Stravinsky’s Music in Hitler’s Germany
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Despite considerable research into musical life in Nazi Germany in recent years, it is still widely assumed that the vibrant new-music scene that characterized the latter years of the Weimar Republic came to a sudden halt after January 1933, to be replaced for twelve long years by little more than Brahms and Wagner imitations. Indeed, given the flight of such major figures as Arnold Schoenberg and Kurt Weill, not to mention the hundreds of less well known (and mostly Jewish) musicians who had contributed so much to Germany’s artistic life, it is easy to assume that after the Nazi takeover Germany became a musical backwater in which “almost all progressive artistic work was banned” and composers were content to cultivate a “boorishly nationalist idiom.”¹ To perform the music of Igor Stravinsky in such an environment was “all but a capital crime.”²

This view is seriously misleading. Not only does it misrepresent the position of modern music in Nazi Germany, it overestimates the popularity of modern music during the previous era, ignoring the lack of interest among much of the general Weimar public as well as the widespread opposition on the part of the country’s cultural conservatives. Thus it obscures the degree of continuity that can be discerned in Germany’s musical life from the 1920s through the 1940s, this in spite of the drastic political, social, and cultural changes that took place during this period.³

I would like to thank Pamela Potter for her helpful comments on an earlier version of this article. For their generosity in providing research funding, I am grateful to the Paul Sacher Stiftung (Basel) and to Pro Helvetia (Arts Council of Switzerland). Portions of this essay first appeared in Archiv für Musikwissenschaft (“Die Rezeption der Musik Igor Strawinskys in Hitlerdeutschland”).

An investigation into the circumstances surrounding the reception in Nazi Germany of the music (and person) of Igor Stravinsky offers important insights in this regard. The Nazi regime was not opposed in principle to modern music, though the lack of a consistent music policy, coupled with conflicting attitudes on the part of the various cultural authorities, led to much anxiety for those musicians who supported modern music. The situation was especially complicated with regard to the music of foreign composers, particularly during the aggressively xenophobic early Nazi years, when very little foreign music was performed. This was to change as the economic and political situation grew more stable, and as Germany once again began to look toward its neighbors.

Many foreign composers, including the antifascist Bartók, were eager to profit from German performances. But Stravinsky, the most prominent modernist of the period, was the chief beneficiary. His German supporters—whose activities reveal varying degrees of political commitment—were of crucial importance. Thanks to their determination, Stravinsky's music gradually came to enjoy considerable success. Critics sympathetic to modern music articulated the ideological underpinnings of this success: Stravinsky was a racially and politically acceptable composer, whose tonally based music displayed suitably "national" characteristics. Though he was never officially promoted, and though opposition continued to surface occasionally (most publicly in the "Degenerate Music" exhibition of 1938), Stravinsky's music achieved a relatively secure position in the cultural life of the Third Reich, a position it maintained up to the outbreak of World War II.

The Late Weimar Period

Stravinsky played a vital role in the vibrant musical culture of late-Weimar Germany, where his music was widely performed and hotly debated. "One says 'Stravinsky' and means modern music," commented a critic in 1932, "or one speaks of cacophony, soullessness and anarchy and means Stravinsky." The composer was also in considerable demand as pianist and conductor in performances of his own works, despite his high fees and the increasingly grim economic and political situation during the final years of the Weimar Republic (see Table 1).

4. Sn., "Strawinsky im Königsberger Sinfoniekonzert," Ostpreußische Zeitung, 5 November 1932. All translations not otherwise identified are those of the present author.
5. Stravinsky's German publisher, Willy Strecker of B. Schott's Söhne, Mainz, was largely successful in obtaining the fees Stravinsky wanted, though, as he noted in his letter of 13 February 1931 to the composer, "the requested fees are for these times extremely high" ("die geforderten Honorare sind für die heutige Zeit außerordentlich hoch") (Sammlung Igor Strawinsky, Paul Sacher Stiftung, Basel; hereafter PSS). Aware that Stravinsky's demands might cause resentment,
A significant number of the composer’s German engagements involved the radio stations of Berlin and Frankfurt. From its beginnings in the mid 1920s, German Radio had assumed a leading role in the promotion of new music. Modern composers were frequent visitors. They gave interviews or lectures, played or conducted their music, or attended performances of their works by the stations’ symphony orchestras. (See Table 2 for a list of Stravinsky’s radio recordings.) In his 1935 autobiography Stravinsky praised the “enlightened activity” of the Berlin and Frankfurt stations, noting in particular “the sustained efforts of the latter’s admirable conductor, Rosbaud, who, by his energy, his taste, his experience, and devotion, succeeded very quickly in bringing that organization to a very high artistic pitch.”

The Austrian-born Hans Rosbaud, who took over the music department and the newly established Frankfurt Radio Symphony Orchestra in October 1929, was fast acquiring a reputation throughout Europe as a champion of modern music. At Frankfurt Radio during the early 1930s he regularly conducted works by Schoenberg, Webern, Berg, Hindemith, Bartók, Stravinsky, Debussy, and Ravel. In April 1932 Willy Strecker, Stravinsky’s German publisher, sent the composer details of two studio concerts that Rosbaud was planning for June in honor of Stravinsky’s fiftieth birthday. The first of the two broadcasts, a chamber-music concert, took place on 19 June. Following an introductory lecture by Rosbaud, the Octet, Piano-Rag Music, Pribaoutki, Three Pieces for String Quartet, and Ragtime were performed. Frankfurt Radio’s birthday celebrations concluded with a concert performance of Mavra on 23 June. The composer, accompanied by Vera Sudeikina, drove to Frankfurt for the occasion; the performance was broadcast throughout Germany.

The Frankfurt Radio concerts were not the only birthday celebrations planned for the Frankfurt area. A festival scheduled for 8–10 June at nearby

Strecker suggested on 30 September of that year that the composer lower his fees for the approaching Berlin Radio engagement, “so that it can’t be said that foreigners are receiving unusually high fees while German artists can’t find work” (“damit man nicht sagen kann, die Ausländer erhalten ungewöhnlich hohe Honorare, während die deutschen Künstler keine Arbeit finden”) (PSS). Ever the diplomat, Strecker noted that the goodwill thus obtained would be well worth the financial sacrifice.


9. SSC 2:191 n. 14. Strecker had informed Stravinsky on 13 May that Rosbaud (i.e., Frankfurt Radio) was prepared to cover the composer’s travel costs (PSS).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Work(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Jan. 1930</td>
<td>Berlin (Otto Klemperer)</td>
<td>Capriccio, Conducted Le baiser de la fée, Apollon musagète</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jan. 1930</td>
<td>Berlin Radio</td>
<td>Capriccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Jan. 1930</td>
<td>Leipzig (Klemperer)</td>
<td>Conducted Apollon musagète, Suites 1 and 2 for small orchestra, Petrushka, Firebird Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Feb. 1930</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Oct. 1930</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
<td>Conducted Apollon musagète, Fireworks, Suites 1 and 2, Firebird Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Oct. 1930</td>
<td>Wiesbaden</td>
<td>Conducted Baiser, Suites 1 and 2, Firebird Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Nov. 1930</td>
<td>Bremen (Ernst Wendel)</td>
<td>Capriccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov. 1930</td>
<td>Berlin Radio</td>
<td>Piano Sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nov. 1930</td>
<td>Berlin (Ernest Ansermet)</td>
<td>Capriccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Nov. 1930</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>Conducted Octet, Suites 1 and 2, Rag-Time, Pulcinella Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Nov. 1930</td>
<td>Frankfurt Radio (Hans Rosbaud)</td>
<td>Capriccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dec. 1930</td>
<td>Nuremberg (Bertil Wetzelsberger)</td>
<td>Capriccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Dec. 1930</td>
<td>Mannheim</td>
<td>Conducted Baiser, Suites 1 and 2, Firebird Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jan. 1931</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Conducted Pulcinella Suite, Suites 1 and 2, Firebird Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Oct. 1931</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Conducted Apollon musagète, Violin Concerto (Samuel Dushkin, world première), Petrushka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Oct. 1931</td>
<td>Halle (Georg Göhler)</td>
<td>Capriccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Nov. 1931</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>Conducted Petrushka, Violin Concerto (Dushkin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Nov. 1931</td>
<td>Darmstadt</td>
<td>Conducted Petrushka, Suites 1 and 2, Scherzo fantastique, Firebird Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec. 1931</td>
<td>Cologne (Hermann Abendroth)</td>
<td>Capriccio, Violin Concerto (Dushkin, cond. Stravinsky)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Dec. 1931</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>Conducted Petrushka, Violin Concerto (Dushkin), Scherzo fantastique, Firebird Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct. 1932</td>
<td>Berlin Radio</td>
<td>Recital with Dushkin: Pergolesi Suite, Duo concertant (world première). Also conducted Violin Concerto (Dushkin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Nov. 1932</td>
<td>Königsberg (Bruno Vondenhoff)</td>
<td>Capriccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jan. 1933</td>
<td>Hamburg (Eugen Pabst)</td>
<td>Capriccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Feb. 1933</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>Recital with Dushkin: Pergolesi Suite, Duo concertant, transcriptions from Le Rossignol, Firebird, Petrushka (program also performed in Danzig on 2 Nov. 1932)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sammlung Igor Strawinsky, Paul Sacher Stiftung, Basel.
Table 2  Live Recordings of Stravinsky’s Performances Made by German Radio Before 1933  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Work(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 Jan. 1930</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td><em>Apollon musagète</em> and <em>Le baiser de la fée</em> (excerpts). RRG 229/30 and 231/34 (Schallaufnahmen des Deutschen Rundfunks, no. 2677)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov. 1930</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Piano Sonata. Bln 238/40 (SDR, no. 2838)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Oct. 1931</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Violin Concerto (Samuel Dushkin, world premiere). Bln 1241/46 (SDR, no. 2592)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov. 1931</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td><em>Petrushka</em> (rehearsal excerpts). Ffm 262/263 (SDR, no. 4459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Nov. 1931</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>Violin Concerto (second and fourth movements). Ffm 248/50 (SDR, no. 2593)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct. 1932</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td><em>Duo concertant</em> (with Samuel Dushkin, world premiere). Bln 210.2801/04 (SDR, no. 2730)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: These discs have apparently not survived, though copies of the *Baiser* recordings (but numbered 83/86) were sent by Berlin Radio to the composer (Funk-Stunde to Stravinsky, 20 January 1932 [PSS]).

Bad Homburg was to have presented as its crowning event a performance of *Renard* under Rosbaud’s direction. Financial difficulties, however, forced the festival’s cancellation. A further disappointment was in store for the composer, for Stravinsky had expected Rosbaud’s June concerts to include a performance of *Oedipus Rex*. On 31 May Rosbaud informed him that, since no Frankfurt choir had studied the work (which had not yet been performed in that city), it could not be prepared in time. Rosbaud assured the composer that he would program *Oedipus* the following autumn, during Stravinsky’s next visit. Political events intervened, however; Stravinsky’s birthday visit to Frankfurt Radio proved to be his last.

The wave of nationalism and antisemitism that swept Germany during the summer of 1932 brought the National Socialist German Workers’ Party 37 percent in the July elections. With 230 out of 608 seats, the NSDAP was now the largest party in the Reichstag and its leader, Adolf Hitler, a serious candidate for the chancellorship. Widespread xenophobia, combined with the bleak economic situation, had a chilling effect on Germany’s musical life, especially...

10. Strecker to Stravinsky, 26 April and 13 May 1932 (PSS). For further details on the proposed Bad Homburg festival, see Strecker to Stravinsky, 26 October 1931 and 23 April 1932; Rosbaud to Stravinsky, 23 November 1931; and Stravinsky to Strecker, 22 and 25 April 1932 (PSS).

11. Stravinsky had written to Strecker on 16 May 1932, “I will be in Frankfurt on 23 June. Everything has been settled with Rosbaud, who will do *Mavra* and *Oedipus Rex*” (PSS; translation from SSC 3:233). Stravinsky had also suggested that the conductor Karl Maria Zwißler attend Rosbaud’s performance in preparation for his own proposed production of *Oedipus* at Darmstadt (Stravinsky to Zwißler, 1 June 1932 [PSS]).
with regard to the employment of foreign artists. Stravinsky obtained only four German engagements for the 1932/33 season (see Table 1). His plans had originally included a recital with Samuel Dushkin at Frankfurt Radio. Indeed, Rosbaud had hoped to secure for Frankfurt the world premiere of the *Duo concertant*. By mid-September Stravinsky had heard nothing from Rosbaud or his agent, Detmar Walther, concerning this recital, “on which we were firmly counting,” and asked Strecker to “give them a prod.” His publisher’s reply was a sober one. “These are very unfortunate times: because of the political situation, conductors and concert agents approach foreign artists very hesitantly,” he wrote.

Rosbaud himself, because of his Austrian nationality, is having difficulties maintaining his position at the Radio. He told me that if he were to engage you and Dushkin or [Beveridge] Webster at this time, he would be dismissed immediately. Twice already he has been summoned to Berlin, where they have outlined for him the conditions under which he will be allowed to keep his job.

Strecker felt that, while conditions would improve when the political situation stabilized, Rosbaud’s case reflected “the nervous tension that prevails in the whole of our artistic life.”

Shortly thereafter, Stravinsky received a similar letter from Walther, stating that the Reichsrundfunkkommissar had refused to give Frankfurt Radio permission to engage the composer. To proceed without this permission, Walther noted, would be to risk losing one’s position. Cancellations of German engagements were widespread at this time. Dushkin had written to Stravinsky the previous month, “In the last two weeks Milstein and Patigorsky have had fifteen concerts canceled in Germany, and, for the same reason (Hitler), Horowitz does not play at all.”

Toward the end of October Rosbaud himself wrote to the composer. He revealed that following the June performances in Frankfurt a “virulent campaign” had been launched “not only against the performance of your music, 12. Typical of the times was a motion brought forward by National Socialists in the Prussian parliament. Pointing out that foreign artists were working in state theaters while “large sections of the German artistic community are without bread,” the motion called for the cancellation of contracts with non-German artists “at the first available opportunity.” See “Buntes allerlei,” *Zeitschrift für Musik* 99 (1932): 711.

13. Rosbaud to Stravinsky, 25 October 1932 (PSS). Detmar Walther, Stravinsky’s Frankfurt agent, had informed the composer on 19 July of his negotiations with the radio stations in both Berlin and Frankfurt; on 11 September, when it appeared that Berlin Radio might not be able to meet Stravinsky’s fees, the composer himself suggested to Walther that Frankfurt give the premiere (PSS).

14. Stravinsky to Strecker, 14 September 1932 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:234).

15. Strecker to Stravinsky, 19 September 1932 (PSS; translation after SSC 3:235 n. 28, where “Dushkin” should read “you and Dushkin”). The American pianist Beveridge Webster was at that time living in Europe.

16. Walther to Stravinsky, 30 September 1932 (PSS); Dushkin to Stravinsky, 22 August 1932 (PSS; translation from SSC 2:298).
but also against me, as the conductor and organizer." As the nationalistic wave had reached its peak, the radio administration in Frankfurt and Berlin had warned him that "any further performance of non-German music, without exception," would cost him his position. It was thus impossible for him to schedule a performance of Oedipus, as he had promised, or to offer Stravinsky an engagement. "I can only hope that you will realize, dear Mr. Stravinsky, that in this case the circumstances are stronger than all my efforts." He was, he continued, looking forward to the upcoming elections, in which "one hopes that this chauvinistic movement will receive a setback."17

The National Socialists did in fact suffer reverses in the elections of 6 November, losing 34 of their 230 seats. By the end of the year Rosbaud felt optimistic enough to invite Stravinsky to Frankfurt Radio for a May engagement.18 The next month, while en route with Dushkin to his Munich recital, Stravinsky stopped off in Wiesbaden, where he and Rosbaud discussed their plans for the spring concert. The date was 30 January 1933, the very day when Adolf Hitler was named chancellor. Three weeks later Rosbaud was forced once more to rescind his invitation. "The day on which I last saw you in Wiesbaden brought us a new government," he wrote.

In the meantime the situation has clarified itself to the extent that I must tell you, with my most bitter regrets, that for the present it is totally impossible to invite you to a concert at Frankfurt Radio. None of us knows how much longer


(Rosbaud noted that he had written Stravinsky an explanatory letter during a visit that summer with Anton Weber in Bad Fusch [not Bad-Fischau, as given in SSC 3:234 n. 27]; the earlier letter seems to have gone astray.)

Bertil Wetzelsberger's fiftieth-birthday tribute to the composer in Nuremberg had also aroused opposition. On 16 June 1933 the conductor sent Stravinsky a copy of a program he had conducted on 17 March of the previous year. It included two commemorative works: Haydn's Symphony No. 95 ("Zur Feier der 200. Wiederkehr von Haydns Geburtstag") and Stravinsky's Petrushka ("Zum Geburtstag des Komponisten: 17. Juni 1882"). Wetzelsberger wrote that his audience was scandalized that he should consider Haydn and Stravinsky as equally good composers (PSS).

