspalast (1,750 Seats)</td>
<td>Germans (Earlier in the same evening, an open dress rehearsal was held for Jewish survivors and other “Victims of Fascism”)</td>
<td>Jewish community of Berlin 74,500 Marks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Menuhin landed at Tempelhof Airport on the morning of September 27 and attended his rehearsal with Furtwängler and the Philharmonic shortly thereafter. Towards the end of the rehearsal at Titania Palast, an American Military Policeman interrupted by saying, “Five o’clock gentlemen,” and asking the musicians to finish quickly so that the theater could be used for a pre-scheduled variety show for Allied soldiers. Although it is not known to posterity what exactly Menuhin said to allow the rehearsal to continue, the violinist persuaded the Military Policeman (MP) to let them proceed. *(Der Spiegel contended Menuhin’s *Liebenswürdigkeit* (graciousness) charmed the officer and he granted them more time.)*28 In the following photograph, note that it is Menuhin who appears to be doing the talking while Furtwängler looks on.

---

28 “*Tumult um Karten,*” *Der Spiegel* 40, 4 October 1947.
Menuhin’s first performance, held on Sunday, September 28th, was an evening concert with Furtwängler and the Philharmonic for American troops only, although it was broadcast over RIAS. The tickets were sold in dollars, and the concert raised $1,000 for

Berlin’s polio victims\textsuperscript{30} and $3,000 for the city's orchestras, which were desperately in need of new instruments, bows, reeds, and strings.\textsuperscript{31}

Menuhin repeated the performance two days later, this time for an all-German audience. The concert created mass hysteria, with some Berliners waiting in line overnight to try and get one of the 1,920 tickets for the hall. Although expectations were high for the first postwar concert with a Jewish-American artist, the performance on September 30 was an odd affair. American Military Police (MPs) demanded to check the identification cards of all in attendance, causing the performance to begin some 30 minutes late. Furthermore, throughout the concert the officers paced up and down the aisles to check the documents of anyone they might have missed, interrupting the music and obstructing the view of the German audience. As the final notes sounded, the American officers immediately began to clear the hall, abruptly severing the applause. Presumably, the Americans were concerned about possible political demonstrations by the German audience and wanted to avoid any such disturbances.\textsuperscript{32} Still, the heavy-handedness of the MPs illustrates the tension between the objectives of the Military Government and the re-educational aims of the ICD; the Military Government’s agenda was to maintain order even at the expense of re-education. (Even once the Visiting Artists Program was officially sanctioned in 1948, General Lucius Clay remained skeptical of the entire project, cabling the ICD branch office, “In view of food and other

\textsuperscript{30} Berlin’s 1947 polio outbreak meant that non-fraternization rules between American soldiers and German civilians were even more strictly observed.

\textsuperscript{31} “Tumult um Karten” Der Spiegel 40, 4 October 1947. See also Burton, Menuhin, 282-83. Burton places Menuhin’s total earnings at 75,400 Marks, which he claims was given exclusively to the Jewish community in Berlin.

\textsuperscript{32} Frühauf, “Music and Politics after the Holocaust,” 887-904.
vital shortages, we feel that utilization of our funds for such purposes is of doubtful wisdom.”)\textsuperscript{33}

Apart from concerts for the Germans and Americans, Menuhin also felt it was important that he perform for Jewish survivors in Berlin. As a result, the Military Government and Jewish authorities arranged for Menuhin to perform for Jewish Displaced Persons (or DPs) on two separate occasions: once during a free, late-afternoon concert at a local cinema, and a second time at an open dress rehearsal at the Russian-licensed Staatsoper. Most of the survivors were living in one of Berlin’s three Displaced Persons Camps, in either the American Sector’s Mariendorf Bialik-Center or Düppel-Center at Schlachtensee, or the smaller, French-controlled camp in Wittenau. The Düppel-Center was the largest camp; in September 1946 it was still home to 5,130 Jews.\textsuperscript{34} The camps functioned as a kind of waiting room until the Jewish DPs could secure permission to emigrate to the United States, Israel, Canada, or South Africa. For some refugees, their experience in DP camps would last longer than their Nazi internment, as the last DP camp in Berlin did not close until 1952.\textsuperscript{35}

Consequently, the American Military Government was faced not only with the task of re-educating the German population, but also question of what to do with the former victims of Fascism. On December 6, 1945, Officer J.H. Hills drafted a memorandum entitled “Theatrical and Musical Entertainment by and for Displaced Persons,” to the Commanding General in Berlin:

\textsuperscript{33} General Lucius Clay, Cable, 6 May 1948, RG 260, Box 45, Slide 20, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Records of the Director and Deputy Director 1945-49, NARA II.


Some 300,000 displaced persons, including Jews and others persecuted by the Nazis, are now in Displaced Persons Assembly Centers. The morale of these people will suffer and their control will become a difficult military problem unless all possible means are employed to make them happy.36

It was decided that local theaters throughout Germany should be made available to displaced persons wanting to stage events, if no stage was already existing within the DP center. Significantly, the memorandum ends with the caution, “The audience at each performance should consist exclusively either of displaced persons or of German civilians. They should not be mixed.”37 Fraternization between Germans and Jews in this period was unsurprisingly strained, as former prisoners and perpetrators lived virtually alongside one another.

Harold Fishbein, director of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) organized Menuhin’s October 1, 1947 late afternoon concert for the benefit of Jewish DPs from Berlin’s Düppel-Center at Schlachtensee.38 The American Military Government even arranged for a special shuttle service to transport the survivors from the camp to the concert’s location at Tivoli cinema. When the violinist arrived at the theater, however, he was quite surprised to find the hall (with capacity for 1,000) practically empty with less than fifty people present. Backstage, he was shocked to learn the reason for such poor attendance. An editorial had appeared in the Düppel-Center’s newspaper that morning urging survivors not to attend Menuhin’s concert because the violinist had performed the previous evening for the Germans, whom

---

37 Ibid. The amount of research done on music in displaced persons camps in postwar Germany is surprisingly small when compared to the attention given to music in the camps during the Holocaust.
38 Abraham Hyman, The Undefeated (Jerusalem: Gefen Publishing House Ltd., 1993), 340. The UNRRA and the Allies were jointly responsible for administering the DP camps throughout Germany, Italy and Austria, which still housed nearly 200,000 Jewish survivors.
the editorial equivocally branded as “the murderers of the Jews.”39 To avoid embarrassing Menuhin, Abraham S. Hyman, a legal consultant to American Authorities on Jewish Affairs in Germany, had even attempted to find refugee children to fill the empty hall.40

Disappointed, Menuhin went to the Düppel-Center the following day to speak with the Jewish survivors. He later wrote, “Boos, hisses and imprecations followed us all the way,” as he made his way to the stage to explain why he had performed with Furtwängler and the Philharmonic. Menuhin addressed the crowd in German, appealing to the link between music and humanity, and when he had finally won them over, the crowd began to shout “Unsere Yehudi! Unsere Yehudi” (Our Yehudi! Our Yehudi!), begging him for another concert. Unfortunately, fearing bodily harm, Menuhin had left his Stradivarius back at the hotel.41 In his memoir, Menuhin concluded that the concentration camp survivors had still been easier to win over for playing with Furtwängler than his Jewish critics in America.

The second event for the Jewish survivors took place the following day as an afternoon dress rehearsal with the Staatskapelle and Furtwängler, and was held in the Soviet sector. (With the Staatsoper’s destruction in 1944, the ensemble’s new home was in the Admiralspalast at Friedrichstrasse). The program was also wildly different from the repertoire played in the American Zone: Gluck’s *Alceste* Overture, Beethoven’s Violin Concerto in D-Major op. 61, and Wagner’s Prelude and *Liebestod* from *Tristan und Isolde*. The presence of Wagner is surprising; expecting concentration camp survivors to attentively absorb the strains of Wagner and then return to their respective

refugee camps seemed in poor taste, and perhaps reflected the Russian insensitivity towards the plight of DPs. There is no record of how the dress rehearsal was received by the audience, although there were no demonstrations or reported disturbances.42

Menuhin’s performance later that evening for a German, American, and Russian audience was a smashing success, complete with a thirty minute standing ovation. Afterwards, the Russians made him their guest of honor at a dinner party at the Soviet Artists’ club Die Möwe (The Seagull). ICD officers Benno Frank, Walter Hinrichsen, Dr. Berol McClaskey, and Ambassador Murphy attended. The concert brought in 50,000 Marks, at that time the highest ever recorded at the Staatsoper.43 ICD chief Benno Frank boasted in his report:

> It can definitely be stated that it was the most successful concert given since the occupation in Berlin. 30% of the audience were Russian officers …Russian officers and many concert-goers agreed that the Staatsoper never witnessed before such an out-burst for any artist. Several Russian officers not known to me, but recognizing me as an American, shook [sic] hands with me, emotionally overwhelmed by Menuhin’s playing.44

Frank’s closing remark that “in conclusion it can be said that Mr. Menuhin represents the best U.S. ambassador as an artist and as a human being,”45 eerily echoes a diary entry of Goebbels in which he wrote of Furtwängler: “He once again has done us excellent service abroad.”46 Most clear from Frank’s report, however, is a sense of jubilation at the Soviet response to Menuhin’s appearance.

From the Military Government perspective, Menuhin’s 1947 concerts were overwhelming successes. Considering the professed re-education aims Menuhin’s visit

---

42 Frühauf, “Music and Politics after the Holocaust,” 892.
43 Ibid.
46 Quoted in Kater, Twisted Muse, 201.
was to promote, the violinist accomplished his mission. His concerts for the Germans were sold out and he was wildly applauded after each appearance. What Military Government reports leave out completely, however, were Menuhin’s interactions with Jewish DPs. Instead, the ICD reports focus only on his encounters with the German population. In a piece entitled “Yehudi Menuhin Visits Berlin,” written by John Bitter as a final report, the violinist’s visit is cast as the highest possible success for the American Reorientation program without once mentioning the concerts for Jewish DPs. In his final report, Benno Frank admitted, “Again and again it has to be stressed the necessity to get here only top-ranking U.S. artists as this event has shown again the receptiveness of European people for great art.”

To the Jewish DPs, it must have seemed as though the events of 1933 to 1945 were being actively forgotten, as Menuhin played the German masters with the Berlin Philharmonic under the baton of the Third Reich’s most celebrated conductor. Whether intended or not, the free charity concerts, squeezed into Menuhin’s afternoons, must have appeared a bitter contrast to the evening, full-length performances for paying Germans. Ultimately, Menuhin was roundly criticized by the Jewish community for being the first Jewish musician to concertize with Furtwängler for a German audience. Although his own motivations were to begin the process of reconciliation between the Jewish and German people, he certainly miscalculated the public response to his visit. Why then, did Leonard Bernstein’s 1948 visit to Bavaria not evoke the same outcry? He also performed

---

49 When Menuhin traveled to Israel in 1950, his manager nearly cancelled the tour after a terrorist group made assassination threats against Menuhin’s life. Frühauf, “Music and Politics after the Holocaust, 897.
at two DP camps the day after he conducted the Munich Philharmonic before an all-
German audience, much to the delight of Germans and Jewish survivors alike.50

Bernstein’s acceptance and Menuhin’s rejection probably have more to do with
context than with the performances themselves. Bernstein’s stop in Munich was on the
way to a series of concerts in Israel, and he had just been named Chief Conductor of the
Palestine Symphony Orchestra, undoubtedly garnering him support from Munich’s
Jewish survivors. Bernstein, young and relatively unknown, represented a fresh,
promising start for the survivors who wanted to look towards the future and not be
reminded of the recent past.51 There was also a symbolic difference between the Berlin
and Munich Philharmonics. The Berlin Philharmonic had been the most highly
politicized Orchestra of the Third Reich with the era’s most illustrious conductor. There
was a definite contrast between a Jewish artist performing with the former
Reichsorchester, the chosen orchestra of the Reich, and the Munich Philharmonic, a
Bavarian institution.

In his memoir written in 1979, Menuhin maintained that Furtwängler was “an
outsider in Nazi Germany and a Nazi in the eyes of outsiders.”52 Ultimately, the
violinist's support for Furtwängler damaged his reputation in the United States, as
audiences perceived his willingness to concertize in postwar Germany as an affront to his
Jewish faith and American citizenship.53

50 Monod, Settling Scores, 205-06.
51 Ibid., 205-10.
52 Menuhin, Unfinished Journey, 260.
53 Monod, Settling Scores, 165-66; Robert Magidoff, Yehudi Menuhin: The Story of the Man and of the
Bernstein in Bavaria

In May of 1948, Bernstein was invited to Munich to give two concerts with the Philharmonic by conductor Georg Solti, musical director of Munich’s Staatsoper. Although it was not an invitation extended by the American Military Government, Munich cultural officer Carlos Moseley arranged accommodations, transportation, and food for Bernstein, whom he had known from his days at Tanglewood.54 Only days before the conductor’s arrival, the orchestra had gone on strike for higher food rations as one of the oboists had passed out from exhaustion. Moseley finally got them to agree to give one concert with Bernstein (not two as originally planned) by paying them 115 packs of cigarettes. Annoyed, but relieved to have won a modicum of cooperation, Moseley decided the bargain was “a foul but reasonable threat [as] cigarettes can be exchanged for food.”55 The Military Government refused to help Moseley with his efforts, he believed, because Bernstein was rumored to have communist leanings.

Bernstein’s concert with the Munich Philharmonic was an incredible success, with Moseley declaring:

A miracle…Bernstein, a young Jew and an American, stepped up to rehearse a grumbling, hungry German orchestra for its first rehearsal—in German at that. I was as tense as an E String with Menuhin doing a double stop on it. Within ten minutes his energy and personality and magnificent musical genius (a great and true genius) began to overwhelm the orchestra. By the end of the concert, they would have died for him.56

54 Carlos Moseley, “Monthly Summaries for Period from 1 April 1948 through 30 April 1948,” 27 April 1948, RG 260, Box 20, Slide 142, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria: Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, NARA II.
55 Quoted in Monod, Settling Scores, 205.
56 Ibid., 206. Moseley would go on to become the Chairman of the New York Philharmonic. In 1965, he implemented the idea of having the Philharmonic perform free concerts in Central Park for New Yorkers.
But Bernstein’s success was not limited to the German orchestra and audience; he also toured two DP camps the following day and led their chamber orchestras. At one camp, Jewish survivor Henny Durshmakin Gerko sang Hebrew songs from the Ghetto with Bernstein accompanying her\(^{57}\) in a marked contrast to Menuhin’s performances in Berlin. Moseley, who was present at both Bernstein’s camp performances, recalled that it was “one of the most extraordinary experiences of my life….so moving and terrible in its tragedy that I had to hang on for dear life to keep from making an ass of myself.”\(^{58}\)

Bernstein wrote home to his friend and secretary Helen Coates,

> The Munich concert was the greatest success...Especially because I had three obstacles to overcome-- youth, Americanism & Jewishness...It means so much...since music is the German's last stand in their ‘master-race’ claim."\(^{59}\)

One wonders if Bernstein recalled his Munich experience in December of 1989, as he led musicians from East and West Germany, the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain and France in two performances of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony. In changing Schiller’s verse from *Freude* (joy) to *Freiheit* (freedom), Bernstein’s performance again signified the beginning of a new Germany, although this time, it was a reunified one.

---


\(^{58}\) Quoted in Monod, *Settling Scores*, 206.

Visiting Artists Program

By the late 1940s, ICD planners felt it was vital to bring American musicians to Germany in order to show firsthand the strength of America’s musical organizations. Recognizing it would not be an easy undertaking, given the lack of food and lodging, sporadic transportation and general material shortages, the ICD nonetheless felt it was essential to organize a concert series that would prove the superiority of American musical life.\(^6^0\) The entire program was nearly tabled, however, after a 1946 ICD survey conducted among the American Government revealed a strong prejudice against such a program. These objections would not be so damning had they not come from Robert Murphy, the acting American Ambassador to Germany and the State Department’s political advisor to General Clay, the American Military Governor of West Germany. Among his concerns, Ambassador Murphy cited possible objections from United States taxpayers and projected difficulties in recruiting “first-class” talent, although the crux of Murphy’s concern with the program was “the entertainment as such of German nationals.”\(^6^1\)

The ambassador’s concerns were mirrored by many in the Military Government who could not conceive of music as anything more than a tool for mindless enjoyment. Furthermore, Murphy feared possible backlash from American taxpayers when they learned Government money was being spent to sponsor tours of American musicians in Germany, a former pariah nation only one year after the war’s end. When ICD Chief Robert McClure approached the Military Government in 1947 to host Marian Anderson,


\(^{61}\) Ibid.
Murphy rejected his plea, fearing the wrath of taxpayers.\textsuperscript{62} Clay, too, was skeptical of the Program, as he did not want scarce material resources within Germany to be squandered.\textsuperscript{63} Their fundamental incomprehension of music’s power to re-educate, however, lay at the crux of both Murphy’s and Clay’s objections.

ICD Officers Eric Clarke of Berlin’s Film, Music, and Theater branch and Nicolas Nabokov of Berlin’s Intelligence Section were incensed at Murphy’s letter of objection, and retorted that “entertainment as such,” would not be the aim of the Visiting Artist Program; rather, it would only further reorientation efforts by positively representing American culture abroad. In a letter of response to Murphy, Nabokov and Clark offered the Ambassador a not-so-veiled jab in their conclusion: “It would be a pity to lay the matter before the State Department while he [Murphy] does not concur.”\textsuperscript{64} Rather than risking professional consequences, Murphy ultimately gave his blessing.

But it was not until March of 1948 that OMGUS approved plans for visiting American artists, though not to exceed twenty-five musicians within a six-month period. The program would be organized by EUCOM (European Command) and ICD. EUCOM was to arrange the tour transport within Germany and accommodations, while the ICD of OMGUS was responsible for selecting artists, their scheduling and publicity, and organizing the concert tour locations. The ICD would be responsible for selecting these “Carnegie Hall Types,”\textsuperscript{65} and scheduling concerts throughout all four zones of occupation and in Berlin. The most invasive and ambitious re-education program to date,
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\textsuperscript{62} Thacker, \textit{Music After Hitler}, 95-96.
\textsuperscript{63} Monod, \textit{Settling Scores}, 213.
\textsuperscript{64} Eric Clarke, Nicolas Nabokov, and Robert Murphy, “Staff Study on U.S. Artists,” 29 March 1946, RG 260, Box 134, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Central Decimal File of the Executive Office, 1944-49, NARA II.
Visiting Artist Program was meant to pave the way for State Department sponsored music tours throughout the 1950s.

Rather than being funded by the American taxpayers, the initiative was supposedly supported through donations of $10,000 from private sources in the United States.66 Nowhere in the documents are the sponsors named, however, leading one to believe the donor was, in fact, the American Government itself. This practice was also adopted for American cultural propaganda efforts during the 1950s, as the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) used the Ford Foundation to fund the Congress for Cultural Freedom. By moving government money through the Foundation, the CIA could create the illusion that the Congress for Cultural Freedom, which sponsored concerts, lecture, and journals with offices in more than thirty-five countries, was free from any political affiliation.67 (Nicolas Nabokov was the Secretary General for the Congress from 1950 until its dismantling in 1967.)

Still, the initial $10,000 would cover only travel expenses to and from Germany, with the artists donating their time and collecting no fees. In theory, American soldiers would replenish the Visiting Artist Fund by buying their tickets in dollars. What the ICD would soon learn, however, is that troops were reluctant to part with American dollars to fund the reorientation project. This plan was sorely compromised once servicemen began buying their tickets in marks rather than dollars, as Bitter complained in his report, “U.S."

personnel in Berlin are not anxious to part with their dollars for concerts.” Soldiers would frequently mail dollars home to their families, preferring instead to use local currency for its favorable exchange rate. (The rate of exchange was approximately 10 Reichsmarks to the dollar).  

Already anticipating negative responses to the Visiting Artist Program, the ICD prepared a mock-script that was to be distributed among cultural officers in Germany to answer any questions concerning the initiative. It emphasizes that neither American taxpayers nor German civilians would foot the bill for the concerts. The Program’s success, however, fell far short of what Theater & Music Officers had envisioned. Clarke and Nabokov’s assertion that “any idea of resorting to inferior talent is repugnant to us,” was unfortunately a prophetic utterance. Given that the funding came through only in January 1948, Harrison Kerr, Chief of Music and Art Unit, Reorientation Branch based in the New York ICD office, was unable to plan an effective season. Rather than the illustrious line-up of first rate artists, the ICD was forced to settle for who was available; meaning, who had the time and the desire to come to postwar Germany, still stigmatized by the very recent memory of National Socialist atrocities and the stain of German collaboration.

Frustrated by the shortsightedness of ICD policies, Carlos Moseley, Chief of
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69 Grossmann, Jews, Germans, and Allies, 27. Until the Military Government cracked down on American soldiers sending home dollars, they mailed more money home than they earned from their salaries. The black market could be incredibly lucrative, with a carton of Lucky Strike cigarettes selling for roughly 2,000 RM. A G.I. could then convert this sum back into dollars at a ratio of ten to one.
70 “Script on Visiting American Artists Program” RG 206, Box 21, Slide 158-59, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria: Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, NARA II.
72 Monod, Settling Scores, 205-52.
Bavaria's Music Control Section, pushed for more elite American artists to concertize in Germany. 

He petitioned the Education and Cultural Resources Branch to bring Vladimir Horowitz, Arthur Rubinstein, Rudolph Serkin, Isaac Stern, and Igor Stravinsky to postwar Germany, all of whom were citizens of the United States. Unfortunately, Moseley’s requests were denied by Harrison Kerr in the ICD New York office on the grounds these musicians had all been born outside the United States, although it is highly doubtful Rubinstein and Horowitz would have agreed at any rate. They had already signed a protest against Furtwängler's potential appearances with the Chicago Symphony in 1948.

While the ICD attempted to stress the importance of the Visiting Artist Program to the Military Government, they were less than successful. Viewing the program as nothing more than a headache (having to arrange travel and accommodations in postwar Germany was no simple task), the Military Government refused to support the ICD’s efforts. Faced with a limited material resources and not enough time to plan a season, the Visiting Artists Program could not be as discriminating in whom they hired. Among the recruited artists for 1948 were a twenty-one-year-old violin prodigy, Patricia Travers, American folk singer Tom Scott, harpsichordist Ralph Kirkpatrick, Metropolitan
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73 Ibid., 205-43.
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Baritone Mack Harrell, the Walden String Quartet, and the Yale Glee Club.\textsuperscript{77}

Travers, a New Jersey native and one of the most widely publicized Visiting Artists, concertized throughout Germany in May and June of 1948. Travers’s selection may reveal a clever calculation on the part of cultural officers, who believed that because of her age, she would attract a larger German audience. Indeed, nearly all the German reviews including those in the \textit{Frankfurter Press, Heute, Münchener Merker, Münchener Tagebuch}, and \textit{Süddeutsche Zeitung} mention Travers’s age in the first several sentences.

The violinist gave a series of concerts throughout Germany in Augsburg, Berlin, Frankfurt, Munich, and Nuremberg, performing Violin Concertos by Brahms and American composer Roger Sessions, and Sonatas by Ives and Bach. The repertoire selection, undoubtedly chosen by the ICD, was meant to emphasize the connection between German and American classical composers. For example, Travers’s Nuremberg Concert featured Bach’s Sonata no. 1 in G Minor, Ives’s Sonata no. 2 for Piano and Violin, and Brahms’s Violin Concerto op. 77. The unlikely partnership of the Bach, Ives and Brahms leaves one to ponder if the American composer was placed in the middle to ensure listeners would not leave.

In Berlin, Travers had to perform with the RIAS Symphony Orchestra, rather than the Philharmonic, who had already embarked on a tour of Great Britain. The May 16 concert featured the Brahms Violin Concerto, Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, and \textit{3 Episodes} by Richard Mohaupt, a modernist German composer popular before the war,

\textsuperscript{77} C. W. Winderstein, “Abrechnung Tom Scott 5.6.48, 18 Uhr Sophiensaal,” RG 260, Box 21, Slide 126, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria: Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, NARA II. Tom Scott’s Munich visit cost the ICD an additional 280.81 RM as ticket sales were not strong enough to cover the costs of advertising and hall rentals.
but whose works the Nazis had banned.78 (Conveniently enough for the ICD, he had immigrated to the New York in 1939 to protect his wife, who was Jewish.) The performance was led by Leopold Ludwig, who had recently evaded a one-year jail sentence by the British for providing false information on his denazification 

_Fragenbogen_ (questionnaire).79

Figure 2.2: Travers’s Concert Program Cover, Munich80

Travers’s concert reviews from her ICD tour generally criticize either her playing or her repertoire. The _Münchener Merker_ critic writes of that the Ives Sonata “is rooted in the somewhat cluttered sound-world of the turn of the century,”81 revealing an utter lack of interest in American modernism. After Travers’s concert with the Munich Philharmonic on June 1, which featured the music of Brahms and Sessions, Edmund Nick of the _Münchener Tagebuch_ wrote:

> For the style of Roger Session it is difficult to find an analogy…And the
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78 Mohaupt wrote primarily for programmatic works for the stage, including ballets and operas.
79 Thacker, _Music After Hitler_, 56.
80 “Patricia Travers’s File,” RG 260, Box 21, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria: Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, NARA II.
thing is long, horribly long! Above the maze of this painfully disrupted harmony, the beautiful sound of Patricia Travers’s violin—in which so much compressed, delicate sweetness becomes audible—blooms like a single flower on a dump.\textsuperscript{82}

Although Walter Panofsky of the \textit{Süddeutsche Zeitung} did not have a problem with her repertoire, he did find Travers’s Brahms, “erschreckend unbrahmsisch”\textsuperscript{83} (Alarmingly Unbrahms-ish).

As these reviews indicate, Travers’s appearances did little for the advancement of the re-education effort. In Stuttgart, music officer Bill Castello had to bribe the orchestra to play with her after they simply declined to perform at all. Travers reached Bremen to be told there was still not a concert venue secured for her, as U.S. Special Services had failed to petition local organizers for their help. In Munich, Moseley could not find a concert agent willing to sponsor her, and was left to run around the city frantically hanging up posters by himself.\textsuperscript{84} Travers’s tour of Germany was to be among her last engagements. She gave up the violin by the early 1950s, never to play in public again, and living the rest of her life in obscurity.\textsuperscript{85}

Although harpsichordist Ralph Kirkpatrick already had an international reputation, his tour throughout West Germany was equally problematic, as it produced “virtually no income.”\textsuperscript{86} Coming in the middle of the Western currency reform when

\textsuperscript{82} Edmund Nick, “Musikalisches Streifzüge,” \textit{Münchener Tagebuch}, No. 23, 8 June 1948. “Für den Stil von Roger Sessions ist schwer ein Analogon zu finden…Und lang ist das Ding, schrecklich lang!…Der schöne Geigenton Patricia Travers, in dem schon so viele edele Süßigkeit zusammengedrängt hörbar wird, blüht über dem Gestrüpp dieser qualvoll zerrütteten Harmonien wie eine einsame Blume auf eine Schutthalde.”

\textsuperscript{83} Walter Padofsky, “Patricia Travers,” \textit{Süddeutsche Zeitung}, 1 June 1948.

\textsuperscript{84} Monod, \textit{Settling Scores}, 217.

\textsuperscript{85} Margalit Fox, “Patricia Travers, Violinist who Vanished, Dies at 82,” \textit{New York Times}, 6 March 2010. Joshua Bell owned Travers’s 1732 Tom Taylor Stradivarius before switching to his current instrument, the 1713 Gibson ex Huberman Stradivarius.

\textsuperscript{86} Carlos Moseley, “Expenses incurred with Ralph Kirkpatrick’s Bavarian Tour,” 17 July 1948, RG 260, Box 21, Slide 71, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria: Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, NARA II.
inflation was running rampant, German civilians were unwilling to part with money for concerts. Even the concert fees were not always paid by the German venues, as in the case of the Opera house in Nuremberg, which never paid the Military Government the 1,000 Marks it had agreed on to present Travers and Kirkpatrick.  

Bitter’s final report neglects to mention the program’s short-comings, instead exaggerating the success of each visit:

At this time a summary may be made of the result of recent visits of American artists in Berlin. The public, which was more or less prepared for Hollywood personalities and flashy appearances because of many years of Goebbels-Propaganda, was most pleasantly surprised. The charm and brilliant musicianship of Patricia Travers, violinist, the genuine and appealing character of Tom Scott, folk-song

87 Carlos Moseley, “Fees for the Guest Appearances of Patricia Travers and Tom Scott in Nürenburg,” 4 November 1948, RG 260, Box 21, Slide 125, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria: Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, NARA II.
88 Ralph Kirkpatrick File, RG 260, Box 21, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria: Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, NARA II.
singer, the outstanding musicianship and thorough background of Ralph Kirkpatrick, harpsichordist...showed these American musicians as among the world’s best in the eyes of public and press. It is sincerely hoped that this program may somehow be continued.89

The 1949 budget for the Visiting Artist program was substantial, as there was a fund of $168,240 for the year 1949 to bring experts to postwar Germany, some $60,000 of which was reserved for the Education and Cultural Relations Branch to bring educators, musicians, and artists to Germany.90

Still, despite the increase in funds, the result was generally disappointing. A particularly upsetting performance was given by pianist Webster Aitken, a student of Artur Schnabel, who was engaged to play two concerts with the Munich Philharmonic in April of 1949. The concerts went disastrously, with Moseley complaining, “The concerts did not establish Mr. Aitken as an artist of importance nor were they indicative of the best in American musicianship.”91 Admitting the concert had the worst ticket sales of any in the Munich Philharmonic’s history, Moseley also despaired that Aitken’s performance had simply confirmed the German prejudice that American musicians were simply technicians and that “great interpretation of great music lies outside their grasp.”92 In a blatant display of anti-Americanism, Moseley heard one audience member complaining that Aitken, “plays Beethoven like an Indian.”93

92 Ibid.
93 Ibid.
Ultimately, the Visiting Artist Program’s impact was far more localized than cultural officers had hoped due to lack of funds, poor planning, and artistic miscalculation. The successful tours of American musicians were those which occurred outside the boundaries of the Program, generally given by those artists whose international reputation preceded them.

**Hindemith’s Return to Berlin**

The only other highly successful visit in this period was made by Paul Hindemith, who was invited through the Visiting Experts Program rather than through the Visiting Artist Program. Although ICD officers requested Hindemith’s presence as early as 1945, their requests were denied by Harrison Kerr, the ICD’s music administrator based in New York City. Kerr’s reluctance to invite Hindemith suggests that he may have been aware of the composer’s early collaborations with the National Socialists.

Kerr himself was an interesting figure, a composer and a former student of Nadia Boulanger. During the Great Depression, he worked as an orchestrator for the National Broadcasting Company’s General Motors Show, and after the war, he was named Chief
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94 Monod, Settling Scores, 119.
95 Ostensibly, Hindemith was the perfect representative of the new German-American partnership. Although early on he had attempted to win the favor of the Nazi Regime (as he wrote Ernst Toch in 1933, “I have been asked to cooperate, and have not declined”) this was not widely known in the immediate postwar period. If anything, his public shaming by the National Socialists concerning the 1934 Staatsoper performance of his opera *Mathis der Maler* made it seem as though Hindemith always been an opponent of the Regime. (Due to the opera’s poor reception, Hindemith took a leave of absence from his professorship at Berlin’s Musikakhoeschule.) In support of Hindemith, Furtwängler published a letter in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* and resigned his conductorship with the Philharmonic, Staatsoper, and his Vice Presidency of the Reichsmusikkammer, although he recanted his statement the following year. In the meantime, Hindemith immigrated to Switzerland and then to the United States. In 1939, he wrote to his wife concerning his earlier pretentions of National Socialist collaboration; “I always see myself as the mouse who recklessly danced in front of the trap and even ventured inside; quite by chance, when it happened to be outside, the trap closed!” See Kater, Twisted Muse, 179; Paul Hindemith, das Private Logbuch: Briefe an seine Frau Gertud (Mainz: Schott, 1995), 357; and Steven M. Whiting, “Un-settling Scores: A Review of Michael Kater’s Eight Composers of the Nazi Era.” *German Society and Politics* 19.3 (Fall 2001): 80.
of the Music and Art Unit for the reorientation program in occupied countries. Kerr staunchly believed his purpose was to further the standing of American classical music in former totalitarian countries, and as a result, he carefully selected music and composers to present a carefully polished image of Musical America. Hindemith, although a recent American citizen, did not fit into Kerr’s rendering.96

Although Hindemith returned to Germany in the summer of 1947 to visit relatives and friends in Frankfurt, the Military Government still neglected to contract Hindemith for any lectures, although he had already made appearances in Austria, Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland.97 Hindemith finally appeared under Military auspices in the Winter of 1949, although he was not sponsored by Kerr’s Visiting Artist Program, but rather the Visiting Experts Program. His visit from January 25 until February 28, 1949, was mostly spent in Bavaria, though he did come to Berlin from February 13th until the 19th, where he conducted the Berlin Philharmonic twice and lectured at the Freie Universität and Hochschule für Musik.98 In planning the program with the Berlin Philharmonic, Moseley suggested Mozart’s Prague Symphony no. 38, a Cherubini Overture, and two of Hindemith’s compositions, listing the following three as possibilities: Symphony in E-Flat (1940), Symphonia serena (1946), and Nobilissima Visione Orchestersuite (1938). Gertrude Hindemith, his wife, countered with the suggestion of an all Hindemith program.99 Ultimately, a compromise was reached as the

98 The documentation concerning Hindemith’s visit is located in RG 260, Box 21, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria: Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, NARA II.
99 On January 4, 1949, Gertrude Hindemith wrote Moseley with the following suggestions for the Berlin Program: Prelude to When the Lilacs Last in the Door-Yard Bloomed, Concerto for Piano 1945, Overture Amor and Psyche, and a choice of Symphonic Serena, Symphony in E-flat, or Symphonic Metamorphosis.
Philharmonic performed *The Four Temperaments, Theme and Variation for Piano and Orchestra* (1940) and Symphony in E-flat on February 17, along with Mozart’s Symphony no. 39 (1788) and Cherubini’s *Medea Overture* (1797). The following evening, in addition to the Mozart and Cherubini, the Philharmonic played his *Nobilissima Visione Orchestersuite* and Symphony in E-flat.

During one of his Berlin lectures, Hindemith provoked great controversy by calling the 12-tone method and its reliance on technique “shallow.” This was not uncharacteristic of Hindemith’s stance on twelve-tone music, as he later contended, “What is art in this technique was already art beforehand, without it, and can continue to be so after it. The technique as such does not create any works of art.” As he had since *Mathis der Maler*, Hindemith called for European Art music to become more autonomous from political and religious spheres. Audiences were scandalized; hence the tour was considered successful.

**Cultural Restoration in Isolation**

Despite the ebullient ICD praise for Berlin’s re-education program as leading the “cultural restoration of Germany,” the reality was far more modest in scope. Although cultural officers were intent on promoting democracy through a variety of music and radio programming, their efforts to conflate classical music and political ideology were meeting with limited success. In February of 1947, 48 percent of German respondents surveyed by the Military Government felt that National Socialism “was a good idea badly
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100 Quoted in Monod, *Settling Scores*, 220.
carried out." Regardless, it was advantageous for OMGUS to portray the ICD as overwhelmingly successful in Germany’s re-education and reorientation; Congress controlled the OMGUS budget, and the Military Government needed to justify a costly peacetime occupation in former enemy nation. Furthermore, a newly elected Republican Congress meant the American political climate veered to the right, and consequently OMGUS cultural policy faced greater pressure than ever. Chief Benno Frank recognized the difficulties facing cultural officers, admitting:

A long time will be required for Theater & Music to fulfill its traditional mission of reorienting the German people. New talents will have to be developed, new material will have to be introduced, new forms will have to be established...Theater & Music officers will have to overcome the lack of theater facilities, material difficulties and the over-all prejudices of the German theater profession.

While Frank’s memorandum neglects to touch on any “over-all prejudices” of cultural officers, the document is one of the few honest appraisals of the ICD’s limited success in the early postwar years. From 1945 until 1949, the ICD’s Theater and Music branch had limited success due to shortages in staff, denazification challenges, logistical limitations and material shortages that plagued the city. Apart from shortages in materials and personnel that undermined music officers’ efforts, Berlin’s unique geographical circumstances played a role even before the Berlin Blockade (June 24, 1948–May 12, 1949) or the building of the wall in August of 1961. As an April OMGUS memorandum highlights, Berlin’s location nearly 70 miles East of the American zone made the city
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103 “Trends in German Public Opinion,” Report 175, June 1949, Box 26, RG 260, Records of the Information Control Division: Records of the Director and Deputy Director, 1945-49, NARA II.
...an isolated spot at present. It is exceedingly difficult for Germans to move to or from this city, which has played a leading part in the cultural restoration of Germany.\textsuperscript{106}

Military trains were the only dependable mode of transportation, though until 1947 OMGUS strictly forbid German civilians to ride on them with Allied personnel; even then the only exceptions were pre-approved musicians and artists, not to exceed six people per day in order to preserve valuable seats for Military personnel.\textsuperscript{107} Officer John Bitter pushed for the allowance of musicians on military trains, lamenting,

Prominent artists, unless assisted in this way, will not travel. A great actress or conductor cannot perform after a journey of ten to forty-eight hours if he or she is forced to stand or hang onto the car door. Thus the public is made to suffer and performances are cancelled.\textsuperscript{108}

His complaints were not unfounded, as the 1947 Brahms Festival at the Staatsoper lacked conductor Hans Knappertsbusch due to the American Military Government’s tardiness in processing his travel orders.

Despite the difficulties posed by transportation issues and the limited success of certain ICD policies and programs, including the Visiting Artists Program and the promotion of American classical music, theater and music officers in Berlin nevertheless played a vital role in the \textit{Wiederaufbau} (reconstruction) of classical music culture. Erich Otto, who worked to reconstruct postwar theatrical life by restarting the \textit{Genossenschaft Deutscher Bühnen Angehörigen}, or stage actors association, wrote of how his work was aided by the Western Powers in Berlin: “Namely, I am indebted to the former American theater officers, and among them to the leading officer, Mr. Benno Frank, who opened

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid.
many ways for me!” Similarly, Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt also had warm memories of his relationship with American theater and music officers. He later wrote about his experiences in early postwar Berlin:


Note that Stuckenschmidt closes with “at that time,” demarcating the shift in American policy toward the Soviet Union. The city was run by the Allied Kommandatura, comprised of representatives from all four Allied countries, created in an attempt to facilitate quadripartite governance. (This arrangement lasted until March 20, 1948, when the Soviet contingent walked out of a Kommandatura meeting, never to return, signaling that any hopes for mutual cooperation were at an end.) Tensions between the Soviets and the Americans were generally manageable until 1947, when American Military Governor, Lucius Clay, introduced “Operation-Talk Back,” giving OMGUS licensed media outlets the right to overtly criticize Soviet Union policies. Consequently, the music branch’s rhetoric also began to shift to a more transparently anti-Soviet stance.

The intensification of American music promotion was concurrent with the onset of the

---


Cold War in 1947, as American authorities began to exploit all German avenues to push back on Soviet policies; political scientist Cora Sol Goldstein contends “occupied Germany became the first battlefront of psychological warfare between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.” This is evident in the tenor of the ICD memorandums of the time, just as American Music promotion was beginning to take precedence and the Visiting Artist Program was put into action in 1948. By December of 1947, the Soviet’s Kulturbund (Cultural League) was banned for its Communist leanings in the American and British sectors. Surprisingly, the Kulturbund’s ban did not mean that the repertoire they played excluded American music. In Bitter’s report from December 1947 he writes:

The Kulturbund, although still smarting because of the ban in the U.S. and British sectors, gave a concert of modern U.S. chamber music that was a musical success. Works by Copland, Quincy Porter, and Walter Piston were received with interest.

In an ironic twist, the Soviets were promoting the very kind of American music the ICD hoped to encourage German ensembles to perform. (Note that Quincy Porter becomes Quinty Porter on the following postcard, sent to the mayor of Zehlendorf to advertise the Kulturbund performance.)
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112 The Kulturbund was formed by the Soviets as a kind of artist collective, sponsoring frequent concerts and lectures.
While the Soviets were sponsoring evenings of American chamber music, the Americans were also promoting their music through the creation of *Amerika Häuser*, or American cultural centers, which the Military Government began constructing throughout Germany in 1947. The America Houses were created to compete with a recent flurry of Soviet cultural propaganda, and particularly the successful Soviet book tours that had emphasized the rich contribution of Soviet writers and thinkers to European intellectual life. The Houses featured lectures, concerts, and films about contemporary American life in English and in German; in Berlin alone there were seven centers. There were also

---

114 “Zehnter Abend Zeitgenössischer Musik,” 5 December 1947, Sammlung 280, 4861-5129, Slide 9174, Landesarchiv, Berlin. The violinist, Hans Bastiaan, (his name is misspelled on the postcard), is currently the oldest living member of the Berlin Philharmonic. He was born in 1911.

weekly performances of American classical music given by local musicians, namely the works of Copland, Barber, Harris, Ives, and William Schuman which were generally paired with Beethoven or Haydn. After concerts, anonymous surveys were handed out with the prompt: “What do you think of American chamber music, insofar as you have learned from our concerts? Please state your honest opinion, you need not sign your name.”\textsuperscript{116} While some reviews were positive, as exemplified by a reaction to a Munich performance of Barber’s \textit{Adagio for Strings}: “America also has a great future in Music!,”\textsuperscript{117} not all listeners were as enthusiastic, with another audience member noting that Roy Harris’s String Quintet (1940) was, “A perfect example of the musical style of the late Baroque, 200 years too late.”\textsuperscript{118} While listener reactions varied, the music branch pressed on with re-education and reorientation, confident as to the restorative powers of American classical music.

The centers were introduced immediately before Berlin’s first major division between the Eastern and Western Allies: the Berlin Blockade. The June 1948 currency reform in West Germany and West Berlin meant that inflation reigned as the price of concert tickets became unaffordable for most Germans. The economic reforms of the Western Allies so angered the Soviets that Stalin embarked on a drastic plan of action to force the Americans out of Berlin. During the Berlin Blockade, which lasted from June 24, 1948 until May 12, 1949, the Soviets cut off all ground supply routes to West Berlin, taking advantage of a loophole in the Potsdam Agreement and hoping American

\textsuperscript{116} Questionnaire, 3 February 1948, RG 260, Box 19, Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, Bavaria: The Music Section, 1945-49, NARA II. “Was halten Sie von amerikanischer kammermusik, soweit Sie sie in unseren Konzerten kennengelernt haben? Bitte Ihre ehrliche Meinung, Sie brauchen nicht unterzeichnen.”

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid.
authorities would relinquish Berlin to Soviet control. The Blockade and the “inhuman conditions through which the Russians were trying to dominate the city,” as Officer Mellinger wrote, made it necessary to feed West Berlin through thousands of airlifts. For nearly a year, the Western Allies, and particularly American forces, brought 2.3 million tons of food on 277,500 flights into Tempelhof Airport.

Now burdened by travel restrictions and inflation alike, John Bitter despaired in his July 1948 weekly report: “The theaters in the US Sector of Berlin have been hit very hard by the blockade. The factors in order of importance are: lack of transportation, lack of electricity and currency reform.” By December of 1948, one Westmark was equal to four Eastmarks, and theaters in West Berlin stopped accepting the Eastmark in the Spring of 1949. After the currency reform, Stuttgart’s music officer Everett Helm contended, “The key to a full house is Beethoven… [though] Tchaikovsky is also sure-fire [as is Strauss],” as more conservative repertoire generally meant better ticket sales.

Historian David Monod posits that the ICD’s involvement actually worked to polarize avant-garde and modern music, and that by the late 1940s, avant-garde music flourished through state support and the Darmstadt Summer Courses, the music of modernists like Hindemith and Stravinsky languished. I do not, however, wholly agree with Monod’s assessment. His viewpoint ignores the success of Hindemith’s 1949 visit and the many successful performances of Hindemith’s work it inspired, including a

---

120 Judt, Postwar, 146. Some 73 Allied soldiers died when their planes crashed.
123 Monod, Settling Scores, 193.
staging of *Mathis der Maler* in Munich that Furtwängler also attended. Furthermore, Stravinsky’s works had been extremely popular with the German public; in the 1946–47 Munich concert season, *Histoire du soldat* was performed six times due to audience demand.124 Furthermore, one might consider that during the War, audiences heard many Stravinsky-influenced compositions by listening to Carl Orff and Gottfried von Einem.125 In Berlin, the Haus am Waldsee in conjunction with Zehlendorf’s *Amt für Kunst* (Department of Art) sponsored evenings of modern chamber music featuring works by Hindemith, Fortner, Sessions, and Antheil.126

American authorities used 1947 to 1949 as experimental ones to learn how to wage cultural propaganda within the confines of West Berlin, an endeavor that would be augmented by more successful endeavors by State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in the 1950s. Through the licensing of ensembles, artists, and venues, and denazification proceedings, American authorities began using the arts in Germany as a means to espouse political ideology. Although from 1945 to 1949, the ICD’s Theater and Music branch had limited success due to shortages in staff, denazification challenges, and logistical limitations posed by the currency reform and Blockade, the role of culture in rebuilding postwar Berlin cannot be overestimated.

The invasion of the political sphere by the musical was manifested in the management of arts organizations, as ICD cultural officers sought to control repertoire and promote American music as a way to encourage a political agenda. By renting scores of American classical music, sponsoring lectures about American cultural life, and

---

125 I am grateful to Professor Steven Whiting for pointing this out.
screening approved films, the America Houses were intended to promote the image of the United States as a benevolent, prosperous, and cultured nation. And although the Visiting Artists Program was planned to complement this ideal, its success was hindered by the quality of Artists it managed to attract. Although the visits of Bernstein and Menuhin were significant not only for their collaborations with German musicians, but also for their interaction with Jewish survivors, the ICD was unable to entice more high profile artists to concertize postwar Germany. Even Hindemith’s visit in February of 1949 was coupled in part with his desire to visit family in southern Germany. While these three musicians were well-received for a variety of reasons; Menuhin for his virtuosity, Bernstein for his charm, and Hindemith for his controversial lectures and for his Munich performance of *Mathis der Maler*, the Military Government was faced with staggering material difficulties which made each visit particularly difficult to plan. (When Bernstein arrived, he had no hotel in which to stay. Moseley was forced to pay an actor friend, out of his own pocket, to vacate his home for a week so Bernstein would have a roof over his head.)

The evolving role of the American presence in Berlin meant that by the late 1940s, as Cora Sol Goldstein writes, “the leitmotif of the American political message in Germany was the new friendship between a democratic and prosperous United States and a freedom-loving western Germany.” As postwar strategy changed from combating Nazism to containing communism, the State Department realized that the cultural front was the new battleground, and by the early 1950s America had much grander designs. As American forces occupied not only West Berlin but also the city’s vibrant cultural

128 Goldstein, *Capturing the German Eye*, 18.
life, the shifting political agenda became a palimpsest on which the new German–American cultural partnership was etched.
Chapter III

From Horst Wessel Lied to Stars and Stripes Forever:
The Berlin Philharmonic and the American Military Government

Figure 3.1: Die alte Philharmonie, 1944

Shortly after arriving in Berlin in July of 1945, officer John Bitter wandered through the ruins of the Philharmonic, hoping to locate any surviving scores among the rubble. A year and a half earlier, British phosphorus bombs had smashed through the roof of the concert hall, and within hours, the Philharmonic had lost its home of fifty-six

1 “Die alte Philharmonie 1944,” F 5 II / 1944-1, courtesy of Alfred Hornoff, Berlin Philharmonic Archive. The photograph was taken by Hornoff, a violinist with the Philharmonic from 1921-62, who risked execution (Todesstrafe) for taking pictures of the ruined Philharmonic if caught by Nazi authorities. The back of the photograph reads, “Unter Lebensgefahr (Todesstrafe) aufgenommen.”
years. Bitter’s search for scores proved fruitless, and the destruction only underscored the enormity of his task: to sever the ties between the Philharmonic and the National Socialist patronage that had sustained it for twelve years. Though the financial backing of Goebbels’s Propaganda Ministry saved the orchestra from financial ruin, the cost of this alliance would plague the orchestra and its primary conductor, Wilhelm Furtwängler, in the years to come.

By close of July of 1945, the Philharmonic would be concertizing under a new conductor, Leo Borchard, for a regime of a different nature: the American Military Government. This chapter concerns the early postwar fate of the orchestra as the primary ensemble residing in the American sector. The Philharmonic would be complicit in its own symbolic domination, to borrow Pierre Bourdieu’s term, by acquiescing to certain American Military Government requirements in order to resume concertizing, including alterations in management, musicians and repertoire. Between 1945 and 1949, the Philharmonic played within highly propagandized settings: for Allied troops, under the baton of American officers, and for concerts with American musicians visiting Berlin. The performative framework the Philharmonic occupied in the postwar period was as fraught with political subtext as during the Third Reich. As works by former Entartete (degenerate) composers like Mahler and Mendelssohn were reintroduced, we must ask

---


4 Already by July 24, the Berlin Philharmonic had begun giving concerts for the American Military Government when it repeated its program from July 8 and 9 at the Titania Palast, featuring Mendelssohn’s Hebrides Overture, Tchaikovsky’s Fifth Symphony and the Schumann Cello Concerto with cellist Arthur Troester. Leo Borchard conducted. P 1945 VII 24 Program, Berlin Philharmonic Archive.
how music was re-politicized as the Philharmonic struggled to shed its former associations with National Socialism.

The orchestra’s residence in the American sector was an incredible advantage for the American Military Government’s reorientation plans; what the cultural reeducation program lacked in terms of numbers of ensembles could be tempered by the Philharmonic’s worldwide renown.5 According to regulations set forth by the Information Control Division (ICD), each West Berlin ensemble was required to have a license supervised by an American cultural officer. The license was jointly issued in the name of the primary conductor or director, who was also responsible for the ensemble’s artistic integrity. John Bitter, as the supervisor and military license holder for the Berlin Philharmonic, was instrumental in the Philharmonic’s reorganization. Involved in everything from locating scores, performance and practice venues, he even conducted the ensemble himself on more than thirty occasions, blurring his professional relationship to the orchestra even as he worked tirelessly to ensure the Philharmonic’s survival.6

In order to interrogate why American authorities were so invested in the Philharmonic’s rehabilitation and its usage as a propaganda tool, it is essential to understand how the orchestra came to occupy such a highly politicized context within Germany society.7 The ensemble was created in 1882 as a private corporation by a group of musicians who were dissatisfied with their current conductor, Benjamin Bilse, a

5 The matter of where the Philharmonic would reside was not decided until 1946; the British also hoped to woo the orchestra into making Charlottenburg’s Theater des Westens its home. Matthias Strässner, Der Dirigent Leo Borchard: Eine unvollendete Karriere (Berlin: Transit Buchverlag, 1999), 230.
7 As Sociologist Wolf Lepenies writes in his introduction, “Eine (fast) alltägliche deutsche Geschichte,” Aster entitled his book Das Reichsorchester: Die Berliner Philharmoniker und der Nationalsozialismus using the conjunction und (and), rather than unter (under) or während (during), because Aster wanted to make clear that there existed “eine fast symbiotische Beziehung,” (an almost symbiotic relationship), between the Philharmonic and the National Socialists.
military bandsman from Silesia. Breaking away from Bilse’s ensemble, the musicians formed their own “Philharmonic Orchestra,” and each musician bought into the Philharmonic at 600 Reichsmarks, giving the orchestra complete autonomy in all artistic choices. Their first venue was a converted roller-skating rink located at 21 Bernburger Strasse, a space that with modifications would become their home until its destruction in 1944.

Unfortunately, the ensemble’s business model was not sustainable and the Philharmonic began to have financial difficulties as early as 1912 when the city of Berlin paid the orchestra for a series of public concerts in order to keep the institution afloat. The Philharmonic’s economic hardships continued throughout the 1920s, and by 1928 Furtwängler and the orchestra management were fiercely campaigning to have the Reich, Prussia, and Berlin city government become the Philharmonic’s primary shareholders and buy out the musicians. Although it would save the orchestra from financial ruin, the reorganization would come at the price of the ensemble’s artistic autonomy. The proposed restructuring ultimately fell through, however, and the orchestra’s finances remained uncertain.

The National Socialists rise to power and subsequent creation of the Propaganda Ministry in 1933 was a seemingly advantageous development for the Philharmonic: rather than dealing with the Prussian Government’s Ministry of Finance and Ministry of the Interior, neither of which was equipped to handle their requests, the Nazi Propaganda

---

8 Silesia was part of the German Reich until 1945, and was composed primarily of Poland, with smaller regions in Germany and the Czech Republic. Incidentally, as beer and hot chocolate were served to the audience during Bilse’s performances, it is little wonder the musicians demanded better working conditions. Ronald Taylor, *Berlin and its Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 205.

9 In 1931, the city even merged the Berlin Symphony Orchestra with the Philharmonic in order to reallocate the additional funds to the Philharmonic. Unfortunately, the increased subsidy was not enough. Potter, “The ‘Seizure’ of the Berlin Philharmonic,” in Cuomo, *National Socialist Cultural Policy*, 42-47.
Ministry was more than prepared to cater to the needs of the Orchestra. Thus, Furtwängler eventually made a Faustian bargain with Goebbels, agreeing to turn the ownership of the Philharmonic solely over to the Reich, making the musicians employees of the state. The transition was complete by January 15, 1934.10 Ostensibly, the decision was a saavy one as the Orchestra was already 74,000 Reichsmarks in debt.11

But with increased funding came an increasingly politicized framework in which the Philharmonic had to perform. Although musicians were not required to become Nazi party members, they did need to join the Propaganda Ministry’s Reichsmusikkammer, the organization responsible for coordinating Germany’s professional musicians under the Third Reich. The RMK managed all facets of the music industry, from setting wage scales to establishing guidelines for music education in schools. Apart from membership in the RMK, the orchestra played at Nazi Rallies (Reichsparteitage) and other important holidays including Hitler’s birthday celebrations, and the Reichsmusiktage (Reich Music Days). The ensemble also performed at munitions factories and Hitler Youth gatherings to boost morale, even touring throughout Nazi-occupied countries.12 The National Socialists recognized the international standing of the Philharmonic and exploited the credibility its music could bring, lending a patina of respectability to the Regime.

Nevertheless, from 1933 until 1944, when the Philharmonic embarked on their last propaganda tour to Spain, the orchestra had little about which to complain. Their relationship with the Nazis was mutually beneficial, and as the highest paid musicians in

---

10 Ibid., 50-51.
12 Potter, “The ‘Seizure’ of the Berlin Philharmonic,” in Cuomo, *National Socialist Cultural Policy*, 52. See also Aster, *Das Reichsorchester*, 181-234. In order to give an idea of the sheer number of people these events reached, Aster writes that at the August 1936 Parteitage in Nuremberg, in one day alone, the Philharmonic managed to play for a larger audience than had comprised their entire previous season.
Germany, its members were exempt from military service because Goebbels considered concert tours in occupied countries just as vital as armed combat. During the war, when travel papers were nearly impossible to obtain, the Philharmonic travelled widely throughout occupied Europe, including Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, France, Holland, Italy, Poland, Romania, Serbia, and Spain, performing to full houses. At the close of each tour, Philharmonic members could bring back food and other materials that were growing scarce in Berlin, where, despite shortages and the increasing threat of Allied bombing raids, a rich and vibrant musical culture thrived until fairly late into the War.

But there were, of course, more sinister undercurrents within the Philharmonic under National Socialism. The ensemble’s four Jewish members, concertmaster Szymon Goldberg, first violinist Gilbert Back, and cellists Nicolai Graudan and Joseph Schuster all left the orchestra by 1935 when their contracts were not renewed under mounting pressure from Nazi authorities. Furtwängler’s long-time secretary, Berta Giessmar, also Jewish, fled Berlin. She moved to England to work with Sir Thomas Beecham and the

---
13 Lepenies, “Eine (fast) alltägliche deutsche Geschichte” in Aster, Das Reichsorchester, 19. Philharmonic members earned ten percent more than any other musicians in Germany.
14 Potter, “The Nazi ‘Seizure’ of the Berlin Philharmonic,” in Cuomo, National Socialist Cultural Policy, 58. Double Bassist Erich Hartmann was present on the last Philharmonic tour of Spain. He recalled, “After the concerts in Barcelona the audience honored us with hundreds of small laurel wreaths which were thrown onto the podium.” (Nach den Konzerten in Barcelona beehrte uns das Publikum mit hunderten von kleinen Lorbeerkränzen, die auf das Podium geworfen wurden.) Hartmann, Die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null, 18-19.
15 Goldberg would achieve great success in the United States; in 1955 he focused exclusively on conducting and led the Boston, Chicago, and Cleveland Symphony Orchestras. Boris Schwarz. “Goldberg, Szymon.” In Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/subscriber/article/grove/music/11376 (accessed August 1, 2011). See also Aster, Das Reichsorchester, 95, 99-104. Although the musicians were not dismissed, the Propaganda Ministry placed increasing pressure on the Philharmonic management and Furtwängler to aryanize the Philharmonic. At the close of the 1933-34 Philharmonic season, Schuster and Goldberg left Germany, and Graudan followed shortly thereafter. Back was eventually bought out of his contract in 1935. In a 1985 interview with Elizabeth Furtwängler, the conductor’s wife, she vehemently denied that it was the orchestra’s decision to force out the remaining Jewish musicians. Klaus Lang, Celibidache und Furtwängler: Der große philharmonische Konflikt in der Berliner Nachkriegszeit (Augsburg: Wissner, 2010), 53.
London Philharmonic.Shortly after these musicians and Giessmar fled, “Aryanization cards” were required of all Philharmonic players.

Four more members had Jewish wives; by 1938 the women were forbidden to attend Philharmonic concerts. Three of the men immigrated with their families to ensure their wives’ safety. Clarinetist Ernst Fischer, whose wife was also Jewish, decided to remain in Berlin throughout the war despite the dangers. Undoubtedly, Fischer’s standing in the orchestra protected his wife from deportation. None of the Jewish musicians who had left the Berlin Philharmonic would resume their positions in the postwar period, although Joseph Schuster did visit in 1963 as the cello soloist for Dvorak’s Cello Concerto. Additionally, Hugo Kolberg, who had fled with his wife in 1938, again served as the concertmaster of the Orchestra from 1958 until 1963 in the final years of his career.

Another concern that equally impacted all Berliners, regardless of ethnic background, was the Allied bombing raids. From 1943 until 1945, Berlin became the most heavily bombarded city in all of World War II, enduring 363 aerial attacks. As a special privilege, members of the Philharmonic and their families received Bunker Identification Cards that ensured them a place below ground in the event of an air raid. In the hopes of avoiding interruptions by bombings, Philharmonic concerts were

---

19 Aster, Das Reichsorchester, 106. Although he had since separated from his wife, Kolberg was still awarded Wiedergutmachung (reparations) from the German Government in 1958.
21 Gerhardt, Variationen mit Orchester, Band II, 166.
rescheduled to begin around 3 o’clock in the afternoon.\textsuperscript{22} As a precautionary measure, however, all programs were printed with instructions on how to proceed in case of an air raid:

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Berlin Philharmonic Program, 1943}
\end{figure}

\begin{quote}
“In an air raid all listeners must adjourn to the breezeways and coatrooms of the ground floor.”\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

In order to protect the Philharmonic’s concert hall from bombing during the evenings, musicians volunteered to work \textit{Luftschutzdienst} (air raid protection service). Erich Hartmann, a double bass player with the Philharmonic from 1943 until 1985, was on \textit{Luftschutzdienst} the night of January 29, 1944, when the hall was destroyed.\textsuperscript{24} He and the musicians were only able to salvage six stools before the roof was engulfed in flames; “It was difficult for us to comprehend all of that,” he admitted, as the men watched one of the most beautiful halls in Europe burn.\textsuperscript{25}

Even without a home to concertize in, the Philharmonic kept performing and touring although German defeat was imminent. The final concerts under the Third Reich took place on April 15 and 16, 1945 in the Beethovensaal next to the destroyed

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{22} “Das Berliner Philharmonische Orchester nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg,” B 150, August 1956, Möller K.G., Waidmanslust, Berlin Philharmonic Archive.

\textsuperscript{23} “Philharmonisches Konzert,” 27 June 1943, B 30 1942/43, Berlin Philharmonic Archive.

\textsuperscript{24} Hartmann joined the Philharmonic after being wounded on the Eastern Front. \textit{Die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null}, 17.

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 16. “Es war schwer für uns, das alles zu begreifen.”
\end{footnotes}
Robert Heger and George Schumann conducted; Furtwängler had already left for refuge in Switzerland several months earlier. The orchestra performed Carl Maria von Weber's *Ouvertüre zu Oberon*, Brahms's Double Concerto for Violin, Cello and Orchestra, and Strauss's *Tod und Verklärung* (Death and Transfiguration). The last work was an apt choice; Strauss had written the tone poem to depict an artist on his deathbed contemplating his impending demise. Two weeks later, the Russians arrived in Berlin, beginning what Hartmann called "the most lawless time that Berlin has ever experienced, right here, where there was bitter fighting for every district." The conduct of the Soviet soldiers was no secret as they ransacked the city; German women feared rape, and any remaining German men feared internment in Soviet camps.

It was in the last days of the Third Reich that conductor Leo Borchard huddled in a cellar with several musicians and his partner, Ruth Andreas-Friedrich. The group hoped to survive the Russian take-over of the city as Soviet troops stormed their basement on April 28, 1945. Upon realizing that Borchard could speak Russian, the Soviet commanding officer asked if he knew the Russian National Anthem, which he promptly sang. As Ruth Andreas-Friedrich wrote in her diary, "Er singt um unser Leben" (He sings for our lives).

Born to German parents in Moscow in 1899, Borchard moved to Berlin in 1920,

---

26 Ibid., 27-28; See also Aster, *Das Reichsorchester*, 326. There are some discrepancies concerning when the last concert before the *Zusammenbruch* took place; in a 1956 pamphlet produced by the Philharmonic entitled, "Das Berliner Philharmonische Orchester nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg," April 8, 1945 is listed as the final concert. The Philharmonic Online Archive does not list the April 8th concert at all, and shows only a concert on March 19th as the final performance. Potter puts the final performance on April 11th as "a concert for Mr. Speer," the head architect of the Third Reich. Potter, "The Nazi ‘Seizure’ of the Berlin Philharmonic," in Cuomo, *National Socialist Cultural Policy*, 58.

27 Hartmann, *Die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null*, 29. "Ich meine, es war die gesetzloseste Zeit, die Berlin jemals erlebte, eben hier, wo um jeden Bezirk erbittert gekämpft wurde."

and it was in part thanks to his Russian language skills that General Bersarin appointed him the new Generalmusikdirektor of the Berlin Philharmonic. 29 (Although the Philharmonic would become an American-licensed ensemble, the Soviets had control of the entire city until the Americans arrived in early July.) In the eyes of the Russians, it did not hurt that Borchard and Andreas-Friedrich had been marginally active in Onkel Emil, a small, communist underground resistance group that hid Jews and provided them with falsified documents. 30

Although Berlin Philharmonic historian and musician Peter Muck has written that Borchard was banned from conducting during the Third Reich, 31 this statement is untrue. While he had certainly conducted infrequently, Borchard last led the Philharmonic in March of 1943 for a concert of contemporary music by Gottfried von Einem, Hans Brehme, Werner Egk, Goffredo Petrassi, and Zoltan Kodaly. The repertoire is perhaps surprising given the Nazi’s stance on modernism, but the concert still featured primarily German composers whose style was fairly moderate. (Furthermore, Egk was the leader of the composer’s section of the Reichsmusikkammer.) 32 Borchard was even sent by the Reichsmusikkammer to Greece where he served as a cultural ambassador for several weeks in the early 1940s. 33

Shortly after Germany’s unconditional surrender on May 8, the forty remaining Philharmonic members left in Berlin began to rehearse in the apartment of Ernst Fischer

---

29 Strässner, Der Dirigent Leo Borchard, 213.
33 Ursula Vryzaki, “Deutsch-griechische Musikbeziehungen in den Jahren 1935-45” (lecture, Humboldt University, 27 January 2012.)
with Borchard.34 With the city now under Soviet control, the musicians were uncertain of the ensemble’s fate, but decided to continue practicing together in the event they were allowed to perform. The orchestra’s double bassists brought their instruments to rehearsal in wheelbarrows as Berlin’s transportation system had been crippled by bombing; Hartmann recalled pushing his own double bass in a stroller (Kinderwagen).35 Although some scores had been salvaged from the rubble of the Philharmonic immediately after its bombing in 1944, the ensemble was still compelled to borrow music from other ensembles like the Berliner Zahnärzte Orchester (Berlin Orchestra of Dentists). On May 14, Soviet General Bersarin held a meeting with leading Berlin artists, including Borchard, to discuss plans for the rebuilding of cultural life in all sectors.36 The Soviet aim was to restart musical and theatrical activities as soon as possible. Russian emphasis on continuity meant that they adopted an extremely lax stance on denazification, a mindset the Americans found irksome when they arrived two months later. But above all, the Soviet Military Government wanted to quickly restart cultural life so that they would be perceived as patrons of Berlin’s high culture.