18. Rosbaud to Stravinsky, telegram of 31 December 1932 (PSS). In a follow-up letter written that evening, he noted, "In the meantime the general situation has also changed somewhat for the better, such that even at the radio station one slowly dares to breathe a little more freely" ("Inzwischen haben sich auch die allgemeinen Verhältnisse etwas zum Besseren geändert, so daß man auch im Rundfunk allmählich ein wenig aufzutmen wagt") (PSS).
he will still be able to keep his position; things will get even worse if after the elections Dr. Goebbels, as is likely, becomes head of radio. I cannot tell you how unhappy I am, dear Mr. Stravinsky, that you cannot play here at present. But you will see that all my best efforts here accomplished nothing. . . . Let us hope for better times.19

The Nazi Years

Introduction

The drastically altered political and artistic climate that followed the Nazi takeover did nothing to lessen Stravinsky’s interest in performances of his music in Germany. Financial and artistic considerations were of primary concern, but the composer’s easy tolerance of the Nazi regime was also the result of his reactionary political views during this period, coupled with a prejudice against Jews.20 The changes in the composer’s political outlook throughout his career have been described by Robert Craft under the apt title “Stravinsky’s Politics: Left, Right, Left.”21 As a young man Stravinsky held liberal sympathies, but his political views were radically altered by the Russian Revolution, which “separated him from relatives and friends . . . as well as from his entire formative world.”22

19. Rosbaud to Stravinsky, 19 February 1933 (PSS): “Der Tag, an dem ich Sie zum letzten Mal in Wiesbaden sah, hat uns eine neue Regierung gebracht. Inzwischen hat sich die Lage so weit geklärkt, daß ich Ihnen zu meinem schmerzlichsten Bedauern sagen muß, daß es vorläufig ganz unmöglich ist, Sie zu einem Konzert im Frankfurter Radio einzuladen. Es weiß keiner von uns, wie lange er seine Stellung überhaupt noch behalten kann; das alles wird noch schlimmer werden, wenn nach den Wahlen wahrscheinlich Dr. Gobbels [sic] Randfunkkommissar werden wird. Ich kann Ihnen nicht sagen, wie unlücklich ich bin, daß Sie, hochverehrter Herr Strawinsky, augenblicklich hier nicht spielen können. Doch Sie werden sehen, daß hier all mein guter Wille nichts vermag. . . . Hoffen wir auf bessere Zeiten!” (The translation given in SSC 3:235 n. 28 is faulty: “I cannot tell you how unhappy I am . . . that soon we will not be permitted to play your music here” [emphasis added].) With regard to the boycott of foreign musicians, Craft comments: “Nevertheless, in April 1933 Stravinsky received a personal invitation to attend an ‘international congress’ in Bayreuth in August” (ibid.). The congress in question was the “II. Internationaler Kongreß des Welt-, Musik- und Sangesbundes,” held in Bayreuth on 17–20 August 1933. The communication of 19 April is not, however, a “personal invitation,” but a mimeographed letter sent—from Vienna—to all honorary members of the society (PSS).

20. As Craft has noted, “political and financial wisdom were synonymous for Stravinsky in 1933” (Vera Stravinsky and Robert Craft, Stravinsky in Pictures and Documents [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978], 553 [hereafter SPD]). The most extensive investigation of Stravinsky’s antisemitism to date is provided by Richard Taruskin, Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 454–60.


22. SPD, 550.
The composer’s attraction to Italian fascism and his personal admiration for Benito Mussolini are well known.23 In 1930 Stravinsky was quoted as saying, just before his first meeting with Il Duce, “I don’t believe that anyone venerates Mussolini more than I. To me, he is the one man who counts nowadays in the whole world. . . . He is the saviour of Italy and—let us hope—of Europe.” After meeting Mussolini, Stravinsky commented, “This pilgrimage to Rome will remain one of the happiest events of my life.”24 In October 1933 Mussolini acknowledged Stravinsky’s birthday greetings and the following February thanked the composer for a score of Duo concertant.25 In the spring of 1935 Stravinsky was received by both Mussolini and his foreign minister, Count Galeazzo Ciano. According to an interview published in Il Piccolo on 27 May of that year, Stravinsky and Mussolini discussed music, art, and politics. “I told him,” Stravinsky is quoted as saying, “that I felt like a fascist myself.”26 Stravinsky later presented Mussolini with an inscribed copy of his autobiography in “profound admiration for him and for his work.”27 Until the outbreak of war he regularly conducted and performed in Italy, and in at least one instance accepted “with joy” a request to begin a concert with “Giovinezza,” the Fascist hymn.28

Stravinsky’s admiration for the Fascists did not extend to their brown-shirted counterparts.29 With an eye to his German royalties, however, he was

23. On the particular attraction of Italian fascism for Russian exiles, see Taruskin, Defining Russia Musically, 450–51. See also Stephen Walsh, Stravinsky: A Creative Spring, Russia and France, 1882–1934 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999), 520–22. Up to the mid 1930s Stravinsky’s sentiments were shared by a great many artists and intellectuals. Modern-minded Germans were impressed by Fascist support for the avant-garde, especially after the Nazi takeover. Heinrich Strobel, for example, commented wistfully on the Italian situation in his review of the first Maggio Musicale in Florence in May 1933: “One came to the conviction that the Fascist state follows all artistic movements with the strongest interest, and one observed with admiration that it even shows a deep understanding for the ideas of the avant-garde. Special credit certainly goes to Mussolini, who knew from the very beginning how to win the support of Italy’s modern artists” (Melos 12 [1933]: 207).


25. SPD, 662 n. 8.

26. SPD, 324 and 551.

27. Stravinsky to Yury Schleiffer, 14 July 1936; quoted in SPD, 552.

28. SPD, 552.

29. Stravinsky himself came face to face with Nazi violence during his visit to Munich with Dushkin in early February 1933. The composer, Vera Sudeikina, and Erik Schaal (a young Munich businessman and photographer and a fervent Stravinsky supporter) were harassed by a group of Nazis, who shouted antisemitic threats and physically attacked Schaal. Stravinsky later recounted the incident, though mistakenly giving the date as 1932. See Igor Stravinsky and Robert Craft, Dialogues (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), 51. The complaint lodged by Stravinsky and Schaal that night came to nothing, for a general amnesty was declared shortly after the incident (Schaal to Stravinsky, 15 April 1933; see also Schaal’s letters of 14 June and 15 August 1933 [PSS]). The ringleader of the group, an “old fighter” (“alter Kämpfer”) named Werner von Alvensleben, was later arrested in Vienna and sentenced to three
anxious not to antagonize the Nazi authorities. Thus in August 1933, when Otto Klemperer, Bruno Walter, and the writer Stefan Zweig asked him to lend his support to a small touring opera company employing refugee artists that was to be established in Vienna, Stravinsky turned for advice to his Russian publisher, Gavril Gavrilovich Paichadze. “Is it politically wise vis-à-vis Germany to identify myself with Jews like Klemperer and Walter, who are being exiled?” he asked. The composer did decide to support Klemperer’s endeavor, becoming an advisor to the company in November of that year. He was less obliging to other German-Jewish musicians who requested his help, however. Shortly before the Nazi takeover, Stravinsky received a letter from the principal flutist at Frankfurt Radio. On Rosbaud’s advice, Justus Gelfius asked for Stravinsky’s assistance in finding a position outside Germany for his Jewish wife, an experienced harpist who was no longer able to find employment in that country. Stravinsky seems to have ignored the letter. In the spring of 1933, Joseph Rosenstock, who had been fired from his conducting position in Mannheim, asked for help in finding guest engagements. Although Rosenstock was a staunch supporter and Stravinsky had guest-conducted his orchestra in December 1930, the composer seems not to have replied. His indifference to the plight of German-Jewish musicians is consistent with a prejudice against Jews revealed in his correspondence of this period. In a letter of June 1933 to Fyodor Vladimirovich Weber, director of Berlin’s Russischer Musikverlag, Stravinsky expressed surprise that he had received no proposals from Germany for the coming season, “since my negative
attitude toward communism and Judaism—not to put it in stronger terms—is a matter of common knowledge.”

Stravinsky’s desire to continue his connection with Germany after January 1933 was not at first reciprocated. As a prominent modernist he had long evoked for völkisch opponents the spectre of “music bolshevism,” a phrase to which the Russian-born composer was understandably sensitive. Added to this was his foreignness, his close association with Germany’s traditional enemy France, and the persistent rumor that he was Jewish—one that had circulated long before the Nazis made racial “purity” a prerequisite for securing German engagements. Thus Stravinsky was a natural target for the favorite (and largely synonymous) epithets of the ultraconservatives: “atonal,” “bolshevist,” “international,” and “Jewish.”

But several factors were to work in Stravinsky’s favor. Though rumors to the contrary continued to appear sporadically after 1933, he was racially acceptable. Nor were his openly stated political views likely to give offense. During his visit to Munich in February 1933, just days after the Nazi takeover, a German newspaper quoted the composer as saying, “Unfortunately, I must continually emphasize that I am in no sense a revolutionary, either in my general views or in my art, and I was never a Communist, materialist, atheist, or Bolshevik, as is frequently said of me.”

Certain works, such as the “barbaric” Sacre du printemps and the “Brechtian” Histoire du soldat, had long evoked strong opposition in the völkisch camp. With its jazz (or, more accurately, ragtime) rhythms, Histoire had been

35. Taruskin, Defining Russia Musically, 458. Examples of Stravinsky’s “negative attitude” are peppered throughout his letters of this period. See, for example, the excerpts published in Walsh, Stravinsky: A Creative Spring, 192, 300, 333, 372, and 515. Walsh notes that “Stravinsky’s most shameless outbursts of anti-Semitism were usually provoked by questions of money” (ibid., 621 n. 21).

36. For an investigation of the term and the role it played in German musical politics between the wars, see Eckhard John, Musikbolschewismus: Die Politisierung der Musik in Deutschland, 1918–1938 (Stuttgart: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 1994). In 1931, when Heinrich Strobel was interested in preparing a German translation of Boris Asaf’ev’s Kniga o Stravinskom (A Book About Stravinsky) (Leningrad, 1929), Strecker assured the composer that it would not contain any “bolshevist tendencies” (Strecker to Stravinsky, 27 March 1931 [PSS]). Ironically, while Stravinsky was being labeled a Bolshevik in Germany, in the Soviet Union his music was attacked as fascist. See Lev Lebedinsky, 8 let bor’by za proletarskuju musiku (Eight Years of Struggle for Proletarian Music) (Moscow, 1931), 41–42; quoted in Marina Lobanova, “Nikolaj Roslavetz: Ein Schicksal unter der Diktatur,” in Verfemte Musik: Komponisten in den Diktaturen unseres Jahrhunderts. Dokumentation des Kolloquiums vom 9.–12. Januar 1993 in Dresden, ed. Joachim Braun, Vladimir Karbusicky, and Heidi Tamar Hoffmann (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1995), 164.

37. Stravinsky took pains to deny these rumors. On 21 December 1931 he had written to the Revue de Paris concerning a report in a recent issue, “I am not Jewish, and there is no Jewish ancestry in my family” (SSC 2:84–85 n. 3). See also his letter of 2 February 1916 to Serge Diaghilev (SSC 2:22).

the focus of conservative attack ever since its German premiere in 1923. But most of Stravinsky’s music had gained wide acceptance in Germany by 1933. His reputation was furthered by recordings of his works, especially those that featured the composer himself as conductor or pianist. That Stravinsky was an important influence on the generation of German composers to come of age during the late Weimar period was a fact frequently acknowledged (or deplored) by critics during the Nazi years, while the more accessible style of his 1930s music did much to soften all but the most entrenched opposition, as we shall see.

Stravinsky’s German supporters proved to be a powerful asset. Foremost among them was Willy Strecker of Schott’s, the composer’s chief publisher during the 1930s; he was aided by other Stravinsky supporters—whether conductors, performers, composers, or critics—as well as by the composer himself. There fell to Strecker the delicate task of furthering Stravinsky’s German interests without antagonizing the ultranationalists. He found it necessary to move with special care, since during the Weimar period Schott’s (in addition to publishing the works of Jewish composers such as Ernst Toch, Bernhard Sekles, and Matyas Seiber) was responsible for Melos, the progressive music journal that anti-modernists most loved to hate.

Stravinsky’s Columbia recordings were not widely circulated in Germany, however, a fact lamented by the composer on 20 November 1930 in a talk delivered at Frankfurt Radio (his notes, misdated 21 November, are preserved at PSS). Shortly thereafter he repeated his complaint to an unnamed Nuremberg reporter (“Plauderei mit Strawinsky,” 8 Uhr-Blatt, 3 December 1930). See also Electrola to Strecker, 22 August 1934 (copy at PSS).

The distinction between Stravinsky’s 1930s style and his earlier works was drawn, for example, by Herbert Gerigk in his 1938 record reviews for Die Musik. Whereas the Octet (1923) still came close to the spirit of “Jewish musical degradation,” Jeu de cartes (1936) had “more in common with our background.” Quoted in Erik Levi, Music in the Third Reich (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1994), 100.

In 1938 the by then defunct Melos, along with its editor, Heinrich Strobel, was specifically targeted at the “Degenerate Music” exhibition that took place in Düsseldorf.

“Personal-Nachrichten,” Allgemeine Musikzeitung 69 (1942): 66. The occasion for this notice was the diamond wedding anniversary of “Geheimrat Dr. Ludwig Strecker” and his wife, who received handwritten congratulations from the Führer. On Schott’s preeminent position during the Nazi period, see Levi, Music in the Third Reich, 159–63.

39. See Joan Evans, “‘Diabolus triumphans’: Stravinsky’s Histoire du soldat in Weimar and Nazi Germany,” in The Varieties of Musicology: Essays for Murray Lefkowitz, ed. John Daverio and John Ogasapian (Warren Park, Mich.: Harmonie Park Press, 2000), 179–89. Histoire was regularly attacked for its theatrical conception, which was typically—if anachronistically—vilified as “Brechtian.”

40. Stravinsky’s Columbia recordings were not widely circulated in Germany, however, a fact lamented by the composer on 20 November 1930 in a talk delivered at Frankfurt Radio (his notes, misdated 21 November, are preserved at PSS). Shortly thereafter he repeated his complaint to an unnamed Nuremberg reporter (“Plauderei mit Strawinsky,” 8 Uhr-Blatt, 3 December 1930). See also Electrola to Strecker, 22 August 1934 (copy at PSS).

41. See, for example, Fritz Stege’s review of Boris Blacher’s Orchester-Capriccio in “Berliner Musik,” Zeitschrift für Musik 102 (1935): 1246.

42. The distinction between Stravinsky’s 1930s style and his earlier works was drawn, for example, by Herbert Gerigk in his 1938 record reviews for Die Musik. Whereas the Octet (1923) still came close to the spirit of “Jewish musical degradation,” Jeu de cartes (1936) had “more in common with our background.” Quoted in Erik Levi, Music in the Third Reich (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1994), 100.

43. In 1938 the by then defunct Melos, along with its editor, Heinrich Strobel, was specifically targeted at the “Degenerate Music” exhibition that took place in Düsseldorf.

44. “Personal-Nachrichten,” Allgemeine Musikzeitung 69 (1942): 66. The occasion for this notice was the diamond wedding anniversary of “Geheimrat Dr. Ludwig Strecker” and his wife, who received handwritten congratulations from the Führer. On Schott’s preeminent position during the Nazi period, see Levi, Music in the Third Reich, 159–63.
Unofficial boycott

At the end of March 1933 Strecker informed Stravinsky that his name had been placed on a list of Jewish composers compiled by a “Kultur Kampfbund,” an organization “whose aim is to advance German art above all other art and to suppress everything Jewish and Bolshevik.” Strecker informed Stravinsky that his name had been placed on a list of Jewish composers compiled by a “Kultur Kampfbund,” an organization “whose aim is to advance German art above all other art and to suppress everything Jewish and Bolshevik.”45 This watchdog organization, the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur (Combat League for German Culture), had been founded in 1929 by Alfred Rosenberg, the chief ideologue of the Nazi Party. Strecker was not unduly concerned that Stravinsky had been classified as Jewish, since he was certain that the list had been hurriedly drawn up by “inexperienced patriots” (“unerfahrenen Patrioten”) and would be checked by higher authorities. “Even Hindemith,” he noted, “is included on the list, as a 50 percent music bolshevist (for his earlier works).”48 Although Strecker expected only limited damage from this “propaganda,” he asked Stravinsky for a written statement that could, if necessary, be submitted to the authorities. Strecker had spoken with Hindemith, who believed that “in matters of art, reason will very soon regain the upper hand”—an optimistic view shared by many Germans during the early months of 1933.49

45. Strecker to Stravinsky, 29 March 1933 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:236 n. 29, which contains substantial excerpts from this letter, albeit in a rather free translation).
46. The formation of the Kampfbund was announced in the Zeitschrift für Musik 96 (1929): 95. Its aim, as stated in 1932 in its periodical Deutsche Kultur-Wacht, was “to reject both the appointment of artists of Jewish parentage and origin, as well as a typically Jewish interpretation of great German works” (quoted in Oliver Rathkolb, Führer treue und Gottbegnadet: Künstlereliten im Dritten Reich [Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1991], 101). Though its influence declined sharply toward the end of 1933, during the spring and summer of that year the Kampfbund was instrumental in the process of Gleichschaltung (coordination) of the arts, thus helping to set the cultural agenda for the Nazi period. See Alan E. Steinweis, Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reich Chambers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 23–28. Alfred Rosenberg was the author of Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts: Eine Wertzung der seelisch-geistigen Gestaltkampfe unserer Zeit (1930).
47. See Fred K. Prieberg, Musik im NS-Staat (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1982), 36–43.
49. Strecker to Stravinsky, 29 March 1933: “Hindemith selbst . . . glaubt, daß die Vernunft in Kunst und technisch sehr bald wieder die Oberhand gewinnt.” A comment in Strecker’s letter of 18 April 1933 to Stravinsky similarly reflects the attitude of many “unengaged” Germans during this period: “This movement has so much that is healthy and positive that one can regard the artistic and other consequences quite calmly” (PSS; translation after SSC 3:218, which incorrectly gives “that no one can regard”).
On 14 April Stravinsky sent Strecker the requested genealogical information. He also included a strongly worded statement concerning his political views, a document that was to prove of crucial importance in his future relationship with Nazi Germany. To counter the charge of “music bolshevism,” Stravinsky pointed out that he had not returned to Russia (“What would I do there?”) and elaborated on the comments he had made in Munich in February of that year: “I loathe all communism, Marxism, the execrable Soviet monster, and also all liberalism, democratism, atheism, etc. I detest them to such a degree and so unreservedly that any connection with the country of the Soviets would be senseless.”