The first full Philharmonic rehearsal took place on May 21, under Borchard's direction at the Rathaus Wilmersdorf. Despite dire material conditions, the Philharmonic’s first postwar concert was on Sunday, May 26, 1945 at the Titania Palast, a movie theater in Steglitz.37 The first concert was sold out despite the difficulty for audience members to travel even short distances, as Berlin’s transportation system was

---
35 Hartmann, Die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null, 36.
36 Strässner, Der Dirigent Leo Borchard, 213.
not running. Borchard rode his bicycle to the performance.\textsuperscript{38} Ruth Andreas-Friedrich noted the contrast between the Philharmonic's former and current conductors:

Would Furtwängler also at some point make his way to the Philharmonic in such a way? For now he is sitting somewhere in Switzerland and waits for better times. And in the meantime, Andrik [Borchard] is pulling his chestnuts out of the fire.\textsuperscript{39}

Although Borchard was certainly experiencing the career opportunity of his lifetime in the conductor’s absence, as a whole, Berlin’s musical community was critical of Furtwängler, who had left Berlin in the Winter of 1945 for a Swiss villa.

Upon reaching the podium, Borchard was greeted by thunderous applause as the Philharmonic opened with Mendelssohn's \textit{A Midsummer Night's Dream} Overture in a program that also included Mozart’s Concerto in A Major for Violin and Orchestra and Tchaikovsky’s Fourth Symphony (Figure 3.3). The return of Mendelssohn’s music was particularly striking as the Philharmonic had not performed the composer since 1935.\textsuperscript{40} The orchestra still had the Mendelssohn likely due to the efforts of Philharmonic trombonist Friedrich Quante, who had concealed the scores of Jewish composers in a hiding place that he never divulged.\textsuperscript{41}

Ruth Andreas-Friedrich wrote in her diary that the concert erased memories of “Nazis, a lost war and occupation troops,” maintaining that the only important thing was

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 329. “Ob sich Furtwängler wohl auch mal auf solche Weise zur Philharmonie begibt? Vorerst sitzt er irgendwo in der Schweiz und wartet auf bessere Zeiten. Und Andrik holt inzwischen seine Kastanien aus dem Feuer.” Andreas-Friedrich referred to Borchard as “Andrik” because that was his code name in their resistance group, \textit{Onkel Emil}.
\textsuperscript{40} “Konzert Programm,” P 1935, III, 11, Berlin Philharmonic Archive. The violin soloist for the evening was Ulrich Greiling.
\textsuperscript{41} Hartmann, \textit{Die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null}, 37. Historian Matthias Strässner writes that the Mendelssohn scores were hidden in the basement of the Philharmonic, although it seems unlikely that so many scores could have survived the fire-bombing. Strässner, \textit{Der Dirigent Leo Borchard}, 215.
the sound of the violins. Given that the Russians were still pillaging the city, however, and that most of Berlin's civilians were trying to survive without roofs, Andreas-Friedrich's claim of transcendence, while appealing within the larger framework of the Stunde Null (zero hour), is perhaps a calculated exaggeration for the benefit of posterity. Another anonymous eyewitness was less generous in his estimation of the evening; his description is so at odds with Andreas-Friedrich that it leads one to question if they were present at the same concert. Although he praises Borchard’s interpretation, in the middle of the Mendelssohn Overture, Russian officers entered the hall by roughly throwing open the hall doors and brandishing their machine guns. The German audience, terrified but powerless to protest, was unable to relax until the Soviets raucously departed in the final movement of Tchaikovsky’s Fourth Symphony. The anonymous account poignantly reveals the tense dynamic between the Russian occupiers and subjugated population, signifying the beginning of a new era in Berlin’s cultural politics.

42 Andreas-Friedrich, Schauplatz Berlin, 330.
The initial postwar programs of the Berlin Philharmonic were strikingly similar to what they had played in 1943-44, prominently featuring Beethoven and Brahms. The only noticeable difference was the frequent inclusion of Tchaikovsky, of course, played in roughly half of the Philharmonic’s concerts in the occupation’s first few months.\footnote{P 1945, V 26 Berlin Philharmonic Archive.} Just as Mendelssohn was frequently played to display the new, “anti-fascist”

Reichsorchester, Tchaikovsky was selected to appease the Russians, appearing roughly half of first thirty postwar Philharmonic’s programs. The sudden shift in repertoire did not go unnoticed; at the close of July, Borchard’s friend, writer Franz Wallner-Basté⁴⁶, sent him a letter concerning the Philharmonic’s programs:

…And must it always be Tchaikovsky throughout, whose unavoidability in German concerts the Russians have already begun to make fun of, and who has already begun to annoy the Americans?...No hard feelings, caro maestro.⁴⁷

Wallner-Basté had a point; of the seven regular concerts in July, six had featured either Tchaikovsky’s Fourth Symphony, his Romeo and Juliet Overture, or his Fifth Symphony. Despite his complaints, the concert programs did not change. Borchard was savvy enough to realize that by playing Tchaikovsky or Glinka, it could keep him in the good graces of the Russians. Music had already been re-politicized by the summer of 1945, and although divorced from Nazi associations, the performance framework remained highly significant.

The American Arrival in Berlin

When the Americans rolled into Berlin on July 7, there was not much of the city left to conquer; General Lucius Clay, Military Governor of the American sector, declared the capital, “a city of the dead.”⁴⁸ Berlin was divided according the agreement made at the Yalta Conference in February 1945, and once the other Allies arrived, the Soviets receded to their own sector of the city.

---

⁴⁶ Wallner-Basté would later be named the Intendant of RIAS.
⁴⁷ Quoted in Strässner, Der Dirigent Leo Borchard, 228-29. “…Und muss es durchaus immer Tchaikowsky sein, über dessen Unvermeidlichkeit in den deutschen Konzerten die Russen schon anfingen, sich lustig zu machen, und über den die Amerikaner schon anfangen, sich zu ärgern?...Nichts für ungut, caro maestro.”
The Titania Palast, home to the Philharmonic after the bombing of their concert hall, was taken over by the American 2nd Panzer Division on July 8, 1945. The Americans intended to use it as a theater for troop entertainment as it was one of the few halls in their sector that still had a roof. Due to American restrictions, the Philharmonic would not be able to practice and perform in the Titania Palast as freely, greatly troubling Borchard.49 Although the Philharmonic’s primary concert hall was in the American sector, the ensemble was not sure whether it would take up residence in the British or the American sector of Berlin. Most Philharmonic members lived in Zehlendorf, a southwest Bezirk (district) that fell within the American sector but shared a border with Wilmersdorf, controlled by the British. Historian Matthias Strässner writes that the Philharmonic quickly learned that it was possible to pit American and British cultural officers against one another as both Allies wanted the Philharmonic as “a prestige object of the first rank”50 to reside in their respective sectors. Thus, the question became which Ally could offer the Philharmonic better working conditions. By November of 1945, the Philharmonic’s managers decided to stay in the American sector of West Berlin.51

On July 31, British cultural officers and Americans John Bitter and Henry Alter met to discuss an eight-week plan for the Philharmonic with Borchard and the orchestra’s business managers. The Americans and British decided that Philharmonic concerts would take place every weekend, at the very least, alternating between the American sector’s Titania Palast and the British’s Theater des Westens. The

49 It was fairly standard practice for the Americans to seize theaters throughout occupied Germany; according to Circular 120, Headquarters, U.S. Forces, European Theater, “In localities where only one such facility exists in useful condition, a sharing of time between troops and civilians will be arranged.” Quoted in J.H. Hills, “Use of Deutsche Theater, Wiesbaden,” 4 January 1946, RG 260, Box 134, Slide 53, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Central Decimal File of the Executive Office, 1944-49, NARA II.
50 Strässner, Der Dirigent Leo Borchard, 230.
51 Ibid., 230-31.
Philharmonic would also be expected to give separate concerts for British and American troops, and as late as January 6, 1947, fortnightly Monday night concerts were open only to Allied soldiers.52

John Bitter understood that the orchestra was a valuable asset in the game of cultural diplomacy not only between the Americans and the Germans, but also in relation to the other Allies. By mid-August, with the help of Bitter and Mellinger, the Philharmonic had already amassed 100 musicians, short by only ten members.53 Still, Bitter did not appreciate his inferiors’ lax attitudes toward the retention of the Philharmonic in the American Zone; he was fully aware that the Orchestra could chose to move to the British, or worse yet, Russian zone. Infuriated that other Military branches could not see the benefits of the ICD’s German re-education program, he complained,

The Titania Palast problem is growing larger. Special Services with full EUCOM approval are putting on variety shows for Germans. These shows are taking place about 20 evenings a month and have a disastrous effect on our reorientation program. i.e. when the British and the BPO asked to give a performance with the celebrated English pianist Eileen Joyce they were turned down…It is of the utmost importance that we get the ear of a high authority in this matter so that the Titania, our best US sector theatre, is not used for second-rate variety shows.54

Special Services and EUCOM (United States European Command) were the American Military Government organizations responsible for transportation, billeting, and management of troops and civilians. Neither organization was directly involved in the re-education programs of the ICD.

Aside from scheduling time in the Titania Palast cultural officers worked together

53 Strässner, Der Dirigent Leo Borchard, 230.
with the Philharmonic management to establish what the ensemble needed most desperately. Musical scores were in short supply as officers struggled to overcome the severe paper shortage. It was nearly impossible to reproduce music in large quantities; OMGUS even resorted to reusing certain Nazi Party office supplies for inter-office communication.\(^{55}\) Some of the Philharmonic’s music had been evacuated from Berlin to protect it from bombing. Around 250 pounds of music was relocated to the basement of a Philharmonic relative near Bayreuth. Munich Music officers returned the scores to Berlin in May of 1946. It was a fortunate re-acquisition for the Philharmonic, as their programs were “increasingly cramped”\(^{56}\) (or narrow) due to the absence of the scores. Furthermore, many of the Berlin Philharmonic’s instruments were gone, having either been stolen from their hiding place in the Plassenburg, a Renaissance fortress also outside Bayreuth, or looted from the Philharmonic’s basement and bunker. Erich Hartmann writes “Likewise, the instruments that had survived the fire bombing in the basement of the alte Philharmonie fell into the enemies [Feinde] hands as booty and were taken east.”\(^{57}\) Note that Hartmann makes certain to use “Feinde” or enemies, when referring to the Russians.

In the midst of Berlin’s reorganization and the ICD’s work with the Philharmonic, the fraternization boundaries between the occupier and occupied were blurring. Rudolph


\(^{57}\) Hartmann, *Die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null*, 34. “Ebenso fielen die Instrumente, die in den Kellern der alten Philharmonie das Bombenfeuer überstanden hatten, den Feinden als Beute in die Hände und wurden nach Osten mitgenommen.”
Dunbar, a young Guyanese conductor who had studied at the New York Institute of Musical Art (present-day Juilliard) visited Borchard not long after he arrived in Berlin. Dunbar was a Press Correspondent for the Associated Negro Press of Chicago, and he had also served in the United States Military.\(^58\) Dunbar felt an affinity with Borchard, he explained, as both musicians faced persecution in contemporary society; Dunbar often encountered skepticism about his capabilities because he was a black classical musician, and Borchard’s German heritage meant that to outsiders, he was indelibly linked to the Nazi Regime. Ruth Andreas-Friedrich recounted in her diary of his visit:

> Is it a victor, who stands before us? In his elegantly cut American uniform, good-looking like a Panther and passionately interested in Bach and Beethoven?\(^59\)

Although Andreas-Friedrich’s account is ostensibly about Dunbar’s affinity with Borchard, she too exoticizes him. As a parting gift, Borchard gave Dunbar a collection of Bach Cantatas, and extended him an invitation to conduct the Philharmonic in the Fall.

Unfortunately, Borchard would not live long enough to be present at Dunbar’s concert, which took place a few weeks later in early September. On the evening of August 23, 1945, Borchard and Andreas-Friedrich were invited to the villa of a British officer in Grunewald, where the group spent the night drinking and eating. Around midnight, another British officer, Colonel Creighton, offered to take them home, as Berlin's public transportation system was not up and running, and there was a strictly enforced curfew for all German civilians between 11pm until 5am. While driving, Creighton approached an American checkpoint, noticing a swinging lantern that he


mistook for someone attempting to hitch a ride. As the car was full, he kept driving, only to realize too late that the lamp had been a signal to halt from the American checkpoint. When the vehicle did not stop, the American officer on duty fired shots; Borchard was killed immediately. According to Andreas-Friederich, Borchard’s final words to Creighton, uttered seconds before the accident, were simply, “Next time I will play Bach for you.”

An untimely four days after his death, Newsweek ran an article on Borchard that made no mention of his death. Instead of his shooting, Newsweek gleefully reported:

The problem of German music involves not only what to play—but who can be trusted to play it…Leo Borchard, 46-year-old conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic is the only man, according to many critics, around whom the orchestra can hope to rebuild.

The story continued that Borchard couldn't leave Berlin because the Nazis had prevented his wife from fleeing; the entire article is a fabrication, doubly so now that the article’s protagonist was dead. (It was not until 1955, ten years after the shooting, that the American military government declared Borchard’s death a Besatzungsschaden, or an occupation casualty, placing the blame on the British.)

Robert Heger led the Philharmonic in its next concert on August 25th, dedicating the funeral march of the Eroica to Borchard, only three months earlier, the same movement had been used to honor Hitler’s death. Boris Blacher, a West Berlin composer and close friend of Borchard’s, recalled of the fallen conductor:

How often did he dream of the Allied entry into Berlin, and what an irony of fate it must seem to be, that this man who idolized absolute freedom and personal independence, was killed in a

---

60 Andreas-Friedrich, Der Schattenmann, 291.
62 Lang, Celibidache und Furtwängler, 19.
63 Strässner, Der Dirigent Leo Borchard, 235.
blind accident by an Allied bullet four months after the war ended.\textsuperscript{64}

It is interesting to note that Blacher uses the passive voice when writing about his friend’s death; he does not point out it was an American occupation soldier who shot Borchard, only using the phrase “Allied bullet” and thus omitting the shooter’s nationality. Perhaps unwilling to risk his excellent relationship with ICD music officers, Blacher projected a neutral stance, at least in public.

Less than ten days after Borchard’s death, on September 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd}, Dunbar gave the German premiere of William Grant Still’s \textit{Afro-American Symphony}. (Dunbar had been a close friend of Still’s for over twenty years. The two musicians met while playing clarinet in the Harlem Orchestra in the early 1920s.)\textsuperscript{65} Dunbar’s Program also included Carl Maria von Weber’s \textit{Oberon Overture} (also performed on the Philharmonic’s final Third Reich concert), and Tchaikovsky’s Sixth Symphony. The first black man to lead the Berlin Philharmonic, Dunbar wore his American Military Uniform while conducting.\textsuperscript{66} Yet his own status as a second-class citizen within the very organization he represented was a poignant irony. General Lucius Clay, Military Governor of Germany, maintained throughout the postwar period that African American soldiers should be “used primarily as parade troops.”\textsuperscript{67} Dunbar lived most of his life in London, rather than the United States, finding greater acceptance as a black conductor in British society.

\textsuperscript{64} “Leo Borchard dirigerte…”. \textit{Sie} Nr. 26, Pg. 3, Juni 1946, Folder 179, AdK, Berlin.


With an audience of 2,000 Berliners and 500 Allied servicemen, *Time* magazine reported that at the concert’s conclusion, the Philharmonic’s first flutist admitted, “Now at last I understand your American jazz.” Dunbar then presented the orchestra with a Parisian contrabassoon, as the ensemble had lost all in bombing attacks. The *Time* article concludes that Military authorities allowed Dunbar to conduct primarily because “their interest was more in teaching the Germans a lesson in racial tolerance than in Dunbar’s musicianship.” Considering the circumstances, who was exploiting whom?

Certainly Dunbar sought the professional recognition that would come with conducting the Philharmonic. Additionally, he most likely accepted the invitation in the spirit in which it was issued by Borchard; as a gesture of solidarity with a defeated people. Dunbar had already toured extensively throughout Europe but had never been given the chance to work with the Berlin Philharmonic. But the American Military Government had a different aim by approving Dunbar’s concert, namely, to create the illusion that American views on race were much more progressive and liberal than those of the Germans. It seems unlikely that Berliners were unaware of the plight of blacks in America; early Soviet propaganda emphasized the cruelty of the Southern Jim Crow laws, and furthermore, segregation was on display in postwar Germany as black and white GIs still had separate regiments, barracks, and clubs. The segregation of American troops sent a clearer message to the Germans than one concert with Dunbar ever could. In a scathing report for the *Paris Herald Tribune*, composer and

---

69 Ibid.
71 The American Military did not begin the desegregation process until 1948, although into the mid-1950s
correspondent Virgil Thomson argued that the American occupiers treated German civilians like “Negroes in the United States. We expect them to work hard and to be very grateful to us. But we refer to them as ‘Krauts’ and do not eat with them in public.”

Despite the ICD’s desire to portray the United States as a country that celebrated its own diversity, the reality was far from a utopia of racial acceptance.

After Dunbar’s departure, the Philharmonic was now conductor-less and without any clear frontrunners. Furtwängler was still in Switzerland, awaiting word on his denazification proceedings. Hans Knappertsbusch, who had frequently led the Philharmonic on National Socialist propaganda tours, was blacklisted. The American Military Government also deemed conductors Leopold Ludwig and Robert Heger unfit as both men had concertized frequently under the National Socialists. (Heger was eventually blacklisted by the Americans in the Spring of 1946 because he had been a Nazi Party member.) Ludwig was later sentenced by the British to one year in prison for lying on his denazification forms. Consequently, American authorities desperately wanted to find a new director who had not held any positions of leadership under the National Socialists, when a suitable replacement appeared unexpectedly in the form of a twenty-eight year-old Romanian conductor with dapper good looks and excellent timing.

---


73 ICD director Robert McClure even petitioned the American Military Government to allow the visit of Marian Anderson in 1947, but his request was denied by Ambassador Robert Murphy, who feared American taxpayers would balk at the idea of a Visiting Artist Program in Germany. Thacker, Music After Hitler, 95-96.

74 Thacker, Music after Hitler, 51-63.
Composition student Sergiu Celibidache had turned down the chance to flee Berlin as it fell to the Russians in May. When a group of fellow Romanians offered him a remaining spot in their car heading West, Celibidache declined, reluctant to leave his compositions behind in Berlin. Of his fortuitous decision to remain and the chaos of Berlin’s take-over, he admitted:

So then I experienced the Russians and the Americans all together in Berlin. I was injured two times and had a splinter in my head, not because the war was so difficult, but rather because I simply wanted to experience everything with my own eyes.  

While John Bitter is usually credited with finding Celibidache to conduct the Philharmonic, Erich Hartmann writes that it was actually Philharmonic violinist

---

76 Quoted in Lang, Celibidache und Furtwängler, 26.
77 Monod, Settling Scores, 38.
Hermann Bethmann who recommended the young “Celi” (as he would quickly be nicknamed) to lead the orchestra. Bethmann had studied with Celibidache at the Berlin Hochschule für Musik, and suggested he might be a good fit for the orchestra. On August 29, the very day of Borchard’s funeral, Celibidache conducted the Philharmonic for the first time, beginning a tumultuous relationship that would end with Herbert von Karajan being named as the Philharmonic’s conductor for life in 1954.

To the Americans, Celibidache appeared the perfect fit for the Philharmonic: Romanian by birth, he had lived in Berlin since 1936 but had not been a member of the Nazi Party or served in the military; he was exempted from service in the Wehrmacht due to his status as a foreigner. Apart from these qualifications, he was young, energetic, and non-German. Cultural officers were especially eager to install a non-German as head of the Philharmonic to dispel the Nazi claims of German racial superiority once and for all.

Although Annemarie Vogt and other scholars have mistakenly claimed Celibidache had never conducted prior to his time with the Berlin Philharmonic—a claim perpetuated by Celibidache himself— he did have conducting experience, albeit limited. As Klaus Lang has shown, between the years 1941 and 1945 Celibidache conducted some 16 times, including the Rundfunk Sinfonieorchester Berlin (Radio Symphony Orchestra, Berlin) and the Orchester Berliner Musikfreunde (Orchestra of Berlin’s Friends of Music). At one concert on March 7, 1942, the sponsoring organization was the National Socialist Kraft durch Freude (Strength through Joy, or KdF), an organization that played a crucial role in Nazi ideology by encouraging group activities.

78 Hartmann, die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null, 43.
79 Vogt, Warum nicht Beethoven?, 1-38. See also Lang, Celibidache und Furtwängler, 32-38.
“No, but maybe so. Actually, I had conducted a bit in school, but never an orchestra.” (Nein, aber–doch. Ich habe in der Schule so ein bißchen dirigiert, aber ein Orchester nicht.)
and travel. Celibidache’s involvement in the concert was not uncovered until the 1980s.80

In terms of the Philharmonic’s licensing, the American Military Government required a primary conductor to sign his name to contract, and also two members of the management. After passing denazification, Celibidache was listed as the license holder for the Berlin Philharmonic by November of 1945.81 (All ensembles in Berlin had to be given a license by the appropriate military authority, though the Russians were notoriously more relaxed in their requirements.) Although the ensemble was now under an American supervisor, John Bitter, with a military approved conductor, not all the musicians were allowed to remain concertizing. Musicians who had been party members were subjected to greater scrutiny as the ICD tried to create a uniform denazification policy.82 Joseph Stöhr and Lorenz Höber, both former Nazi party members, were fired by the ICD in December of 1945. Höber, in addition to his duties as a violist, had been responsible for many of the Philharmonic’s administrative tasks and was reluctant to relinquish his position. As Music and Theater officer Edward Hogan wrote in May of 1946:

> We are told that Höber, the former business manager whom we fired on order of Public Safety, still can’t get it through his head that the Americans can get rid of him even though he was hired by the city of Berlin.83

Both Höber and Stöhr were rehired by the Russian-controlled Staatsoper in the Spring of

80 Lang, Celibidache und Furtwängler, 32.
82 Newell Jenkins, “Denazification as of August 1,” 12 July 1946, RG 260, Box 237, Slide 3-4, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division: Records Relating to Music and Theater, NARA II. Although active in Württemberg-Baden as the section’s Music Chief, Jenkins did not play much of a role in Berlin.
1946. Höber, however, remained devastated over his Philharmonic dismissal, the ensemble to which he had dedicated half of his life, and he died shortly thereafter, on December 1, 1947.

The Americans then appointed Paul Schrör and Ernst Fuhr as the new managers or Geschäftsführung of the Philharmonic. (Cellist Fuhr’s apartment was where the Philharmonic gathered just after the war ended to discuss the ensemble’s future plans). The Philharmonic decided in November of 1946, however, that the American licensees would be Ernst Fuhr and Richard Wolff, as Wolff was one of the more senior orchestra members.

**The Americans and the Philharmonic**

While American authorities undoubtedly helped in the Philharmonic’s reconstruction, their aid did not come without a price. From 1945-47, the Philharmonic concertized throughout the city in an exhaustive number of venues, including: Zinnowald Saal in Zehlendorf, Cosmos-Kino in Tegel, Quick Theater in Neukölln, Haus des Rundfunks, Theatre des Westens, Titania Palast, Deutsches Opernhaus an der Kantstrasse, Marienkirche, while rehearsing primarily in Dahlem’s Jesus-Christus-Gemeinde. Music officer Henry Alter recalled of these initial months, “I really think that
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86 Lang, *Celibidache und Furtwängler*, 77. See also Muck, *Einhundert Jahre Berliner Philharmonisches Orchester*, 205.
we saved the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra,”\textsuperscript{88} by locating scores and instruments for the ensemble. Similarly, in a later interview, cultural officer John Bitter recalled his impetus to work in postwar Germany:

   Later I said to myself, now the war is over, now I would like to help rebuild the good Germany; that of Beethoven, Schiller, Goethe, and Brahms. One cannot always continue to conduct war.\textsuperscript{89}

So instead he conducted the Berlin Philharmonic some thirty times during his tenure (1945-48). Bitter’s statement was somewhat disingenuous; rather than simply working with the ensemble, he was also interested in using his Military connections to further his musical career by gaining valuable experience for his return to civilian life. For his first performance given for American Troops on December 10, 1945, he opened with John Phillip Sousa’s \textit{The Stars and Stripes Forever} in a program that also included the German premiere of Samuel Barber’s \textit{Adagio for Strings}.\textsuperscript{90} In a 1981, music officer Henry Alter recalled of the concert, “He began with \textit{Stars and Stripes}, looming quite large in his uniform. He actually was not bad. They played the Second Symphony of Sibelius.”\textsuperscript{91}

\textsuperscript{88} Interview with Henry C. Alter, conducted by Brewster Chamberlain and Jürgen Wetzel B Rep. 037, Nr. 79-82, Landesarchiv, Berlin. “Ich glaube wirklich, dass wir das Berliner Philharmonische Orchester gerettet haben.”


\textsuperscript{90} Henry Alter, interview by Brewster Chamberlain and Jürgen Wetzel, May 11, 1981, B Rep. 037, Nr. 79-82, Landesarchiv, Berlin. I am grateful to Professor Steven Whiting for pointing out the elegiac connotations of Barber’s \textit{Adagio} in relation to Toscanini’s famous radio broadcast marking Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s death. Whether Bitter had this performance in mind when he selected \textit{Adagio} is unknown.

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid.
Figure 3.5: John Bitter’s First Philharmonic Concert, 10 December 1945

Note that a Waltz from Strauss’s *Der Rosenkavalier* is penciled in at the bottom of the program, serving as the encore. Strauss, of course, was one of the very composers the ICD had planned to downplay in postwar Germany. Yet six months later, the leading Theater and Music employee in Berlin was conducting Strauss’s work out of pragmatism as surviving musical scores were extremely valuable.

Bitter also played with other orchestras throughout Germany during his time serving in the military, accepting invitations from the Berliner Staatskapelle, Dresden Philharmonic, Hamburg Philharmonic, Berlin’s RIAS Symphonie Orchester, Städtisches Gürzenich-Orchester Köln, and Staatskapelle Kassel. Several works Bitter conducted were completely new to these ensembles; the Hamburg Philharmonic had never performed Bartók’s Piano Concerto no. 3 and Shostakovich’s Symphony no. 1. Similarly, Cologne’s Städtisches Gürzenich-Orchester played Bartok concerto and Ravel’s *La Valse*

---

92 P 1945 XII 10 Berlin Philharmonic Archive. The Tchaikovsky and Sibelius selections were broadcast by Soviet-controlled Berlin Radio, as indicated by the marginal annotations “Funk” (Radio).

93 The remaining programs are housed in the University of Miami Special Collections, where Bitter served as the Dean of the School of Music from 1950-63. Dr. John Bitter Collection, Special Collections, University of Miami Libraries, Coral Gables, Florida.
for the first time in a May 1948 concert with Bitter. In Kassel, Bitter introduced
Hindemith’s Concerto for Cello and Orchestra, a work the composer had written during
his American exile.\(^94\) Bitter frequently conducted Barber, Bartók, Brahms, Hindemith,
Ravel, and Shostakovich, compositions selected to expand the amount of twentieth-
century music performed in postwar Germany. The scores for the performances came
from the Inter-Allied lending library in Berlin, started by all four Allied powers in
September of 1946. The Lending Library, located in the Staatsbibliothek on Unter den
Linden, housed the most extensive repository of modern musical scores in Germany by
1947. Although Bitter’s performances in Germany certainly had a self-serving aspect, his
concerts did introduce new works to German audiences that local conductors would not
have programmed.

Bitter’s close involvement with German orchestras, particularly the Berlin
Philharmonic, was not lost on Eric Clarke, Chief of the Film, Theater, and Music branch.
Clarke complained to a superior, “As the Berlin music officer who has nursed the
Philharmonic along, should he [Bitter] face it in any other capacity?...Is he not weakening
our present stand against entertaining Germans?”\(^95\) While Clarke’s complaints appear to
reveal skepticism about music’s power to educate, concerns similar to those voiced by
Ambassador Robert Murphy and Military Governor Lucius Clay, it is highly unlikely
Clarke would have been so dismissive of high art’s place in the U.S. reorientation
program. In his civilian life, he worked as an administrator for the Metropolitan Opera in

\(^{94}\) See Appendix A for the Program Notes from Bitter’s Personal Archive.
Thomson, RG 260, Box 243, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Records of the Division
Headquarters, 1945-49, NARA II.
New York City, and thus well understood the role of culture in contemporary society. Clarke was annoyed, and perhaps even slightly jealous, that Bitter should enjoy such a high profile within Berlin’s musical community. Erich Hartmann also took issue with Bitter’s relationship to the Philharmonic, writing in his memoirs:

We had to work with him, because he had political influence, maybe even military authority. Although he was anxious to measure up to the task of being our conductor, a task which fell into his hands quite easily. It was certain that he revered our orchestra, although the feeling was not always mutual.

Bitter led the orchestra so frequently that Electrola, owned by Columbia Gramophone Company, even offered him a recording contract with the Philharmonic in 1948. Although Bitter offered to donate his earnings to charity, ICD Chief Benno Frank did not approve his request.

Apart from Bitter, Intelligence officer Nicolas Nabokov was also interested in the Philharmonic’s potential to aid in his own career. On May 25th, 26th, and in two concerts on June 2nd, 1946, the Philharmonic performed Nabokov’s Parade. The Berlin premiere of Nabokov’s work is all the more striking when one considers that between December 1945 and 1947, the Philharmonic performed only one other American work; Barber’s Adagio for Strings.

---

96 For more information on Clarke, see Monod, Settling Scores, 105.
97 Hartmann, Die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null, 42. “Wir mußten mit ihm arbeiten, denn er hatte politischen Einfluß, vielleicht sogar Befehlsgewalt. Er war zwar bemüht, seine ihm recht leicht zugefallene Aufgabe als Dirigent bei uns zu erfüllen. Gewiß war, daß er unser Orchester sehr verehrte, doch nicht immer beruhnte das auf Gegenseitigkeit.”
99 For more on Nabokov, see Francis Stonor Saunders, The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters (New York: New Press, 1999), 113-28; Ross, The Rest is Noise, 346; and Ian Wellens, Music on the Frontline: Nicolas Nabokov’s Struggle against Communism and Middlebrow Culture (Hants: Ashgate, 2002), 1-14, 63-76.
The close involvement of Bitter and Nabokov to the Philharmonic complicates the relationship of ICD personnel to German civilians and to the German musical establishment as a whole.\textsuperscript{101} Strict non-fraternization rules explicitly prohibited American military personnel from providing entertainment for German civilians,\textsuperscript{102} rules that were bent, if not completely broken, when the most prestigious ensemble in Germany was conducted by Bitter or performed music by Nabokov.

\textbf{Figure 3.6: John Bitter Conducts the Berlin Philharmonic, 1949}\textsuperscript{103}

\textsuperscript{101} Monod, \textit{Settling Scores}, 119-21.
\textsuperscript{103} P 1949, II, 27, Berlin Philharmonic Archive.
In a report for the Parisian edition of *Herald Tribune*, Virgil Thomson wrote of the dire material conditions of the Berlin Philharmonic. Thomson lamented, “There are no Nazis in it; many of its members have done time in concentration camps,”\(^{104}\) and complained that orchestra members did not have enough food to eat from the Military Government. (Although Thomson steadfastly asserts the anti-fascist leanings of the orchestra, no member of the ensemble ever spent time in a concentration camp.) He concludes with an anecdote concerning several members of the Philharmonic and their performance at a party given by an unnamed American officer:

> Whether they were paid for their evening’s work or not I do not know; but I do know that they were allowed to pass through a supper room in which buffet tables groaned with food, without being offered so much as a sandwich. It is illegal, I believe, to give away commissary merchandise to citizens of an enemy country.\(^{105}\)

Although unclear which American officer held the party, Thomson’s point is quite clear. The Germans, as a subjugated people, were in no position to protest their treatment by their occupiers, and in Thomson’s view, their treatment by the American occupiers was particularly shameful.

Although the reality was more moderate than Thomson suggests (Philharmonic musicians were in the highest rations bracket), one might ponder the relevance here of Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic violence as the orchestra could ill-afford to refuse any request the ICD might set forth. Symbolic violence, as “the coercion which is set up only through the consent that the dominated cannot fail to give to the dominator,”\(^{106}\)

---


\(^{105}\) Ibid. Thomson’s own music was used for the ICD’s promotion of American music in postwar Germany.

describes the ICD’s ambitious reeducation programs. In this context, symbolic violence occurred through the cultural capital of classical music; by regulating German repertoire and trying to introduce American classical music to postwar West Berlin, the ICD rendered German musicians powerless to protest repertoire choices or performances solely for American personnel.107 “The Americans have colonized our subconscious,”108 muses a character in one of iconic German director Wim Wenders’s films, a sentiment that aptly describes how these musicians were complicit in their own symbolic domination.

**Denazification of the Philharmonic**

Ultimately, one might wonder why the Philharmonic musicians and management accepted the Americans’ rule with little resistance. A possible reason for their cooperation was undoubtedly the denazification process which lasted in the American zone from 1945 until 1947. Although Nazi Party membership had not been particularly rampant within the Berlin Philharmonic, each musician still needed to pass denazification in order to work and to obtain vital ration cards. It is estimated that at least eight and as many as twenty out of 110 musicians in the Berlin Philharmonic were members of the Nazi Party. By comparison, forty-five of the Vienna Philharmonic’s 117 musicians had

---

107 One of the more infamous performances given for Allied personnel featured soprano Marjorie Lawrence and the Berlin Philharmonic in December 1946. Due to inadequate rehearsal, the result was disastrous, and Bitter lamented, “Although it is possible that some persons enjoyed the program, it did not bring credit to the Military Service or musical happiness to any discriminating listeners.” John Bitter, “Weekly Report,” 26 December 1946, RG 260, Box 239, Records of the Education and Cultural Resources Branch, Records Relating to Music and Theater, NARA II. Bitter neglects to mention that Lawrence was suffering from Polio and performed while seated.

been party members.109 This disparity did not go unnoticed, and Bitter admitted in an April 1947 report, “In contrast to the Berlin Philharmonic, the Vienna Philharmonic has always gotten away with murder in its prodigal use of Nazi members.”110 Party members in the Vienna Philharmonic faced few consequences as Austria had already been declared the “first victim” of National Socialism.

Within the Berlin Philharmonic, the ICD fired several musicians for their Nazi Party membership, aside from Joseph Stöhr and Lorenz Höber. Violinist Alfred Graupner and double bassist Arno Burkhardt were both fired in 1945. By 1947, they were re-hired when American denazification was halted.111 Several other musicians fired by the Americans for their Party Membership found work elsewhere: Cellist Wolfram Kleber moved to the British-controlled Städtischen Oper Orchestra, and Horn player George Hedler joined the RIAS orchestra in 1947. (This is particularly surprising as the RIAS orchester was initially started and funded by the Americans.)

Several Philharmonic members experienced darker fates in the immediate postwar years. Double bassist Alfred Krueger committed suicide with his family in April of 1945, as did bassoonist Heinrich Lieberum in August. Harpist Rolf Naumann and Willy Lenz were murdered for their bicycles as they tried to flee West in April of 1945. In May of 1945, trumpeter Anton Schuldes was taken into custody by the invading Soviets, never to be seen again. Lastly, flutist Albert Harzer was badly injured by three American soldiers on his way home from a 1948 Philharmonic concert in an unprovoked attack.112

111 Gerhardt, Variationen mit Orchester, Band II, 20, 43.
112 Ibid., 48, 67-108.
But the subtext of the American denazification efforts revolved around one question: When would the Philharmonic’s former conductor, Wilhelm Furtwängler, be allowed to return? Since February of 1945, Furtwängler had been living in self-imposed Swiss exile in St. Clarens, near Geneva. As the conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic since 1922, he led the orchestra at countless Nazi Party functions throughout the 1930s and 40s, although he had was not a Nazi Party member. As historian Michael Kater contends, most of Furtwängler’s concerts under National Socialism occurred “within highly propagandistic frameworks, rendering his art eminently political.”113 Despite Furtwängler’s insistence that his music could be separate from Nazi politics, his postwar reputation was severely compromised, and in February of 1946, ICD head Robert McClure announced Furtwängler’s blacklisting to be enforced across all zones and sectors of Germany:

It is an indisputable fact that through his activities, Furtwängler was prominently identified with Nazi Germany. By allowing himself to become a tool of the party, he lent an aura of respectability to the circle of men who are now on trial at Nuremberg for crimes against humanity. He not only held office under the Nazis, but also was an advisor to the Propaganda Ministry and lent his name to tours abroad sponsored by Goebbels. It is inconceivable that he should be allowed to occupy a leading position in Germany at a time when we are attempting to wipe out every trace of Nazism.114

McClure and the ICD decided to take a hardline stance with Furtwängler’s case because he had been one of the most highly visible musicians under the Third Reich. The conductor did indeed serve as Vice President of the Reichmusikkammer although he resigned the position in 1934 in support of Paul Hindemith, whose Mathis der Maler was deemed unfit by the National Socialists. (Apart from his RMK Vice Presidency, he also
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113 Kater, The Twisted Muse, 200.
gave up his conductorship of the Berlin Philharmonic and musical director of the Staatsoper.) But his resistance to the Nazis only lasted so long and in the Spring of 1935, Furtwängler issued a letter of apology to the Regime. Although he did not resume his position as Vice President, he returned to conducting the Philharmonic at the close of April. At his second Philharmonic concert after his return on May 3, 1935, the ensemble played Beethoven’s *Egmont Overture*, and Fifth and Sixth Symphonies. Hitler, Goebbels and Göring sat in the front row, and at the close of the concert, Hitler presented the conductor with a flower. Still, contrary to McClure’s claim that Furtwängler had “lent his name to tours abroad,” it was Hans Knappertsbusch who led most of the Philharmonic’s concert tours in occupied countries, although Furtwängler had toured with the Vienna Philharmonic in occupied Hungary, Sweden and the Czech Republic. He also conducted in neutral Switzerland at a concert sponsored by the National Socialists.

Ultimately, Furtwängler’s case was a question of perspective. Erich Hartmann wrote in his memoirs even fifty years later that Furtwängler was fully apolitical, and that “we have to be grateful to him, that he remained in Germany during the Nazi period and that he was able to work here as an artist.” Newsweek, on the other hand, reported “Those much acquainted with Furtwängler know he is not much of a Nazi nor much of a

---


118 Kater, *Twisted Muse*, 201.

119 Hartmann, *die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null*, 51. “Wir schulden ihm Dank dafür, daß er während der Nazi-Zeit in Deutschland geblieben ist und hier künstlerisch wirken konnte.”
hero.”¹²⁰ In the end, Furtwängler’s crime was not that he was a fascist, but rather that he failed to or did not want to recognize the dangerously politicized role the Philharmonic had taken on during the Third Reich. Although Furtwängler claimed to have found the Nazis’ cultural politics distasteful, they still provided a platform from which he could conduct in front of packed concert halls. And, he was duly compensated for his work under the Third Reich; in 1939 alone, he made 200,000 Reichsmarks.¹²¹ According to historians Heinz Geuen and Anno Mungen, the conductor’s case represents, “an object lesson of the impossibility of a cultural sphere devoid of politics.”¹²² Nor, as the events of 1933-45 show, can there be a political sphere devoid of culture.

One wonders what Furtwängler would have done in 1933, had he realized the political and personal implications of remaining in Germany. Would he have still agreed to make the Philharmonic musicians civil servants under the Third Reich? Or, would he have immigrated to America or Great Britain? These questions, while enigmatic and intriguing, are unanswerable. Furtwängler remained in Germany throughout the Third Reich, only leaving in the Winter of 1945, when Germany’s collapse was inevitable.

Furtwängler’s denazification process dragged on for nearly two years, as American authorities vacillated between wanting to punish National Socialism’s most decorated conductor while still retaining his services in West Berlin. Meanwhile, the Soviets openly campaigned for Furtwängler’s return, tempting him with offers to conduct at the Staatsoper rather than waiting for American clearance to return to the

Philharmonic. The Soviets were more than willing to overlook Furtwängler’s recent past for a chance to have him working in their sector. But Furtwängler remained steadfast; he only wanted to be reinstated to conduct his beloved Philharmonic. He knew it would be a symbolic victory if he could resume his former post, rather than accepting the Soviets’ offer. So he decided to wait.

His denazification trial date was finally arranged, and Bitter wrote in an October 1946 ICD report, “Furtwängler will be permitted the use of a lawyer, but for advice only. He must do all the talking himself.” The conductor’s trial took place on December 11 and 17, 1946, to a packed hall and was led by intelligence officer Alex Vogel. Various witnesses were called, including Philharmonic clarinetist Ernst Fischer, who claimed the conductor saved his Jewish wife from deportation. After four months of deliberation, on April 29, 1947, the American Military Government classified Furtwängler as a Mitläufer (follower) and placed him in Category IV, which meant he could still hold a leadership position and return to the Philharmonic.

Furtwängler was, of course, not the only famous musician to undergo postwar scrutiny; Herbert von Karajan, Eugen Jochum, Hans Knappertsbusch, Elisabeth Schwarzkopf, Richard Strauss, Heinz Tietjen, and countless others faced denazification proceedings not only from the occupiers, but also in the court of public opinion. Conductor Herbert von Karajan had joined the Nazi Party in 1933 while living in Salzburg, where he quickly became a rising star. (Just to make sure, he joined the Party again in 1935 when he relocated to Ulm.) Karajan, like Furtwängler, had been

---

125 Aster, *Das Reichsorchester*, 106.
blacklisted by the ICD in 1945, but was reinstated in October of 1947. Henry Alter, stationed in Vienna after his initial months in Berlin, admitted of the denazification of both Karajan and Furtwängler:

It was an unsolvable problem. Every person who had heard Karajan once make music knew that if one did not allow such a person to make music, one would be punishing oneself and not him. Under these conditions it was really not possible to handle Karajan in any way fairly or justly. Actually, it was similar with Furtwängler.

Alter’s comments underscore the seemingly contradictory manner in which the ICD handled these denazification proceedings, as both men returned to the stage within two years of the War’s end. Ultimately, the Americans did not want to lose Karajan or Furtwängler from their zone. As two of the most famous musicians in Germany, the ICD recognized they would make better allies than enemies.

**Furtwängler’s Return**

Furtwängler returned to Berlin at the end of May 1947 to conduct the Philharmonic for the first time since 1945.

It happened on Sunday the 25th of May. Furtwängler conducted for the first time since the war. It was an honest music success, no political demonstration and the Phil played beautifully. The difficulties as to where the first concert should be played were well ironed out beforehand. Besides the all-Beethoven concerts Sunday, Monday, and Thursday at the Titania Palast and Tuesday at the Rundfunk, he will conduct the Staatskapelle next Saturday and Sunday in a program devoted to the music of Beethoven, R. Strauss, and Tchaikovsky. Beyond that no plans have been made.

127 Ibid., 209.
Furtwängler’s return to the Titania Palast was considered a success by American authorities, although at a concert at the Staatsoper several days later, Bitter wrote in his report, “The demonstration of the audience had a political tinge,” referring to the length of time the audience applauded in support of the conductor, whom they felt had been persecuted by American officials who banned his return for two years.

Between 1947 and 1948, Furtwängler conducted in ensembles in Genf, Leipzig, Luzern, Munich, Paris, Salzburg, Stockholm, and Vienna. Although his reviews in the press were generally positive, his reputation among audiences outside Germany was irreparably marred. At a Vienna appearance in November of 1947, fifty former concentration camp prisoners organized a demonstration against Furtwängler. The conductor had to be ushered into the hall through a side door to avoid further embarrassment.

Yet, surprisingly, for one who had fought so long to be reinstated, Furtwängler conducted infrequently in Berlin, much to the chagrin of the Philharmonic. During the 1947 and 1948 season, Furtwängler led the Philharmonic at only twelve concerts to Celibidache’s seventy-six. His wife, Elisabeth Furtwängler, claimed there were several reasons her husband did not resume his former Philharmonic schedule: the vitriol of the foreign press, other conducting engagements, and his desire to devote more time his compositions. (His second love had always been composition, for which his Philharmonic schedule had left little time. When he finally finished his Second

131 Lang, Celibidache und Furtwängler, 132
133 Lang, Celibidache und Furtwängler, 102.
Symphony in 1948, he premiered the work with the Philharmonic in February.)\textsuperscript{134}

Table 3.1: Berlin Philharmonic Postwar Concerts\textsuperscript{135}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Borchard Berlin</th>
<th>Celibidache Berlin</th>
<th>Furtwängler Berlin</th>
<th>Karajan Berlin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still, the unspoken reason Furtwängler stayed away probably had to do with material comforts. Berlin was still a city in disrepair, and by 1947, the shortage of coal caused a crisis of epic proportions. Furtwängler’s life in Switzerland, by comparison, provided the best working conditions he had experienced in years. Now free to take engagements with foreign orchestras, as he was no longer a German civil servant, Furtwängler did much traveling. The fact that did not often conduct the Berlin Philharmonic not only irritated Celibidache and the orchestra, but it also greatly diminished Furtwängler’s own argument about why he had remained in Nazi Germany.


\textsuperscript{135} Reproduced from Lang, *Celibidache und Furtwängler*, 389.
If Furtwängler had stayed in Hitler’s Reich in order give the people hope through music in the Regime’s darkest days, then why, in their greatest hour of need, would he retreat to a villa in Clarens, a little corner of the world seemingly untouched by recent history?

Meanwhile, the morale of the Orchestra hit an all-time low. As Bitter wrote in an August 1947 report:

The Phil is in a bad way. Five of its best first violinists have left the orchestra. In fact it is about 20 players shy of full strength. The morale is low and because of low wage scale, the coming winter, the political situation, etc. the prospects for the future are poor. However, the plans for the next season are ambitious and energetic steps are being taken to right the situation.\textsuperscript{136}

But the situation in 1948 would prove to be even more difficult, as the Americans had also forbidden the Philharmonic to concertize in the Soviet Sector. An October article in \textit{Neues Deutschland} entitled “Terror gegen die Philharmoniker” (Terror against the Philharmonic) deemed the American ban as striking yet another blow to Berlin's cultural life. (Considering the fact that \textit{Neues Deutschland} was a Soviet-licensed news outlet, its anti-American proclamation was somewhat less than surprising). Residing in the American sector not only required that the orchestra would be at the disposal of American and British authorities; it also meant that as the Cold War became increasingly hot, the ensemble could not openly support the Soviet’s \textit{Sozialistische Einheitspartei, Deutschlands} (Socialist Unity Party of Germany).\textsuperscript{137}

Furtwängler’s infrequent appearances with the ensemble did little to improve the morale of the Philharmonic. He raised the Orchestra’s ire when he cancelled ten days

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
prior to a series of July 1948 concerts in which he was to have led American soloists Patricia Travers, and Ralph Kirkpatrick, who were in Germany in conjunction with the Visiting Artists Program. (Although tickets went on sale for the Menuhin concert the day after the currency reform and as inflation ran rampant, the concert was sold out in a matter of hours.) Even more devastating, as Celibidache made clear in a letter of reproach to Furtwängler, was that the city was suffering in the throes of the Blockade:

> Your not coming was all the more incomprehensible as you were already in Munich and notices appeared about it in the local press. In addition all the announced American soloists arrived here as planned…Your advertised Beethoven Cycle with the Viennese in London also does not exactly please the orchestra.

Celibidache continued to conduct the Philharmonic intermittently although their relationship had become strained; he had pushed for the retirement of certain members and advocated restructuring the orchestra’s management, ultimately alienating the musicians. By 1952, Furtwängler had once again been renamed the Philharmonic’s conductor for life; he died only two years later on November 30, 1954. Celibidache would not assume Furtwängler’s conductorship as he had since parted ways with the Orchestra management and many of the musicians. Instead, the morning after Furtwängler’s death, Karajan discussed with Gerhart von Westerman, the Philharmonic’s Intendant, the possibility of taking over the conductorship. Although Karajan had conducted the orchestra a total of four times, and Furtwängler and Karajan had not had the easiest of
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138 Lang, *Celibidache und Furtwängler*, 176-77.
139 Ibid., 177-78. “Ihr Nichtkommen wurde allen umso unverständlicher, als Sie ja bereits in München waren und darüber Notizen in der hiesigen Presse erschienen. Ausserdem trafen alle angekündigten amerikanischen Solisten programmgemäss hier ein…Ihr angekündigte Beethoven–Zyklus mit den Wiernern in London erfreut das Orchester auch nicht gerade sehr.”
relationships, on his deathbed, Furtwängler acknowledged Karajan should be his successor.140

Karajan’s selection was crucial as the Orchestra was only six weeks away from embarking on a concert tour of America. The tour held special political significance as it was meant to be a show of gratitude toward the Americans for their efforts during the Berlin Blockade. According to Westerman, the Philharmonic’s Intendant, the conductor would have to be someone of whom New York’s Columbia Artist Management would approve. Otherwise, the entire tour would be in jeopardy. He frantically wrote to Joachim Tiburtus, Berlin’s Minister of Culture, that “Columbia Artists Management expects us to appear with a German conductor at the helm,”141 and also a director who specialized in German classical and romantic music. Westerman did not even consider Celibidache, as a Romanian who felt a greater affinity with the French Impressionists, as a suitable replacement for Furtwängler. On December 13, 1954, the Philharmonic voted to take Karajan as their conductor,142 effectively terminating Celibidache’s contract with the Philharmonic.

Reintroduction of Entartete Musik (Degenerate Music)

Apart from problems with finding suitable conductors in the postwar period, the Philharmonic also faced logistical questions concerning printed music and instruments. Not only were the physical objects of the score and instruments missing, but there were issues of repertoire to be addressed as well. One of the primary goals of the ICD’s music branch was “to introduce or re-introduce the German public to the large musical world

141 Quoted in Ibid., 269.
142 Ibid., 225-26.
from which they have been cut off for so long.”

But what precisely did the ICD regard as this “large musical world,” left unplayed in Germany for twelve years? As discussed in Chapter I, Germany was not completely devoid of modern music from 1933 until 1945. The music of Jewish composers, however, received a different reception, as it was largely banned or only to be played by Jewish musicians for Jewish audiences. In Mahler’s case, the Jewish Orchestra in Berlin performed his Second Symphony for an all-Jewish audience as late as 1941, though the Berlin Philharmonic had last performed Mahler in 1932. Mendelssohn had been performed as late as March of 1935, when Georg Kulenkampff played the Violin Concerto op. 64 with the Philharmonic under Max Fiedler (Appendix C).

Consequently, a section of the plans for the American Military Government reeducation program included reintroducing the music of Jewish composers, although American authorities did not wish to appear as though they were forcing this repertoire on German orchestras. Mendelssohn was taken up as a champion of the anti-fascist cause because his music fit neatly within the boundaries that the ICD sought to promote in the immediate postwar years; his classicism appeared far removed from the turmoil of the twentieth century, a relic of simpler, more distant Germanic musical lineage. (In Berlin, in the first fifty concerts given by the Philharmonic, Mendelssohn was performed in roughly half, appearing in fifteen out of thirty-two total concerts. Furthermore, only

---

144 Carl Niekerk, Reading Mahler: German Culture and Jewish Identity in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna (Rochester, New York: Camden House, 2010), 216.
the surviving scores—Hebrides Overture op. 26, Midsummer Night’s Dream Overture, Fourth Symphony, and Violin Concerto—were repeated over and over.)¹⁴⁷

Where Mendelssohn evoked security and comfort, Mahler’s music emphasized irony and self-reflection, and Mahler, as a figure of the more recent past, represented a more problematic solution to the question of German, Austrian, and Jewish relationships. Mendelssohn was baptized as a Protestant and was able to practice his profession relatively unencumbered by his family’s religious background. Mahler converted to Catholicism in 1897, although “he lived in the twilight of an era both as a Jew and as a musician,” as anti-Semitism had already begun to take root in Viennese society.¹⁴⁸

Furthermore, the very monumentality of Mahler’s works meant that they were perhaps the wrong musical medium to represent change in a reformed Germany; where the Nazis had relied on the monumentality of Beethoven’s and Wagner’s works, couldn’t Mahler’s compositions be thought in some way to represent continuity with the monumental in music? As Leon Botstein has written, to postwar anti-fascists, “a modernism overtly at odds with Mahler’s project—if only in terms of monumentality—seemed vital and necessary.”¹⁴⁹ Mendelssohn’s music was simply more available and required fewer performing resources than Mahler’s.

Ultimately, Mahler’s reintroduction to the Berlin Philharmonic was most likely impeded for four primary reasons: (1) the ICD’s increasing emphasis on the promotion of American classical music; (2) the complicated process of denazification in Berlin; and (3) the greater accessibility of Mendelssohn’s music (4) the currency reform in the

¹⁴⁸ Talia Pecker Berio, “Mahler’s Jewish Parable,” in Painter, Mahler and His World, 88, 93.
Western Sectors of Berlin. As historian David Monod has noted, prior to the reform, most seats for Berlin concerts were so inexpensive that the worst seats were generally the last ones to sell. In the months following the reform and the introduction of the Deutsch Mark, the performing arts suffered greatly, as Berlin audiences could no longer afford ticket prices. Audiences isolated from Mahler for 12 years had not yet had time to develop a taste for Mahler’s music as organizations programmed more standard fare in the hopes of attracting a wider public.

Still, despite the lack of American Military Government promotion, Mahler’s music was performed on a limited basis in postwar Germany. In an interview conducted in 2000, Elisabeth Furtwängler recalled her husband’s surprise at Mahler’s initial reincorporation into the Austro-Germanic canon:

He [Furtwängler] was only very astonished, that so soon after the war a group of his colleagues, who had been proud party members, rushed at the Symphonies of Mahler, in a manner of speaking, as proof of their political adjustment…

For example, Mahler’s First Symphony was already played by the Vienna Philharmonic on July 3, 1945, under the direction of Robert Fanta; the very orchestra whose NSDAP membership was estimated at around 38%. From 1948-1957, Mahler would be performed by the Berlin Philharmonic thirty times, although conducted only once by Furtwängler; in comparison, the Philharmonic had played Mahler some fifty times between 1915 and 1924, including all nine of his Symphonies.

152 Lewis M. Smoley, “Mahler conducted and recorded: from the concert hall to DVD,” in Cambridge Companion to Mahler, 249. See also the Berlin Philharmonic Online Archive, http://www.berliner-philharmoniker.de/konzerte/suche-archiv/.
Mahler’s music returned to the Berlin Philharmonic in March of 1948 under the baton of conductor Robert Heger. The *Adagio* of the Tenth Symphony was played at the British-controlled Städtische Oper (today the Deutsche Oper), and was framed by Beethoven’s Leonore-Overture no. 3 and Brahms’s First Symphony. The concert took place at 10:30 am, as did many of the Philharmonic’s performances in the postwar period, most likely in an attempt to conserve coal for lighting and heating. (During the previous winter, coal had been so scarce that all theatres and music halls remained open to the public until one hour before curtain to act as shelters).\(^{153}\)

Just under two months later, on May 2 and 3, 1948, the Philharmonic performed Mahler’s Fourth Symphony with Otto Klemperer as its director. As a German Jew, Klemperer had fled the country in 1933 and resettled in America, returning to Europe only in the late 1940s.\(^{154}\) The Philharmonic rehearsal for the Mahler Symphony went abysmally. The second flutist walked in late, only further infuriating Klemperer, who was barely on speaking terms with the orchestra. Unrelenting in his excruciatingly slow tempi, his dark eyes peering out of thick, horn-rimmed glasses, he remained unsmiling as the flutist took his seat. Still, the audience, who remained blissfully unaware of the tense scene between the orchestra and Klemperer, considered the concert a success.


\(^{154}\) Klemperer relocated to the United States not long after he conducted *Tannhäuser* at Berlin’s Staatsoper for a 50th Anniversary celebration of Wagner’s death.
As music officer John Bitter wrote in his Military Government Report:

The famous conductor Otto Klemperer who left Germany in 1934 to avoid racial persecution made a flying trip from Budapest in order to conduct two concerts...Dr. Klemperer is an American citizen. In spite of a marked physical handicap he gave an amazing and touching performance with Mozart’s D Major Symphony and Gustav Mahler’s 4th Symphony which was on the Nazi Index. The audience celebrated and welcomed Klemperer’s return with hearty applause.\textsuperscript{156}

Note that Bitter is quick to point out that Klemperer is now an assimilated American citizen. The ICD feared that the German public would perceive the work of any contemporary German artist as German, not American, as ICD Chief Benno Frank admitted, “In my opinion, we should clearly distinguish between U.S. citizens appearing as U.S. artists, and former German citizens whose art is definitely German.”\textsuperscript{157} Frank believed that it was not simply enough to sponsor the return former émigrés; he felt it

\textsuperscript{155} F 5 V, Klem 2, Berlin Philharmonic Archive.
necessary instead to promote American-born performers rather than those born on foreign soil.

The Fourth Symphony was selected for a number of reasons; not the least of which could be that it was probably one of the few Mahler scores to survive the war and was also among Mahler’s shorter symphonic works. Additionally, the Fourth Symphony was the last work of Mahler’s to be performed by the Philharmonic before the Nazis’ rise to power, and perhaps Klemperer chose the symphony as a symbolic gesture, even if the “himmlische Leben” (heavenly life) of the fourth movement provided a stark contrast to postwar living conditions.

In a letter from to Furtwängler, Celibidache wrote disparagingly of Klemperer’s visit, “The ‘great’ Klemperer– he is really great– illustrated for me the subtle meaning of
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the German word Trottel (idiot).

Similarly, Furtwängler and Klemperer, once friendly, had parted ways personally and artistically. Erich Hartmann contended the friction between Klemperer and the ensemble

...Can be explained by the fact that as a Jew, he had to leave Germany and now was standing before an Orchestra that belonged to the privileged in the Nazi era, though it was never a Nazi Orchestra.

Hartmann's observations raise far more questions than they answer; his claim that the ensemble was “never a Nazi orchestra” although it was among “the most privileged in the Nazi era,” highlights the contradictory and uncomfortable cultural politics of the postwar period. Although American authorities viewed Klemperer’s return as a success for German re-education efforts, unmentioned was the orchestra’s own role during National Socialism. After all, the ensemble was already in the service of another patron.

159 Lang, Celibidache und Furtwängler, 185.
160 Ibid., 183-84. Intendant Boleslaw Barlog recalled Klemperer's furious outburst during his visit when Furtwängler's name was mentioned over dinner at the American Club in Dahlem. Klemperer called the conductor a Nazi, retracting his statement only when Hans Söhnker, an actor at Barlog's Schlossparktheater, admonished him.
161 Hartmann, Die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null, 49-50. “Vielleicht trug zu seiner Art sich zu geben bei, daß er als Jude Deutschland verlassen mußte und jetzt einem Orchester gegenüberstand, daß zu den Privilegierten in der Nazi-Zeit gehörte, das allerdings niemals ein Nazi-Orchester war.”
Chapter IV

The Ruin as an Artistic Catalyst in the Compositions of Boris Blacher, Karl Amadeus Hartmann, and Richard Strauss

By May of 1945, Berlin was a tangled mess of iron and steel.1 As Hans Werner Richter, the famed writer and leader of Gruppe 47, a literary circle who discussed politics in post-Hitlerite Germany, wrote: “The hallmark of our time is the ruin...It lives in us, as we in it. It is our new reality that beckons and has yet to be shaped.”2 The “new reality,” however, seemed to be based in surrealism more than anything else, with the viewer trapped in a dream-like haze of rubble, debris, and moral ambiguity. Although much scholarship on postwar Berlin has interpreted the ruins simply as allegories for the depravity of a nation3, I believe we can instead locate a productive tension within the city’s destruction.

In this chapter, I will analyze the ruin as an artistic catalyst and its role in the creation of new musical works, not simply as an indicator of moral decay. Much as a

---

phoenix rising from the ashes, Berlin’s cultural *Wiederaufbau* (reconstruction) occurred not over but rather *within* the ruins of the cityscape, transforming the ruin from a passive space to a site of negotiation, renegotiation, and even transgression. As a synecdoche of Germany’s ruined landscape, how might we view musical scores as tomes of loss and mourning?

While the first half of this dissertation addressed the ICD’s presentation and framing of classical works in Berlin, this chapter will widen its scope to include newly composed postwar works by Boris Blacher, Karl Amadeus Hartmann, and Richard Strauss. This section will show how the ruin of Germany is indelibly etched in the style and content of these compositions, as the American occupation had unexpected consequences for these composers’ output. Furthermore, this chapter contrasts the work of other cultural historians, including Hermann Glaser and Wolfgang Schivelbusch, who have written of the stagnation of postwar musical life due to the destruction of Germany cities.4

First, the ruin’s influence in other sectors of cultural life, including film, visual art, and photography, will be analyzed. This section is intended to show how these disciplines integrated and aestheticized the destruction. In the second half of the chapter, the postwar compositions of Blacher, Hartmann, and Strauss are analyzed by interrogating the various ways in which an aesthetic of ruin is inscribed in their work. By examining the various ways in which German artists, writers, and musicians recorded and aestheticized the ruin, this chapter investigates the new cultural practices begun as a reaction to the rubble. *Trümmerfilme* (Rubble Films), *Trümmerkünste* (Rubble Art), and
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Trümmerphotographie (Rubble Photography) created visually spectacular panoramas that also documented the Allied bombing raids. Trümmerliteratur (Rubble Literature) explored themes of alienation, disillusionment, and guilt in relation to Germany’s recent past. But, in a glaring omission, as musicologist Andrew Oster has noted, the term Trümtermusik (Rubble Music) has never been applied to postwar compositions.\(^5\) He contends that the Funkoper (Radio Opera) is the best example of rubble music because the genre was free from the visual trappings of sets and costumes.

I would argue, however, that there is nothing particular to the Funkoper which can be deemed an intentional use of Germany’s ruin, and such an assessment overlooks the Funkoper’s presence prior to and after the Second World War, beginning in 1929 and ending around 1957.\(^6\) The genre simply presented a cheaper, faster way to produce new works. Instead of seeking an answer to Oster’s question, “what is rubble music?,”\(^7\) this chapter will investigate the idea of a ruin aesthetic in music. Rather than labeling an entire pre-existing genre as representative of a Ruin aesthetic, I will look at individual works by Blacher, Hartmann, and Strauss, interrogating how moral and material destruction are depicted in their scores, as well as memory and loss, vital components of the ruin aesthetic.

---


\(^7\) Oster, “Rubble, Radio, and Reconstruction,” 139.
Towards a Ruin Aesthetic in Music:  
Postwar Berlin and Trümmerkunst (Rubble Art)

Evocative in their destruction, ruins engage the viewer in a process of reminiscence and reflection, as he or she experiences the tension between the past and the present. The very term “ruin” implies process; Ruina literally translates to a “collapsing in upon itself,” a gradual though haphazard process brought about by time’s progression.8 Life in postwar Berlin was inextricably linked with process: the denazification process, the process of coming to terms with the past (Vergangenheitsbewältigung), and the process of clearing the rubble itself.

In pragmatic terms, the ruin of the city raised certain logistical issues for cultural life. During the last two weeks of the War, the city had endured the Battle of Berlin (April 16-May 2), which exacted a staggering human and material toll. Erich Hartmann described Berlin in May of 1945:

It was a time without law, and even after the war life was very dangerous…The ruins were practically still smoking; there were bodies and horse cadavers lying about the streets and squares; the stench was penetrating…One time I noticed in Elßholzstraße in Schöneberg a grand piano dangling behind a column in the fourth floor of a ruin. Although it could not fall, it could not be saved either.9

Hartmann’s experience of wandering through the ruins is a recurring trope in postwar accounts, providing an evocative counterpoint to the rapidity with which cultural life

---

8 For more on the tension between the viewer and the ruin, see Helmut Puff, “Ruins as Models: Displaying Destruction in Postwar Germany,” in Hell and Schönle, Ruins of Modernity, 253-69. Puff’s essay investigates the various ways which viewers engage with architectural models of bombed postwar cities. The models, housed in various Rathäuser (town halls) and museums throughout Germany, have immortalized the temporary, transforming postwar rubble into a permanent monument, and, according to Puff, thus elevating them to the status of ruins.

resumed after the war. Still, the lack of surviving concert halls made it difficult to find performance spaces for Berlin’s ensembles; as historian Elizabeth Janik writes, by 1945, “the German musical tradition was left practically homeless in Berlin.”