Strecker suggested that the composer also send this information to Russischer Musikverlag in Berlin. He considered it “beneath [Stravinsky’s] dignity” to publicize the statement “prior to an official attack,” which he thought unlikely; Hindemith, he added, shared his view. Noting that Pierre Monteux had played a Stravinsky work in a recent Berlin concert, he concluded that the attendance of government officials was “a sign that the higher-ups have quite reasonable views.” Though “non-German art” would no doubt suffer a “temporary setback,” Strecker felt sure that “as always, what is truly worthwhile will again assume its rightful place.”

At the end of the 1932/33 season, as the intense xenophobia of the regime’s early months slowly abated, Strecker saw even more reason for optimism. “Here in Germany the situation is beginning to clear,” he reported to Stravinsky. Though he had had “some rather harsh correspondence” concerning “your ‘degenerate Bolshevik art,’” he believed the danger now to be over. He was sure that the new guidelines being worked out would “prove to be quite rational” and that Stravinsky’s music would resume its former position. “The people in the leading circles have great insight,” he assured the composer, “and understand the need to present the good things that other countries may have to offer.”

Yet despite Strecker’s rosy optimism, there were no concert plans to announce as the new season approached. In October, as the first full season of

50. Stravinsky to Strecker, 14 April 1933 (PSS). The original letter, along with a typed copy and a German translation, is preserved in the archives of Schott Musik International, Mainz (hereafter Schott’s).
51. Translation from SSC 3:236.
52. Strecker to Stravinsky, 18 April 1933 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:236–37 n. 29). Monteux had conducted Petrushka in his Berlin Philharmonic concert of 5 April 1933.
53. Strecker to Stravinsky, 18 April 1933: "Ein vorübergehender Rückschlag auf nicht-deutsche Kunst wird zweifellos eintreten, aber das wirkliche Wertvolle wird nach wie vor die ihm gebührende Stellung einnehmen."
54. Strecker to Stravinsky, 20 July 1933 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:237 n. 30). On 3 August Strecker wrote to explain the unusually low royalties, noting that German theaters “have avoided presentations of practically all foreign works in the past six months” (PSS; translation from SSC 3:237 n. 30). The postscript, conveying Hindemith’s greetings, was added not by Strecker, as claimed in volume 3 of SSC, but by the composer himself.
the Nazi era was getting under way, Strecker met with Rosbaud, who once again was hoping to be allowed to invite Stravinsky to Frankfurt Radio. In a move clearly intended to head off any opposition, Strecker sent the conductor copies of Stravinsky’s statement of 14 April.55 Early in the new year Strecker informed Stravinsky that the opera houses of Frankfurt and Mannheim had promised to stage Firebird the next season; otherwise there was little to report.56 On 12 March Strecker attended Furtwangler’s highly successful world premiere of Hindemith’s Mathis der Maler symphony in Berlin. Recognizing that this performance was of “extraordinary significance for the recognition of modern music,” Strecker hoped, as he wrote to Stravinsky, “that this victory will also reopen the German stages and concert halls for your works next season.”57

At the beginning of the 1934/35 season, Strecker reported that the opera Mathis der Maler would be ready by the end of November and that he expected from “this great work the decisive victory for modern music that we badly need.”58 Both Furtwangler and Rosbaud, he reported, had plans to perform Stravinsky’s music in the winter season. “I certainly hope that they will then be followed by other conductors who don’t dare to be the first.”59 Strecker added that Rosbaud, if he received permission, “would even like to do an entire evening of your works in Berlin with you as soloist.” Wary of provoking opposition, Strecker thought it might be wiser to wait a little longer. “Leave this to me,” he suggested. “It would be best if you did not undertake anything in Germany without letting me know.” He also advised Stravinsky to postpone his plans for a German edition of his autobiography until he had been “rediscovered” in that country.60

55. Strecker to Rosbaud, 12 October 1933 (Schott’s).
56. Strecker to Stravinsky, 30 January 1934 (PSS).
57. Strecker to Stravinsky, 14 March 1934 (PSS): “Die Aufführung war für die Anerkennung der modernen Musik von ganz außerordentlicher Bedeutung . . . Ich hoffe, daß dieser Sieg auch Ihren Werken für die nächste Saison wieder die deutschen Bühnen und Konzertsäle öffnet.”
58. Strecker to Stravinsky, 2 September 1934 (PSS): “Bis Ende November wird die Oper fertig sein und ich erhoffe mir von diesem großen Werk den endgültigen Sieg der modernen Musik den wir notwendig brauchen.” As is well known, the world premiere of the opera took place in Zurich in May 1938; it was never performed in Nazi Germany.
59. Ibid.: “Furtwängler sowie Rosbaud haben mir versprochen, im kommenden Winter Werke von Ihnen zu spielen, und ich hoffe bestimmt, daß andere Dirigenten dann folgen werden, die es nicht wagen, den Anfang zu machen.” Strecker placed considerable store in Furtwängler, Germany’s leading conductor. In his letter of 14 March 1934 he had noted, “For the time being, [Furtwängler] is the only one whose position is sufficiently strong to influence general opinion and trends” (PSS; translation from SSC 3:266 n. 80).
60. Strecker to Stravinsky, 2 September 1934: “Wenn es Rosbaud erlaubt wird, möchte er sogar einen ganzen Abend Ihrer Werke mit Ihnen als Solist in Berlin machen . . . Überlassen Sie dies mir und unternehmen Sie am besten nichts in Deutschland ohne mich es wissen zu lassen . . . Warten Sie mit einer deutschen Ausgabe, bis Sie hier (wohl im nächsten Jahr) ‘neu entdeckt’ werden!” Strecker seems to have alluded to Rosbaud’s plan in his letter of 30 January 1934 to the composer: “I’m planning further propaganda for you with Rosbaud, concerning which I shall
Rosbaud was surely encouraged in his intentions by a statement issued by German Radio authorities at the end of July 1934, which indicated that there was no racial or political objection to Stravinsky. This in no way signaled a general acceptance of Stravinsky’s music, however, for while it was left up to the individual radio stations to decide which works to program, the decision had to reflect a “clear distinction” among the various periods of Stravinsky’s career. Thus the responsibility to avoid works that might be deemed inappropriate was on the programmers themselves. Strecker, ever cautious, may have persuaded Rosbaud to abandon his plans for a Berlin concert; at any rate, no such event took place. The conductor did have one small satisfaction, however. On 26 August he arranged for Leopold Stokowski’s 1930 recording of Sacre to be broadcast over Frankfurt Radio, though at the inconspicuous hour of midnight. This seems to have been the only occasion on which a work by Stravinsky was broadcast that season by German Radio; otherwise his music was “completely ignored” (“völlig ignoriert”).

The Sacre that was heard in Berlin some three months later was one of the few performances of Stravinsky’s music during the early Nazi period. The prolonged applause that greeted Erich Kleiber and the Berlin Philharmonic on 14 November was widely interpreted as support for both composer and conductor. Champions of modern music were delighted. Heinrich Strobel declared that Kleiber had “broken the Stravinsky spell,” while Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt openly celebrated Stravinsky’s “victory.”

---

61. Reichssendeleitung A 2 b, Berlin, statement of 27 July 1934 (Bundesarchiv Koblenz, R78/691). The radio authorities had almost certainly been sent a copy of Stravinsky’s April 1933 statement, either by Strecker or possibly by Rosbaud, to whom (as we have seen) Strecker had sent copies the previous autumn.

62. See the program listings for 26 August 1934 in the Südwestdeutsche Rundfunk-Zeitung. This broadcast was later used as ammunition by Stravinsky’s (and Rosbaud’s) enemies, as we shall see.


---

write more when the plans are somewhat further along. One must proceed slowly in order not to upset things” (“Mit Rosbaud plane ich eine weitere Propaganda für Sie, über die ich noch schreiben werde, wenn die Pläne etwas vorgeschritten sind. Man muß langsam vorgehen, um nichts zu verderben . . .”) (PSS). Rosbaud was a frequent guest conductor in the German capital, both at Berlin Radio and with the Berlin Philharmonic.
ally informed the composer of Furtwängler’s intention to stage *Firebird* at the Berlin Staatsoper during the coming winter.65

Shortly after Kleiber’s concert, a public statement in support of Stravinsky was made by none other than Richard Strauss. According to the unnamed reporter for Nuremberg’s *Fränkischer Kurier*, the president of the Reichsmusikkammer affirmed Stravinsky’s “pure Aryan background” and declared “the ‘cultural bolshevist Igor Stravinsky’” to be nothing more than a fiction. The report concludes, “Richard Strauss emphatically and definitively declared that the Russian Igor Stravinsky is known to be enthusiastic about the ideas of Adolf Hitler.”66 Strecker sent Stravinsky the clipping, noting that it was being reprinted throughout the country. Though seemingly embarrassed by its tone, he felt that the article’s effect would be beneficial. “This,” he declared, “is partly a result of the information you put at my disposal a year ago”—that is, Stravinsky’s statement of 14 April 1933, which Strecker had apparently submitted to the Reichsmusikkammer.67 Support for Stravinsky during this period also appeared at a more grassroots level. In October the composer sent Strecker a pamphlet containing an article entitled “Warum meine Musik nicht geschätzt wird.” This appeared under his name in the 12 July 1934 issue of *Das Tha-Ga-Blatt*, a weekly pamphlet published for its customers by Thams und Garfs-Geschäfte of Hamburg (“Kenner trinken Tha-Ga-Kaffee!”).68

Despite Kleiber’s success, Strauss’s reassurances, and the optimism of Strobel, Strecker, and others, the composer’s supporters were not yet successful in breaking the unofficial boycott. The Berlin Philharmonic’s *Sacre* remained one of a handful of performances of Stravinsky’s music that season and the sole German performance of the work during the Nazi period. In July Strecker complained to Dushkin about “the unfortunate present situation,” in


67. Strecker to Stravinsky, 30 November 1934 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:237 n. 30).

68. Both Stravinsky’s letter of 17 October 1934 and *Das Tha-Ga-Blatt* of 12 July 1934 are preserved at Schott’s; a second copy of the publication is found at PSS. The article is an abridged translation of “Pourquoi l’on n’aime pas ma musique. Une interview d’Igor Stravinsky” (*Journal de Genève*, 14 November 1928), which in turn apparently translates an English original (“Copyright London General Press”). Under its German title the interview had appeared during the Weimar period in *Musik und Gesellschaft: Arbeitsblätter für soziale Musikpflege und Musikpolitik* 1 (1930): 169–72.
which Germany was “temporarily inaccessible” to Stravinsky. His letter was occasioned by Schott’s interest in securing the publishing rights to Stravinsky’s most recent work, the Concerto for Two Solo Pianos, a piece destined to play a crucial role in Stravinsky’s subsequent relationship with Nazi Germany.

Breaking the “Stravinsky spell”: the Internationales Zeitgenössisches Musikfest, Baden-Baden

A thaw in the opposition toward Stravinsky and his music began to take place during the 1935/36 season. This can be attributed to several related factors. The turbulence of the early Nazi period was by now giving way to a more settled (if more shackled) situation, as efforts toward Gleichschaltung, the coordination of all aspects of German life in accordance with Nazi policy, bore fruit. Also important was the resolution in Goebbels’s favor of his long-standing and acrimonious battle with party ideologue Rosenberg over the direction of the country’s cultural life. Though the Amt Rosenberg continued to act as ideological watchdog, the propaganda minister could now pursue his more pragmatic approach to cultural issues. The economy was improving, which resulted in a lessening of the xenophobia that had characterized the early years. Germany was thus ready to resume its cherished role as cultural leader. Foreign music and musicians, subject to racial and political considerations, now began to be heard again in German cities.

Especially significant with regard to Germany’s new outward-looking attitude were the circumstances surrounding Berlin’s hosting of the 1936 Summer Olympics. Months of preparation were dedicated to ensuring that

69. Strecker to Dushkin, 31 July 1935 (Schott’s): “wir müssen nun leider mit der augenblicklichen ungünstlichen Lage rechnen, unter der vorläufig sogar ganz Deutschland für Strawinsky verschlossen ist.” The speed with which Stravinsky’s music was excluded from Germany’s musical life after the Nazi takeover is dramatically reflected in the pages of Die Musik. Whereas in 1932/33 Stravinsky warrants forty-six entries in the index, the number for 1933/34 drops to fifteen, practically all of which pertain either to passing (usually derogatory) comments or to concert reviews from foreign correspondents.

70. On the rivalry between Rosenberg and Goebbels, see Reinhard Bollmus, Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner: Studien zum Machtkampf im nationalsozialistischen Herrschaftssystem (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1970). In 1934 Hitler had appointed Rosenberg the party’s ideological supervisor (“Beauftragter des Führers für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Schulung und Erziehung der Partei und gleichgeschalteten Verbände”). His department was referred to as the “Amt Rosenberg.”

71. Although full employment was not reached until 1938/39, in 1936 the high unemployment inherited by the Nazi regime dropped for the first time below 1928/29 levels (Kater, The Twisted Muse, 8).

72. An effort to resume international contacts had already been made on 6 June 1934, when Richard Strauss inaugurated the Ständiger Rat für die internationale Zusammenarbeit der Komponisten (Permanent Council for International Cooperation Among Composers). Clearly meant to replace the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM), whose German section had been dissolved in 1933, the Permanent Council organized music festivals in Germany and elsewhere between 1935 and 1939.
foreign visitors would be favorably impressed with the achievements, particularly the cultural achievements, of the New Germany. Significant, too, were the activities of the numerous organizations devoted to new music that sprang up throughout Germany during this period. Frankfurt’s Arbeitskreis für Neue Musik was especially active on behalf of Stravinsky’s music, as we shall see, while similar groups existed in Berlin, Munich, Essen, and Düsseldorf, at whose concerts one could hear music by composers from all over Europe. Thus Stravinsky’s gradual acceptance, diligently prepared by his supporters, is largely attributable to Germany’s desire, after the isolation of the early Nazi years, to rejoin the European cultural community. And what better way to signal this desire than by allowing German audiences to hear again the music of Europe’s best-known modern composer?

Michael Kater has suggested a causal connection between the improving fortunes of Stravinsky’s music and Hindemith’s gradual eclipse after 1935, with many Germans, Nazi and non-Nazi alike, now “looking to Stravinsky” to provide “welcome inspiration” for Germany’s young composers. Such a direct link is unlikely, however, for while it is true that Germans of varying degrees of political involvement supported Stravinsky’s music, the more ideologically committed could hardly have accepted him as a model. Surely they would have agreed with Herbert Gerigk, a leading Nazi musicologist, who saw no reason to exclude Stravinsky’s music, yet warned against using him as an “ideal” for Germany. Stravinsky, he wrote, represented “a folk tradition foreign to ours” ("eines uns fernstehenden Volkstums"); as a Russian and an Asian, he “must never be considered one of our cultural circle.”

Stravinsky himself was to take an active part in what the German press would soon refer to as his “rehabilitation.” In November 1935 he informed Strecker that he was considering his publisher’s invitation to visit him in Wiesbaden, especially since it would provide an opportunity to make on-the-spot concert arrangements: “I would be so happy to resume my musical relations with Germany.”

73. Prieberg, Musik im NS-Staat, 297-98.
75. Herbert Gerigk, “Musikpolitische Umschau,” Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte 10 (1939): 86. Gerigk’s position as head of the music division in the Amt Rosenberg gave him access to the vast cultural-political archive from which he was to draw in compiling (with Theophil Stengel) the now infamous Lexikon der Juden in der Musik: Mit einem Titelverzeichnis jüdischer Werke (Berlin: Bernhard Hahnefeld Verlag, 1940).
76. Stravinsky to Strecker, 17 November 1935 (PSS): “Je serais si content de reprendre mes relations musicales avec l’Allemagne.” This sentence is curiously omitted in SSC 3:238 (end of first paragraph). (The remainder of this letter as published by Craft belongs in fact to Stravinsky’s letter of 29 December 1931, other excerpts from which are published in SSC 3:229-30.) On 1 December 1935 Stravinsky sent Strecker a follow-up postcard: “Did you receive my letter of 17 November?” (“Avez vous reçu ma lettre du 17 nov.”) (Schott’s). Stravinsky’s desire to look for German concerts that season was also prompted by his decision to cancel a planned American tour. The visit to Wiesbaden did not take place, however.
Just at this time, Baden-Baden’s Generalmusikdirektor Herbert Albert was organizing, with the support of the Kurverwaltung (spa administration), an international festival of contemporary music scheduled to take place on 3–5 April 1936.77 Invited to perform at the festival, Stravinsky sought Strecker’s opinion.78 His publisher advised him to accept, adding that if permission from Berlin could be obtained, Rosbaud would schedule an engagement for him at Frankfurt Radio as well. There was also the possibility of a second concert in Frankfurt, given by “young modern musicians who are all enthusiastic supporters of your art.”79 These musicians were members of the recently formed Arbeitskreis für Neue Musik, whose artistic director was the composer Gerhard Frommel.80

Stravinsky was keenly interested in the proposed German engagements, especially the Baden-Baden concert, at which he and his son Sviatoslav (Soulima) were invited to perform his Concerto for Two Solo Pianos.81 That he was willing to consider canceling his South American tour if Baden-Baden were to make up the 7,000 francs he would lose is evidence of the importance with which he invested his first public appearance in Germany since 1933.82

77. The parallels between the new Internationales Zeitgenössisches Musikfest and the annual festivals of contemporary music at Donaueschingen and Baden-Baden that had been a highlight of the German new-music scene before 1933 were not lost on the festival’s organizers or, subsequently, its reviewers.