Although the music tradition was homeless, filmmakers were finding new inspiration in the city as Berlin provided the backdrop to some forty-seven Trümmerfilme between 1945 and 1948. The Trümmerfilm genre was characterized by long, wide-angle shots of bombed cities, and the plots were often concerned with moral ambiguity, human resilience and suffering against a ruined cityscape. Among the genre’s most famous examples are Wolfgang Staudte’s Die Mörderer sind unter uns (1946) (The Murderers Are Among Us) and Italian director Roberto Rosselini’s Germania anno zero (1947) (Germany, Year Zero), both shot in Berlin. Although they are films about the difficulty of survival, neither mentions the word “Jew.” Similarly, Billy Wilder’s A Foreign Affair (1948) featured clips of Berlin that Wilder had taken while serving as an ICD film officer, but does not delve into darker questions of German complicity. (Wilder was himself an Austrian émigré).

Film scholar Eric Rentschler contends that the Trümmerfilm fetishizes and transfigures the rubble even as the ruined landscape served as a reminder of the consequences of collusion with the Regime. The shots of the Berlin’s ruins stylized the destruction, as “many of these films stage ruins not only as overbearing but also as

---

12 Judt, Postwar, 233.
aesthetically stunning configurations.” But by 1949, the Heimatfilm and Hollywood had taken over German cinema as themes of homecoming and love rekindled became more popular with audiences than the gray realities of everyday life.

The ruin also found its way into visual artworks, forming the new genre of Trümmerrealismus (Rubble Realism). German artists Werner Heldt (1904-54), Karl Hofer (1878-1955), and Wilhelm Rudolph (1889-1982) all used the ruin and rubble prominently in their work from 1945 until 1948. Heldt and Hofer were based in Berlin; Rudolph in Dresden. Rudolph’s work focuses on the remnants from the British and American firebombing during February 13–15, 1945, and his charcoal drawings are primarily focused on the landscapes themselves, omitting any human forms. Heldt’s series of ruin works, including Fensterausblick mit totem Vogel, 1945 (Window View with a Dead Bird) and Berlin am Meer, 1946–48 (Berlin on the Sea) feature destroyed houses melting into an ocean of ruins. Hofer’s Ruinennacht, 1947 (Night of the Ruins) depicts the eerily laughing facades of a bombed Berlin.

---

Note that Hofer places a piano in the painting’s foreground to suggest not only Berlin’s material ruin, but cultural as well. In 1945, Hofer joined the Soviet’s *Kultur bund zur demokratischen Erneuerung Deutschlands* (Cultural League for the Democratic Renewal of Germany) and helped to re-establish the Berlin Hochschule für bildende Künste, where he had been a Professor before his dismissal by the National Socialists.

Other artists were more concerned with preserving the cityscape as it had once

---

appeared. Otto Nagel, another Berlin artist, began painting the older corners of the city near Klosterstrasse and Petrikirche during the war as he realized Berlin’s destruction was imminent. And in the postwar period, he would take walks through the ruins, sketching their forms even as the city rebuilt.  

Apart from painting and drawing in the realm of visual art, *Trümmerphotographie* also aestheticized the ruin. The genre was largely begun by Henry Ries, a Berlin-born Jew who immigrated to America in the 1930s to escape Nazi persecution. He served as a photojournalist for the American Military Government first in Asia and then in postwar German cities, documenting the destruction from the ground and aerially. His most iconic image captured Berliners standing on a pile of rubble at Tempelhof while an American plane dropped food and supplies during the Blockade. Apart from Ries, another American military photojournalist, Adolph Karl Byers, documented the ruin with Hein Gorny, a German friend Byers had made in the 1930s while both were living in New York City. Gorny had been primarily an advertising and animal photographer whose work had been banned under the Third Reich. Once Byers arrived in Berlin the two began taking aerial photographs of the ruined city. The photographs are highly unusual for their time as they were partially created by a German civilian; in the immediate postwar years the airways belonged only to the victorious Allied countries.

---

19 Ries travelled to New York in 1937 but was denied entry into the United States over a paperwork glitch. He returned to Europe but was finally able to gain access into American in 1938. 
Themes of destruction also worked their way into the works of *Trümmerliteratur* (Rubble Literature) by authors Heinrich Böll and Wolfgang Borchert. Borchert’s final work, *Draußen vor der Tür* (Outside the Door) details the homecoming of prisoner of war, Beckmann, who is unable to recognize or rejoin the society he left. When Böll famously noted in his fictional *Briefe an meine Söhne* (Letters to my Sons) about the significance of May 8, 1945; “We wait on our ‘enemies’ as ‘emancipators’,” he summarized the conflicted postwar German attitude toward the Allies. Led by Hans Werner Richter, *Gruppe 47*, which included writers Heinrich Böll, Erich Kästner, Hans Magnus Enzensberger, believed that only by confronting Germany’s destruction could postwar authors free the country from its Nazi past.22

Still other writers recorded the physical destruction in their diaries and its cultural toll. As Ruth Andreas-Friedrich, conductor Leo Borchard’s partner, recalled of the *alte Philharmonie*, “Where at one time Bruno Walter made music, a dead horse lays between rubble and walls. The bloated body, with black, petrified eyes.”23 As Andreas-Friedrich’s observation makes clear, the production, presentation, and framing of classical music itself was fundamentally altered by Berlin’s bombing. Bombed-out concert halls became open-air concert venues; the photograph below was taken in 1950 as Celibidache conducted the Philharmonic in the ruins of their former concert hall. The shot is from a documentary film about the Philharmonic called *Das klingenden Herz* (The

---


Resounding Heart).\textsuperscript{24} The film features Celibidache conducting Beethoven’s *Egmont Overture* interspersed with shots of the hall’s rubble. Due to the piece’s delicate political subtext, i.e. the beheading of Count Egmont after he attempted to resist the Spanish Hapsburg occupation of the Netherlands, Celibidache’s repertoire selection was highly significant. One the one hand, his choice of the *Egmont Overture* could be perceived as a symbol of solidarity with those who resisted the Nazi Regime. On the other hand, however, he could have selected the work as a veiled contemporary critique of Germany’s current occupiers.\textsuperscript{25}

\textbf{Figure 4.2: Celibidache and the Berlin Philharmonic in the Ruins of the *alte Philharmonie* (1950)}\textsuperscript{26}


\textsuperscript{25} I am grateful to Professor Steven Whiting for pointing out the significance of Celibidache’s choice, and for sending me his text on the *Egmont Overture*.

\textsuperscript{26} Gerhardt, *Variationen mit Orchester*, Band II, 257.
But apart from influencing art, photography, film, literature, and providing an unintended performance space, how did the ruin in postwar Germany function as a catalyst for the production of new music? Even if most of the concert halls and opera houses might have been destroyed, Germany’s next generation of composers was coming of age.

**Boris Blacher: The Last Days of Berlin and Oramente as Musical Ruins**

Born in Russian-speaking Manchuria in 1903, Blacher studied music in Siberia and Charbin, China, before moving to Berlin to study architecture in 1922. Soon dissatisfied with his studies, Blacher enrolled at the Hochschule für Musik to study composition with Friedrich Ernst Koch. He enjoyed a moderately successful career in Berlin as an arranger and composer, and a brief appointment at Dresden Conservatory in 1938. (He was dismissed by the National Socialists one year later because of his stance on modern music.)

Considered stateless by the National Socialists, Blacher was exempted from service in the *Wehrmacht*. Furthermore, Blacher was one-quarter Jewish, and although his life was not in danger, his work would not find overwhelming success within the Regime. Consequently, he was free from the denazification proceedings which impeded, if only temporarily, the careers of many prominent Berlin musicians.

By 1945, Blacher was uniquely poised to become one of the key players in West

---


29 Ibid., 66-69.
Berlin’s musical scene. He and his wife, pianist Gerty-Herzog, lived in Zehlendorf, an outlying Western suburb of Berlin’s American Sector that had been spared the heaviest war damage as seventy-six percent of its homes were still inhabitable.\(^{30}\) Not only was he a gifted musician, Blacher was politically savvy enough to enjoy the patronage of both superpower occupiers; furthermore, like Borchard, it did not hurt that he spoke fluent Russian. The composer received commissions from the Soviets while still enjoying the position, as David Monod has written, “the Americans’ darling,”\(^{31}\) as Officers Bitter and Nabokov would frequently secure extra food rations for Blacher and his wife. As his biographer and friend, musicologist Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt noted,

\[
\text{Blacher, still undivided, used his inexhaustible manpower for all conceivable functions. In both radio stations, the American as well as the Russian-licensed, in all theaters, in the concerts of the Berlin Philharmonic as well as the Staatsoper, one could hear Blacher's compositions.}^{32}
\]

Blacher’s own style can be characterized by a driving rhythm, with linear, compact construction and a clarity of line strongly influenced by Stravinsky, and French composers like Milhaud and Satie, rather than Austro-Germanic composers. In 1946, Blacher began teaching at the Internationales Musikinstitut in Berlin-Zehlendorf, an American-controlled residential suburb, started by two colleagues, Josef Rufer and Paul Höffer. Ironically, although the Soviets fired Höffer from his position at Berlin’s Hochschule für Musik for his activities under National Socialism, his newly-founded International Institute actively promoted modern music. (In fact in 1946, several of the teachers at the Institute apart from Höffer, including pianist Gerhard Pulchet and Heinz

\(^{30}\) Zehlendorf was in relatively good condition compared with Steglitz, the neighboring district, which was seventy-five percent destroyed. “Die Gebäudeschäden in Berlin,” 8 November 1945, Berliner Zeitung. LAZ–280, 5501–5800 No. 27. Landesarchiv, Berlin.
\(^{31}\) Monod, Settling Scores, 123.
Tiessen, were forbidden from resuming their positions at the Hochschule.) Although the school was mainly financed through student tuition, the Kunstant-Zehlendorf (Office for the Arts, Zehlendorf) also contributed funds, as did the American Military Government. (Fifty percent of the proceeds from one of Yehudi Menuhin’s 1947 concerts went to the Institute, and the other half to the Hochschule für Musik.) The Institute’s curriculum mainly focused on modern composers of the pre-Nazi era, especially Stravinsky, Bartók, and Hindemith, as Höffer and Blacher were most familiar with their works. (Rufer primarily taught Schoenberg’s music, having studied with him in the 1920s and served as his assistant until Schoenberg fled in 1933.) No music was discussed which had been composed in Nazi Germany; similarly, students did not ask their teachers about works they had composed as commissions during the Third Reich. In contrast to the Darmstadt school, however, the institute closed in 1949 when all who had been barred from returning to the Hochschule could finally resume their positions.33 Blacher too joined the faculty of the Hochschule für Musik and in 1953 he was appointed the school’s director, a post he held until 1970. He also served as Vice President of West Berlin’s Akademie der Künste, alongside President Hans Scharoun, the architect for Berlin’s neue Philharmonie, begun in 1960 completed in 1963.34

But before these accolades and in the darkest period of Berlin’s history, Blacher was trying to survive through various radio commissions and teaching appointments. His first composition after the war was for a Berliner Rundfunk Hörspiel (radio play), Die

Letzten Tage von Berlin (The Last Days of Berlin) which aired on April 30, 1946.\textsuperscript{35} Unfortunately, there is very little information available about the Die letzten Tage von Berlin as the original recording and transcript no longer exist. Only Blacher’s score remains, unpublished and archived among his papers in the Akademie der Künste.\textsuperscript{36} The music is scored for piccolo, flute, oboe, 2 clarinets, bassoon, trumpet, trombone, bass, drum, and piano, and is divided into six sections. Military drum beats and diminished triads prevail within Blacher’s score; the second section is scored only for solo snare drum, and presumably signals the Nazi’s last stand. Sections 5 and 6 are written \textit{alla Marcia}, and with the sudden introduction of a March in the piano, section 5 presumably marks the victory and arrival of the Russians in Berlin.

\textit{Die letzten Tage von Berlin} was also featured in Berliner Rundfunk’s weekly magazine, \textit{der Rundfunk}. Written by Wilhelm Hoffmann, the play details Berlin’s fall in the last days of April of 1945. The article is accompanied by a series of pictures detailing the destruction; Berliners huddled in basements, buildings toppling onto tram-tracks, and explosions near U-Bahn Stations as civilians hurry for cover. It is as close to “rubble music” as one could get; Blacher’s score literally accompanies the re-telling of the fall of Berlin.\textsuperscript{37} (Although, given that \textit{Die letzten Tage von Berlin} was produced by a Soviet radio station, it is safe to assume the more unsavory elements of battle for Berlin, such as

\textsuperscript{35} Although Berliner Rundfunk was a Soviet-controlled station, its transmitter was located in the British Sector’s Measurenallee. The Rundfunk building had been home to Germany’s most powerful transmitter during the Third Reich, which, as the first occupiers to arrive in Berlin, the Soviets immediately seized.

\textsuperscript{36} Boris Blacher, \textit{Die letzten Tage von Berlin}, score, 1946, Folder 1.75.142, Blacher Archive, AdK, Berlin.

\textsuperscript{37} Other early postwar compositions include Blacher’s \textit{Vier Lieder} op. 25, a setting of poems by communist Friedrich Wolf (1888-1953), a German-Jewish Doctor who had survived the war by immigrating to Moscow. Blacher also composed film music that referenced Germany’s ruin, contributing music for the Soviet documentary film \textit{aus dem Todeslager Sachsenhausen} (Out of the Deathcamp Sachsenhausen). Sachsenhausen was the concentration camp just north of Berlin that housed primarily political prisoners. For more, see “Todeslager Sachsenhausen,” Progress, Film-Verleih, http://www.progress-film.de/de/filmarchiv/film.php?id=494&back=true.
Throughout his career, Blacher was interested in the intersection of rhythm and mathematical processes, and by the late 1940s he began to experiment with composing in Variable Meters, a compositional technique that relied on a predetermined role to determine the number of beats in each measure. His first published work written in variable meters was *Ornamente für Klavier: Sieben Studien über Variable Metren* op. 37 (Ornaments for Piano: Seven Studies in Variable Meters) (1950). The tonal composition is a series of fragmented studies for solo piano. In titling the collection *Ornamente*, Blacher emphasizes their brevity and liminal nature; perhaps much in the same way

---

39 The leading composers at Darmstadt: Boulez, Nono, Stockhausen, and Maderna were so militant in their reverence for serialism that one theorist dubbed them the “Dodecaphonic Police.” For more, see Christopher Fox, “The Darmstadt School.” In *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/subscriber/article/grove/music/49725 (accessed May 1, 2011). Not to be overlooked is that from 1949–51, the American Military Government provided around twenty percent of the funds for the Darmstadt courses. For more on Darmstadt’s origins, see Amy Beal, *New Music, New Allies*, 38-41.
Beethoven intended for his *Six Bagatelles* op. 126, or trifles, to be played in succession.

But where Blacher’s *Hörspiel* (radio play) music for *Die letzten Tage von Berlin* takes the ruin of the city as its primary subject, *Ornamente* functions as a musical ruin through its conflation of memory and destruction. Blacher dedicated the movements mostly to composer friends who had either survived the war in Germany or were Americans aiding in the reconstruction efforts. (Blacher’s exceptions were his fourth movement, dedicated to Priaulx Rainier, a South African born British composer who lived in London, and movement five, dedicated to Swiss composer Rolf Liebermann.) Blacher’s tributes to friends invites a comparison to Ravel’s *Le Tombeau de Couperin*, although Ravel’s dedicatees were all deceased.\(^{40}\) (In early interview, Blacher even cited Ravel as a compositional influence.)\(^{41}\)

*Ornamente* op. 37

I. Virgil Thomson  
II. Rudolf Wagner-Regeny  
III. Karl Amadeus Hartmann  
IV. Priaulx Rainier  
V. Rolf Liebermann  
VI. Nicholas Nabokov  
VII. Gottfried von Einem

With these dedications, Blacher was linking past loss with present reconstruction, bridging national boundaries and political affiliations. *Ornamente* is concurrently a memorial and an anti-monument; its brevity breaks with the monumentality of the late romantics and the monolithic in music which the National Socialists had so exploited in the works of Bruckner, Beethoven, and Wagner. As Leon Botstein has written, postwar

---

\(^{40}\) One of the few postwar Blacher works with a dedication was his *Partita für Streichorchester und Schlagwerk* (Partita for String Orchestra and Percussion) (1945), in memory of Leo Borchard, the first postwar conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic.  
anti-fascists believed that monumentality represented a continuation with 1933 through 1945 and consequently, a modernism which rejected larger forms appeared necessary. In many respects, this call for anti-monumentality was a return to the safe neo-classicism of the 1920s.\(^{42}\) This postwar necessity was made all the more complicated by the nineteenth-century conflation of musical monumentality and German national identity.

As Andreas Huyssen writes in his essay, “Monumental Seduction,”

> To see art performing a world-historical mission is indeed a particularly German phenomenon that resulted from the overprivileging of art and culture in the process of shaping national identity in the period preceding the formation of the German nation state.\(^{43}\)

The overprivileging of Wagner’s music and the National Socialist mobilization of his Gesamtkunstwerke as propaganda meant that Blacher’s project, and that of his contemporaries, was to seek new modes of musical coherence. By 1945, monumentality was considered “politically suspect” as it represented “nineteenth-century nationalism and twentieth-century totalitarianisms,”\(^{44}\) even though monumentality had not been as prevalent during the Third Reich as many believed.\(^{45}\)

Above each movement, Blacher notated the variable meter’s row, using the eighth note as the basic unit of measure; thus, in mvt. I, 234567 represents 2/8, 3/8, 4/8, 5/8, 6/8, 7/8 etc.


\(^{44}\) Ibid., 189.

In a lecture he delivered in the early 1950s, Blacher admitted the influence of the English composer Daniel Jones and American Joseph Schillinger, both of whom made use of shifting meters. The most fundamental difference, however, between Blacher's method and that of Jones or Schillinger was that Blacher constructed his variable meters from a row which organized the piece's formal structure, so that “the metrical process is no longer a product of arbitrariness or chance.”47 (Jones’s and Schillenger’s methods prescribed the melodic content of the work, as well as the rhythmic.) Then, in an interview shortly before his death, Blacher cited Stravinsky’s Sacrificial Dance from *The Rite of Spring* as the primary influence in the creation of his variable meters.48 Blacher provides us with a link to the pre-modern tribe which *Rite* depicts and the Regime he had just survived; both sought to uphold prescribed values and norms despite their outward barbarity.

---

Ornamente op. 37

Movement I is dedicated to American composer Virgil Thomson, whom Blacher met during Thomson’s tour of postwar Germany in the Fall of 1946. As a writer for the New York Herald Tribune, Thomson was assigned to cover Europe’s cultural reconstruction. In an article entitled “German Culture and Army Rule,” published in the Paris edition of the Herald Tribune on 22 September 1946, he wrote:

Music and drama flourish vigorously in all the zones; and the German population, with not much else to do but sit around on an evening in its overcoat, if it owns one, is assiduous in attendance at musical and dramatic entertainment.

In a sense, Thomson’s observations arguably reveal as much about contemporary life in the United States as in occupied Germany. He also highlights Germany’s devastation in the article, observing that Munich “looks like a complete wreck, like a construction in pink sugar that has been rained on.” Thomson’s straightforward analysis of the shortcomings of the American re-education and denazification programs in postwar Germany no doubt won him the respect of German citizens who were disgruntled at the excruciatingly slow pace of German reconstruction.

In Number I of Ornamente, Blacher creates a series of palindromes by using the row 23456789 8765432 and repeating the sequence six times. The movement is in F# minor, though its tonality it accomplished primarily through repeated assertion of the F# in the left-hand bassline. The melodic and harmonic material form the following:

49 Thacker, Music After Hitler, 93–96.
Though the piece is constructed within the larger formal outlines of ternary form, the harmonies are distorted, and the rapidly shifting meters defy listener expectation, erasing any sense of downbeat. If, as Blacher himself admitted, “meter is essentially the heart of music,” than *Ornamente*’s absence of a steady downbeat leaves the listener uncertain of the piece’s formal outlines, as a highly fragmented, though regimented, chaos reigns.52

Nr. 2 was dedicated to Rudolf Wagner-Regény, whom Blacher had known since their school days at Berlin’s Hochschule für Musik.53 He was drafted into the Wehrmacht in 1943 but received a desk job in Paris rather than active combat duty; he later learned it was Gottfried von Einem’s mother, Baroness Gerta von Einem, who ensured his position in the Military was purely a bureaucratic one.54 After the war he obtained a Professorship in Rostock, writing to a mutual friend, “To go to Berlin is nonsense! I can't understand how Blacherino withstands it!”55 (Blacherino was Wagner-Regény’s nickname for the composer.) Wagner-Regény’s movement consists of two palindromes, as the meter starts in 3/8, ascends 9/8, and then returns to 3/8 before repeating the same process.

Nr. 3 was dedicated to Munich-based composer Karl Amadeus Hartmann, one of the few composers who also adopted the technique of Variable Meters (albeit briefly)

---

55 Ibid., 215.
in his Piano Concerto (1953) and Viola Concerto (1955).\textsuperscript{56} Nr. 4 was dedicated to Priaulx Rainier, a South African and English composer who lived primarily in London and worked as a Professor at the Royal Academy of Music. Blacher probably knew Rainier through William Glock, a mutual friend and fellow British composer. The piece is written using cyclical permutation:\textsuperscript{57}

\begin{align*}
45632 \\
56324 \\
63245 \\
32456 \\
24*63 \\
45632 \\
24563 \\
32456 \\
63245 \\
56324 \\
45632
\end{align*}

The piece centers on the repeating interval of the perfect fifth in the right hand, while the left hand punctuates the study with a series of whole and half steps.

Blacher’s Nr. 5 was dedicated to Rolf Liebermann, a Swiss composer, and is based on Summation, as its row: 2 3 5 8 13 8 5 3 repeats thirteen times. As Blacher explained in a lecture, Nr. 5, “Is only an example of the summation row. As many of you know, this row played a large role, oddly enough, in the building of the Pyramids.”\textsuperscript{58} His evocation of one of the seven wonders of the world, conflated with a miniature musical form, highlights the irony in Blacher’s anti-monumentality; not only has the same row constructed an indestructible monument, but it has also built a miniature piece for solo piano, lasting just over one hundred measures.


\textsuperscript{58} “Vortrag,” Boris Blacher, Folder no. 194. AdK, Berlin.
Nr. 6 is dedicated to Nicholas Nabokov, whom Blacher had met shortly after the end of the war. In August of 1945, Nabokov arrived in Berlin as a civilian employee of the War Department. Despite this seemingly contradictory assignment, he was issued the rank of Colonel and made an intelligence officer in the Music, Theater, and Film branch of the Information Control Division. He had been specially selected for postwar reeducation and reorientation precisely because of his international background; he spoke German, Russian, English, and French fluently and had lived for a period in Berlin before the war.\footnote{Saunders, \textit{The Cultural Cold War}, 18. See also Thacker, \textit{Music After Hitler}, 40.} Still, when he arrived, he was shocked at the disparity between the living conditions of the occupied and the occupiers. In an account of his first few months in Berlin, Nabokov admitted:

> I should unfortunately mention an important and a most lugubrious detail: While we (the American occupiers) lived in luxurious, requisitioned villas…the Germans, our neighbors, nestled in bombed out, damp and unheated homes with whatever furniture they were able to save from the bombings’ fires. Their diets were on the starvation level and their clothing was minimal…\footnote{Nabokov, “Boris Blacher,” in Henrich and Eickhoff, \textit{Boris Blacher: Archive zur Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts}, 14-15.}

Shortly after his arrival in Berlin, Nabokov organized a lunch for several Berlin musicians at his home, including Blacher and Josef Rufer, one of the co-founders of the \textit{Internationales Musikinstitut in Berlin-Zehlendorf}. From their first meeting onwards, Nabokov would remain a staunch champion of Blacher’s work.
The piece is the longest by far of the seven that comprise *Ornamente*, and is among the most complex in terms of construction. In his Preface, Blacher notes the piece is based on

---

a Permutation of four elements:62

\[ \begin{align*}
3 & \ 4 & \ 5 & \ 6 \\
3 & \ 4 & \ 6 & \ 5 \\
3 & \ 6 & \ 4 & \ 5 \\
3 & \ 6 & \ 5 & \ 4 \\
3 & \ 5 & \ 6 & \ 4 \\
3 & \ 5 & \ 4 & \ 6 \\
3 & \ 4 & \ 5 & \ 6
\end{align*} \]

Harmonically, the work breaks into five parts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm. 1–24</td>
<td>mm. 25–40</td>
<td>mm. 41–48</td>
<td>mm. 49–72</td>
<td>mm. 73–96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: *Ornamente*, Nr. 6

The way the permutations fall, the harmonic material cycles through six statements of a sequence of four before it changes; the exception is C (mm. 41–48) where both the left and right hands are playing in octaves.

Nr. 7 was dedicated to Gottfried von Einem, who had been a student of the composer’s since 1941. Von Einem was from an affluent Austrian family, and his mother, Baroness Gerta Louise, was a close friend of the Göring family from her school days. It was through his family’s relationship with the Görings that von Einem received a position as Heinz Tietjen assistant at Berlin’s Staatsoper. He was briefly interned by the Gestapo in 1938 when his mother was charged with treason; both were soon released.63

Nr. 7 is also constructed as a palindrome as Blacher asserts C as the tonal goal. Quarter-note octaves of Cs are interspersed with broken arpeggios; their emphasis on C# provides a jarring contrast to Blacher’s octaves.

One could argue that such a strict emphasis on mathematical ordering is

---

antithetical to the very idea of the musical ruin, and that such formal structure implies order, completeness, and continuity. Blacher’s *Ornamente* is, however, an artistic response to ruin and a clear break with the canon. As Blacher writes in the preface of *Ornamente*, that forms like the fugue and the canon, “geopfert werden,” literally, “will be sacrificed,” to his system of variable meters. The musical ruin, as embodied by *Ornamente*, exhibits tonal instability, jarring rhythmic gestures, fragmentation, and obsessive organization; in short, *Ornamente* is emblematic of the postwar search for new modes of musical coherence.

In comparison to Boulez and Stockhausen in this period, who were radicalizing Darmstadt and calling for a complete separation between the political content and musical form, Blacher was always deeply interested in the connection between music and politics. This can be most explicitly heard in his Operas, as their themes often deal with the individual struggling against societal injustice, as in *Der Flut* (1946), *Preussisches Märchen* (1949), and *Großinquisitor* (1947). Furthermore, Blacher also contributed to the *Jüdische Chronik* (1960), a work initiated by Paul Dessau, who, as a Jew, fled Nazi Germany. The *Jüdische Chronik* features arrangements of Hebrew songs compiled from the Warsaw ghetto, and in addition to Blacher and Dessau, Hans Werner Henze, Wagner-Régeny, and Karl Amadeus Hartmann also contributed movements.

64 Boris Blacher, Preface to *Ornamente für Klavier: Sieben Studien über variable Metren* op. 37 (Bote and Bock, Berlin, 1951).


The question of “What remains?” or “Was bleibt?” was one which plagued Boris Blacher throughout his career; in an era of changing regimes and musical styles, there was a transitional quality to everyday life in West Berlin. In an interview given in 1975, the last year of his life, Blacher admitted:

And that remains, too: time as an unmerciful measuring tool that not much—not even by the great composers—can outlast. And what remains of these many nineteenth-century composers? 67

He leaves the question unanswered, dangling for posterity; “What remains?,” though in many ways, the only answer could only be “the ruin.”

Karl Amadeus Hartmann: Sonate 27. April 1945 and Moral Ruin

Karl Amadeus Hartmann (1905-63) was from a family of prominent Munich artists. Rather than following in his father’s or brother’s footsteps, Hartmann instead decided to study composition at Munich’s Akademie der Tonkunst (Academy of Musical Art) with Josef Haas. Unfortunately, the relationship was not an easy one, and Hartmann left in 1929 to pursue independent work. Meanwhile, he formed a close mentorship and friendship with conductor and composer Hermann Scherchen, who was to greatly influence Hartmann’s work throughout the rest of his career.

With the National Socialist rise to power, Hartmann underwent an inner emigration, and did not allow any of his works to be premiered in Germany. 68 Only six

---


68 Inner Emigration has amassed a bulk of secondary literature, including: Flight of Fantasy: New Perspectives on Inner Emigration in German Literature 1933–45, edited by Neil Donahue and Doris
foreign premieres took place in between 1933 and 1945. Hartmann survived through
the generosity of his wife’s family rather than through commissions from the Third
Reich, unlike many of his contemporaries. His compositions from this period,
including *Miserae*, *Concerto funebre*, *Sinfonia tragica*, reflect Hartmann’s discontent
with the Nazis, and are marked by quotations of music condemned by the Third Reich as
degenerate; his *Sinfonia tragica* (1940-43) is heavily influenced by the orchestral writing
of Mahler. Above all, Hartmann’s music is weighed down by its density and stands in
stark contrast to the transparent textures in Blacher’s work.

His work also bears the influence of Anton Webern, with whom the composer
briefly studied in the early 1940s, although they soon parted ways over their politics.
Webern was a staunch supporter of National Socialism and maintained that citizens
should unconditionally respect the authority of the state; Hartmann, however, was
vehemently opposed to what he considered blind acceptance of a corrupted system.

69 “Werkverzeichnis,” in *Karl Amadeus Hartmann und die Musica Viva*, edited by Franz Georg Kaltwasser
(Munich: Piper & Co. Verlag, 1980), 357–63. Hartmann’s works that were premiered between 1933 and
1940 are as follows: *Miserae*, a symphonic poem for Orchestra (1933–34) premiered in Prague (1935);
First String Quartet “Carillon” (1933) premiered in Genf (1936); *Symphonie L’Oeuvre* (1937) in Lüttich
(1939); and *Concerto Funebre* (1939) in St. Gallen (1940). Hartmann’s other works written during the
Third Reich were performed at later dates, or not at all.

70 Raphael Woebs, *Die Politische Theorie in der Neuen Musik: Karl Amadeus Hartmann und Hannah
Arendt* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2010), 36, 55-56.

March 22, 2012). Perhaps not altogether inaccurately, David Monod deemed him, “A composer of
remorselessly grim music.” David Monod, “Internationalism, Regionalism, and National Culture: Music

72 Woebs, *Die Politischen Theorie in der Neuen Musik*, 66-67. The most revealing incident of Hartmann’s
time with Webern was their visit to the Staatsoper in 1942 to hear a festival of contemporary music
(*zeitgenössisches Musikfest*). Hartmann was shocked to realize the composer was a virtual outsider in
Viennese music circles. No one in attendance spoke to him, and Webern was not invited to any post-
performance parties. It remains unclear if Webern was as anonymous as Hartmann suggests, or if the
composer was simply being snubbed by Vienna’s insular and conservative musical elite.
for his music, were not known to Hartmann at the time. Nor was the fact that Webern, in
dire financial straits, had already accepted money from the Künstlerdank (Gratitude of
the Artist) initiative established by the Reichskulturkammer to help struggling artists.)
Hartmann did not return to Austria to study with Webern after their falling out, although
he remained deeply respectful of Webern’s work.

In the Spring of 1945, shortly before the war’s end, Hartmann moved with his
family to Kempfenhausen, near the Starnsberger See (Starnsberger Lake) outside
Munich. The family was hiding to evade an order for Hartmann to report to the
Volkssturm, the last Nazi attempt to compile troops in defense of the Allied invasion. On
April 27th, Hartmann and his family were awakened in the middle of the night by
deafening and relentless shuffling noises. Leaving the house to investigate, Hartmann,
his wife, and their son peered through the hedges at the edge of their lakefront property.
There, on Uferstrasse, just below the house, they were horrified to see countless streams
of emaciated figures filing past. Hartmann realized Nazi guards were marching Dachau
prisoners out of the concentration camp (Evakuierungsmarsch) and away from the
advancing American Army. 

---

73 Kater, Twisted Muse, 73.
74 Dachau is approximately 11 miles north-west of Munich. Woebs, Die Politische Theorie in der Neuen
Musik, 116.
The experience compelled Hartmann to compose *Sonate 27. April 1945*, his first postwar work and last work for solo piano. He began immediately, starting the same day and completing the work on May 8, 1945, the day of Germany’s unconditional capitulation. Hartmann’s Sonata was the first work written by a German composer to directly acknowledge the National Socialists’ crimes against humanity.