78. Musikdirektion Baden-Baden to Stravinsky, 5 December 1935; Stravinsky’s note to Strecker (written at the bottom of the letter) is dated 6 December (PSS). In his reply of 9 December, Strecker noted that it was he who had provided the organizers with Stravinsky’s address (PSS). A letter of 12 February 1936 from Musikdirektion Baden-Baden to Strecker (Schott’s) indicates that the publisher also provided documentary information that Baden-Baden needed in order to obtain permission for Stravinsky’s appearance. Presumably this included Stravinsky’s statement of 14 April 1933.

79. Strecker to Stravinsky, 9 December 1935 (PSS): “mit jungen modernen Musikern, die alle begeisterte Anhänger Ihrer Kunst sind.”


81. Negotiations concerning his planned South American tour prevented Stravinsky from giving the festival organizers a definitive answer at this time. He wrote to Strecker in mid-December: “Would you be so kind as to inform them that my silence is due only to these circumstances” (“Auriez-vous la grande obligation de leur faire savoir que mon silence n’est dû qu’à cette circonstance”) (Stravinsky to Strecker, postcard of 15 December 1935 [Schott’s]; emphasis original). A letter written on Stravinsky’s behalf from Paris on 18 January 1936 to Musikdirektion Baden-Baden contains an apology for the delay (Stravinsky’s copy of the letter is unsigned); the previous day Baden-Baden had written to confirm his in-principle acceptance (PSS). The organizers no doubt followed Strecker’s advice in suggesting the Concerto for Two Solo Pianos; in his letter of 17 November to Strecker, Stravinsky had expressed an interest in performing this recent work (PSS).

82. Stravinsky to Strecker, 18 January 1936 (PSS). The amount (“sept mille francs”) is incorrectly given as “700 francs” in SSC 3:239. On 24 January Strecker wrote that he had forwarded Stravinsky’s proposal to Baden-Baden (PSS).
The festival organizers, however, responded that 7,000 francs (the equivalent of 1,100 marks) was “an honorarium we had not reckoned with” and offered a combined fee of 700 marks for Stravinsky and his son, plus travel and accommodations. Strecker strongly advised the composer to accept these terms. In addition to being “a splendid beginning for your art in Germany,” the festival, which would be attended by the country’s most influential music critics, would also be advantageous to Soulima Stravinsky’s budding career.

On 20 January Strecker informed Stravinsky that Rosbaud was expecting any day to receive permission from Berlin for the engagement at Frankfurt Radio. The Firebird suite had recently been played on tour by Furtwängler and the Berlin Philharmonic, he noted, and this, combined with Stravinsky’s Baden-Baden and Frankfurt appearances, “should break the spell and clear the way for further performances of your works in Germany.” Baden-Baden also required official permission, of course, but Strecker was sure this would be given “immediately and without difficulty.” His optimism—and Baden-Baden’s eventual success—was undoubtedly due in part to the fact that a certain Herr Ludwig, who was in charge of the relevant department of the Propaganda Ministry, was an acquaintance of Herbert Albert, the festival’s organizer.

“I am very moved by the interest you have taken in my reappearance in Germany,” Stravinsky replied, “this Germany that was always so attentive to...
my music. For this reason I gladly accept the proposal from Baden-Baden.\textsuperscript{88} At the end of January Strecker informed Stravinsky that the second Frankfurt engagement was to be an orchestra concert, conducted by Bertil Wetzelsberger, for which Strecker had suggested \textit{Capriccio}. He would try to obtain the highest possible fees from both Wetzelsberger and Rosbaud, he promised, but the most important thing was to obtain official permission, for these concerts would have a “decisive influence” (“ausschlaggebenden Einfluß”) on future performances.\textsuperscript{89}

Stravinsky was nervous about performing \textit{Capriccio}, which he had not played for some time. “Would it be possible to let me conduct this concert instead of Wetzelsberger . . .,” he asked, “and for my son to play my \textit{Capriccio} or my first Concerto under my direction?”\textsuperscript{90} Strecker proposed instead a solution that he felt would be agreeable to all participants. “Perhaps you could conduct one piece, in order to let Wetzelsberger . . ., for diplomatic reasons, conduct a work as well.”\textsuperscript{91} The important thing, he added, was that Stravinsky take part in the concert.

By mid-February Strecker had good news to report. After taking up the matter personally in Berlin, Rosbaud had finally obtained verbal permission for the radio engagement; written confirmation was to follow shortly.\textsuperscript{92} That Strecker was well aware of the precarious nature of the entire venture is evident in his reaction to Stravinsky’s request that his son Théodore design the title page of the Concerto for Two Solo Pianos, which Schott’s was preparing

88. Stravinsky to Strecker, 27 January 1936 (PSS; translation from \textit{SSC} 3:239). Stravinsky requested that both Baden-Baden and Frankfurt Radio obtain authorization for him to take his fees out of the country. Suspecting that it might be difficult to comply with this request, Strecker suggested in his letter of 1 February that Stravinsky’s fees be sent directly to the Hamburg-America Line to pay for the composer’s travel expenses on the \textit{S.S. Cap Arcona} to Buenos Aires (PSS). Stravinsky replied on 8 February that his fare was being taken care of by Athos Palma, director of the Teatro Colón, and repeated his demand that he be allowed to take his fees out of the country (see \textit{SSC} 3:240). Three days later Strecker informed Stravinsky that he had submitted the necessary application (PSS).


90. Strecker to Stravinsky, 1 February 1936 (PSS): “Serait-il possible de me laisser diriger ce concert à la place de Wetzelsberger . . ., et mon fils jouerait mon Capriccio ou mon premier Concerto sous ma direction?”

91. Strecker to Stravinsky, 3 February 1936 (PSS): “Vielleicht dirigieren Sie selbst ein Stück, um Wetzelsberger . . . ebenfalls ein Werk aus diplomatischen Gründen zu überlassen.” In \textit{SSC} 3:240 n. 37 the translation is faulty: “Perhaps you will agree to conduct a piece yourself, then, and have Wetzelsberger [sic] present you, too.”

92. Strecker to Stravinsky, 14 February 1936 (PSS).
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for publication.93 Strecker replied that, though he would personally be happy for Théodore to do the drawing, he was concerned that it would appear too modern, “since here in Germany everything modern— influenced by Picasso, for instance—is unacceptable. With such a drawing you would perhaps give the critics a welcome, if purely superficial, reason for rejection.”94 Ever careful, he suggested a “neutral, inoffensive little vignette” (“eine neutrale, unangreifbare kleine Vignette”). A week later Stravinsky sent Théodore’s stylized pen-and-ink drawing of four hands, which eventually appeared on the cover of the score. “I like this vignette very much . . .,” he commented, “and I would hope that this sketch will not upset anyone.”95

Just days after informing Stravinsky of Berlin’s in-principle permission for the Frankfurt Radio engagement, Strecker received a letter from Gerhard Frommel, organizer of the orchestra concert, informing him that the city’s Musikbeauftragter would not allow the event to take place.96 He would have taken a chance and gone ahead without permission, Frommel noted, but the involvement of the municipal orchestra made this impossible. He would like to try to arrange a chamber-music concert instead, in which case he would not apply for permission, but simply inform the authorities of his intentions. Though the Musikbeauftragter could object, Frommel was certain he would not—probably because the official in question was Frankfurt Opera’s Intendant, Hans Meissner, himself a member of Frommel’s Arbeitskreis.97

93. Stravinsky to Strecker, 16 February 1936; on the same day Stravinsky sent Strecker a copy of the lecture on the concerto that he had prepared for the premiere of the work in Paris the previous November (PSS). The lecture is published in Eric Walter White, Stravinsky: The Composer and His Works, 2d ed. (London: Faber and Faber, 1979), 581–85. “Translate it into German,” Stravinsky suggested, “and I could perhaps show it to the Rundfunk” (translation from SSC 3:241). It was in fact used as program notes for the Baden-Baden concert.


95. Stravinsky to Strecker, 25 February 1936 (PSS): “J’aime beaucoup cette vignette . . . et je veux espérer que ce dessin ne dérangerà personne.” Strecker replied on 27 February, “I find your son’s drawing very original and do not think that it can give offence to anyone” (“Die Zeichnung von Ihrem Sohn finde ich sehr originell und glaube nicht, daß irgend jemand daran Anstoß nehmen kann”) (PSS).

96. Frommel to Strecker, 16 February 1936 (Schott’s). Musikbeauftragter (politically reliable music representatives) were appointed by the Reichsmusikkammer to regulate and control concert life at the local level.

97. On Hans Meissner, see Hanau, Musikinstitutionen in Frankfurt am Main. Frommel also reported to Strecker that he had recently given a lecture on Stravinsky, illustrated with music from Perséphone—a work that had not yet been performed in Germany. In the December 1936 issue of the Neues Musikblatt, Frommel’s student Hugo Puetter, who had also studied with Alban Berg, recalled the “strong impression” made by this lecture (“Der Frankfurter Arbeitskreis für Neue Musik,” 2). Frommel’s lecture, “Neue Klassik in der Musik,” was published under the same title the following year by L. C. Wittich Verlag, Darmstadt, and reviewed by Puetter in the November 1937 issue of the Neues Musikblatt.
Trouble was also brewing at Frankfurt Radio. After meeting with Rosbaud, Strecker reported to Stravinsky the next day:

Rosbaud told me that underground intrigues against your appearance at the radio station have unfortunately surfaced again, even though he already has permission from the top radio administration, as well as from the Reichsmusikkammer. For this reason he will go to Berlin today to clear up the matter. By Tuesday I hope he will be able to give me a definitive word.98

Concerned that Frommel’s unsanctioned chamber-music concert might elicit further controversy, Strecker advised Stravinsky to restrict his engagements to Frankfurt Radio and Baden-Baden. With luck, these would result in offers of orchestra concerts for the following season. As for financial matters, Rosbaud was still working to arrange things to Stravinsky’s satisfaction. “You cannot imagine,” Strecker sighed, “how many difficulties are connected with all these issues at present.”99

On 25 February Stravinsky agreed to perform at both Baden-Baden and Frankfurt Radio.100 Two days later Rosbaud telephoned Strecker with the good news that everything was now arranged, and the following week Strecker sent the conductor the uncorrected proofs of the Concerto for Two Solo Pianos for his comments.101 Everything was now approved for Baden-Baden, he reported to Rosbaud, including permission for Stravinsky to take his fees out of the country in French francs.102 But despite Rosbaud’s assurances, Strecker must have suspected that the situation at Frankfurt Radio was still uncertain, for he continued:

98. Strecker to Stravinsky, 22 February 1936 (PSS): “Rosbaud erzählte mir, daß leider wieder unterirdische Intrigen gegen Ihr Auftreten im Rundfunk eingetreten sind, obwohl er bereits die Genehmigung der obersten Rundfunkleitung, sowie der Reichsmusikkammer hat. Er wird deshalb heute nach Berlin fahren, um die Angelegenheit zu klären und mir bis Dienstag hoffentlich endgültigen Bescheid geben können.” In the spring and summer of 1936 these “underground intrigues” were to flare up into a personal attack against Rosbaud, as we shall see.

99. Ibid.: “Sie können sich nicht vorstellen, mit welchen Schwierigkeiten alle diese Fragen augenblicklich verknüpft sind.”

100. Stravinsky to Strecker, 25 February 1936 (PSS; see SSC 3:242). Apparently Stravinsky had not yet received Strecker’s letter of 22 February, since he indicated that for lack of time he had decided not to accept the orchestra engagement.

101. Strecker to Stravinsky, postcard of 27 February 1936 (PSS); and Strecker to Rosbaud, 5 March 1936 (Schott’s). Strecker asked Rosbaud to return, along with the proofs, the “Stravinsky-Stammbaum,” that is, the genealogical information sent by the composer to Strecker on 14 April 1933, used by Rosbaud in his attempts to obtain permission for the composer’s appearance.

102. Craft’s statement, “Permission was finally obtained by Strecker on March 25” (SSC 3:240 n. 39), is incorrect. On 27 February Strecker informed Stravinsky that he had just heard from Baden-Baden that permission had been granted (PSS). On 10 March, in response to Stravinsky’s letter of 7 March (see SSC 3:242–43), Strecker replied that he had asked Baden-Baden to send the confirmation directly to the composer; Musikdirektion Baden-Baden did so the following day (PSS).
I am convinced that Stravinsky is of the view that the agreement with the radio station is settled and will not subsequently be altered. Without this second engagement, for which indeed all the leading authorities have given permission, he would not come to Germany. Therefore the fee is due in any case, especially since, as you well know, for reasons of friendship he is making extraordinary concessions to the radio in this respect.\(^{103}\)

Strecker’s suspicions proved to be justified. Two days later, when he telephoned Frankfurt Radio to ascertain the exact time of Stravinsky’s concert, he learned that the engagement had been canceled.\(^{104}\)

The Baden-Baden concert took place on Saturday evening, 4 April.\(^{105}\) The Concerto for Two Solo Pianos was the final work on a program that included Conrad Beck’s Serenade for flute, clarinet, and strings, Wolfgang Fortner’s Harpsichord Concerto, Paul Graener’s Cello Concerto, and Jean Francaix’s Piano Concertino.\(^{106}\) In the year of the Berlin Olympics, the organizers were careful to avoid emphasizing the political aspects of this international festival. Customary greetings were cabled to the Führer,\(^{107}\) but the printed program entirely lacked party symbols or messages from party officials. Stravinsky’s performance was widely reviewed in the German press. Though remarks about the “soulless” quality of the music or the “cold passion” of the performance

\(^{103}\) Strecker to Rosbaud, 5 March 1936 (Schott’s): “Ich bin iüberzeugt, Strawinsky steht auf dem Standpunkt, daß der Abschluß mit dem Rundfunk perfekt ist und nicht noch nachträglich geändert werden kann. Ohne dieses zweite Engagement, das ja von allen maßgebenden Stellen genehmigt war, wäre er nicht nach Deutschland gefahren, so daß das Honorar unter allen Umständen fällig ist, zumal er, wie Sie ja wissen, dem Rundfunk in dieser Beziehung aus freund-schaftlichen Gründen außerordentlich entgegen kommt.”

\(^{104}\) Strecker to Rosbaud, 7 March 1936 (Schott’s). In a letter of 4 September 1936 to Stravinsky, Rosbaud commented that he was familiar with the composer’s recent works, but only from studying the scores—an indirect reference to his unsuccessful efforts on Stravinsky’s behalf. He added, “Herr Strecker will certainly have told you something of this and I myself, when I see you again, will give a full account” (“Herr Strecker wird Ihnen wohl darüber einiges erzählt haben und ich selbst werde, wenn ich Sie wieder einmal sehe, ausführlich darüber berichten”) (PSS). Stravinsky and Rosbaud did not meet again until 1951.

\(^{105}\) An eyewitness description of Stravinsky’s performance is provided by Frommel, who in an autobiographical sketch of 1976 recalled that the composer’s appearance was the sensation of the festival. He described both Stravinsky’s piano playing and his famously mannered stage bow as “peculiar”: “He pounded on the piano at such a volume that one could hardly discern the transparency of the music. His deep bows in front of the audience, with arms crossed over the chest . . ., brought to mind a circus director. It was a clever little piece of mimicry [mimische Kabinettstückchen] of which the audience couldn’t get enough” (Peter Cahn, Wolfgang Osthoff, and Johann Peter Vogel, eds., Gerhard Frommel: Der Komponist und sein Werk [Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1979], 41).

\(^{106}\) Stravinsky presumably played the second piano part. On 12 December 1943 he asked Remi Gassman, who was organizing a concert in Chicago, to “tell the pianist who will play with me my Double Concerto, that I will play the second piano as I always do for a good reason to better lead the ensemble” (SSC2:467 n. 7).

were not lacking, critical comment was largely favorable, with one reviewer defending the concerto’s “machine-like rhythm” as an important form-defining element. The spell had been broken, exulted the normally cautious Strecker, and the way opened for the return of Stravinsky’s music to Germany.

Robert Craft has claimed that Stravinsky appeared in Baden-Baden “against his will and under pressure from his German publisher.” But implying that Stravinsky would have preferred not to appear in Nazi Germany and stating that he did so under duress seriously misrepresents the facts. From the published correspondence alone it is obvious that Stravinsky actively solicited German engagements; indeed, Craft himself earlier noted Stravinsky’s “eagerness to perform in Germany.” Of course Strecker was keen for Stravinsky to return to Germany, but it was certainly not necessary to “pressure” him. To his publisher’s surprise, Stravinsky was even willing, after the Frankfurt Radio performance had been canceled, to travel to Germany for the Baden-Baden concert alone. This appearance remained Stravinsky’s “unique concert in the Third Reich” not because he was reluctant to perform in Germany, but because suitable engagements were simply not forthcoming, despite the combined efforts of Strecker, Stravinsky’s other supporters, and the composer himself.

Craft has also claimed that “by choosing to play the piano rather than to conduct [Stravinsky] managed to avoid all personal encounters.” This is

---

108. Ibid., 783 (“soulless”); St., Badische Landeszeitung (“cold passion”); Alfred Burgartz, “Baden-Badener Musikfrühling. Die Ergebnisse des Internationalen zeitgenössischen Musikfestes (vom 3. bis 5. April),” Die Musik-Woche, 18 April 1936, 6 (“machine-like rhythm”). The second review was one of eleven excerpted by Strecker (without title or date) and sent to Stravinsky on 21 April 1936 (PSS); authors included such well-known names as Heinrich Strobel (Berliner Tageblatt) and Robert Oboussier (Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung). Criticism of the neoclassical style as “soulless” and “cold” was of course nothing new. Both terms are found, for example, in a piece of doggerel by A. E. W. Miller of Leipzig, published in the October 1930 issue of the venerable (and increasingly right-wing) Zeitschrift für Musik: “Atonalismus seelenlos / Und kalte Sachlichkeit, / Der Nigger Jazz, der Gernegroß, / Die stampfen durch die Zeit” (p. 821).
109. Strecker to Stravinsky, 21 April 1936 (PSS). The Zeitschrift für Musik devoted a column and a half to the concerto when it was published the following year, with the enthusiastic reviewer characterizing it as one of the most imaginative and forward-looking works of the time (Walter Hapke, “Musikalien: für Klavier,” Zeitschrift für Musik 104 [1937]: 662–63).
111. SSC2:2251 n. 51.
112. Far from pressuring the composer, in at least one instance (to be discussed below) Strecker deemed an engagement unsuitable and advised Stravinsky to turn it down.
113. The quotation is from Craft: “[Stravinsky’s] unique concert in the Third Reich took place at the insistence of B. Schott’s Söhne” (SPD, 554). Stravinsky’s Baden-Baden concert was not the only performance in Nazi Germany in which the composer participated, though it was his only public appearance—that is, if one discounts the recital that he and Dushkin gave in Munich three days after the Nazi takeover. In February 1938 Stravinsky recorded Jeu de cartes in Berlin with the Berlin Philharmonic. Craft seems to miss the point when he comments that “recordings are not public performances” (“Jews and Geniuses,” 276).
misleading on two counts. There is no reason to assume that Stravinsky would have been reluctant to conduct in Baden-Baden, had he been invited to do so. He had specifically asked to conduct the ill-fated Frankfurt orchestra concert and on several later occasions declared himself willing to conduct, as we shall see. Nor did the composer “avoid all personal encounters” in Baden-Baden. “All the young composers are excited about meeting you in person,” Strecker had written to Stravinsky shortly before the festival. Among these was Gerhard Frommel, whose Suite for Small Orchestra was performed, and who later reminded the composer that they had spoken for several hours following Stravinsky’s concert.

“New possibilities”

“People are now less fearful [of presenting your works],” Strecker wrote to Stravinsky in early July 1936, three months after the composer’s Baden-Baden appearance. “The boycott has been broken and new possibilities unearthed.” But there were few new developments to report, and the situation was still far from stable. “The influential people in the important positions change from one day to the next,” Strecker noted, “and contacts that one has established turn out a few weeks later to be outdated.”

The first of the “new possibilities” arose just three days after Stravinsky’s Baden-Baden concert, when Hans von Benda, artistic director of the Berlin Philharmonic, approached Stravinsky about appearing as soloist under Furtwängler the following season. A second “possibility” placed Strecker and Stravinsky in a distinct quandary. On 6 July 1936 Strecker reported that


116. Frommel to Stravinsky, May 1937 (PSS). Frommel vividly recalled their meeting in his autobiographical sketch of 1976: “The gnomelike little man in a long coat, large spectacles and a bowler hat seemed like a figure from another world. The night hours passed in a relaxed and cheerful mood. Stravinsky was talkative and responded with pleasure to my many carefully directed questions. We connected immediately through our admiration for Bellini, [an admiration] shared by only a few of our contemporaries. Bruckner he admired; the subject of Hitler was not mentioned” (Cahn, Osthoff, and Vogel, eds., Gerhard Frommel, 41).

117. Strecker to Stravinsky, 6 July 1936 (PSS; translation from SSC 3.243 n. 42).

118. Strecker to Stravinsky, 6 July 1936: “von Tag zu Tag ändern sich die einflussreichen Leute an den wichtigen Stellen, und Beziehungen, die man gerade angeknüpft hat, erweisen sich wenige Wochen später als überholt.” In SSC 3.243 n. 42, “Beziehungen” is incorrectly given as “contracts.”

119. Hans von Benda to Stravinsky, 7 April 1936 (PSS). Benda was head of Berlin Radio’s music department during the Weimar years; his progressive music programming had been responsible for Stravinsky’s frequent visits. Benda requested that his query be considered confidential, since Furtwängler, who was out of the country, had not yet been consulted. Nothing was to come of this plan, though Stravinsky and Benda may have discussed it during the composer’s visit to Berlin in February 1938 to record Jeu de cartes; Benda’s business card is preserved among Stravinsky’s travel papers (PSS).
Berlin’s Jüdischer Kulturbund had requested permission to mount a production of *Histoire du soldat*. The Jewish Culture League had been established in June 1933, after hundreds of Jewish theater artists and musicians had been dismissed as a result of the Civil Service Law passed in April of that year. This law was the first of many measures that resulted in the eventual exclusion of Germany’s Jews from the country’s cultural life. Performances by Jews were restricted to those sponsored by the JKB and given before exclusively Jewish audiences.120

“I did not consider it wise to tell this organization pointblank that we do not want the work presented,” Strecker reported, “so instead I demanded 100 marks per performance—a price I was certain they could not pay.”121 Strecker had given the JKB Stravinsky’s address (the composer was still on tour in South America), but he strongly advised him not to make any concessions. After reminding him that performances of *Histoire* had occasioned attacks on his music in the past, Strecker warned that a performance under Jewish auspices would also animate the old rumor that Stravinsky was Jewish: “if you permit the Jewish Kulturbund to perform it, your enemies will gleefully term you, as well as your art, ‘Jewish,’ spoiling everything we have managed to nurture.”122

Two weeks later, realizing that performances under the auspices of the Kulturbund would be unlikely to attract attention outside the Jewish community, Strecker softened his position. “I have fixed the condition that permission must be obtained from the German Reichstheaterkammer,” he wrote. “Should authorization be granted, we could agree to the performances, which would take place in the Jewish quarter, exclusively for that audience, and, I made sure, would not be mentioned in any newspapers.”123 At the end of July he reported that the official permission had arrived, and he requested that Stravinsky, “as an exception,” allow “a small reduction” of the fees.124 But the

---


121. Strecker to Stravinsky, 6 July 1936 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:243 n. 42). A comparison of Stravinsky’s German royalties during this period confirms that a hundred marks per performance was indeed higher than the usual fee.

122. Ibid. Strecker seems not to have known that, although the JKB’s guidelines encouraged performances of music by Jews, works by non-Jewish composers were also regularly performed. Up to February 1938, for example, only half of the orchestral works and oratorios performed by the JKB in Berlin were written by Jews (19 of 39); in Frankfurt and Breslau the proportion was even lower (15 of 45, and 10 of 31, respectively). Herbert Freeden, *Jüdisches Theater in Nazi-Deutschland* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964), 126. Though restrictions on German music were progressively applied, music by foreign composers, including non-Jews, could be performed until the JKB’s dissolution in 1941.

123. Strecker to Stravinsky, 21 July 1936 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:243 n. 42).

composer, fearful of "losing all of the ground that we have gained," was "in no hurry" to agree. He reminded Strecker of his earlier advice (i.e., not to make any concessions), adding, "I am unaware of any subsequent developments that may have changed your attitude."125

Strecker's change of mind was prompted by political considerations, for the fact that the Kulturbund had been granted official permission cast the affair in a different light:

If we refused now, our refusal would be interpreted as an explicit act of unfriendliness toward Jews. Abroad, this could have unfavorable repercussions for you. In America, for example, it would surely be known that you refused the German Jews a performance even after the German authorities agreed.126

Not surprisingly, Stravinsky found his publisher's argument persuasive; permission was granted and the production went ahead. Directed by Wolfgang Fraenkel, *Histoire* was performed in Berlin on 4 November 1936 and 23 January 1937, with a *Gastspiel* in Breslau on 17 January. Ironically, it was to be the only German production of the work during the Nazi years.127

Strecker learned in the summer of 1936 that the Berlin Staatsoper was interested in mounting a production of *Le baiser de la fée*, a work that had not yet been staged in the German capital.128 He greeted this welcome news as proof that the regime harbored no objection to Stravinsky's music. "This success," he added, "we clearly owe to Baden-Baden."129 Stravinsky confirmed

---

125. Stravinsky to Strecker, 1 August 1936 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:243-44). Craft's statement, "Evidently Stravinsky had not yet received Strecker's letter of July 28" (SSC 3:244 n. 44), is puzzling, for it seems clear that Stravinsky was responding to Strecker's request for a reduction in fees contained in this letter.

126. Strecker to Stravinsky, 3 August 1936 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:244 n. 44).

127. Schott’s royalty statements, 31 December 1936 and 1 April 1937 (PSS). For more on this production, as well as on additional performances of Stravinsky’s music by Berlin’s Kulturbund, see Evans, “ ‘Diabolus triumphans,’ ” 182–84. Performances of Stravinsky’s music outside of Berlin can also be documented. On 24 October 1935, for example, Hamburg’s Kulturbund audience heard Richard Goldschmied perform the Serenade in A, while on 20 November of that year, also in Hamburg, Bernhard Abramowitsch played the piano transcription of the “Danse infernale” from *Firebird* (programs are preserved at the Leo Baeck Institute, New York).

128. The German premiere of *Le baiser* had taken place (under Klemperer) on 23 January 1930 at a Krolloper concert; the first staged performance was given by Magdeburg’s Stadththeater (under Walter Beck) during the early months of the 1932/33 season. See Russischer Musikverlag’s royalty statements for 1932 and 1933 (PSS); and L. E. Reindl, “Igor Strawinskij: Kuß der Fee (Magdeburg, Stadththeater),” *Die Musik* 25 (1932/33): 284.

129. Strecker to Stravinsky, 21 July 1936 (PSS); “Diesen Erfolg haben wir bestimmt Baden-Baden zu verdanken.” Hindemith regarded the Staatsoper’s plans as a favorable sign in terms of his own hoped-for “rehabilitation.” See Claudia Maurer Zench, “Zwischen Boykott und Anpassung an den Charakter der Zeit: Über die Schwierigkeiten eines deutschen Komponisten mit dem Dritten Reich,” *Hindemith-Jahrbuch* 9 (1980): 101. Hindemith’s optimism was short-lived, for in October a ban was issued on performances of his music.
that Russischer Musikverlag was indeed drawing up a contract for the “happy event” (“fait réjouissant”). He also reported that he had been invited to conduct one or two performances in Berlin of *Firebird* and *Petrushka* with Colonel de Basil’s Ballet Russe in October of that year. Strecker, however, expressed serious doubts about the suitability of this engagement. “The Scala is a variety theater in which, it is true, ballets and other artistically worthwhile performances are given,” he wrote, “but very many acrobats and other variety-show attractions also appear.” He felt that Stravinsky’s first appearance in Berlin should be under the auspices of the Staatsoper, the Berlin Philharmonic, Berlin Radio, or some other organization commensurate with his artistic position, not in the “second-class environment” (“zweitklassigen Rahmen”) of the Scala, and certainly not for the low fees that the Ballet Russe would pay him. Strecker assured the composer that a much more appropriate and worthwhile engagement would be found; the Baden-Baden appearance, he added, “was extremely valuable in this regard.” As usual, Stravinsky followed his publisher’s advice: “unless the conditions change,” he wrote, “I shall certainly not present myself under those circumstances.”

The most immediate result of the breaking of the unofficial boycott was an increase in performances of the two popular early ballets, especially *Firebird*. This perennial favorite had been among the few Stravinsky works performed during the earlier period. Now the Russian Firebird danced more and more frequently on German stages; at least eighteen productions of the ballet took place between 1935 and 1940. The renewed interest in Stravinsky’s music...
extended to his more recent works as well. On 5 June 1937, the German premiere of *Perséphone* (in German translation) was presented at the Landestheater Braunschweig during a festival of contemporary writers and composers (Festwoche zeitgenössischer Dichter und Komponisten). One of very few stagings of the melodrama during the 1930s, the production was under the musical direction of Ewald Lindemann; three performances were given that season. Following opening night, Intendant Alexander Schum reported to Stravinsky on the profound effect of the work. His sentiments were echoed by Hindemith, who along with many German musicians and critics traveled to Braunschweig to attend the premiere.\(^{136}\) *Perséphone* was favorably reviewed throughout the country. Lindemann outdid himself, exclaimed the *Braunschweiger Neueste Nachrichten*; the performance was simply the highlight of the festival. Regardless of how one felt about Stravinsky’s music, commented *Die Musik-Woche*’s Alfred Burgartz (hedging his bets), this score, “considered purely objectively,” was a masterpiece. Strobel, writing for the *Berliner Tageblatt*, praised the theater for tackling a difficult new work: “Such courage and idealism are the pride of the German art theater.”\(^{137}\) Strecker was understandably pleased by the work’s German reception. Compared to most of the French and English critics, he wrote, “here one actually seems to have properly recognized the stature and significance of the work.”\(^ {138} \)

The breaking of the unofficial Stravinsky boycott was a welcome development for Frankfurt’s Gerhard Frommel and his Arbeitskreis für Neue Musik. The second program of their 1936/37 season was devoted exclusively to the work whose Baden-Baden performance had paved the way for this success: the Concerto for Two Solo Pianos.\(^ {139} \) Friends of new music pronounced the

---

\(^{136}\) Alexander Schum to Stravinsky, telegram of 6 June 1937. In his reply Stravinsky thanked all who contributed to the performance’s success (undated telegram draft). Hindemith’s postcard to Stravinsky, written after the premiere on 5 June but postmarked Berlin, 28 June, also includes comments from Lindemann, Josef Witt (who sang the role of Eumolpos), Gertrud Hindemith, and others. These materials, along with a program of the premiere, are preserved at PSS.

\(^{137}\) The quotations are from a pamphlet containing excerpts from seventeen German reviews, published by Russischer Musikverlag (PSS).

\(^{138}\) Strobel to Stravinsky, 21 June 1937 (PSS): “Man scheint hier wirklich die Größe und Bedeutung des Werkes richtig erkannt zu haben.” Stravinsky had conducted the world premiere at the Paris Opera on 30 April 1934.

\(^{139}\) Hugo Puetter, “Der Frankfurter Arbeitskreis für Neue Musik,” *Neues Musikblatt*, December 1936, 2. Frommel gave a lecture on Stravinsky, which was followed by an analysis of the concerto by pianist Georg Kuhlmann. The work was then performed twice from Frommel and Kuhlmann. According to Hanau (*Musikinstitutionen in Frankfurt am Main*, 126 n. 328), the
evening a complete success. Toward the end of the season Frommel sent Stravinsky a warmly inscribed copy of his recently published *Neue Klassik in der Musik*, in which he praised the older composer as the fulfillment of classicism in music. The essay, Frommel wrote, was proof of the indebtedness of Germany’s young composers to Stravinsky. Nor was Frommel the only German composer to contact Stravinsky after 1936, now that his music was being heard again. Rudolf Buske, a twenty-two-year-old Berlin composer, wrote to express his admiration and to elicit Stravinsky’s opinion on a toccata he had written, which was scheduled to be broadcast the next month. The following October, just days after the high-profile premiere of *Jeu de cartes* at the Dresden Staatsoper, Stravinsky was contacted by John Philippson, a German writer who wanted the composer to provide music for his pantomime fairy tale, *Hanka, oder die Wunderblume*. There is no evidence that Stravinsky responded to either request.

“Artistic rehabilitation”: the European premiere of *Jeu de cartes* in Dresden

Stravinsky’s April 1936 appearance had taken place relatively late in the season, after many concert and theater organizers had already decided on their programs for the coming year. Thus the full effects of the lifting of the boycott were noticeable only in 1937/38. More performances of Stravinsky’s music took place during this season than at any other time during the Nazi period. Two artists had worked on the concerto for six months before the performance—that is, ever since Frommel had heard Stravinsky and his son perform the work in Baden-Baden. Other works scheduled for performance that season included Stravinsky’s Octet.

140. Puetter, “Der Frankfurter Arbeitskreis für Neue Musik.” The *Frankfurter Volksblatt* of 21 November did not share Puetter’s enthusiasm. Though it commended the performers for their efforts, it considered their talents squandered on this work (“Where does cultural bolshevism begin? Where does oversophisticated intellectualism cease? We know the answer”) (quoted in Hanau, *Musikinstitutionen in Frankfurt am Main*, 126).

On 6 July 1936 Strecker had informed Stravinsky that several pianists had expressed interest in the concerto (PSS). At least one further performance can be documented. On 3 and 4 February 1938 Hertha Kluge-Kahn and Pál Kiss presented the first two movements in a Braunschweig *Hauskonzert*. On 11 February Kluge-Kahn sent Stravinsky two reviews of the occasion, noting that she and Kiss planned to perform the complete concerto in Hanover the following month, as well as in Berlin the following winter (PSS).

141. Frommel to Stravinsky, May 1937 (PSS).

142. Rudolf Buske to Stravinsky, 8 May 1937; and John Philippson to Stravinsky, 17 October 1937 (PSS). Philippson assured Stravinsky of his “Aryan” background (transcription of letter kindly provided by Ingrid Weston).