In his programmatic introduction to the Sonata, Hartmann wrote: “Am 27. und 28 April schleppte sich ein Menschenstrom von Dachauer „Schutzhäftlingen“ an uns vorüber–unendlich war der Strom–unendlich war das Elend–unendlich war das Leid.” (On the 27 and 28 of April 1945, a stream of people trudged past us, “preventative detainees” from Dachau–endless was the stream–endless was the misery–endless was the suffering–). There are two versions of the work; Hartman revised the *Sonate 27. April*

---


1945 in 1948, omitting the Scherzo movement in his second version. In bold are the versions of the movements that are typically performed (Bewegt–Scherzo b–Allegro funebre–Allegro risoluto–Allegro furioso).

Version I: 1945
   I. Bewegt
   II. Scherzo – Presto assai [2 Fassungen: a/b]  
      III. Adagio marciale
      IV. Allegro furioso (stürmisch, leidenschaftlich)

Version II: 1948
   I. Bewegt [leicht revidiert]  
   II. Marcia funebre [revidiert]
   III. Allegro risoluto [stark revidiert]

The sonata is a polyphony of competing references with allusions to Jewish folk melodies, Beethoven’s Lebewohl motive, the Internationale chorus, and Russian folk tunes. Although Hartmann was not Jewish or Russian, he was introduced to the Russian Folk tunes by conductor Hermann Scherchen, his mentor. Scherchen had been detained in Russia during WWI as a prisoner of war, and after his captivity, transcribed several of the folk tunes and Arbeiterlieder (workers’ songs) he learned while in the camp.

As he began the composition, Hartmann sketched the similarities between his sonata and Chopin’s Sonata No. 2 in B-flat minor, op. 35 (1839), as he wanted the work to strongly correlate with Chopin’s mood of funereal commemoration. He wanted to compose a musical tomb of loss and morning, or “a Tombeau of cultural necessity,”78 as cultural theorist Raphael Woeb has deemed Hartman’s work.

Hartmann, 27. April 1945
I. Bewegt
II. Presto assai (Scherzo)
III. Marcia funebre (lento)
IV. Allegro furioso/risoluto

Chopin, Sonata op. 35
I. Grave/Doppio movimento
II. Scherzo
III. Marche Funèbre Lento
IV. Finale (Presto)

78 Woeb, Die politische Theorie in der Neuen Musik, 130.
Although Hartmann was honoring the Jewish victims of Dachau in his composition, Dachau was primarily a camp for political prisoners, and most of its Jewish inmates were deported to Auschwitz following the Final Solution in 1942.79

I. Bewegt (Active)
The first movement is reminiscent of sonata rondo form:

A (Jewish Melody), mm. 1-5
B (Lebewohl Motive), mm. 6-9
AB mm. 9-12
C mm. 13-19
A’ mm. 19-23
B’ mm. 24-49
A’’ mm. 50-65

The first movement features Jewish liturgical music juxtaposed with the Lebewohl or Les Adieux motif (Farewell) that opens Beethoven’s Piano Sonata op. 81a. The use of the farewell motive juxtaposed with the ritual melody is symbolic of the troubled German-Jewish relationship. Hartmann had previously referenced Jewish incantation music in his Miserae (1934) and First String Quartet (1933-35),80 although the opening melody certainly bears a certain affinity with Stravinsky’s solo oboe in Rite of Spring and Ravel’s opening phrase in the Left Hand Concerto.

The movement is structured by the interplay of the Lebewohl and “Jewish” motives, most prominent in mm. 1-15. Mahler also used the Lebewohl in the first and

---

79 For more on Dachau, see Harold Marcuse, Legacies of Dachau, The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp, 1933-2001 (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2001), 37-72. From 1933 to 1944, Dachau averaged 4 deaths per day, but by 1945 this number soared to over 100 people each day due to food shortages, although Dachau had not been designed as a death camp.

last movements of his Ninth Symphony and in *das Lied von der Erde*.\textsuperscript{81} Hartmann was keenly aware of this as an avid supporter of Mahler’s music; in the first seven concerts of *Musica Viva*, Hartmann’s postwar concert series in Munich, he programmed Mahler four times, including *das Lied von der Erde*. Apart from a possible homage to Mahler, however, was Hartmann’s use of the *Lebewohl* motive meant to represent the corruption of contemporary Germany, as it was featured so prominently in this work commemorating a concentration camp? Furthermore, note how the initial motive resembles “Es muss sein” from mvt. IV of Beethoven’s op. 135.\textsuperscript{82}


\textsuperscript{82} My thanks to Professor Steven Whiting for suggesting this line of thought in a recent discussion in April 2012.
Musical Example 4.3: Hartmann, *Sonate 27. April 1945*, I. Bewegt, mm. 1-15. The *Lebewohl* motive is highlighted with blue lines

Sonate „27. April 1945“
(Manuskript II)

Karl Amadeus Hartmann
1905 - 1963

The concluding measures of the first movement (mm. 49-65) alternate between a four-part chorale texture and a melismatic line as another variant of Hartmann’s Jewish melody. Only at m. 58 and m. 65 is the Jewish melody is allowed to cadence. One could

---

compare Hartmann’s final measures with the Shema Yisrael that closes Schoenberg’s A Survivor from Warsaw (1947), the only section of the piece that is strictly twelve-tone. Where Schoenberg reserves his compositional method exclusively for the Hebrew prayer, making a claim as to the resilience of Jewish culture even as the chorus is sent to the gas chambers, Hartmann writes the Sonata’s first cadence within the Jewish ritual music, suggesting that order, protocol, and decency still have their place within Judaism but not within German culture. (In the first version of movement I, Hartmann does not write the Jewish melodies in octaves as he does in his 1948 revised manuscript. Other than this, the two versions are nearly identical.)

II. Scherzo

Hartmann revised the Scherzo and the second version is most often performed. The movement references the first two lines of Internationale, which can be heard in Hartmann’s accenting of the opening motive: D-C-G-E-A. The Scherzo also bears certain affinities to Webern’s Klaviervariationen op. 27, particularly where Hartmann plays with Spiegelsymmetrie (mirror symmetry),84 a hallmark of Webers’s op. 27. (This passage also resembles a Beethovenian Scherzo from one of the Late String Quartets.)85

---

84 Woebs, Die Politische Theorie in der Neuen Musik, 66.
85 Again, I am grateful to Professor Steven Whiting for suggesting this in a recent conversation.
Musical Example 4.4: Hartmann, *Sonate 27. April 1945*, II. *Scherzo*, mm. 97-112

III. Marcia funebre

Hartmann’s funeral march uses the popular Weimar Republic *Arbeiterlied* (workers’ song) as its melodic basis, *Brüder, zur Sonne, zur Freiheit* (Brothers, Towards the Sun, Towards Freedom) which is a translation of the Russian original, *Смелво, товарищи, в ногу*, which Russian revolutionary Leonid P. Radin penned in 1897. Hartmann knew the song from conductor and close friend, Hermann Scherchen, who had been held as a Russian prisoner of war during World War I. Scherchen, who led a Berlin *Arbeiterchor* (Workers’ Chorus) translated the song from Russian in 1920. With the rise of National Socialism, however, the song had been recast as a fascist anthem, even broadcast with loudspeakers into Dachau’s barracks in an effort to motivate the camp’s prisoners.

---

I.
Brothers, towards the sun, towards freedom
Brothers, upwards to the light
Light out of the dark past
Illuminates the future!

II.
See how the train of millions
Passing endless through the night
Until your longing demands
Heaven and night overflows.

The second verse concerning “the train of millions” is undoubtedly a reference to the marching prisoners. Furthermore, the frequent use of Russian folk melodies was undoubtedly Hartmann’s homage to the impending Russian invasion. At the close of April 1945, it was not clear to German civilians precisely how their country would fare among the Allies. Perhaps Hartmann was anticipating that the Russians, rather than the Americans, would govern Munich. In another musical reference, Hartmann borrowed the opening dotted rhythm from movement III (March Funèbre) of Chopin’s Piano Sonata op. 35.
Musical Example 4.5: Chopin, Sonata no. 2 op. 35, mm. 1-10

Marche funèbre.
Lento.

Musical Example 4.6: Hartmann, Sonate 27. April 1945
III. Marcia funebre, mm. 1-6

89 Frederic Chopin, Piano Sonata no. 2 op. 35 (New York: Schirmer, 1895).
90 Karl Amadeus Hartmann, Sonate 27. April 1945 (Mainz: Schott Music, 1983).
IV. Allegro furioso

Movement IV is based on the Russian Civil War song, “Partisans from Amur.”

I. *Durchs Gebirge, durch die Steppe zog unsre kühne Division,*
*hin zur Küste dieser weißen,*
*heiß umstrittenen Bastion.*

II. *Rot von Blut wie unsere Fahne war das Zeug. Doch treu dem Schwur,*
*stürmten wir, die Eskadronen,*
*Partisanen von Amur.*

I.
Through the mountains, through the Steppe
Our bold division
To our coast these Whites,
Hotly contested bastion.

II.
Red from blood like our flags
Was the lot. Still true to the oath,
We storm, the squadron,
Partisans from Amur.

Hartmann intersperses motivic fragments from the song with the Jewish melody,
culminating in a jarring break at m. 77. (In the first version of the manuscript *Allegro furioso,* this interpolation is missing.)
Musical Example 4.7: Hartmann, *Sonate 27. April 1945*, IV, *Allegro furioso*, mm. 77-81

But precisely because Hartmann’s Sonata was the first work written by a German composer to openly acknowledges the Holocaust, he feared a reprisal if the work was performed publicly. By comparison, another early work that dealt specifically with the Holocaust, Schoenberg’s *Survivor from Warsaw* (1947), had its German premiere in 1950 at the Darmstadt’s *Internationale Ferienkurse für Neue Musik*, and was widely hailed by critics. But then again, Schoenberg wrote his *Survivor* from a comfortable distance in sunny southern California, not amongst the very people his work critiqued. And, it should be noted, when *Survivor* premiered at Darmstadt, the most vocal opposition to the piece came from the performers themselves, as they feared political consequences for appearing in a work that dealt so

---

92 By comparison, another early work that dealt specifically with the Holocaust, Schoenberg’s *Survivor from Warsaw* (1947), had its German premiere in 1950 at the Darmstadt’s *Internationale Ferienkurse für Neue Musik*, and was widely hailed by critics. But then again, Schoenberg wrote his *Survivor* from a comfortable distance in sunny southern California, not amongst the very people his work critiqued. And, it should be noted, when *Survivor* premiered at Darmstadt, the most vocal opposition to the piece came from the performers themselves, as they feared political consequences for appearing in a work that dealt so
1946 before a small, private circle of friends in Munich. Perhaps Hartmann’s insistence the work remain in the drawer seems contradictory; the Nazis were defeated and theoretically so too were the restrictive cultural politics they had espoused. Furthermore, a performance of the Sonata probably would have been welcomed by the American occupiers, whose re-education agenda largely favored the idea of German collective guilt. But Hartmann feared it was too early to premiere a work that commemorated the Holocaust and the ruination of Germanic musical culture by combining das Lebewohl with Jewish incantation music; as he wrote to Scherchen, “Unfortunately, one must note that the ‘Nazi spirit’ continues to bloom everywhere. How can one change this population?”94 The Sonata had its first public performance only after Hartmann’s death, played by pianist Herbert Henck in June of 1983. The recording was broadcast over Bayerischer Rundfunk.95

Despite his reluctance to have his second piano sonata premiered, Hartmann remained determined to promote a more liberal-minded approach to Munich’s classical music culture. Unwilling to leave Germany during the Third Reich, he was eager to now take on a leading role in the country’s cultural Wiederaufbau, even finding an unlikely patron in the American Military Government.

openly with the Holocaust. One member of the chorus recalled how difficult it had been to find other men willing to participate in the concert, and during rehearsals, he overheard disgruntled musicians mutter, “The Amis should sing it themselves,” or “The Jews should sing it themselves.” (Here, “Amis” is a slang term for Americans.) For more, see Joy Calico, “Schoenberg’s Symbolic Remigration: A Survivor from Warsaw in Postwar West Germany,” in Journal of Musicology 26/1 (Winter 2009): 22, 28-30.
93 Woebs, Die Politische Theorie in der Neuen Musik, 63–66.
Musica viva and Musical Reconstruction

ICD re-education efforts in Munich took a different form than those in Berlin. In Munich, American cultural officers did not have to compete with the Soviets in terms of recruiting reliable personnel. As the former capital of the Third Reich, Berlin was subjected to a more extensive denazification process, and the city’s musical culture had been the most highly politicized of anywhere in Germany. Berlin had also experienced greater destruction and more bombings, leaving material resources and concert halls scarce. Munich, by comparison, still had its beloved Prinzregententheater, which, although damaged, was sound enough to billet American GIs upon their arrival in April. And, most significantly, in Berlin, while classical music and the Philharmonic were the primary concerns of cultural officers, in Munich, modern music played a significant role with the inception of the concert series, Musica Viva, or “living music.” The series was meant to reintroduce Munich to twentieth-century composers, and was sponsored in part by the American Military Government.

ICD music control in Munich was led by Harry Bogner, an architect from Milwaukee who had little interest in music and even less interest in being a music officer. Upon his arrival in May, Bogner immediately reinstated performers without running background checks to ensure none had been elite Nazi Party Members. The musicians’ over hasty approval meant that by the end of July, after Bogner’s departure, the Military Government would reverse his decisions, firing 40 Staatsoper musicians and 19 Munich Philharmonic players for their Nazi affiliations. The new chief of music was John Evarts,

96 Before the currency reform in 1948, someone living in West Berlin could easily work for the Soviets, and vice versa. After the currency reform, however, it was nearly impossible for someone living in the West to work in the East, as they would not be paid enough in Ostmarks (East Marks) to live West Berlin.
97 Monod, Settling Scores, 24.
an efficient, well-trained former Professor from North Carolina’s Black Mountain College who was to lead the Munich branch until 1947. (Black Mountain College had been home to many illustrious émigré professors including Edward Lowinsky; John Cage also taught there during the 1940s.)

The beginning of the American occupation in Munich had left cultural officers looking foolish, short-sighted, and fickle. Although the ICD’s professed aim was to locate “a few solid non-Nazi bricks from the mass of rubble and with them [begin] to build up a new musical structure in Bavaria,” determining whether the bricks were former fascists was not a simple task. Conductor Hans Knappertsbusch concertized until October 1945 when the Americans blacklisted him for his activities during the Third Reich. His removal was particularly awkward for the ICD branch in Munich, as they had already featured him in a Munich Philharmonic concert exclusively for American military personnel. Worse yet, ICD music officer Edward Kilenyi had performed alongside Knappertsbusch as the piano soloist.

So when Hartmann approached the Military Government about beginning a new music program in Munich, Evarts jumped at the offer, hoping to ease the damage already done. Hartmann’s appeal to American authorities coincided that of Heinz Pringsheim, the future music director of Bayerische Rundfunk. Pringsheim recalled that Evarts was “a

99 “Directive for Psychological Warfare and Control of German Information Services,” 18 April 1945 SHAEF: Psychological Warfare Division, RG 331, Box 19, NARA II.
100 Monod, “Internationalism, Regionalism, and National Culture,” 349-50; and Monod, Settling Scores, 38.
pleasant department leader, an obviously musical full-fledged Sergeant.” After both men met with the Evarts, they recognized their goals were possible with backing from the American occupiers. In a letter to friend and clarinetist Willy Tautenhahn, Hartmann wrote:

But luckily the men from the American music control department are young people who figure everything out. Especially the music control officer Mr. John Evarts is a through and through musical person, very intellectual and extraordinarily polite. You can guess how glad I am about this.

(One might contrast Evarts’s reception with Bitter’s in Berlin, who found it more difficult to hire politically clean personnel in a city where the Americans were constantly struggling to keep up with the Russian cultural program.) Hartmann, Pringsheim, and Evarts hoped to re-introduce Munich’s conservative concert-going public to the work of modern and Jewish composers. In addition to Hartmann’s job as a dramaturg at the Bavarian State Opera, in October of 1945, he began Musica Viva with American money, German musicians, and international repertoire. In founding Musica Viva, Hartmann was adamant that art should reflect an active engagement with Germany’s recent past.

Hartmann’s ideas for Musica viva stemmed from the 1920s when he was still student. His father Friedrich Richard Hartmann and brother, Adolph, were both visual artists and members of Die Juryfreien (The Jury-Free), a Munich artist collective created in 1910. Die Juryfreien sought to liberate themselves from the monopoly of conservative

---

102 Ibid.
city galleries by presenting their works in a different framework. The group’s most famous exhibition was by Der Blaue Reiter in 1911 and 1912, an event that also included a performance of Arnold Schoenberg’s *Herzgewächse* op. 20. From its inception, the Artist Collective strove to combine modern music and art to emphasizing their affinities with one another. In 1928, Hartmann became more involved with *Die Juryfreien*, convincing artists to pair their exhibitions with modern music from Bartok, Casella, Egk, Hindemith, Honegger, Milhaud, Orff, Porter, Poulenc, Ravel, Satie, and Stravinsky. The list of composers is nearly identical to Hartmann’s first-year *Musica Viva* programming, as he searched for a new performance context and space among the ruins of Munich.

Hartmann’s first concert took place in the unheated Prinzregententheater on October 7, 1945; only twenty people were present, wrapped in their winter coats. Due to the theater’s other engagements, Hartmann had to schedule the concert for 10:30 a.m. The Bayerisches Staatsorchester played the Fourth Symphony of Mahler, Busoni's *Lustspiel-Overture*, and Debussy's *Iberia*. (Conductor Bertil Wetzelsberger led those members who were still in the city.) The next concert featured Stravinsky's Piano Sonata (1924) and Hartmann's own *Concerto funèbre* (1940). Hartmann then planned ten concerts for the 1945/46 season that included works by Casella, de Falla, Hartmann, Hindemith, Honegger, Janacek, Martinu, Milhaud, Schoenberg, Stravinsky, and Prokofiev. Hartmann's programming was similar to Wolfgang Steineck's in Darmstadt, where the pre-World War Two modernists were stressed at the beginning.

---

107 Haas, *Karl Amadeus Hartmann*, 119. Hartmann’s wife, Elisabeth, points out that due to poor transportation in bombed-out Munich, one hundred people present at the early concerts was actually quite a significant number.
However, unlike Darmstadt, where Boulez, Stockhausen, Maderna, and Nono soon took over, *Musica Viva* shied away from programming more avant-garde fare. (Hartmann himself bore no great love for the avant-garde. On the dominance of serialism among the younger generation of composers he admitted, “It might be the consequence of Hitler's *Gleichschaltungen* (coordination), that even when I run away, I cannot withhold a benevolent smirk.”)\(^{109}\)

Hartmann’s early efforts were plagued with difficulties as he struggled to get scores from other countries; Germany's postal service was still slow and unreliable. He also spent much time searching for appropriate venues that had not been destroyed and musicians who were able to cope with the challenging scores, many of whom had never been exposed to the music. In the first season, audiences were slow to respond to Hartmann's programming and as a result the ticket sales were fairly abyssmal. A January 1946 *Neue Zeitung* article called *Musica viva*’s educational efficacy into question:

*Hindemith, Toch, Stravinsky, Martinu, Hartmann and others resound, but before half empty rows. The echo is absent, the young people are absent. It is necessary to teach the youth. But where and how?*\(^{110}\)

But by 1947, things had begun to change. Material conditions in Germany had improved and shelter and food were more plentiful. At first alienated by Hartmann’s programming, Munich’s public had begun to warm to the series. Hartmann viewed *Musica viva* in connection to Germany's recent history, and programmed accordingly. In a concert of all-American music he conducted during the 1946-47 season, the program

---


notes open with a quote from Franklin Delano Roosevelt urging for a peaceful co-
existence of all people and an end to the War. The musical program featured Frederick
Jacobi’s String Quartet no. 2, David Diamond’s Quintet for Flute, String Trio, and Piano,
and William Schuman’s Symphony for Strings. Framing the musical offerings were
selections from American poets Robert Frost and Edna St. Vincent-Millay. (It did not
hurt that for concerts featuring American compositions, the ICD promised Hartmann an
extra subsidy.)¹¹¹

Hartmann also frequently featured Thomas Mann’s work, and during the 1948/49
season, Mann's proclamation, “Nein, das ist kein schlechtes Zeitalter, das ist ein Wald
von großen Männern”¹¹² (No, that is not a terrible era, that is a forest of great men)
adorned each program cover. Hartmann selected the quotation in reference to the
country’s reconstruction efforts, both cultural and physical.¹¹³

Not only did Hartmann receive funds from the ICD for *Music Viva* (by 1948 the
Americans were contributing some 4,200 DM), but Radio Munich (under American
control and funding) became a highly visible supporter as well, giving tickets at
discounted rates to students as well as 8,000 DM annually for broadcasting rights. In
1948 alone, apart from their generous financial contribution, the ICD subsidized 7

¹¹¹ Monod, *Settling Scores*, 123."
¹¹² Mann, “Leiden und Größe Richard Wagners,” *Thomas Mann Essays, Band 4: Achtung, Europa! 1933-
1938* (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1995), 12. The quotation is from Mann’s lecture in which he criticized the Nazi
mis-appropriation of Wagner’s work. Strauss, among other prominent musicians, signed a petition against
Mann’s lecture in 1933.
¹¹³ “Konzert Amerikanischer Musik,” Spielzeit 1946/47, RG 260, Box 18, Slide 17, Records of the Office
of Military Government, Bavaria: Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, The Music
Section 1945–49, NARA II. Other Thomas Mann quotes featured by Hartmann include Mann’s quote from
May 10, 1945, “Ich sage: es ist trotz allem eine große Stunde, die Rückkehr Deutschlands zur
Menschlichkeit.” (I say: despite everything it is a great hour; Germany’s return to humanity).
concerts for pupils from 10 music schools with 350 tickets.\textsuperscript{114} When the Americans relinquished control of Radio Munich and cultural affairs back to the Germans in 1950, they retained much the same funding system as established by the Americans.\textsuperscript{115} Working first with officer John Evarts, and then with officer Carlos Moseley from 1947-49, Hartmann planned a series of successful concerts until his death in 1963.\textsuperscript{116}

Hartmann’s success with \textit{Musica Viva} highlights one of the ironies of the American re-education efforts; the American cultural agenda for postwar Germany only achieved success when the initiative was headed by a German, and the Darmstadt School and \textit{Musica Viva} are the most visible examples of successful American-financed projects led by German musicians. Although Hartmann needed the funding of American authorities, the ICD needed Hartmann’s innovative and thorough knowledge of Munich’s musical culture in order to create a series that would appeal to the public.

Reinhold Kriele, Hartmann's former composition student, recalled many fruitful discussions in Hartmann's home after the war:

…He knew how to make it clear why totalitarian regimes have to fear music: because music means in itself freedom, because it proves ideological independence. National Socialism, Fascism, and Communism were for him the same suppressor of the humane within music…Some of the amiable and naïve Allied culture and music officers (such a thing was possible at the time) whom he had invited to our talks became aware of the importance of the relationship between music and politics only through Hartmann.\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{114} Information concerning the ICD distribution of \textit{Musica Viva} and America House Concert tickets is held in RG 260, Box 18, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria: Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, The Music Section 1945–49, NARA II. Schools that received free tickets included Händel Conservatorium, Akademie der Tonkunst, and the University of Munich. See also David Monod, \textit{Settling Scores}, 199, and Rothe, “Rethinking \textit{Musica Viva},” 254.

\textsuperscript{115} Rothe, “Rethinking \textit{Musica Viva},” 254.

\textsuperscript{116} Moseley would go on to become the chairman of the New York Philharmonic.

As Hartmann wrote in 1965, “Der Künstler hat sicher eine politische Funktion und muß wohl auch eine politische Anschauung haben, wenn er in seiner Zeit stehen will.” (The Artist definitely has a political function and must also have a political outlook, if he is to stand in his time). Hartmann’s convictions about art and politics were rare in the immediate postwar period, an era which cultivated amnesia in order to move cultural renewal forward. *Musica viva*, literally “living music”, reminded Munich’s citizens that its past and future cultural achievements lay just beneath the city’s rubble.

**Richard Strauss and the American Occupiers**

At the end of April 1945, when the American 103rd Infantry and Tenth Armored Division arrived in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, a small village located outside of Munich, they found the area largely intact. Spared the aerial bombings that had destroyed Munich, Garmisch appeared still frozen in the Weimar Republic. As the American Division approached an unmarked villa, intending to use it for military headquarters, a small, elderly man greeted them at the foot of the stairs. To the commanding officer, he said simply, “I am Richard Strauss, the composer of *Rosenkavalier* and *Salome*.“ After a meal with eight American officers and several bottles of wine, the Strauss villa was not requisitioned for military use and an off-limits sign was placed in the yard.

---

Musik...Mancher der liebenswürdigen und naiven alliierten Kultur- und Musikoffiziere (so etwas gab es damals), die er zu unseren Gesprächen eingeladen hatte, wurde sich über die Dimensionen des Verhältnisses zwischen Musik und Politik erst durch ihn klar.”

Hartmann, *Kleine Schriften*, 72-73.

Composer Richard Strauss was eighty-years-old when the Second World War ended. Deeply saddened by the country’s destruction and the staggering toll it had taken on Germany’s proud cultural legacy, he wrote in his diary,

On the 12th of March, the majestic Vienna Opera fell victim to bombs. From 1 May onward the most terrible period of humanity came to an end, the twelve-year reign of bestiality, ignorance, and illiteracy and the greatest criminals, during which Germany’s two thousand years of cultural development came to ruin, and irreplaceable monuments of architecture and works of art were destroyed by a criminal soldiery.120

But despite Strauss’s depression and his increasingly poor health, he kept composing music. The final section of this chapter will investigate the ruin as a potent allegory for Germany’s renewal in Strauss’s late works, as he battled old age and denazification. As Bryan Gilliam notes, Strauss’s late work belies “a continuing faith in the genres and forms of a long German musical tradition,”121 one that in 1945 lay in ruins, but one which Strauss believed could recover its former luster. Rather than viewing these works, which are largely neoclassical, as an anachronistic glance backward, as Edward Said does, how might we look to Metamorphosen (1945), his study for 23 Strings as an answer to unanswered questions in Strauss’s earlier work?122

The destruction of Germany and Austria was weighing heavily on Strauss’s mind when he completed Metamorphosen, as he began sketching the composition only one day


121 Gilliam, “Between Resignation and Hope,” in Painter and Crow, Late Thoughts, 176.

after the bombing of Vienna’s Staatsoper. As Timothy Jackson has demonstrated, *Metamorphosen* is largely based upon Strauss’s unfinished choral setting of Goethe’s poem *Niemand wird sich selber kennen* (No one can know himself), and as such, is a largely self-confessional work concerning Strauss’s own relationship to the Nazi Regime.¹²³ Strauss’s diaries, however, do not speak to Jackson’s claims. What his postwar diary entries do express, however, is an increasing pessimism, unusual for the generally over-optimistic composer.¹²⁴ He wrote repeatedly to family and friends that he had nothing more to create and that his last compositions were mere “wrist exercises” to keep him from drifting freely into senility.

Not long after the war ended, Strauss contended that “political Germany had to be destroyed after it fulfilled its world mission, namely, creating and perfecting German music,”¹²⁵ a mission in which he had played a leading role. Gravely concerned with the material destruction of the country’s cultural institutions, Strauss even wrote a letter to Karl Böhm, his successor at the Vienna Staatsoper, outlining his suggestions for the rebuilding of Austrian and German opera houses. He concludes that “Despite the monumental accomplishment of Bayreuth, German operatic life on the whole has not done justice to the importance of this artform,”¹²⁶ calling for all major European cities to each reconstruct two opera houses; one for grand-scale productions and a smaller house

---

¹²⁶ Alfred Mann, “The Artistic Testament of Richard Strauss,” in *Musical Quarterly* 36/1 (January 1950): 1–8. Strauss had given the letter to an American soldier, Alfred Mann, to mail to Böhm as the German postal service was still not up and running. Mann, a musicologist, made a translation for the Military Government, and then published the letter post post Strauss’s death.
for chamber works. In spite of the country’s cultural and political destruction, Strauss recommended opera, as his first and last love, as the key to Germany’s renewal.

Furthermore, the American Military Government and the occupation shaped his final years in surprising ways, as Strauss was subjected to a lengthy denazification process. Although the Military Government had declined to requisition Strauss’s villa, they could not protect his postwar reputation. His short-lived presidency of the Reichsmusikkammer (1933-35) had left his reputation severely damaged in the eyes of the Allies although he served mostly as an “absentee president,” refusing to move to Berlin. He was fired by propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels when the Gestapo intercepted his letter to Stefan Zweig, a librettist and long-time friend, in which Strauss wrote he was only “play-acting” as president. Strauss’s words alone might not have been enough to get him fired, but Zweig’s Jewish background was.

While Strauss’s intentions in accepting the post were probably a combination of wanting to protect his Jewish daughter-in-law, a desire to influence musical reforms in Germany (including extending copyright laws), and a desire to further his career, scholars have nonetheless pondered why, as Germany’s most famous living composer, Strauss felt he needed to cooperate with the Regime at all. (Apart from his presidency, he even stepped in to conduct the Berlin Philharmonic at a concert in March of 1933, after Jewish conductor Bruno Walter refused, fearing for his safety.) Although it is impossible to


128 Kater, *Twisted Muse*, 210. Kater writes that Hitler was so indignant towards Strauss that he forbade him access to the Swiss sanatorium where he was hoping to seek medical treatment.

completely answer the question of why Strauss initially collaborated, the answer probably lies somewhere along the lines of self-preservation, self-promotion, and simple naiveté.

Yet despite the official Military Government line on Strauss as one of skepticism, the composer and many of the American Military personnel now stationed in Garmisch had a warm relationship. On May 10, he wrote to his friend and biographer Willi Schuh, who was also a music critic for the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, that he was astounded by how friendly the American occupiers were; “I can hardly get away from all the autograph hunters–many’s the time I have to note down the waltz from *Rosenkavalier*, and on one occasion, the *Don Juan* motif.”130 So many visitors to the house asked him who the bust in his front hallway depicted that an exasperated Strauss advised his wife, “If they ask once more, tell them it’s Hitler’s father.”131 (It was actually Beethoven.)

One visitor in particular had a particularly memorable visit with Strauss. John de Lancie, a 24-year-old American soldier stationed in Bavaria in May of 1945 was ecstatic to learn that Richard Strauss lived not far from his outpost. De Lancie was an oboist, having studied at Curtis from 1936 until 1940; he was drafted shortly thereafter. (After the war he would join the Philadelphia Orchestra and resume teaching at Curtis, where he was the school’s director from 1977 until 1985 after a long and successful international reads Strauss’s compliance as merely stemming from a sense of duty, writing, “Richard Strauss, with a spirit of The-Show-Must-Go-On, stepped in to conduct the concert.” For more, see Sam Shirakawa, *The Devil’s Music Master: The Controversial Life and Career of Wilhelm Furtwängler* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 150.


Because Strauss could speak very little English and de Lancie very little German, they communicated primarily in French. Figure 4.5 documents the Strauss family entertaining de Lancie and Alfred Mann in May of 1945. Later that evening, Strauss played excerpts from his compositions at the piano, much to the delight of Mann and de Lancie.

As de Lancie left, he asked the composer if he had ever considered writing a concerto for oboe, to which Strauss replied simply, “nein.” De Lancie thought little of his question until he read a year later of the concerto’s premiere in an American newspaper. Inside the front cover of his manuscript for the concerto’s sketches, Strauss penciled “Oboe Concerto 1945/suggested by an American soldier/ (Oboe player from Chicago),” although de Lancie was actually from California.

133 Wilhelm, Richard Strauss Persönlich, 399.
Figure 4.5: Strauss chats with de Lancie (Top) and later entertains the Americans with his family (Below). From left to right: de Lancie and Alfred Mann (seated), Strauss’s grandson, Christian, (pouring the wine), Strauss (seated), his wife, Pauline (seated), and Alice, his daughter-in-law (standing).  

135 Wilhelm, Richard Strauss Persönlich, 399. Mann appears to be taking notes, either because he was translating for de Lancie and Strauss, or because he wanted to record the meeting for posterity.
Although Strauss may have been inspired by de Lancie’s and Alfred Mann’s visit, not all of his encounters with American soldiers would prove so fruitful. On the May 15, 1945 an American military jeep pulled up to the Strauss residence. Two men introducing themselves only as “American correspondents” talked with the composer for an hour in his garden, along with his son and daughter-in-law. Unbeknownst to Strauss, one of the men was Klaus Mann, the son of Thomas Mann. Although his visit was ostensibly to write an article on the composer for the American Military paper, *Stars and Stripes*, Mann had a hidden agenda. In 1933, Strauss had signed a petition in Munich condemning Thomas Mann for his Wagner lecture, *Leiden und Größe Richard Wagners* (The Passion and Grandeur of Wagner) which raised objections concerning the Nazis re-appropriation of Wagner's music. (Mann gave the lecture in Brussels, Munich, Amsterdam and Paris.)

Klaus Mann, enraged by Strauss's actions, decided to avenge his father by writing a series of articles about his Garmisch visit entitled, “Strauss still unabashed about ties with Nazis,” “His Heart Beat in Nazi-Time,” published in *Stars and Stripes* on May 19, 1945, and “Three German Masters,” which appeared in *Esquire’s* January 1946 issue.

When Mann's articles appeared in *Stars and Stripes*, Strauss was horrified. Apart from exaggerating the posh conditions in which the Strauss family lived, painting them as beneficiaries of Nazi regime, the articles maintained that Strauss still felt loyalty towards certain Nazi Party leaders, including Baldur von Schirach, the former Hitler Youth leader.

---


137 Michael Kater described the articles simply as “character assassinations.”
and Governor of Vienna. Strauss probably did still feel a debt of gratitude towards Schirach, as the composer and his wife had lived in Vienna under his protection from 1941 onwards. Strauss's daughter-in-law, Alice, has even credited him with her survival in the Third Reich.¹³⁹

But in “Strauss still unabashed about ties with Nazis,” Mann admitted his May 1945 interview with the composer had been given under false pretenses. Of his decision to remain anonymous, Mann wrote: “I thought it wiser not to disclose my identity; our host might have been embarrassed or irritated.”¹⁴⁰ Strauss was embarrassed and irritated. He wrote a letter to Thomas Mann shortly after the articles in *Stars and Stripes* were published, expressing his annoyance with Klaus’s under-handed journalistic methods. But he must have decided in the end that his rebuke would only cause more damage as he never mailed the letter.¹⁴¹ In 1946, Strauss moved to Switzerland with his wife, Alice. He was not cleared by an American denazification tribunal until June of 1948, and just over a year later he would be dead.¹⁴²

¹³⁸ Rösch, “‘I thought it wiser not to disclose my identity,’ ” in Schmidt-Schütz and Wimmer, *Thomas Mann Jahrbuch* 14 (2001): 233–48. See also Ross, *The Rest is Noise*, 353–54. Strauss had built his comfortable villa before the Third Reich with the royalties from *Salome*. ¹³⁹ Wilhelm, *Richard Strauss Persönlich*, 377. Schirach was sentenced to twenty years in prison after he Nuremberg Trials in 1946. ¹⁴⁰ Klaus Mann, “Strauss still unabashed about ties with Nazis,” in *Stars and Stripes*, 29 May 1945. ¹⁴¹ Walter Thomas, *Richard Strauss und seine Zeitgenossen* (Munich: A. Langen und G. Müller, 1964), 283. Ross, *The Rest is Noise*, 353-54. ¹⁴² Strauss’s case has parallels with his fellow Bavarian composer, Carl Orff. Orff, too, had compromised in a multitude of ways, including composing replacement music for Mendelssohn’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and campaigning unsuccessfully for the Hitler Youth to use his parts of his *Schulwerk*. It was no great secret that the Nazis had greatly admired *Carmina Burana* and that Orff benefited from their patronage even though he had one Jewish grandparent, although he was able to conceal this. But Orff had one major factor in his favor that Strauss did not. During the 1920s, he had taken on a young American student by the name of Newell Jenkins. Jenkins offered Orff assistance in the 1930s to leave Germany, but the composer was unwilling to emigrate. When Jenkins returned to Germany in 1945 as Württemberg-Baden’s chief music officer, it was exactly the connection that Orff needed to reestablish himself as a composer of great stature and anti-fascist political leanings. He told Jenkins that he had been a member of the resistance group *die Weiße Rose* (the White Rose). With military authority behind him, Jenkins made sure that Orff was cleared of all denazification charges by taking advantage of an early loophole in American denazification policy. Potential German employees for the American Military Government were
The Metamorphosis of Richard Strauss’s Late Style

While the occupation undoubtedly left its mark on Strauss’s life, how did Germany’s ruin manifest in his late style works, especially in his study for 23 strings, *Metamorphosen*? And what of the very idea of late style as an interpretative framework? How do a composer’s late works reveal or resolve unanswered questions from his earlier compositions?

The idea of ruin or decay has long been embedded in the late style works of composers since the nineteenth century. In line with a tradition of scholarship beginning with Beethoven, whose early, middle, and late periods were first classified as such by Johann Aloys Schlosser in 1827, late style was viewed as a period of decay, infirmity, or sickness. But by the latter half of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, scholarly perception of late style had shifted. As apparent in Wagner’s Essay *Beethoven*, late style compositions were considered the rich, crowning achievements of long and illustrious careers. By the twentieth century, largely due to the writings of Theodor Adorno, late style had acquired another dimension, whereby the fragmentation, intractability, and sheer difficulty they usually possessed made them worthy of consideration. When Adorno wrote, “In the history of art late works are the catastrophes,” he may have been referring to Beethoven, but the destructive essence in his statement could well be applied to Richard Strauss. Strauss’s late style, beginning with his last opera, *Capriccio*...
(1941) and ending with *Vier letzte Lieder* (1949), has long been criticized for its stylistic conservatism and neoclassical influences. But what if one views Strauss’s final compositions as complicated memorials to a Germany which no longer existed? As music theorist Josef Straus writes, “late style may be less about anticipating death than living with a disability, less about the future hypothetical than the present reality.”

Strauss, his health failing and struggling financially, hoped to eek out a living with his “wrist exercises” and to weather his denazification proceedings. (His assets had been frozen by the Military Government in 1945.)

This is not to suggest that Strauss’s late works are wholly unproblematic. Quite the contrary, as Edward Said notes of *Capriccio* (1941) his final opera:

> There is something that is very disconcerting about the fact that the opera was staged at a time and in a place where a stone’s throw away the extermination of Europe’s Jews was being planned. Yet none of this ruffles the surface of the work…What is to be made of this far-from-negligible fact?

While Said’s comment once again raises uncomfortable questions about Strauss’s involvement with the Regime, it also underlines the composer’s overwhelming tendency to normalize. Strauss’s late works, composed during the rise and fall of the Third Reich, with their tonal, neoclassical lines were attempts to cloak his personal and professional difficulties in balanced phrases and lush harmonies. Whereas Blacher and Hartmann attempted to commemorate physical and moral ruin in their works, Strauss's

---


compositions are attempts to reconstruct, as Germany's ruin no where breaks through the placid surface of his compositions.

Strauss scholars have long attempted to locate in his late works a special significance concerning Germany’s fate. *Metamorphosen* (1945) has been neatly placed into his *oeuvre* as either a work representative of the destruction of Munich, a funereal elegy for Hitler, or as a kind of self-confession of own role under the Nazi regime.\(^{148}\)

The prominent *Eroica* quotation at the piece’s conclusion, labeled “in Memoriam,” has been read as both an homage to Hitler\(^{149}\) and as proof of Strauss’s repudiation of the dictator, much in the same way Beethoven rejected Napoleon, the leader he once sought to immortalize with the *Eroica*.

In the late summer of 1944, as it became increasingly apparent that the Nazis were going to lose the war, Strauss turned to the verses of Goethe for comfort. He composed a setting for men’s chorus of Goethe’s poem *Niemand wird sich selber kennen* (No one can know himself). This incomplete choral setting would later become the basis for *Metamorphosen*.\(^{150}\)

Niemand wird sich selber kennen
Sich von seinem Selbst-Ich trennen;
Doch probier’ er jeden Tag,
Was nach aussen endlich klar,
Was er ist und was er war,
Was er kann und was er mag.

No one can know himself
Detach himself from his Self-I
Yet, let him put to the test every day,
That which is objectively finally clear,
What he is and what he was,
What he can and what he may.

---


\(^{149}\) Controversy began over the meaning of *Metamorphosen* after a Dutch critic leveled the charge that the piece was a musical memorial to Hitler. Mattheüs Vermeulen, “Een dubbel schandaal: Het Concertgebouw herdenkt Hitler,” *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 11 October 1947, 7.

Timothy Jackson posits that *Metamorphosen* is Strauss’s musical confession of complicity during the Third Reich. Although this claim is difficult to substantiate, it is certain that Germany’s bombings were weighing heavily on Strauss’s mind. Strauss received the commission for *Metamorphosen* in August of 1944, from Paul Sacher, who wanted Strauss to write something for his Collegium Musicum Zürich. (Sacher was a major figure in the performance of both early and modern music, commissioning more than 200 works from twentieth-century composers during his tenure at the Musikakademie in Basel). The composition also bears rhythmic affinities with the *Trauer um München* (Mourning for Munich) sketch from his *Gedächtniswalzer* (Remembrance Waltz) originally conceived in 1939 as background music for documentary film about Munich, which was then revised by Strauss in 1945 to include the *Trauer um München* sketch.

Strauss did not complete *Metamorphosen* until 1945, and the premiere was set for January 25, 1946. At the final rehearsal, Strauss asked Paul Sacher if he could lead the final run-through. At the piece’s conclusion, Strauss thanked the musicians, turned, and promptly left the hall, electing not to attend the premiere the following evening. Perhaps, as Timothy Jackson suggests, Strauss’s absence reflected the extremely personal nature of the work. Or, taking into account that he was eight-one years old, perhaps he was simply too tired to attend. Still, the melancholia in *Metamorphosen* is undeniable.

---

151 Ibid.
152 The commission was for pragmatic reasons as well; Sacher and Strauss hoped the composer would be allowed by the Nazis to travel to Switzerland for the piece’s premiere, where Strauss hoped to seek treatment at his favorite spa in Baden, outside of Zürich. The point was rendered moot, however, as Strauss did not complete the work until after the war, and even then he was granted permission by the Americans to travel to Switzerland only in October 1945. May, “Last Works,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Richard Strauss*, 186–87, and Kater, *Twisted Muse*, 186, 210.
especially when compared to the ebullience of his final operas, and his Oboe and Horn Concertos, and the piece’s title allows the listener to easily transcribe his or her own meaning onto the piece, as it could reference any poet from Ovid to Goethe. As Caroline Walker Bynum writes, “Metamorphosis expresses a labile world of flux and transformation, encountered through story,”154 and in Strauss’s rendering, the story is certainly concerned with instability and culpability, as he left the ruins of the Third Reich for Switzerland, not wholly unlike Wilhelm Furtwängler.

Given the complexity of the time in which he lived, and his own problematic relationship to it, it is not surprising the debate about Strauss has taken on a life of its own. Political upheaval and personal loss would leave their mark as Strauss, Blacher, and Hartmann tried to reconstruct a Germany free from fascist influence. The Second World War and its aftermath were deeply inscribed in their compositions, as was the influence of the American Military Government. Blacher received much support from the ICD and commissions from RIAS (Radio in the American Sector), remaining a close friend of Nicholas Nabokov even after the occupation. Hartmann, too, benefited from ICD funding, receiving a platform to introduce modern music to Munich through the American re-education efforts. The Strauss villa was nearly over-run with eager autograph seekers who influenced the composer in unexpected ways, including John de Lancie, who spurred the composer to write an Oboe Concerto.

The Ruin provided a valuable catalyst for all three composers to write works commemorating the destruction. Blacher’s Die letzten Tage von Berlin was written to portray the city’s final days under Nazi rule, and his fragmented, sometimes jarring

Ornamente was a tombeau he dedicated to close friends who had survived the War or aided in reconstruction. Moral ruin is Hartmann’s focus in Sonate 27. April 1945, a work that depicts the evacuation march of Dachau detainees. By combining the Lebewohl motive with Jewish ritual music, Hartmann contrasts the distorted depravity of Germany’s musical heritage with the resilience of Jewish culture. Lastly, Strauss’s final compositions attempt to relocate Germany’s classical tradition among the rubble, as Metamorphosen’s interwoven themes culminate in Beethoven’s Trauermarsch (Funeral March). Although one cannot speak of Trümmermusik (Rubble Music) as a definitive genre, each of these works represents a personal meditation on the end of the Second World War and its aftermath. While Hartmann and Blacher wrote to preserve the ruins of German cities, Strauss wrote in spite of them.
As Henry Gluski flew over Berlin before landing at Tempelhof in August of 1945, he could not believe the destruction he witnessed. Nineteen-year-old Gluski had just accepted a radio broadcasting position with Berlin’s Armed Forces Network (AFN), run by the Americans. The station began airing on August 4, 1945, opening with Gershwin’s *Rhapsody in Blue*. As the most junior member of the AFN staff, Gluski was assigned to the shows that no one else wanted to program, that is, the early morning show and the weekly Symphony Hour. For the latter, Gluski chose mostly nineteenth- and twentieth-century music, particularly the music of Jewish composers Mahler and Mendelssohn. Although each Symphony Hour began with the national anthems of all four Allies, he recalled the Soviet Anthem was eventually omitted in 1946 after an American general officer complained. But even as the Cold War was heating up, Gluski still opened the program with excerpts from Prokofiev’s *The Love for Three Oranges*, presumably because it did not have the same Russian nationalistic connotations.\(^1\)

Gluski entered Berlin at a tumultuous time for the Military Government. After the initial few months setting up operations, the ICD was deeply entrenched in denazification proceedings, screening Germans for work permits and trying to restore a sense of order and normalcy to cultural life. The airwaves were the fastest and most

---

\(^1\) Henry Gluski, telephone interview by the author, 1 July 2010.
effective way to communicate to the public, and the military government recognized the
value of radio as a re-education tool. As opposed to the contemporary music festivals at
Darmstadt and Donaucshingen, which promoted modern music among a limited number
of devout followers, the radio would become the primary mode of musical dissemination
in Berlin. The American-controlled radio station, *Rundfunk im amerikanischen Sektor*
(Radio in the American Sector, or RIAS) and other West German stations were able to
broadcast new music to a wider audience than the music festivals, and from 1946 until
1975, West German stations commissioned more than 933 new works. Their prolific
sponsorship also had to do with the financing structure of German radio stations, all of
which were given sizable state subsidies with radio listeners paying a small fee. This
proved in striking contrast to the system in America, where approximately one thousand
privately run stations were dependent on advertising.

This chapter concerns RIAS, the OMGUS sponsored radio station of West Berlin,
and its music programming. RIAS was created to rival the Soviet’s Radio Berlin (created
on May 23, 1945), becoming the primary station for OMGUS to disseminate propaganda
by featuring a variety of musical broadcasts, news programs, and informational reports.
Throughout 1946, the ICD began expanding classical music’s role in Berlin’s radio
programming, as there was “a strong radio competition and the necessity for the

---

2 The National Socialists felt similarly about radio’s power. Goebbels’ famous declaration, “Was will denn
dieser Furtwängler mit seinen lächerlichen 2.000 Zuhörern in der Philharmonie? Was wir brauchen sind
die Millionen und die haben wir mit dem Rundfunk,” seems pertinent here. Quoted in Wolfgang Schaller,*
*Operette unter Hakenkreuz: zwischen Hoffähiger Kunst und “Entartung”: Beiträge einer Tagung der*
*Staatsoperette Dresden* (Berlin: Metropol, 2007), 117
3 Andrew Oster, “Rubble, Radio, and Reconstruction: The Genre of Funkoper in Postwar Occupied
4 Amy Beal, “The Army, the Airwaves, and the Avant-Garde: American Classical Music in Postwar West
Drahtfunk to stand out as a cultural instrument.”⁵ I will examine the broadcasts of musicologist and music critic Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt, whose RIAS program Studio für neue Musik (Studio for New Music) re-introduced Berliners to the music of Hindemith, Webern, Schoenberg, and Weill, among others. In using RIAS to disseminate modern music, the Americans nurtured an early and valuable platform for its promotion, especially in light of financial restrictions that kept Berliners from attending concerts of modern music. Furthermore, RIAS and AFN served to reassure Berliners that the Americans would maintain their foothold in West Berlin. As Mark White, AFN Berlin’s program director, recalled, “AFN Berlin was a lot closer to its audience because we were all living on this island, so to speak.”⁶ The radio was used by the Americans not only to re-educate the German populace, but also to maintain their political and cultural presence during the first of many tenuous phases during the occupation.

Historian David Monod has written that the music of twentieth-century composers like Hartmann, Hindemith, Milhaud and Stravinsky suffered as a result of the 1948 currency reform. According to Monod, audiences that not been exposed to their music were unwilling to spend what little financial resources they had on concerts featuring contemporary composers.⁷ But he overlooks the role that radio played in this period, exposing a wider public to compositions they probably would not have attended concerts to hear. Although Monod neglects to mention the importance of radio, its elimination of the gap between the private and public spheres was a marked contribution

---

to the listening practices of West German society. As a low-cost way to introduce audiences to new music, the radio became the most accessible method for the distribution of modern music in postwar Germany, as the Americans supported five radio stations across Germany: RIAS Berlin, Radio Bremen, Radio Frankfurt, Radio Munich, and Radio Stuttgart. The Americans controlled so many stations because the Allies had agreed it was an important step for cultural decentralization of Germany to re-establish the regional stations that had existed before the war. Still, the Soviets, British, and French only supported one station each: Berliner Rundfunk, Nordwestdeutscherrundfunk (NWDR), and Südwestfunk (SWF), respectively.

Radio Usage in the 1920s and 1930s

Radio use in Germany had been steadily climbing since the 1920s. In 1925 it is estimated that radio had approximately 500,000 German subscribers, and by 1930, there were more than 3 million homes with radio service. With the National Socialists rise to power, all stations became property of the Propaganda Ministry to standardize broadcasts under the state’s Rundfunkgesellschaft (broadcasting company). All radio personnel from the Weimar Republic were replaced with members of the Nazi Party. Radio ownership sky-rocketed after Propaganda Minister Goebbels commissioned the

---

8 For more on the elimination of a public versus private sphere in opera performance, see Oster, “Rubble, Radio, and Reconstruction,” 136.
9 Radio Luxembourg served as the main U.S. propaganda station from September of 1944 until November 1945, before the creation of stations throughout Germany. Larry Hartenian, Controlling Information in U.S. Occupied Germany, 1945-49: Media and Manipulation and Propaganda (Lewistown, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 2003), 52-54.
Volksempfänger (People's Receiver), a cheap and readily available radio receiver in August of 1933. With the declaration of war in 1939, radio’s mass media possibilities were needed to keep morale of civilians and German soldiers high, as Germany became the second largest radio listening public in Europe, just behind England. (One can see this reflected in a simple comparison of yearly radio production; in 1932 German manufacturers produced 3,980,852 radios, and by 1939 that number was nearly 11 million.) Apart from broadcasts updating civilians on the war effort, radio stations also programmed a staggering amount of German classical music and Hörspiele (Radio plays). Listening to a foreign station like the BBC was illegal and carried serious consequences if one were caught.

The Airwaves Competition between the Soviets and Americans

When the Soviets arrived in Berlin, they seized what had been the Third Reich’s most powerful transmitter, located in Measurenalle in Charlottenburg, the future British Sector. The Soviets understood what a powerful re-education tool radio could be, and already by May 23rd, the Russians began broadcasting Radio Berlin (Rundfunk Berlin) for nineteen hours per day. They aired news, morning gymnastics, classical music, and Volksmusik, in addition to programs tailored to German audiences, including Musik für die Hausfrau (Music for the Housewife), Der Pulsschlag Berlins (The Heartbeat of Berlin), Was wir wissen müssen (What we must know), and Das ABC der leichten Muse

---

14 Levi, Music in the Third Reich, 124.
15 “Hört den Rundfunksender Berlin,” in Tägliche Rundschau, 20 May 1945, Rundfunk Programme vom 23.Mai 1945 bis 5.February 1946, Deutsches Rundfunk Archiv, Postdam, Germany. Tägliche Rundschau featured daily phrases and slogans, usually just above the radio programming section. One saying from July 28, 1945, an early attempt at postwar humor, reads: Nazilogik: “Nicht wir Nazis sind schuld am Krieg, die Anti-faschisten sind Schuld, sie hätten ihn verhindern müssen!” (Nazi Logic: We Nazis are not responsible for the War, the anti-fascists are responsible; they should have prevented it from happening!)
(The ABCs of the light-hearted Muse) a program that featured interviews with artists persecuted by the Regime. The Soviets featured broadcasts of classical music, mostly from Russian composers like Tchaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, and Glasunov, and German musicians Brahms, Haydn, Mozart, and Schubert. The Russians even commemorated Richard Strauss’s birthday on June 11, 1945 with a special broadcast featuring an hour and forty-five minutes of his music.16

The first broadcast of live music occurred on May 27, 1945, featuring Leopold Ludwig conducting musicians from various Berlin Opera Houses in excerpts from Mozart’s *The Marriage of Figaro*, *Don Juan*, and Beethoven’s *Fidelio*. The program closed with *Leonore Overture* no. 3 and Tchaikovsky’s Symphony no. 5, a symbolic gesture that was undoubtedly meant to show the new-found unity between the two former enemy countries.17 In a similar spirit of co-operation, the first airing of a Berlin Philharmonic concert took place on June 17th, featuring a Symphonic Poem by Glasunov entitled *Stenka Razin*, two movements from Debussy’s *Nocturnes* (*Fêtes, Nuages*) and Beethoven’s Seventh Symphony. The choice of *Stenka Razin* was no accident; the Cossack leader had challenged the Russian Tsar’s rule in the 17th century, hoping to give power to the oppressed. The piece draws a strong parallel with how the Soviets perceived their role in postwar Germany. Leo Borchard conducted the ensemble.18

When the Americans arrived in July, they too realized the need to establish a radio presence in Berlin as quickly as possible. On July 17, several G.I.s reached Berlin

with the aim of creating Berlin’s Armed Forces Network (AFN) in under 17 days. With an antenna consisting of a wire between two trees, a 250-Watt transmitter, and 2 trucks in which to set up their equipment, they were able to broadcast to a roughly 2-mile radius. Despite its modest range, AFN provided valuable news and music in the first several weeks of the occupation, and by August, the station relocated to 28 Podbielskiallee to the requisitioned 27-room mansion of Joachim von Ribbentrop, the former Nazi foreign minister. (He was tried at Nuremberg and executed for war crimes in 1946.)19 Because American Forces Network (AFN) was initially designed as simply a station for American G.I.s stationed in Berlin, OMGUS realized that in order to rival the Soviet’s Berlin Radio they would need to create another station tailored exclusively to German listeners.

A second American station, Drahtfunk im amerikanischen Sektor (Wired Radio in the American Sector, DIAS) began broadcasting on February 7, 1946.20 Programs included news, music, and informational shows that were aired from 5 p.m. until midnight. On September 5, 1946, DIAS became Rundfunk im amerikanischen Sektor (RIAS), after the station acquired a transmitter and therefore greater broadcasting abilities. RIAS became the primary station for OMGUS to disseminate information, and programs now included “Forbidden Books,” and “News from Overseas.”21 Stimmen der Völker (The Voices of the People)22 was an extremely popular show that featured reports, music, and poetry from around the world, highlighting a particularly country each week.

20 Larry Hartenian, Controlling Information in U.S. Occupied Germany, 54. When the DIAS first aired, it was broadcast by Drahtfunk, a wired radio service that Berliners could get when they attached their telephone wires to a radio set. Drahtfunk broadcasting is of a poorer quality than Rundfunk. Donald Roger Browne, “The History and Programming Policies of RIAS: Radio in the American Sector (of Berlin),” (PhD Diss., University of Michigan, 1961), viii, 355.
21 Beal, “The Army, the Airwaves, and the Avant-Garde,” 484.
22 The show was presumably titled after Johann Gottfried Herder’s collection of folk songs.
One *Amerika* episode featured the works of Robert Frost, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Walt Whitman, and Ralph Waldo Emerson.

In terms of musical programming, the ICD planned to air, “Sonatinas by Schubert, trios and quartets by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Brahms, Dvořák, and so on.” The August 28, 1945 OMGUS newsletter concerning Radio Stuttgart reads:

> In absence of former entertainment sources—from cafes to concert halls—the German public expects radio to provide them with entertainment of a caliber comparable to pre-1933 production. This is particularly true of music, both light and serious...A large share of the more sophisticated requests ask for Offenbach, Mendelssohn, and other composers banned after 1933. These requests make it clear, however, that they want music of the masters with no improvisation.

Although American controlled radio stations may have been willing to play the “music of the masters,” in the year following the war, materials were scarce and stations had to work with the recordings available to them. RIAS reserved approximately 55-60% of its airtime for music, much more airtime than the Political or News Department received, although one must take in to account between 12 p.m. and 6 a.m. only music was broadcast. The American Military Government also distributed surveys for RIAS to gauge what German listeners wanted to hear. A 1946 survey revealed that 14% of Berliners felt RIAS was broadcasting *too much* jazz. (Other radio surveys throughout

---

24 “6871st District Information Services Control Command: News Letter,” Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Records of Information Services Division Staff advisor, 1945-49. RG 260, Box 63, NARA II.
Germany suggest this number is even higher, with around 25% of listeners disparaging the amount of jazz and American dance music played.)

In line with the German radio tradition, the Americans also created a choir, the RIAS Chamber Choir, (Kammerchor), the RIAS Symphony Orchestra, and RIAS Tanzorchester (Dance Orchestra) to perform on the air and to give live concerts. There was money for these “extras” by American standards due to the difference in the way German and American radio stations were funded. In Germany, stations were nationalized, collecting a subsidy from the government that freed them any dependence on commercial sponsors. Due to their state-guaranteed backing, they had the financial freedom to fund orchestras and choirs of extremely high caliber. German émigré composer Ernst Krenek remarked, “The best orchestras are the radio orchestras,” because of the German system’s generous state-supported budgets. As a non-commercial venture, the stations could not make a profit, so instead, they highly paid their musicians and personnel, making the West German radio a highly attractive place to work. New music was heavily supported because there was no risk of losing sponsors.

But apart from playing classical music, RIAS hoped to convey a message of enlightened internationalism by promoting new and foreign works. Especially “In Berlin where there is a strong radio competition and the necessity for the Drahtfunk to stand out as a cultural instrument” the ICD recognized the value in radio as a re-educational tool.


27 The RIAS Symphony Orchestra became the German Symphony Orchestra in 1993.

28 Quoted in Beal, “The Army, the Airwaves, and the Avant-Garde,” 486. Taken from an Oral History at Yale University on American Music with Krenek, 22 March 1975.

29 Ibid.

But the ICD was too short-staffed to accomplish this alone. Cultural officers would also need the assistance of the very people they were charged with re-educating.

**Stuckenschmidt and the Studio für neue Musik**

Cultural officers in all media fields relied a great deal upon those Germans who had been found to be “politically reliable”; as ICD Chief Robert McClure noted concerning the re-education effort, “it is believed that the outward and visible aspects of the work should be entrusted entirely to Germans of proper background and qualifications.”

One such German, Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt (1901-88), was to become an integral part of the American cultural agenda in Berlin. Educated in Berlin, Ulm, and Magdeburg, and self-taught in theory and musicology, Stuckenschmidt had worked as a freelance writer and composer in Paris, Hamburg, Prague, and Bremen before returning to Berlin in the 1930s. But Stuckenschmidt’s support for New Music had made his scholarship unwelcome in the Third Reich, and after his November 1934 *Berliner Zeitung* review of Berg’s *Lulu-Symphonie* (performed to a full house at the Staatsoper), he received an edict from the *Reichsverband der deutschen Presse* that his criticism betrayed a “zweifellos jüdischerseits beinflusste Richtung” (a direction indubitably influenced from the Jewish side), and barred him from publishing in Germany. It was precisely his commitment to New Music and his persecution under

---

31 “Suggested Information Control Program for the Reorientation of German Youth,” 22 August 1945, Records of the Information Control Division (ICD): Central Decimal File of the Executive Office, 1944-49. RG 260, Box 134. NARA II.


the Nazis, however that made Stuckenschmidt attractive to the ICD.34

In the early 1940s, Stuckenschmidt was conscripted into the Wehrmacht as a translator, and after the war he served time in an American prisoner of war camp in France, where he became a translator for OMGUS. Upon his return to Berlin in 1946, he was offered a job by the ICD as the director of the Studio für Neue Musik (Studio for New Music) which would air Friday evenings on Berlin’s DIAS (later RIAS).

Stuckenschmidt was extremely savvy, and recognized his new alliance with OMGUS could prove mutually beneficial; he was to remain heavily involved with the State Department and the CIA throughout the 1950s. In the initial stages of his Studio für Neue Musik, which aired for the first time on July 12, 1946 with a program on Debussy, Stuckenschmidt had to utilize the time-slot (from 10:45 until 11:00 p.m.) to incorporate both musical examples and explanations for key musical features to listeners unfamiliar with the repertoire. His texts had to be approved in advance of airing by ICD officers.

While his bi-monthly lectures sometimes concerned musical concepts, like dissonance, they also detailed twentieth-century composers whose work had been largely absent during the Third Reich. His format appealed to skeptical listeners and proponents of new music alike; he organized nearly every lecture into a pro/contra format in which one speaker was a supporter of New Music and the other a staunch critic. Recognizing the importance of these broadcasts as a way to communicate modern repertoire to those who might not go hear it in concert, Stuckenschmidt planned their every detail in order to

34 Stuckenschmidt was an incredibly prolific writer, and in addition to writing several fundamental books on twentieth-century music, he also authored seminal texts on composers Blacher, Ravel, Schoenberg, and Stravinsky, among others. See Twentieth Century Music (London and New York: World University, 1969); Boris Blacher (Berlin: Bote & Bock, 1985); Maurice Ravel: Variationen über Person und Werk (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1966); Schönberg: Leben, Umwelt, Werk (Zürich,1974); Strawinsky und sein Jahrhundert (Berlin: Piper, 1957).
utilize his timeslot most effectively. Rendered within this political context, as the program was bankrolled by OMGUS, it is significant which composers and topics Stuckenschmidt selected. His schedule is as follows:

**Studio für Neue Musik, 1946:**
- 12.7: Claude Debussy
- 9.8: Béla Bartók
- 23.8: Igor Stravinsky
- 13.9: Dissonance
- 27.9: Arnold Schönberg
- 11.10: Leoš Janáček
- 22.11: Dissonance and Melody Line
- 6.12: Alban Berg
- 20.12: Classicism

The first lecture to address a concept *Ein Gespräch über Dissonanzen* (A Talk about Dissonances) features a *Musiker* (Musician) and a *Musikfreund* (Friend of Music) discussing the role of dissonance throughout Western classical music. The *Musiker* was read by Stuckenschmidt, the *Musikfreund* was Hermann Schindler, and Paul Höffer assisted in writing the manuscript. (Höffer, along with Josef Rufer, co-founded the Internationales Musikinstitut in Berlin-Zehlendorf, and Schindler was a RIAS moderator.)

After the *Musiker* plays an excerpt from Ernst Krenek’s *Toccata and Chaconne* op. 13, featuring variations on the Bach chorale, *Ja ich glaub an Jesum Christum* (Yes, I believe in Jesus Christ) the follow conversation ensues:

**Musikfreund** (comes in quickly): What are you making an uproar for here? That is frightful!
**Musiker**: (keeps playing)
**Musikfreund**: But would you please stop, that is absolutely unbearable!
**Musiker**: (has remained playing, but stops now): What are you raving about?
What you have just heard was a Choral from Krenek, that was written more than twenty years ago.

---

**Musikfreund:** Do you seriously take this garble as music?  

The *Musiker* points out that what might today be a consonance (i.e. a major triad) would have been considered a dissonance 500 years ago, “Sie glauben, diese Zumutung stellt nur die moderne Musik?” (You think this impertinence arises only in modern music?). Stuckenschmidt then proceeds to compare Hindemith, who, as he points out, fled Germany on account of “seiner Dissonanzen,” (his dissonances) to Johann Sebastian Bach, who left his organ position in Arnstadt after his “neuartige Klänge” (novel sounds) greatly disturbed the congregation. According to Stuckenschmidt, Bach’s love of dissonance classified him:

> In this respect more “modern” (to finally use this word) than all of his sons, more dissonant than even Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven and the entire 19th century. In his harmonies, he still belongs today in the ranks of modern composers.  