143. Opposition still remained, of course, especially in ultraconservative circles. A typical example, an antisemitic tirade directed in part against Schoenberg and Stravinsky as the most prominent composers of “degenerate” music, appeared in *Der SA-Mann* on 18 September 1937, a translation of which appears in George Mosse, *Nazi Culture: Intellectual, Cultural and Social Life in the Third Reich* (New York: Schocken Books, 1981), 47–53 (see esp. 51–53).
At the end of September 1937, Strecker informed Stravinsky that he had been included in a Frankfurt exhibition of modern music by foreign composers that was now about to be shown abroad. The exhibition, "Schöpferes Musikleben des Auslands," took place in conjunction with the annual (and, as it turned out, final) festival of the venerable Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein in Frankfurt and Darmstadt in June 1937. Organized by Albert Richard Mohr, cofounder with Frommel of Frankfurt's Arbeitskreis für Neue Musik, it featured composers from seventeen European countries. Under the title "Das zeitgenössische Musikleben Europas," it traveled in October to The Hague.

"Happily, there exists here in Germany much interest in your works," Strecker reported in the first week of October, "and if nothing unexpected happens you can be very satisfied with your acceptance here." The Berlin premiere of Le baiser de la fée at the Staatsoper had been a fine success, despite a "renewed minor attack" ("erneute kleine Attacke") in the press just prior to the performance. This attack, Strecker believed, was less worrisome than the "overzealousness" of the composer's friends; cautious as ever, Strecker considered "any sensation just now to be undesirable." On 13 October 1937, shortly after Le baiser opened at the Berlin Staatsoper and less than six months after its world premiere in New York, the first European performance of Jeu de cartes took place at the Dresden Staatsoper. There is reason to believe that this work was composed as much for Germany as for Balanchine's newly formed American Ballet, which commissioned it. Stravinsky had begun work on Jeu at the end of 1935, a period when, as we have seen, he was impatient to resume his contact with...

144. Strecker to Stravinsky, 27 September 1937 (PSS). Stravinsky was represented in the exhibition by the manuscript of the piano score of his Violin Concerto, which he had earlier given to his publisher. (In SSC 3:253 n. 56 the date of this letter is incorrect, as are details of the translation.)

145. Hanau, Musikinstitutionen in Frankfurt am Main, 141–42. In preparation for the showing in The Hague, the organizers asked for an additional Stravinsky manuscript from Strecker, who forwarded the request to the composer in his letter of 27 September; there is no evidence that Stravinsky complied.

146. Strecker to Stravinsky, 6 October 1937 (PSS): "Hier in Deutschland besteht erfreulicherweise viel Interesse für Ihre Werke und wenn nichts Unerwartetes geschieht, können Sie mit der Anerkennung bei uns sehr zufrieden sein."

147. Ibid.: "Es ist der Übereifer Ihrer Freunde, vor dem ich Angst habe. Jede Sensation halte ich augenblicklich für unerwünscht." The translation of the first sentence as given in SSC 3:253 n. 55 is incorrect ("What I fear most is the anxiety that [such articles] may produce in your friends"), as is the date of the letter: for "one week later" read "one month later." The production, which opened on 2 October 1937, was choreographed by Lizzie Maudrick and conducted by Herbert Trantow. The evening also included the world premiere of Rudolf Wagner-Régeny's Der zerbrochene Krug. For a review of both works, see Karl H. Ruppel, "'Der zerbrochene Krug' als Ballett," Neues Musikblatt, October 1937, 5.

148. The first concert performance of Jeu de cartes had recently been conducted by Stravinsky in Venice on 12 September (not 14 September, as given in SSC 2:321).
Germany. The composer’s comments on the origins of *Jeu de cartes*, as published in their first formulation in his *Themes and Episodes*, are intriguing in this regard. After attributing his interest in the ballet’s subject to childhood memories of the casinos typical of German spa towns (an atmosphere vividly evoked in the master of ceremonies’ “trombone” voice” that opens each of the three Deals), Stravinsky writes: “It will have to be admitted also that *Jeu de cartes* is in many ways the most ‘German’ of my works. Its period and setting, if I had chosen to identify them, would have been a Baden-Baden of the Romantic Age.” The numerous borrowings, for example from Johann Strauss and (famously) Rossini, are “part of that picture,” snippets overheard from a “concert by the Kursaal Band.” After allowing that the work’s march rhythms and its “now somewhat painful” humor might also be considered German, Stravinsky continues, “I cannot say to what extent I may have been aware of this at the time, or to what degree (unconscious, in any case) the music may have been designed for German tastes and German audiences.” Curiously, most of these comments were replaced in the revised edition by the single, brusque sentence, “The score was not designed for any particular audience.” It is certainly true that the ballet’s “German” aspects relate more to external matters than to the music itself, for despite the Viennese allusions (and the ubiquitous master of ceremonies), the sound world of *Jeu de cartes* is more Latin than Teutonic, owing little more to the German tradition than what Stephen Walsh has referred to as the “slightly souped-up Beethoven sound.” All the more striking, then, is the extent to which Stravinsky, in the earlier edition, associated the origins of this work with Germany.

If *Jeu de cartes* was “designed for German . . . audiences” (consciously or otherwise), it is possible that other works written during this period were similarly affected by Stravinsky’s eagerness to reestablish his position in Germany. In discussing the composer’s less adventurous style of the 1930s, Walsh points out that during this period Stravinsky began to receive commissions from “conventional institutions,” especially those in the “artistically conservative” United States, in response to which the ever practical composer showed little

149. According to his later recollections, Stravinsky began *Jeu de cartes* on 2 December 1935, that is, shortly after he had written to Strecker (on 17 November) requesting engagements for the coming season, and just days before he received the invitation from Baden-Baden. See Igor Stravinsky, *Themes and Conclusions* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972), 44; this volume includes a revised edition of Stravinsky and Craft, *Themes and Episodes*. The ballet was still very much in progress during the next autumn (it was completed on 6 December 1936), a time when Stravinsky was eager to follow up his Baden-Baden appearance with further German successes. (Interestingly, Stravinsky claimed that the passage from numbers 189 to 192 was composed while he was en route to South America in April of that year—that is, just days after leaving Baden-Baden [*Themes and Conclusions*, 44].) Correspondence with Strecker concerning German performances of *Jeu* began in September 1936; see SSC2:317.


of the radical spirit long associated with his music. Could it be that Stravinsky was also influenced by his desire to resume his relationship with the (now) "artistically conservative" country that once had provided him with the largest share of his royalties?

At the end of November 1936 Strecker requested from Stravinsky the "choreography" (i.e., the scenario), which had to be submitted to the Reichstheaterkammer in order to obtain permission to have *Jeu de cartes* performed. By early July 1937 he had secured a number of performances, with Dresden to give the first staging of the ballet. "None of our German ballet companies can compare with foreign ones," he admitted, but a Dresden performance would be "better than the average level" found in other German theaters. There was an additional reason for entrusting the ballet to Dresden. The new ballet mistress, Valeria Kratina, enjoyed "complete support from all the officials—which is very important these days," Strecker wrote. "Thus your work will be presented under politically as well as artistically propitious circumstances." Conducted by Karl Böhm, the European premiere of *Jeu de cartes* took place during the Gaukulturwoche, the regional arts festival organized and supported by the Nazi Party. The ballet was a "really big success," Strecker reported. "All the important, modern-minded critics write enthusiastically and greet the work and its success as your artistic rehabilitation in Germany."

153. Ibid., 161–62.

154. Strecker to Stravinsky, 26/27 November 1936 (PSS). Stravinsky complied on 2 December, sending "the synopsis of the action in French and the scenario in French and English, to be translated into German, in case you need them for the piano score and orchestra score" (PSS; translation from SSC 2:318). Though his work was not credited, the piano score of *Jeu de cartes* was prepared for Schott's in Paris by the (Jewish) pianist and composer Erich Itor Kahn (1905–56), who until April 1933 had been Rosbaud's assistant at Frankfurt Radio.

155. Strecker to Stravinsky, 6 July 1937 (PSS): "Alle unsere deutschen Ballette können sich mit den ausländischen nicht vergleichen; aber Dresden ist eine große Bühne und die Aufführung wird besser sein wie das Durchschnittsniveau an anderen deutschen Theatern, an das man gewohnt ist." Strecker preferred that *Jeu* be introduced in the provinces before reaching Berlin (Strecker to Stravinsky, 26 September 1936 [PSS]). In fact, although concert performances were subsequently given in Berlin and elsewhere, Dresden's production was to be the only German staging of the work during the Nazi period.

156. Strecker to Stravinsky, 19 July 1937 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:252 n. 53, where "Ihr Werk" is mistranslated as "her work" and the date is incorrectly given as 19 June). On 22 July Stravinsky replied, "Delighted to have the German premiere in Dresden" (PSS; translation from SSC 3:252).

157. *Jeu de cartes* was given a total of seven performances in Dresden that season: on 13, 19, and 25 October; 4 and 11 November; 1 December; and 17 January (Schott's royalty statements of 31 December 1937 and 31 March 1938 [PSS]). The program also included ballets by Richard Mohaupt (*Die Gaunerstreiche der Courache*) and Julius Weismann (*Landsknechte*), both of which were conducted by Ernst Richter.

158. Strecker to Stravinsky, 21 October 1937 (PSS): "Die Dresdener Aufführung war ein ganz großer Erfolg . . . Alle wichtigen, modern eingestellten Kritiker schreiben begeistert und
Strecker also commented on the German translation of Stravinsky’s autobiography, which had recently been published—fully two years after the original French edition. The delay was no accident. As we have seen, in September 1934 (that is, before *Chroniques de ma vie* had appeared), Strecker had advised Stravinsky to postpone a German edition, which could only have aggravated the animosity toward the composer evident during the early Nazi period. But by 1937 the climate had changed. Now the composer’s autobiography, albeit with a number of politically motivated cuts, could safely appear in Germany. The book “has met with much interest,” Strecker reported, “and should help to dispel rumors.” And indeed, critics drew attention to Stravinsky’s admiration for German music, his Russian background, and—crucially—his unequivocally anticommunist views. Thus the favorable reception of Stravinsky’s *Erinnerungen* contributed in no small way to his German “rehabilitation.”

Concert performances of *Jeu de cartes* followed the Dresden premiere. At the end of November, Strecker informed Stravinsky of a “fine success” in Hamburg, though for “unknown reasons” the Munich performance, which

begrüßen das Werk und den Erfolg als Ihre künstlerische Rehabilitierung in Deutschland.” Stravinsky replied to Strecker’s letter of 21 October 1937 the following day, requesting a program; Strecker agreed on 26 October to bring both program and reviews with him on a planned trip to Paris (PSS). In fact, Schott’s published a brochure of reviews of *Jeu*, so that, as Strecker shrewdly put it, “in future the critics know what they can write about it” (“damit die Kritiker wissen, was sie in Zukunft darüber schreiben können”) (Strecker to Stravinsky, 19 November 1937 [PSS]).

Stravinsky later noted that “the greatest success of the music was in Germany” and referred specifically to the ballet’s “great stage success in Dresden” (though he mistakenly gave the year as 1938) (Stravinsky and Craft, *Themes and Episodes*, 35). The reference to Dresden does not appear in the revised edition (Stravinsky, *Themes and Conclusions*, 44).

159. Igor Stravinsky, *Erinnerungen*, trans. Richard Tüngel (Zurich and Berlin: Atlantis-Verlag, 1937). On 23 April 1937 L. Schwann Druckerei und Verlag of Düsseldorf had written to Stravinsky, hoping to arrange a meeting in Paris between their representative and the composer (PSS). It is tempting to speculate that the German firm may also have been interested in publishing the work.

160. The German edition contained two substantial cuts. One involved Stravinsky’s caustic remarks on the Bayreuth Festival, the other his (largely favorable) comments on Jewish violinists. See Joan Evans, “Some Remarks on the Publication and Reception of Stravinsky’s *Erinnerungen*,” *Mitteilungen der Paul Sacher Stiftung* 9 (1996): 17–23. Oddly, although the passage dealing with Bayreuth was restored after 1945, Stravinsky’s comments concerning Jewish violinists were not. They are lacking in all German editions of his autobiography to date.

161. Strecker to Stravinsky, 21 October 1937 (PSS; translation from SSC2:502).

162. See, for example, Edwin von der Nüll’s comments in his review of the Berlin premiere of *Le baiser de la fée* (“Durchschlagender Erfolg des Staatsopern-Auftrags. Der große Ballettabend im Hause Unter den Linden,” *Berliner Zeitung am Mittag*, 4 October 1937). See also Evans, “Publication and Reception of Stravinsky’s *Erinnerungen*,” 20.

163. One week before the work opened in Dresden, Strecker confirmed that Hamburg, Berlin, Munich, Münster, Stuttgart, and Wiesbaden had already scheduled concert performances (Strecker to Stravinsky, 6 October 1937 [PSS]).
Clemens Krauss was to have conducted on the fifteenth, did not take place.\textsuperscript{164} The work was performed in Wiesbaden on 14 January 1938, while the Berlin Philharmonic’s performance (under Eugen Jochum) ten days earlier had garnered “unanimously favorable” reviews.\textsuperscript{165}

The performance of \textit{Jeu de cartes} in Münster on 20 May 1938 was conducted by Hans Rosbaud, who at end of the previous season had left Frankfurt Radio to become Münster’s Generalmusikdirektor. Rosbaud’s departure from Frankfurt was directly related to his involvement in the plans to bring Stravinsky back to Germany in 1936. On 26 February of that year—just four days after Strecker had reported to the composer concerning “underground intrigues” at Frankfurt Radio—the Gestapo questioned Josef Felix Hess, the station’s second Kapellmeister, concerning Rosbaud. An ardent party member (and storm trooper) who had long despised his superior’s modernist sympathies, Hess denounced Rosbaud. Describing him as having a “Jewish manner” (“jüdische Art”), Hess pointed out that Rosbaud “had recently negotiated with Stravinsky in order to engage him and his son for a piano recital.”\textsuperscript{166} He also brought to the Gestapo’s attention the fact that a Stravinsky recording had been played at Frankfurt Radio, an apparent reference to the broadcast of Stokowski’s \textit{Sacre} in August 1934. The radio authorities came to Rosbaud’s defense and relieved the second Kapellmeister of his duties. Hess then took the radio station to court, where in the summer of 1936 he publicly repeated his accusations against Rosbaud. Hess’s dismissal was finally upheld, but the widely publicized affair contributed to Rosbaud’s decision to abandon the politically sensitive atmosphere of Frankfurt Radio for the relative seclusion of provincial Münster.\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{164}. Strecker to Stravinsky, 27 November 1937 (PSS): “Kartenspiel im Konzert hatte auch in Hamburg einen schonen Erfolg. Die Münchner Aufführung fand aus mir unbekannten Gründen nicht statt.” The Hamburg performance (under Eugen Jochum) took place on 22 November. Strecker had sent Stravinsky details of the planned Munich performance on 26 October (PSS; see SSC 2:321).

\textsuperscript{165}. Strecker to Stravinsky, 14 January 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:257 n. 60). Carl Fischer conducted in Wiesbaden. Jochum’s Berlin performance was to have been conducted by Furtwängler. Strecker felt that Jochum “treated the work too romantically” and looked forward to Stravinsky’s recorded interpretation of the work, which, “in Germany at least,” would be accepted as “the authentic one” (translation from SSC 3:257 n. 60).

\textsuperscript{166}. “Rosbaud [sic] [ist] noch in jüngster Zeit mit Strawinsky in Verhandlungen getreten, um ihn und seinen Sohn zu einem Klavierkonzert zu verpflichten” (Arbeitsgericht Frankfurt am Main, “In Sachen Hess [vs.] Reichssender Frankfurt a.M.,” 3 July 1936, 2). A carbon copy of the twelve-page document is preserved in the Hans Rosbaud Collection, Hans Moldenhauer Archives at Washington State University, Pullman, Wash. Other relevant documents are found at the Bundesarchiv Berlin (Reichsmusikkammer files, “Hess, Josef”).

\textsuperscript{167}. An account of the affair appeared in the \textit{Frankfurter Zeitung} on 13 June 1936 (“Eine Kündigung am Reichssender Frankfurt vor dem Arbeitsgericht”). According to this article, which was reprinted the following day in several other German papers, Hess described Rosbaud as “the embodiment of the typical Jew” and claimed that he understood music “in a Jewish sense.” The account that appeared in the \textit{Berliner Tageblatt} on 14 June is reprinted in Joseph Wulf,
“Too great a sensation”

The acceptance of Stravinsky’s music after 1936 did not extend to Stravinsky the performer. Conductors and concert organizers were well aware that the “prize-fight element” implicit in a personal appearance was likely to arouse opposition. Although a number of promising leads developed in the wake of his Baden-Baden visit, and although his supporters did their utmost to help, Stravinsky’s 1936 engagement remained his only public appearance in Nazi Germany.

In August 1937, encouraged by the success of Persephone in Braunschweig and by the extensive plans for the 1937/38 season, Stravinsky again attempted to secure German engagements. Having already agreed to conduct concert performances of Jeu de cartes in Venice, London, Amsterdam, Naples, and Paris, he now thought to add Germany to his itinerary. “What are the possibilities of my conducting a certain number of concerts this winter in Germany, including Jeu de cartes, with Frankfurt as the base?” he wrote to Strecker. His request was unfortunately a little late, Strecker replied, since most of the season’s programs had already been decided upon. But he promised to contact Gustav Fineman of Westdeutsche Konzertdirektion, who might be able to arrange something. Two days later he relayed an encouraging message: engagements in Berlin, Munich, Münster, and Wiesbaden might still be possible. Stravinsky immediately informed Fineman that he would be “quite happy to conduct in Germany this season.” As for his fees, he wrote, “My wish is expressed with the words ‘as much as possible’—‘je plus je mieux’—, and in any case not less than a thousand marks.” Westdeutsche Konzertdirektion responded that the Berlin Philharmonic, the Leipzig Gewandhaus, the Frankfurt Museums-Gesellschaft, and the Hamburg...
Philharmonic were all interested, but would prefer that Stravinsky postpone his engagements to the following season, since programs for the 1937/38 season were already set. Stravinsky agreed. “If I stay in Europe next year . . . ,” he wrote, “I am ready to accept a German tour as conductor of my works. In the event that I go to America, it would still be possible for me to come to Germany and give this series of concerts in the autumn of 1938.”