Stuckenschmidt recognized the best way to introduce his audience to modern, unfamiliar music, was to appeal to the familiar. By evoking a parallel between Bach and modernity, Stuckenschmidt sought to make the dissonance of New Music a natural consequence of the Germanic musical tradition, much in the same way Schoenberg claimed his “Emancipation of the dissonance” was a logical and inevitable outcome.

---


Musikfreund: (tritt schnell ein) Was für einen Lärm machen Sie denn hier? Das ist ja fürchterlich! 

Musiker: (spielt weiter) 

MF: Aber so hören Sie doch auf, das kann ja kein Mensch aushalten! 

M: (hat weitergespielt, hört jetzt auf) Worüber regen Sie sich eigentlich so auf? Was Sie soeben hören, war ein Choral von Krenek, der vor mehr als zwanzig Jahren geschrieben wurde. 

MF: Also, Sie nennen dieses Missgetön ernsthaft Musik?

Aside from outlining musical concepts, Stuckenschmidt also promoted American music and musicians in his broadcasts between 1946-47. His lecture on Aaron Copland featured the composer’s *Rondino* for String Quartet (1923-28) and the *Lincoln Portrait* (1942). The program is revealing, taking place as a dialogue between a skeptic and a proponent of Copland’s work. The skeptic asks, “Do the Americans have their own composers of this intellectually revolutionary style?...Real talents, that can compare to those imported from Europe?”

The proponent of Copland’s work, read (of course) by Stuckenschmidt, allays the skeptic’s fears by proclaiming Copland to be the leader of the American Modernist school. He also notes, “During the World War from 1942-45, these artistic ambitions were increasingly supported by the government,” in reference to the Works Progress Administration (WPA) music program. The pivotal moment of the program comes when Stuckenschmidt discusses the text of the *Lincoln Portrait*:

*As I would not be a slave, so would I not be a master.* That expresses my idea of democracy…In the Coplandian construction, the entire *Lincoln Portrait*, for me, embodies a lot of national directness. These attributes have brought about a typical American literature of high rank, and these attributes also pervade the music of the United States and bring it to its own form.

Although the Americans generally gave Stuckenschmidt free rein as to what he programmed, painting the United States as a culturally vibrant democracy was never far from the ICD’s aim. By promoting the works of suitable American composers like

---

Copland and Gershwin, the Americans hoped to encourage the idea that the United States
was not without its own classical music tradition. In October of 1948, the Americans
sponsored a series of Gershwin concerts with the RIAS Symphony Orchestra led by
Sergiu Celibidache. The program consisted of *Rhapsody in Blue*, *An American in Paris*,
and *Concerto in F* with George Puchelt (also a faculty member at *Internationales
Musikinstitut in Berlin-Zehlendorf*) as piano soloist.41 The program notes contended that
*Rhapsody in Blue* was the result of a new genre, a mixture of orchestral and jazz music
“with typical American coloring.”42 The program further reassures the audience:

> It is known that Gershwin is—very consciously—the bearer of American
> national music traditions, but since *An American in Paris*, he connects
to them the musical inheritance of Western Europe to such a degree that
even Stravinsky and Ravel had nothing more to teach him about it.43

And although the ICD’s efforts were concentrated in Berlin, re-education through modern
music was not simply a RIAS phenomenon. American-controlled Radio Stuttgart
sponsored similar programs, including “Modern American Music” which aired in
October of 1948. The show featured two characters named Peter and Georg Müller, who
supported and criticized modern American music, respectively. Peter plays recordings of
Piston, Copland, and dello Joio he had gotten “from his Uncle in America.”44 George
remains unconvinced by what he considers to be harsh, jarring sounds. Peter counters
George’s skepticism by admitting: “music is an expression of our time, and our time is

---

41 “Im Titania-Palast: George Gershwin Konzert,” 17-20 October 1948, Folder 502/47-49: Veranstaltungen
und Programme, Deutsches Rundfunk Archiv, Postdam, Germany.
42 Ibid. 43 Ibid.  “Wohl ist Gershwin—sehr bewußt—Träger national amerikanischer Musiktraditionen, aber seit dem
*Amerikaner in Paris* verbindet er mit ihnen das musikalische Erbgut Westeuropas in einem Maße, daß
selbst Stravinsky und Ravel im Grundsätzlichen ihm nicht viel mehr vermitteln können.”
44 Quoted in Beal, “The Army, the Airwaves, and the Avant-Garde,” 485. “His Uncle in America” could
also reference the proverbial relative who finds success in the United States after leaving the Old World.
full of dissonances.”45 By the program’s conclusion, George has been completely won over, admitting, “It’s clear to me I am at fault, not the music I have been criticizing.”46

In December of 1947, NBC Thesaurus Record Sets finally arrived at the American-controlled stations in Berlin, Frankfurt, Munich, and Stuttgart, and the ICD also produced a “Catalogue of American Musical Compositions” to help music officers program appropriate music.47

Apart from introducing listeners to American music, the radio also sponsored performances of formerly Entartete Musik, including a week of recordings to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Mendelssohn’s death.48 The program featured several hours of Mendelssohn’s music daily from October 28th until November 4th, 1947. The RIAS Symphony Orchestra was featured only in one recording, Die erste Walpurgisnacht, as most of the other recordings were made by the Boston and New York Philharmonic Orchestras. With Boston led by Koussevitzky and Mitropoulos, and New York by Artur Rodzinski, the broadcasts were meant to emphasize the fruitfulness of the American–European partnership. Furthermore, the New York Philharmonic recording of the Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto featured Menuhin as its soloist, fresh from his Fall 1947 tour of West Germany.

45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
Re-nazifying Wagner?: The Return of the Bayreuth Festival

On the other end of the musical spectrum, not all RIAS concerts in the postwar years featured American or Jewish composers. RIAS also programmed all-German contemporary music concerts with works from Blacher, von Einem, Werner Egk, and Carl Orff. The last two composers were particularly surprising choices, as Egk had been the former leader of the composers’ section of the Reichsmusikkammer; and Orff’s music had also been well received under the Nazis. Although both passed denazification, their postwar reputations were severely compromised. During a January 1950 RIAS concert, Orff was significantly represented with excerpts from Carmina burana, the very work the Nazis had so openly admired.49

And, in perhaps the most surprising of all partnerships, on June 27, 1948, the RIAS Symphony Orchestra sponsored an all-Wagnerian Program held at the Titania Palast, conducted by Walter Sieber.50 Although the concert was the first dedicated solely to Wagner’s works in the American sector since the end of the war,51 not everything about the performance suggested a clean break with the Third Reich. Of the evening’s three featured soloists, two had prominently been involved with the Wagner Festival at Bayreuth between 1933-45. Erich Witte, a German tenor and vocal Hitler supporter, had appeared as David in Die Meisteringer von Nüremberg at Bayreuth in 1943 and 1944. Jaro Prohaska, an Austrian bass-baritone, had sung frequently at the Festival appearing as Amfortas, the Dutchman, Gunther, Hans Sachs, Telramund, and Wotan between 1933

and 1944. Perhaps the fact that the operas were unstaged, framed by an American-controlled radio station, added to their neutrality. Furthermore, after 1947, all American blacklists were discontinued, allowing musicians who had been banned to resume working.

Although it is perhaps surprising that Wagner’s music would have been performed so soon after the war, the American occupational government supported Wagner’s re-introduction, albeit within certain limits. When approached by the Bavarian local government about supporting the reopening of the Bayreuth Festival, the American Military Government refused, on the grounds it would not permit the Festival to re-open if Winifred Wagner was still prominently involved. (Born in Britain, Winifred Wagner was the composer’s daughter-in-law and widow of his son, Siegfried.) After all, the Bayreuth Festival, or “Beulah” as one confused American officer called it, had thrived during the 1930s and early 1940s through Nazi Patronage with Winifred prominently at its helm. (Hitler had been a close friend of the Wagner family since the 1920s, and by 1935, the Nazis were paying 500,000 RM for each new production.) When Winifred refused to relinquish control, Military Government subsequently denied permission and money for its reopening, and without financial support, the Wagner Family was unable to hold the Festival.

When the Festival finally reopened in 1951, its abstract sets and sparse designs were a far cry from the opulent Heinz Tietjen productions of the war years. (Although

---

53 Monod, Settling Scores, 253.
55 Monod, Settling Scores, 255.
there were several prominent American Military officials in attendance, the cultural politics had changed since 1949, as the Americans no longer controlled the content of German productions.) The stagings may have been different, but many of the musicians remained the same as during the National Socialist years, including Karl Böhm, Wilhelm Furtwängler, Herbert von Karajan, Clemens Krauss, Elizabeth Schwartzkopf, and Erich Witte. Winifred Wagner was no longer the Festival’s figurehead, but had passed the torch to her sons, Wolfgang and Wieland. The Festival opened with a performance of Beethoven’s Ninth led by Furtwängler. Richard Taruskin, in writing about Furtwängler’s presence at the event, contended:

His performances preserved in aspic a century-old tradition of Beethoven that went back precisely to the great figure the Bayreuth Festival worships…Indeed, that anachronistic link with Wagner was precisely what made Furtwängler indispensable to the occasion his performance celebrated, and he surely did all he could, in the event, to emphasize it.57

In an era where Germany had ceased to exist as a unified nation, perhaps Furtwängler’s presence suggested a longing for national continuity. Furtwängler had conducted the final Bayreuth performance in 1944, just before Goebbels had declared total war and shut down most theaters and halls in Germany. Thus, in many ways, “the new Bayreuth style” was really the old, cleverly recast through its renouncement of opulent costumes and stage designs. The only marked change sat among the Festival’s international, cosmopolitan audience in the forms of the French, British, and American High Commissioners.58

But the regulation of Wagner, German classical music, and the promotion of modern music were not RIAS’s only concerns in their cultural programming. Officer Ilse Nehemias, a content analyst for RIAS, also hoped to encourage more shows on modern art. While peeking in the windows of the Gerd Rosen Gallery on Kurfürstendamm, Nehemias eavesdropped and recorded the shocked reactions to the Picassos on display:

“How impossible, who is going to hang such terrible things in his room, maybe some of the Amis…”

“What has become of our wonderful clean German art again? We were so proud to have gotten rid of our entartete Kunst (degenerate art) and now they have the nerve to show us such dirt again…”

While we ought to take Nehemias’s report with a grain of salt (she had to justify her job’s validity in her memorandums to an occupational government that was desperately looking to cut costs), RIAS began to program a series of broadcasts designed to raise the profile of modern art in Germany. The creation of Prolog, a German modern artist collective started by American cultural officers was another way in which the ICD hoped to promote and encourage modern artists. Between 1945 and 1949, more than 1,100 art exhibitions were held in Germany with 70 Berlin shows in the year 1946 alone.60

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York would send exhibitions to Germany featuring Jackson Pollock and Robert Rauschenberg. By the 1960s, the American government was spending thousands of dollars to sponsor the “Art in Embassies” program, which displayed works by American

artists and other modernists like Max Beckmann, Paul Klee, Gerhard Marcks, Otto Müller, and Emil Nolde in their Embassies worldwide.  

**The Blockade and an Increase in RIAS Listenership**

But despite RIAS’s efforts to educate, the programs they broadcast had a difficult time finding an audience in the station’s early years. The primary problem in attracting listenership was RIAS’s signal quality, which was not as good as Berliner Rundfunk. As a result, most Berliners were listening to the Soviet station regardless of the sector they lived in or their own political views. An October 1946 RIAS survey revealed that the most popular station in Berlin was still Berliner Rundfunk with some 67% of Berlin’s listenership. Meanwhile, RIAS only attracted some 16% of the city. Still, convinced of RIAS’s strategic worth as a re-education tool, by January of 1948, the American Military had decided to make RIAS the primary station in all of Germany by acquiring a more powerful transmitter than the Americans’ previous model.

Then, in the summer of 1948, RIAS experienced an unexpected jump in listenership through a surprising turn of events, surpassing even Berliner Rundfunk. The Soviet Blockade (June 24, 1948- May 12, 1949) of West Berlin did the most to boost the station’s listenership, giving the American station 80% of Berlin’s ears. The tension between the American and Soviet occupiers had come to a head, and now there were definite geographical implications attached. RIAS increased broadcasting hours to 18

---

hours a day, double their current amount. Armed Forces Network (AFN) decided to program 24-hours a day in order to keep American pilots awake as they flew in and out of Tempelhof Airport, bringing supplies that kept the island of West Berlin functioning for the nearly a year. In writing about the Blockade and its impact on Berlin’s cultural scene, Stuckenschmidt contended:

Due to the blockade and currency reform the heyday of Berlin’s musical life comes to an ending in 1948. What now follows is characterized by the political separation of the spheres and a new, very different construction in both halves of the city.

By 1949, American authorities began relinquishing control of their stations to the Germans. The transfer marked a shift from Phase II to Phase III of the ICD agenda, allowing the Germans to resume control of the airwaves. The Bildungsauftrag (Educational contract), under which all German stations operated after 1950, meant that music directors were legally obligated to air pedagogical programs about modern music. Thus, stations were not only the distributors of new music, but also the educators of the German public. (The radio stations of the Federal Republic of Germany combined to create the ARD, a coalition of stations in West Germany.) Although Germans ran the station, the Americans still stayed heavily involved with production; RIAS remained under American Administration until its dismantling in 1992.

64 “RIAS Policy,” 5 January 1948, RG 260, Box 34, Radio Control, Radio Policy File (1945-1949), NARA II.
66 Beal, “The Army, the Airwaves, and the Avant-Garde,” 484.
67 Hartenian, Controlling Information in U.S. Occupied Germany, 1945-49, 90.
68 Beal, “The Army, the Airwaves, and the Avant-Garde,” 487.
As the Soviet-American relationship deteriorated throughout the 1950s, changing from reluctant co-existence to open confrontation, these politics were also reflected in their music programming choices. To directly combat the Soviet socialist realism, the Americans began to publically support the avant-garde. John Cage was first introduced to the German public in November of 1952 by composer Herbert Eimert in his late-night Cologne radio program about new music. Eimert gave a brief biography of Cage, and then the following disclaimer:

Please brace yourselves, my dear listeners, we are now in America…We cannot forget that America not only adopted our European music culture, but that it also regards all those music phenomenon with great impartiality. If, in America, an experimental musician like John Cage steps into the public sphere—naturally not an international public, he would have no opportunity for that—rather in front of interested listeners, one thing is certain: his experiments will be heard without prejudice, and not morally judged and dismissed in the name of holy eternal criteria of value, as would immediately be the case here in our country.70

Eimert’s optimistic report of Cage’s reception in America would have delighted the composer, who was already finding American audiences, especially under McCarthy, to be quite hostile to his work. Broke and rather desperate, Cage scheduled a German tour in the hopes of locating a public as it was becoming increasingly difficult for him to pay his rent. Cage finally secured permission to come to Germany, along with David Tudor, a pianist, composer, and friend of Cage’s. Cage and Tudor’s debut performance at Donaueschingen in 1954 so scandalized the audience that one critic wrote simply, “Abandon all hope!”71 Their pieces for prepared piano were greeted with a mixture of laughter, boos, hisses, and rapt attention. Cage had found his audience.

---

70 Beal, “The Army, the Airwaves, and the Avant-Garde,” 488.
American support of the avant-garde was not the only way in which the United States tried subterfuge of Russian cultural policies. In response to Soviet Berlin Radio broadcasts of American Jazz accompanied by descriptions of the violent treatment of African Americans in the United States, RIAS created new shows on Louis Armstrong, making sure to emphasize the American public’s adoration for the musician.72

When David Brubeck went on his State Department tour in 1958, he was sent only to countries pegged as valuable political allies: Belgium, Denmark, England, Germany, Holland, and Sweden. When Brubeck insisted on adding Communist Poland, the State Department balked, refusing to help him obtain visas. Eventually Brubeck succeeded, but when he touched down in East Berlin, he encountered a major problem: the group had no travel visa to pass through East Germany to reach Poland. Told he would have to hide in the trunk of a car and pass through the Brandenburg Gate in order to obtain the proper papers, Brubeck refused and insisted on staying in the backseat, although the incident compelled him to write a song and an album entitled Brandenburg Gate. The group ultimately went on to give a wildly successful series of concerts in Poland with no help from the State Department.73

Brubeck’s visit can be seen in direct opposition to that of Paul Robeson, who visited the German Democratic Republic on several occasions during the 1950s and 60s. Robeson’s professed support for Communism meant the U.S. Government revoked his passport for 8 years, allowing him to leave the country only in 1960 after an eight-year

72 Browne, “The History and Programming Policies of RIAS,” 232. Incidentally, Armstrong made many tours of under the auspices of the State Department in the 1950s and 60s. In 1955, while appearing in West Berlin, Armstrong decided to try his luck and enter East Berlin through Checkpoint Charlie. Although he didn’t have the necessary papers, the Russian guards let him through because they recognized him as “Satchmo.” Penny von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 11-12.
73 Ibid., 48-50.
embargo. Robeson was particularly beloved in East Berlin, and in 1958, the Soviets still held a 60th birthday concert (minus Robeson) in solidarity with his plight. Once his travel restrictions were lifted, Robeson travelled to East Berlin to receive an honorary Doctorate from Humboldt Universität. As Kira Thurman has pointed out, Robeson’s reception in the East German press reveals the GDR exoticized Robeson as much as it hailed him as a fellow comrade.  

But the developments of the 1950s and the State Department plans could not have taken place without the groundwork laid by the Military Government during 1945 to 1949. In the immediate postwar years, RIAS provided valuable programming, albeit with a noted bias for portraying American culture in the best of all possible lights. Amy Beal writes of the American re-education initiatives in Germany:

> That OMGUS would support such programs in order to educate German listeners about the cultural and intellectual value of modern music, but that the American government itself would not support such programs at home reveals to what extent cultural products were manufactured and disbursed as tools in the reeducation battle, and later, during the Cold War effort to maintain cultural diversity—and American cultural hegemony—in western Europe.

Clearly the ICD’s product for the German people was also a result of the American-
Soviet relationship, or deterioration thereof. American programming was calculated in response to the Russian efforts in a defensive strategy to keep German radio audiences, regardless of whether they lived in the East or West, listening to RIAS and AFN. Music critic and former cultural officer Everett Helm admitted, “Without the radio, the intense musical life of present-day Europe would be unthinkable.”\(^7^7\) And by the 1950s, although initially created for American soldiers stationed in Berlin, AFN became popular with the Germans because of its Rock N’ Roll programming and its announcers. George Hudak, AFN’s most popular broadcaster, became the “Liebling of Berlin,” by coining phrases like “auf Wiederbyebye” and “thank you very dankeschön.”\(^7^8\)

But not all listeners were overjoyed to hear American popular music broadcast on a regular basis. There remained Berliners who resisted this importation of American culture, feeling it somehow usurped their German identity. After reading complaint letters from RIAS listeners to the station’s programming department, Historian Jessica Genow-Hecht observed that some Germans “felt they had to choose between Bing Crosby merged with democracy or Tchaikovsky coupled with communism.”\(^7^9\)

In 1962, Berlin AFN switched to 24-hour a day broadcasting because the Soviets had begun to steal their frequency to air propaganda. The new policy of continuous programming prompted panic when AFN did shut down for breaks; the station would be bombarded with phone calls from American G.I.s and Berliners asking what was wrong. Mark White, AFN Berlin’s program director, recalled of the increasingly tense political atmosphere: “There was this feeling, well, if AFN is off the air, maybe something is

---


\(^7^8\) Mark White, “To Inform, Educate and Entertain—That was our Job,” in Weiß, Mensah and Strauss, The Link with Home, 38.

going on we don’t know about. After all, in Berlin the Soviets were just across the street.”

The Soviets may have been across the street, but they too were listening. Both AFN and RIAS acquired a significant following in East Berlin, frequently receiving letters requesting American popular music. Mark White recalled one incident during the early 1960s in which one request for Bill Haley’s “Rock Around the Clock,” came tied to a rock thrown over the Wall. Elvis Presley was most popular with Russian soldiers, who scribbled their requests on postcards sent to Podbielskiallee despite strict prohibitions on fraternization between the Americans and Soviets. RIAS finally stopped broadcasting operations in 1992; AFN in 1994, signing off with The Star-Spangled Banner. The American foray into German radio programming was over.

---

80 Mark White quoted in Weiß, Mensah and Strauss, The Link with Home, 36.
81 Terry Snell, “It’s only Rock ‘N Roll…,” in Weiß, Mensah and Strauss, The Link with Home, 6. (Presley had been stationed in West Germany from October 1958 until March 1959.)
Conclusion

On December 5, 1949, OMGUS was officially dissolved, and Theater and Music control was discontinued. John Bitter’s application to continue as a music officer was denied.\(^1\) The Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany (HICOOG) assumed control for postwar Germany, and along with the State Department and the CIA, these organizations embarked on an entirely new reorientation plan for 1950s Berlin. Without cultural officers overseeing German musical life at the regional level, the reforms the Americans had pushed for, including more performances of American music by composers like Barber and Copland, withered to naught. Additionally, American appointed German personnel was gradually crowded out and replaced by formerly blacklisted musicians.\(^2\)

This dissertation was motivated by questions about the politicization and framing of classical music in a post-fascist context. Because the National Socialists had been

---

\(^1\) Louis Miniclier to John Bitter, 3 October 1949, RG 260, Box 18, Slide 280, Box 18, Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, NARA II.

such visible and fervent patrons of the arts, sponsoring performances within highly
propagandistic settings like rallies, the American Military Government sought to purge
these fascist associations and instead re-appropriate German Hochkultur (high culture) by
emphasizing its democratic humanism. But after a lengthy and violent conflict, how did
the Americans perceive their role as cultural re-educators in a conquered nation? What
were the American misconceptions about German classical music institutions, and vice
versa? And, ultimately, was the American cultural occupation successful in achieving its
re-education goals of denazification and reorientation?

The easy answer is yes and no. (Or perhaps jein better expresses what I mean to say– a fusion of ja und nein that equals a conditional “maybe”.) Yes, West Germany
would be transformed into the Federal Republic of Germany, a thriving constitutional
republic rebuilt and molded by the Western Allies, its Wirtschaftswunder (economic
miracle) largely possible due to Gastarbeiter (foreign workers) brought to the country
from Turkey, Greece and Italy.3 In this sense, the ICD’s desire to root Nazism out of
Germany’s culture was largely successful.4 But was this directly related to American
efforts, or would Nazism have languished in the postwar years regardless of extensive
American cultural propaganda?

As the first facet of the ICD’s re-education program, the effectiveness of
denazification has long been called into question. In 1945, 8 million Nazi party members
still lived in Germany. Of the 16 million Fragebogen completed, American occupation

---

4 Though certain fringe groups do claim fascist orientation, they remain a minority.
forces determined that 3.5 million were “chargeable cases,” which resulted in a total of 486 executions. In the end, the failure of cultural denazification, however, was that hardly any of the charges resulted in punishment, as musicians resumed their careers virtually unimpeded after the war. Although many prominent musicians during the Third Reich had not joined the Party, their co-operation with the Regime was also a form of compromise. But to blacklist every artist who had concertized for the regime was impossible, and the Americans could not agree on a consistent and fair way to deal with those who had. Furthermore, when musicians in Berlin were placed on the blacklist, they could simply head to the Russian sector to find work. (In the days before the Wall, all one needed was a permit to pass between the various sectors of occupation.)

In the end, it is difficult to make overarching claims about the effectiveness of the American re-education program. Even among the ICD’s cultural officers, efficacy varied depending on the relationships they were able to build with German civilians, their location, and their own musical backgrounds. John Evarts and Edward Kilyeni had a warm and productive relationship with Karl Amadeus Hartmann in Munich, but also encountered a fair amount of resistance to the promotion of modern music from conservative Munich audiences. Newell Jenkins, Chief of Music and Theater in Württemberg-Baden (and a former student of Carl Orff) encountered such staunch resistance to modern and American music that he introduced “Friends and Enemies of Modern Music,” a concert series designed to counter the complaints of skeptics. Henry Adler, stationed first in Berlin and then in Vienna, recalled the powerful musical

---

5 In Austria the whitewashing was even more pronounced; of 130,000 people investigated for war crimes, only 23,000 were actually put on trial and 30 were executed. Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), 52-56.

personalities of Furtwängler and Karajan, and the enormous pressure to reinstate them both. (He admitted Karajan even became his nemesis during their time together in Vienna.) 7 Carlos Moseley left Munich deeply frustrated at the lack of support from the ICD in helping to bring American artists to Germany. 8 And in Berlin, Frederick Mellinger, Walter Hinrichsen, and John Bitter struggled to recruit politically clean civilians as their efforts were constantly measured against the Soviets, who were known to entice artists to their sector with better food and pay. 9 From 1945 until 1949, Berlin was a microcosm of competing antagonisms between the emerging superpowers as each tried to mold post-Hitlerite Germany into what Washington or Moscow deemed fit.

Although Toby Thacker has shown that performances of American classical music sharply decreased after 1949 10, this is not to say that American music left Germany for good. It was simply that it was not the kind of American classical music ICD planners like Harrison Kerr or Deems Taylor had envisioned for their “an exportable image of America”. 11 In other words, perhaps the increasing absence of American classical music in the 1950s simply reflected the growing German interest in American popular and avant-garde music. In Berlin, AFN’s Rock and Roll had garnered an increasing number of German devotees. By the 1950s, the CIA and State Department would sponsor various American popular and jazz artists, including Louie Armstrong, Count Basie, Dave Brubeck, Ella Fitzgerald, and Frank Sinatra to play throughout Europe. Additionally, American avant-garde composers like John Cage, David Tudor,

7 Interview with Henry C. Alter, conducted by Brewster Chamberlain and Jürgen Wetzel. 11 May 1981, B Rep. 037, Nr. 79-82, Landesarchiv, Berlin.
8 Monod, Settling Scores, 205-06.
9 Ibid., 230.
Elliott Carter, and Morton Feldman were beginning to attract a West German audience through their performances at festivals like Darmstadt and Donaueschingen. Funding from the Ford Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation, and the German Academic Exchange Service (*Deutsche Akademischer Austauschdienst*, or DAAD) made the transnational collaborations between German and American musicians possible.\(^{12}\)

This dissertation also considered the fundamental morality of the American venture in Germany. Was the ICD’s cultural re-education program a noble attempt to weed out Nazism? Or was their insistence on control stifling to the artists they were trying to help, thereby emulating the fascist cultural politics to which they were ostensibly opposed?\(^{13}\) Once again, one could answer with *jein*; on one hand, the pragmatic work of the cultural officers across Germany in locating scores, instruments and costumes was invaluable. (In one such recovery operation, cultural officers were surprised to see the townspeople wearing the Opera costumes they had pillaged from their local salt mine.)\(^{14}\) These practical concerns occupied much of their time, and without the resources (transportation, manpower, and communication network) of the American Military Government, cultural rebuilding would have undoubtedly proceeded at a much slower rate. Furthermore, some genuine friendships and professional relationships were established. Of the American support that Karl Amadeus Hartmann


\(^{13}\) I would like to thank my committee for pointing this out at my dissertation oral presentation.

\(^{14}\) Phone Interview with Dr. Paul Laird, 16 February 2012.
received, John Evarts admitted, “Hartmann deserves it as much as any.”\textsuperscript{15} The most successful cultural officers were those that viewed their role not as occupiers, but more as facilitators.

Where the American presence in postwar Germany took an uncomfortable turn, however, was when individuals used their power for questionable or self-serving purposes. With such an abundance of career opportunities, one can certainly imagine the temptation facing cultural officers, many of whom already had strong relationships with the Germans, blurring the line between professional and personal agendas. Several ICD employees had works premiered by German ensembles, including Harrison Kerr, Nicholas Nabokov, and, of course, John Bitter. As late as 1955, Nabokov was writing to Blacher asking him to convince Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau to perform his \textit{Symboli Chrestiani} at its Venice premiere. (Nabokov concludes the letter with the subtle plea, “In case you don’t know Dieskau personally, please let me know through whom I could stalk him.”)\textsuperscript{16} Other officers performed with or conducted German orchestras, as in officer Edward Kilyeni who performed as piano soloist with the Munich Philharmonic, or Bitter’s unusual conductor-supervisor relationship to the Philharmonic. (Arguably, conducting the Miami Symphony Orchestra one year and the Berlin Philharmonic the next might have gone to anyone’s head.)

The ICD ended its extensive re-education efforts in December of 1949, as the State Department and the CIA assumed control of cultural propaganda. The Office of Military Government, United States (OMGUS) became the Office of the U.S. High Commissioner of Germany (HICOG), representing American interests in Germany. In

\textsuperscript{15} Quoted in Monod, Settling Scores, 199.
\textsuperscript{16} Nabokov to Blacher, 4 January 1955, Folder: 417, Boris Blacher, AdK.
the words of Gottfried Eberle, former music director of RIAS, “Die Götter wechseln, die Religion bleibt die gleiche” (The gods change, the religion remains the same). But rather than promoting American classical music to skeptical German audiences, the State Department and CIA would realize that the Americans had a much more powerful weapon in popular culture.

Appendix A
National Archives and Records Administration, II (NARA II)
Musica Viva Program Cover, 1948/1949
RG 260, Box 18, NARA II

"– nein, das ist kein schlechtes Zeitalter,
das ist ein Wald von großen Männern"
nach Thomas Mann
DEUTSCHE STAATSOEPER
Admiralspalast, Friedrichstraße 101-102

Freitag, den 29. November 1946, 19 Uhr

SINFONIE-KONZERT
der
STAATSKAPELLE

Dirigent: JOHN BITTER

H. Berlioz: Ouvertüre „Römischer Karneval“
op. 9

W. A. Mozart: Sinfonie Nr. 29 A-dur (K 201)
Allegro moderato
Andante
Larghetto
Allegro con spirito

PAUSE

D. Schostakowitsch: 5. Sinfonie op. 47
Moderato
Allegretto
Largo
Allegro non troppo

11.46 Viola und Salz, Texto 5/44, Kodex 70-71
Mittwoch, den 9. Juli 1947 - 19 Uhr

Konzert
des
Berliner Philharmonischen Orchesters
Dirigent: John Bitter
Soloist: Jaró Prohaska, Staatsoper Berlin

Serenade für Streicher . . . . P. Tschaikowsky

Englische und amerikanische Volkslieder
instrumentiert von D. Schostakowitsch

Die Seemannskant
John Anderson
Billy Boy
Oh, meine Eiche und Eiche
König Artuas Diener
Als ich durch den Rüggen ging . . .
Frühlingsreigen
Wenn Johnny nach Hause kommt

Jaró Prohaska

Pause

Symphonie Nr. I, Opus 10 . . D. Schostakowitsch

Allegretto
Allegro
Lento
Allegro molto — lento — Allegro molto
STAATSTHEATER KASSEL
Stadthalle – Ulmer Saal
Freitag, den 16. Februar 1940, 19 Uhr

5. Symphoniekonzert
von Johannes Brahms
Dirigent: John Bitter
Solist: Professor Ludwig Hoellcher, Cello

Richard Strauss
Don Juan
Tonablichtung (nach Nikolaus Lens) für großes Orchester op. 26
(Prag 1906)

+ Paul Hindemith
Konzert für Violoncello und Orchester (1940)
Allegro moderato – Andante con moto – Allegro vivace

Johannes Brahms
Symphonie Nr. 9, D-Dur, op. 73
Allegro assai vivace – Presto – Allegro con spirito

+ Zum ersten Mal.
Appendix C
Berlin Philharmonic Archive

Program, 11 March 1935
(The last Philharmonic Performance of Mendelssohn during the Third Reich.)
Die alte Philharmonic (The Old Philharmonic), 1945
Berlin Philharmonic Archive
(F 7 II, 1945-1)
Die alte Philharmonic (The Old Philharmonic), 1944
Berlin Philharmonic Archive
(F 7 II, 1944-3)
Die alte Philharmonic (The Old Philharmonic), 1944
Berlin Philharmonic Archive
(F 4 II, 1944-5)
Die alte Philharmonic (The Old Philharmonic), 1944
Berlin Philharmonic Archive
(F 4 II, 1944-2)
Die alte Philharmonic (The Old Philharmonic), 1944
Berlin Philharmonic Archive
(F 5 II, 1944-4)
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