In mid-November Stravinsky received from the same agency an offer to conduct a concert on 10 July 1938 in Bad Nauheim for a fee of 1,300 marks. Strecker advised him to accept the engagement. There were still “strong antagonisms and animosities” to contend with, he wrote. “Not many people dare to engage you, since they expect to produce too great a sensation and thereby opposition.” But, Strecker felt, a beginning had to be made, and a concert at an international spa would be a good start. Even without the additional concerts that the organizers hoped to obtain for him, it would “pave the way” for a more extensive engagement the following season. “Conditions here are unusual,” he added, “and many currents exist whose meaning and influence are difficult to assess.”

Stravinsky accepted the offer. But once again trouble loomed on the horizon. As in Frankfurt two years earlier, plans for the composer’s personal participation ran up against local opposition, and permission for his appearance was denied. Strecker sent Stravinsky the news at the end of April. In an attempt to discover what lay behind the refusal, he had queried the Reichsmusikkammer; its advice was “not to force the issue.” The official in charge happened to be “an avowed enemy of your music, as well as an influential person,” Strecker explained. “If we were to request that this refusal be lifted, the case would be made into a precedent for an overall injunction against your works.”

172. Westdeutsche Konzertdirektion to Stravinsky, 28 August 1937 (PSS). Stravinsky to Westdeutsche Konzertdirektion, 5 September 1937 (PSS): “si je reste en Europe l’année prochaine . . . , je suis prêt à accepter une tournée en Allemagne comme chef d’orchestre de mes œuvres. Dans le cas que je m’en aille en Amérique il me serait toujours possible de venir en Allemagne et de donner cette série de concerts en automne 1938” (emphasis original). (The date of the letter is incorrectly given as 7 September in SPD, 553.)

173. Fineman to Stravinsky, 15 November 1937 (PSS).


175. In his letter of 7 December 1937, Stravinsky asked Strecker to convey his acceptance to Westdeutsche Konzertdirektion (PSS). On 16 February the agency confirmed to Schott’s the composer’s fee of 1,300 marks (Schott’s). On the advice of Henri Jourdan, cultural attaché of the French Institute in Berlin, Stravinsky requested that Bad Nauheim arrange to have his fee paid directly to him in France, thus circumventing the restrictions on taking currency out of Germany (Stravinsky to Strecker, 27 February 1938 [PSS]). Stravinsky had met with Jourdan the previous week, when the composer was in Berlin to record *Jeu de cartes*. Also present at the meeting was Telefunken’s artistic director, Herbert Grenzebach (not “Grenzbach,” as given in SSC 3:259).

176. Strecker to Stravinsky, 29 April 1938 (PSS). Strecker mistakenly writes 29 May. The translation is from SSC 3:262 n. 72, where the date is incorrectly given as 20 April.
and currents in Germany at present that it is wise not to push through any-
thing by force.” The Nauheim organizers were “very unhappy” about the
decision, but, he concluded, “there is really nothing that can be done about
it.”

No protest seems to have been raised concerning Stravinsky’s visit to Berlin
in February 1938 to record Jeu de cartes with the Berlin Philharmonic; signifi-
cantly, this was not a public appearance. Following the successful premiere of
the work in Dresden the previous autumn, Telefunken had offered Stravinsky
a recording contract. As usual, the composer sought his publisher’s advice.
“Is this a serious, quality firm,” he asked, “and, if so, what terms should I set?”
Strecker encouraged him to accept the offer, pointing out that a recording
with Telefunken, the largest and most powerful record company in Germany,
might also spark public interest in his other recordings, which, since they were
neither made nor advertised in Germany, remained “practically unavailable”
(“so gut wie nicht erhältlich”). On the morning of 8 December 1937, dur-
ing a stopover in Berlin while en route to concerts in Tallinn and Riga,
Stravinsky met with Telefunken officials and worked out a contract. He re-
turned on 18 February to make what was the premiere recording of the
work. After hearing the sample discs, which were sent to Paris via diplo-
matic pouch, Stravinsky pronounced the recording excellent. He was less

177. Strecker to Stravinsky, 29 April 1938: “Es herrschen leider augenblicklich soviele ver-
schiedene Richtungen und Strömungen in Deutschland, daß man klug tut, nichts mit Gewalt
durchzusetzen. Man ist in Nauheim sehr unglücklich über diese Entscheidung, gegen die sich lei-
der wirklich nichts machen läßt.” Stravinsky seems to have doubted that the engagement would
take place; on 30 April he replied, “I was certain that the Bad Nauheim affair would end in a re-
fusal” (PSS; translation from SSC 3:262).
178. Telefunkenplatte, Aufnahm-Abteilung, to Stravinsky, 29 November 1937 (PSS).
179. Stravinsky to Strecker, 1 December 1937 (translation from SSC 3:255); and Strecker to
Stravinsky, 3 December 1937 (PSS).
180. Stravinsky to Strecker, 18 December 1937 (PSS; see SSC 3:255). An eight-point state-
ment giving details of the recording project is contained in Grenzebach’s letter of 15 February
1938 to the composer; the final contract was sent by Grenzebach on 7 March (i.e., after the
recording had been completed) (PSS).
181. Stravinsky to Strecker, 17 February 1938 (PSS). On 3 January Stravinsky had written to
his publisher, “I am waiting impatiently for the letter from these gentlemen giving me at least an
idea of the dates (in February . . .) when the Berlin Philharmonic will be free to record Jeu de
cartes” (“Avec impatience j’attends la lettre de ces messieurs me donnant au moins une idée des
dates [en février . . .] où la Philharmonie de Berlin sera libre d’enregistrer Jeu de cartes”) (PSS).
The work was recorded on 19 and 21 February (Telefunken SK2460-2). “Everything went very
well in Berlin at the Singakademie,” Stravinsky reported to Strecker on 27 February. “I was very
happy to record my Jeu de cartes with that magnificent orchestra” (PSS; translation from SSC
3:258). The Berlin Philharmonic knew the work well, since (as noted above) they had performed
it under Jochum’s direction the previous month.
182. Stravinsky’s verdict was communicated to Grenzebach in a postcard of 4 April
(Grenzebach to Stravinsky, 7 April 1938 [PSS]). On 24 March 1938 Henri Jourdan had in-
fomed Stravinsky that the discs had arrived at the French embassy in Berlin and could be picked
up in Paris at the Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Quai d’Orsay (PSS). Stravinsky should not
hesitate to call on him, Jourdan wrote, if he could be of further help—an offer that the composer
was shortly to take up.
pleased with the time it took—nearly five months—to obtain his fees. “Diffi-
culties concerning engagements by foreign artists have once again arisen . . .,”
Strecker reported in early April. “At present we must be constantly prepared
for all kinds of surprises.”183

Stravinsky’s portrait was given pride of place in Telefunken’s April catalog.
Hans Reimann assured customers that this music could be enjoyed even by
“untrained ears” (“ungeschulten Ohren”).184 His comment that “whoever
loves Tchaikovsky must love Jeu de cartes” (“wer Tschaikowsky liebt, muß das
‘Kartenspiel’ . . . liebgewinnen”) echoes a persistent theme. Edwin von der
Nüll, for example, who characterized Le baiser de la fée as “back to Russian
Romanticism, back to Tchaikovsky,” described Jen as a “complete retreat to
old Russia.”185 It is deeply ironic that despite the composer’s efforts to dis-
tance himself from his Russian roots during this period, German critics, listen-
ing to his music through a filter of “blood and soil” (“Blut und Boden”)
ideology, praised its perceived Russian, hence suitably “national,” qualities.

Stravinsky’s recording of Jen de cartes was greeted with keen interest in
Germany and contributed, along with the German publication of his auto-
biography, to the high profile that his music achieved during the 1937/38
season.186 By the end of June, well over a thousand copies had been sold in
Germany—this despite the negative publicity generated the previous month
by the composer’s inclusion in the “Degenerate Music” exhibition in Düssel-
dorf (discussed below). Not surprisingly, the recording also attracted interna-
tional attention, with at least one reviewer making pointed reference to the
circumstances under which it was made. Given Germany’s attitude toward
modern music as shown by its treatment of Hindemith, wrote a French critic,
the coupling of Stravinsky’s name with that of the Berlin Philharmonic was
not without a certain irony. It was also ironic, he noted, that Jen, with its
Viennese allusions, paid tribute to a country that since the recent Anschluss no

183. Strecker to Stravinsky, 8 April 1938 (PSS): “Es sind inzwischen schon wieder neue
Schwierigkeiten wegen Engagements ausländischer Künstler entstanden . . . Wir müssen augen-
blicklich auf mancherlei Überraschungen ständig gefaßt sein.” Grenzebach had hoped (unsuccess-
fully, as it turned out) to be able to send the money through diplomatic channels (Grenzebach
to Stravinsky, 14 January 1938 [PSS]). On 28 March Stravinsky wrote Grenzebach concerning
his advance (PSS). Having heard nothing by 6 April, he asked Strecker to investigate (Schott’s).
(Since the date is missing on Stravinsky’s copy of this letter, it appears in SSC 3:259 as “[Early
April 1938].”) Only on 5 July could Telefunken inform Stravinsky that permission to transfer the
funds had finally been obtained; one week later a check for 13,629 francs (1,040 marks), drawn
on a French bank, was sent by the Dresdner Bank to the composer (PSS).

184. A copy of the catalog is preserved at PSS. The recording was released on 1 April
(Grenzebach to Stravinsky, 7 April 1938 [PSS]).

Gaukulturwoche: Deutsche Uraufführung vom ‘Kartenspiel’ im Rahmen des Ballettabends der
Dresdener Oper,” Berliner Zeitung am Mittag, 14 October 1937.

186. For reviews of Stravinsky’s recording of Jen, see Richard Petzoldt, Allgemeine Musik-
zeitung 65 (1938): 381; and Herbert Gerigk, Die Musik 30 (1937/38): 782.
187. Telefunken to Stravinsky, 26 July 1938 (PSS).
longer existed. The growing acceptance of Stravinsky’s music was reflected in an increased interest in other recordings of his music as well. This is already evident from a review that appeared in March 1938, just before the release of *Jeu de cartes*, in which Helmut Schmidt-Garre, with a sympathetic matter-of-factness, discussed a wide variety of Stravinsky’s recordings. These included performances of two controversial earlier works, both of which had become strangers to Germany: *Sacre* (“unbelievable rhythmic precision”) and *Histoire du soldat* (“an outstandingly successful recording”). Apparently unaware of Samuel Dushkin’s “non-Aryan” status, the reviewer singled out for special attention the “technically excellent” recording of the Violin Concerto.

Strecker had hoped (in vain, as it turned out) that on his way back to Paris from his recording engagement in Berlin, Stravinsky might stop off in Mainz to see the “excellent” new production of *Firebird*. If he could attend, Strecker wrote, it might be possible to schedule an extra performance. His appearance “would be noticed in all of southern Germany” and would provide encouragement for his loyal Mainz supporters. Strecker assured Stravinsky that his presence would be unlikely to provoke a demonstration, since “it would already be the fifth performance” (i.e., not opening night). Among Stravinsky’s supporters, Strecker singled out the city’s Generalmusikdirektor, Karl Maria Zwüßler, “an unusually good conductor . . . , who has now done the *Petrushka* suite, the *Symphony of Psalms*, and *Firebird*, one right after the other. No other German city up to now has dared such a feat.”


189. Helmut Schmidt-Garre, “Zeitgenössische Musik auf Schallplatten,” *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 65 (1938): 157. Other Stravinsky recordings discussed in this review are *Firebird*, *Petrushka*, *Capriccio*, *Symphony of Psalms*, the Octet, and the Serenade in A. Additional reviews from this period include those by Herbert Gerigk in *Die Musik* 30 (1937/38): 688 (Serenade in A) and 833 (Octet), and in *Die Musik* 31 (1938/39): 212 (Petrushka) and 265 (Les noces); as well as those by Richard Petzoldt in *AMZ* 65 (1938): 588 (Capriccio) and 758 (Petrushka), and in *AMZ* 66 (1939): 212–13 (Les noces) and 428–29 (Fireworks).

190. Strecker to Stravinsky, 28 January 1938; the production opened on 26 January (Schott’s royalty statement of 31 March 1938) (PSS). According to Ernst Krause’s review, this was the first staging of *Firebird* in Mainz (“Moderer Ballettabend in Mainz,” *Neues Musikblatt*, February 1938, 4). In his letter of 3 February to the composer, Strecker praised the production, which for Mainz was “astonishingly good” (PSS).

191. Strecker to Stravinsky, 28 January 1938; translation from SSC 3:258 n. 61. Ernst Krause must have heard rumors of the invitation, for in the review cited above he noted, incorrectly, that Stravinsky “is to conduct one of the coming performances.”

192. Strecker to Stravinsky, 28 January 1938: “Zwüßler ist ein ungewöhnlich guter Dirigent . . . , der jetzt hintereinander die *Petruschka-Suite, Psalmensonate* und den *Feuervogel* machte. Eine Tat, die in diesem Umfange bisher noch keine andere deutsche Stadt wagte.” On 21 December 1937 Strecker had reported to Stravinsky that “the performance of your *Symphony of Psalms*, which I had recommended to our good conductor Generalmusikdirektor Zwüßler for the ‘Liedertafel’ here in Mainz, had a very fine success and made a strong impression in all the musical circles” (“daß die Aufführung Ihrer *Psalmensonate*, die ich hier unserem guten Dirigenten GMD Zwüßler für die ‘Liedertafel’ in Mainz empfohlen hatte, einen sehr schönen Erfolg hatte.
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Generalmusikdirektor's success: Zwißler, a party member, was also Mainz's Musikbeauftragter. 193

On 24 April 1938, just at the time when permission for Stravinsky’s Bad Nauheim engagement was denied, the third Internationales Zeitgenössisches Musikfest in Baden-Baden staged a performance of *Perséphone*, whose successful German premiere had taken place in Braunschweig the previous season. Strecker had informed Stravinsky at the end of 1937 that Gotthold E. Lessing, Baden-Baden’s new Generalmusikdirektor, was enthusiastic about the work, which would be danced by the ballet of the Munich Staatstheater under Sonja Korty. Strecker had asked Russischer Musikverlag, the publisher of *Perséphone*, to be as accommodating as possible in its financial demands, since “such a performance, especially in Baden-Baden, is the best propaganda for the work that one could wish for.” 194

Stravinsky regretted that he could not be directly involved in the performance. “I would certainly be even more pleased if I could conduct it myself,” he replied, “but after what you told me, I realize that financial difficulties

und in allen musikalischen Kreisen großen Eindruck machte”) (PSS). The work was performed twice on this occasion (Zwißler to Stravinsky, 6 November 1938 [PSS]). The former conductor of the Hessisches Landestheater in Darmstadt had long been an admirer of Stravinsky’s music. After Stravinsky’s concert there on 23 November 1931, Zwißler had written to him, warmly declaring his support (the letter is undated); on 29 May 1932 he informed the composer that he had scheduled Sacre for the 1932/33 season and would also like to perform *Oedipus, Les noces, or Le rossignol* (PSS). These plans apparently fell victim to the deteriorating political situation.

193. Fritz Bouquet, “Aus dem Mainzer Musikleben,” *Neues Musikblatt*, July/August 1938, 9. Stravinsky replied on 1 February that he was unable to attend the extra performance planned for 24 February, since he was scheduled to conduct a rehearsal the next day in Paris: “I am truly disappointed, for I would very much have liked to attend and to be with you on that day” (PSS; translation from SSC 3:257). (He added indignantly that the Paris rehearsal was to take place “at 9 a.m.! the pigs” [“à 9 h. du matin! les cochons”; emphasis original].) Just over a week later, Stravinsky cabled Strecker in London: “My concert postponed to 4 March. Can attend Firebird performance 24 February” (“Mon concert remis au 4 mars puis assister représentation *Oiseau Mayence* 24 février”) (draft of 10 February 1938 [PSS]). Thus on 13 February he asked Grenzebach to arrange a stopover in Wiesbaden on his return ticket to Paris from Berlin (PSS). Upon receiving Stravinsky’s telegram Strecker immediately contacted Mainz, but it was now too late to alter the theater’s schedule (Willy Strecker to Stravinsky, 10 February 1938; and Ludwig Strecker to Stravinsky, 12 February 1938 [PSS]).

Plans for yet another 1938 appearance also came to naught. This involved an invitation to conduct *Petrushka* with Colonel de Basil’s Ballet Russe in Berlin on 22 and 26 April (Stravinsky to Strecker, 5 February 1938 [PSS]): “they’re paying me very decent money,” Stravinsky reported (“man zahlt mir ein ganz anständiges Geld”); the mention of money typically prompted a switch from French to German. The invitation fell through when de Basil was unable to comply with Stravinsky’s request that he engage the Berlin Philharmonic (Stravinsky to Grenzebach, 28 March 1938 [PSS]).

194. Strecker to Stravinsky, 21 December 1937 (PSS): “Sie wissen, daß eine solche Aufführung, gerade in Baden-Baden, die beste Propaganda für das Werk ist, die man sich wünschen kann.” Strecker added, “You see, I’m even becoming the ‘representative’ of Russischer Musikverlag!” (“Sie sehen, ich werde noch der ‘Vertreter’ des Russischer Musikverlages!”).
would surely prevent such a possibility.”195 He was less happy to find himself identified as “Igor Strawinsky (Ruußland)” in the program that he received several weeks before the performance. In the margin he exclaimed (in German), “Russian? Not since 1934. Russian music? Also not. In what sense ‘Russian’?”196 Strecker promised to forward Stravinsky’s complaint to Baden-Baden, assuring the composer that the mistake would be corrected.197 Ever mindful of public relations, he suggested that it would be “diplomatic” of the composer to send to Baden-Baden a thank-you letter stressing both the “idealistic strivings” of those involved and the “international significance” of the festival’s achievements. Such a letter would be published, he added, and “thus would be helpful to us in the future.”198

Strecker traveled to Baden-Baden to attend the performance.199 He judged the production “infinitely superior” to the world premiere in Paris, though done with very simple means. The early press reports were “entirely positive,” and, most importantly, the performance had so far elicited no opposition. “Even so,” he consoled the composer, “it is better that you were not present, because demonstrations might, in that case, have ensued, and these would be ammunition for your enemies.”200

---

195. Stravinsky to Strecker, 3 January 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:256). Prieberg is mistaken in claiming that Stravinsky attended the performance (Musik im NS-Staat, 54).
196. Translation from SSC 3:258 n. 63. The program (with Stravinsky’s comments) is preserved at PSS.
197. Strecker to Stravinsky, 4 March 1938 (PSS).
198. Strecker to Stravinsky, 20 April 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:261 n. 70). Strecker’s mention of the publication of a thank-you letter refers obliquely to a request that Stravinsky had recently received. Fully aware of Baden-Baden’s former importance as a new-music center, the German press, like the festival’s organizers, set great store on the “international significance” of the event. Thus on 12 April the Badische Presse asked Stravinsky to contribute an article to a special issue of the newspaper; they also requested a photograph. On 18 April Stravinsky testily asked Strecker to decline on his behalf: “explain to them ... that one can find in Germany ... [one] of my photos without bothering me” (“expliquez leur ... qu’on peut trouver en Allemagne ... [une] de mes photos sans me déranger”) (both letters preserved at Schott’s). Strecker’s apparent attempt to mollify the local press by providing them with useful comments from the composer came to nothing, for in this case Stravinsky—uncharacteristically—seems not to have followed Strecker’s advice.
199. Directly after the performance on 24 April Strecker sent Stravinsky a postcard: “Perséphone a wonderful performance and a really great success, unfortunately without you!” (“Perséphone eine wunderbare Aufführung und ein ganz großer Erfolg, leider ohne Sie!”) (PSS). The card was also signed by Gotthold E. Lessing, Werner Reinhart (Stravinsky’s Swiss patron), the violinist Alma Moodie, and an unidentified person (in Russian).
200. Strecker to Stravinsky, 26 April 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:262 n. 70). In his letter of 30 April Strecker wrote, “Perséphone has really superb reviews!” (“Perséphone hat eine ganz vorzügliche Presse!”) (PSS). Strecker’s personal relationship with Sonja Korty may have colored his report, for though the work itself seems to have been well accepted, critics were far from unanimous in praising the production. The editor of Die Musik was among several who criticized Korty’s “dilettantisch” choreography, as well as her unsatisfactory performance in the title role (Herbert Gerigk, “Musikfest der Aufführungsfolge in Baden-Baden,” Die Musik 30 [1937/38]: 556).
“The Stravinsky ‘problem’: the Entartete Musik exhibition

That Stravinsky’s enemies were still a force to be reckoned with was shown by an event that took place exactly one month after the Baden-Baden staging of *Persephone*. On 24 May 1938 the exhibition “Degenerate Music” (“Entartete Musik”) opened at the Kunstpalast in Düsseldorf. It was shown in conjunction with (though not an official part of) the first Reichsmusiktage, the völkisch-oriented national music festival that replaced the Tonkünstlerfest of the Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein, which had been dissolved following its annual meeting the previous year.201 The exhibition of “degenerate music” was modeled on the “Entartete Kunst” (“Degenerate Art”) exhibition that had opened in Munich in 1937.202 The main organizer of the Düsseldorf exhibition was Weimar’s Intendant, Hans Severus Ziegler, an “old fighter” who while in charge of Thuringia’s cultural affairs between January 1930 and April 1931 had banned from all state-supported concerts works of “music bolshevists” such as Hindemith and Stravinsky.203

The aim of the Düsseldorf exhibition, as reported by a young Wolfgang Steinecke, was to provide a “helpful contribution to the mental, spiritual and moral renewal of the German people.”204 On display were photos or caricatures

201. Concerning the völkisch character of the festival, see Heinz Drewes’s statement, “Zu den Reichsmusiktagen in Düsseldorf,” *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 65 (1938): 325. Drewes, who was both head of the Propaganda Ministry’s music department and vice president of the Reichsmusikkammer, contrasts the new festival with the elitist gatherings of the past (“the music is no longer the concern of a small special-interest group, but of the entire Volk”) and stresses its all-inclusive character: art music and folk music, opera and operetta, symphonic music and military music, as well as music of the Hitler Youth, and so on.

202. Partial reconstructions of these now infamous exhibitions have been mounted in recent years. See Albrecht Dümling and Peter Girth, eds., *Entartete Musik: Dokumentation und Kommentar zur Düsseldorfer Ausstellung von 1938*, 3d ed. (Düsseldorf: Der Kleine Verlag, 1993); and Stephanie Barron, ed., *“Degenerate Art”: The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991). The present-day attention given the “Entartete Musik” exhibition, especially in terms of concerts and recordings, should not lead one to overestimate its contemporary significance, which in no way approached that of its model.

203. Bollmus, *Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner*, 54. Ziegler owed his official position to Wilhelm Frick, who in 1930, as a result of the Nazi Party’s electoral successes in Thuringia, had been appointed minister of the interior in the state’s coalition government. The actions of Frick, the first Nazi to hold an important governmental position, were to make Thuringia a rehearsal stage for Nazi cultural policies.

204. Wolfgang Steinecke, “‘Entartete Musik.’ Eröffnung der Düsseldorfer Ausstellung,” *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 25 May 1938. Significantly, this report by the founder in 1946 of Darmstadt’s Internationale Ferienkurse für Neue Musik is for the most part restricted to quotations from the speech by Ziegler that opened the exhibition. Steinecke’s detailed description of the exhibition, “Was die Ausstellung ‘Entartete Musik’ zeigt,” appeared on 26 May in the same newspaper. This article (reproduced in Dümling and Girth, eds., *Entartete Musik*, 194) was to form the main source for the 1988 reconstruction of the exhibition. See Albrecht Dümling, “‘Entartete Musik’: Zur Rezeption der Ausstellung in Düsseldorf, Weimar und Wien 1938–1939,” in *Beiträge ’90: Österreichische Musiker im Exil*, ed. Österreichische Gesellschaft für Musik (Kassel: Bärenreiter, [1990]), 87.
of “degenerate” composers, performers, critics, and other figures from Weimar Germany’s musical scene, accompanied by “explanatory” placards. Displayed also were copies of scores and books, as well as sound recordings. In specially constructed booths, patrons could hear samples of music written by the composers involved. These included, among many others, Schoenberg, Hindemith, Weill—and Stravinsky.

Under a reproduction of a well-known portrait of the composer by Jacques-Emile Blanche there appeared the caption: “Who invented the story that Stravinsky comes from the Russian nobility?” This was accompanied by a quote from the opening measures of Petrushka and a copy of an article written by “the Jew Alfred Einstein.” A placard next to Stravinsky’s portrait read: “We respect national art, but we reject the international in art. That is the Stravinsky ‘problem.’ ” Included among the “degenerate” scores and books were Histoire du soldat and the German edition of Stravinsky’s autobiography.

In an introductory lecture entitled “Tonal and Atonal Music: Their Historical and Racial Foundations” (“Tonale und atonale Musik, ihre geschichtlichen und rassischen Grundlagen”), Otto zur Nedden of Jena attacked the “destructive tendencies” of Weill, Hindemith, and Stravinsky, whose music “consciously aims to demolish musical form, and has stirred up the basest instincts.” Nedden illustrated his lecture with recorded examples.

205. “The exhibition is arranged in the manner of a partitioned gramophone shop with the exceptions that sound proofing and intervening doors have been omitted. . . . Apparently the object is to cause nausea through one generous dose” (Ralph Barnes, “German ‘Degenerate Music’ Show Seeks to Restore ‘Nordic Melody’. Reich Symphony Orchestra, 100 p.c. Nazi, All in Brown, Provides Proper Contrast,” New York Herald Tribune, Paris, 4 June 1938).

206. Composers such as Alban Berg, Ernst Toch, and Josef Hauer were exhibited as “lesser bolshevist big shots” (“kleinere Bolschewistengroßöner”). Gerhard Frommel, represented by his Neue Klassik in der Musik, was displayed with the “Theoretiker der Atonalität” (Steinecke, “Entartete Musik”).

207. “Wer erfand Strawinskys Herkunft aus einem alten russischen Bojarengeschlecht?” (Photographs of the exhibit sent by Henri Jourdan to the composer are preserved at PSS.) Stravinsky’s memory retained a more straightforward version of the racial slur: “ ‘Judge from this whether or not Stravinsky is a Jew’ ” (Themes and Conclusions, 44).

208. “Wir achten die Kunst der Nationen aber wir verneinen die Internationale in der Kunst. Das ist das ‘Problem’ Strawinsky.” By using a contrasting color for the word “Internationale,” the organizers highlighted the word, thus suggesting a communist connection. This implication had a long history. See, for example, the February 1924 issue of the Zeitschrift für Musik, where an article written by Adolph Heuss appears under the title “Die musikalische Internationale. Zur Gründung einer Ortsgruppe Leipzig der ‘Internationalen Gesellschaft für neue Musik.’ ”

209. Steinecke, “Was die Ausstellung ‘Entartete Musik’ zeigt.” A photograph of a manuscript page from Histoire was included as a plate in the German edition of Stravinsky’s autobiography—a curious choice, given the opposition that this work had long evoked from the ultraconservative wing. Even many of Stravinsky’s supporters in Nazi Germany drew the line at this “satanic” work. With the exception of the Jüdischer Kulturbund’s 1936/37 production, discussed above, no German stage dared to produce it.

from _Firebird_ ("Infernal Dance") and _Sacre_, music that he compared unfavorably to Sibelius’s _Finlandia_.

Stravinsky was dismayed to learn that he was included in the exhibition. "And this after the great success of _Jeu de cartes_ and _Persephone_ (repeated the day before yesterday in Braunschweig)," he fumed, "while _Firebird_ is played . . . all over Germany!" With characteristic single-mindedness, and with a degree of self-centeredness astonishing even for this supremely self-oriented man, Stravinsky set out to obtain an apology from the German authorities. Following Strecker’s advice, he first enlisted the help of Isidor Philipp. "Knowing that you are personally acquainted with our ambassador in Berlin, Monsieur [André] François-Poncet," Stravinsky wrote to the pianist, "I take the liberty of asking you to bring to his attention the following." He noted that in Düsseldorf "my musical activity and even my person are presented to the public in an absolutely inadmissible way," and continued:

Under any other circumstances I would not have paid any attention to such a display. But in the present case I find it necessary to react, since I consider this the result of unfair competition on the part of certain musical circles in Germany who are trying to create an effective weapon against me and the expansion of my music in Germany, as well as in countries where the voice of the German press may have a certain influence.

Since this incident seemed to be part of an ongoing "organized campaign," he hoped that the ambassador would "intervene with the German authorities in order to defend my interests as a French citizen and musician, interests that are being severely damaged.

211. Given the interest in Nordic music in Nazi Germany, it is not surprising that Sibelius was among those awarded the Goethe prize by Hitler in 1935 (Levi, _Music in the Third Reich_, 35 n. 29). In a series of recordings offered for sale to its members by Rosenberg’s NS-Kulturgemeinde between 1936 and 1937, contemporary music was represented by a single work, _Finlandia_ (ibid., 146).

212. Stravinsky to Strecker, 27 May 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:265). The Braunschweig performance actually took place on 26 May.

213. Stravinsky to Isidor Philipp, 30 May 1938 (PSS): "Sachant que vous connaissez personnellement notre Ambassadeur à Berlin, Monsieur François-Poncet, je me permets de vous demander de porter à sa connaissance ce qui suit." On the same day, Stravinsky sent Strecker a copy of his letter to Philipp, written "after a conversation with him (and following your letter of the 28th)" (PSS; translation after SSC 3:266, which mistakenly gives "our conversation with him"). Strecker’s letter of 28 May to Stravinsky seems not to have survived. Stravinsky was well acquainted with the pianist, with whom both he and his son Soulima had studied (Charles M. Joseph, _Stravinsky Inside Out_ [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001], 79).

214. Stravinsky to Philipp, 30 May 1938: "J’ai eu la désagréable surprise d’apprendre des journaux allemands parvenus ici que mon activité musicale et ma personne même y sont présentés au public d’une façon absolument inadmissible. En toute autre circonstance je n’aurais pas prêté attention à une pareille manifestation. Mais dans le cas présent j’éprouve la nécessité de réagir puisque je considère ceci comme le résultat d’une concurrence déloyale de certains milieux musicaux allemands qui tachent de créer une arme efficace contre moi et l’expansion de ma musique en Allemagne ainsi que dans les pays où la voix de la presse allemande peut avoir une certaine
Philipp agreed to send a registered letter to François-Poncet the same day, enclosing a copy of Stravinsky’s letter. He also gave the composer a letter of introduction to Jean Marx, an “important functionary” (“un gros fonctionnaire”) in the Department of Political and Commercial Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris. Stravinsky met with Marx that very day. At the latter’s request, he followed up their meeting with a “short sketch of the affair that was the object of our conversation.” After describing the exhibition and quoting from reviews that had appeared in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* and the *Berliner Zeitung am Mittag*, Stravinsky repeated the charge of “unfair competition”: “instances of such hostile acts against me and my music recur repeatedly in recent years, and seem to be part of a well-organized and well-executed campaign.” As shown by the caption under his portrait, he continued, his enemies even “tried to imply” that he was a Jew: “knowing the unfortunate significance of this question in Germany, I consider this an attempt to create an effective weapon against me and my work to which I cannot remain indifferent.” Marx arranged for a diplomatic note to be sent by the French embassy in Berlin to the German Foreign Affairs Office. It stressed the contradiction between Stravinsky’s portrayal in Düsseldorf and the brilliant success of one of his stage works in the German capital that winter (i.e., the Staatsoper’s production of *Le baiser de la fée*).

Stravinsky next turned to Henri Jourdan of the French Institute in Berlin. He demanded from the Reichsmusikkammer, “which organized this exhibi-

---

215. Stravinsky to Strecker, 30 May 1938 (PSS). In his reply of 4 June 1938 François-Poncet assured Philipp that Stravinsky could count on his support (PSS).

216. Stravinsky to Strecker, 30 May 1938. Philipp’s letter of introduction (dated “lundi” [i.e., 30 May]) is preserved at PSS, along with an envelope addressed to Monsieur Marx, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères.

217. Ibid.: “Comme suite à notre entretien d’hier et suivant votre désir, je m’empresse de vous donner ci-après un bref aperçu de la question qui était l’objet de notre entretien.”

218. Ibid.: “Je suis venu à cette conclusion, vu que les cas de pareilles actions hostiles envers moi et ma musique se répètent régulièrement ces dernières années et présentent l’aspect d’une campagne bien organisée et suivie. Comme le prouve l’inscription sous mon portrait, mes adversaires ne s’arrêtent même pas devant des insinuations contraires à la vérité. A maintes reprises, on a essayé de me faire passer pour un juif . . . [S]achant l’importance que cette question a malheureusement en Allemagne, je considère cela comme une tentative de créer une arme efficace contre moi et mon oeuvre, ce à quoi je ne puis rester indifférent.”

219. Marx to Stravinsky, 14 June 1938 (PSS). The diplomatic note from the French embassy (Pol. II 1742) was dated 15 June 1938; two days later a second memorandum (No. 381) was sent. (This information is contained in a letter of 22 July 1938 from the German Foreign Office to the French embassy, to be discussed below.)
tion [sic],” a statement (“déclaration efficace”) acknowledging its mistake not only in placing him “in the category of ‘Entartete Musik,”’ but also in sanctioning the “provocative doubts” concerning his origins.220 After meeting with the French ambassador, Jourdan replied, noting dryly that “in general the Reich does not volunteer public apologies,” but assuring Stravinsky that the ambassador and he would insist.221

“[Jourdan] thinks that I may expect a letter of apology within the next two weeks,” Stravinsky reported to Strecker toward the end of June.222 A month later, having heard nothing, he wrote again to Jourdan. “This two-month silence,” he complained to Strecker on the same day, “is already somewhat alarming.”223 Jourdan replied the following week, summarizing (in French) the official reply sent by the German Foreign Affairs Office to the French embassy.224 Stravinsky was also sent a full translation of the official reply by the Quai d’Orsay, though he did not receive a copy of the German original until September.225 Dated 22 July, it reads:

On the occasion of the opening of the “Degenerate Music” exhibition in Düsseldorf it was expressly pointed out that the exhibition was not directed against individual artists, but only against certain artistic directions. The choice of the materials for the exhibition, which has since ended, was the result of a purely professional viewpoint. The composer Igor Stravinsky was represented only as one of the pioneers of a certain musical orientation, atonality.

The very fact stated in the French embassy’s diplomatic note . . . , that during the early months of 1938 a work of Igor Stravinsky’s was performed for quite some time in Berlin, proves that the exhibition intended to condemn neither the person of Igor Stravinsky nor his work as a whole.226

220. Stravinsky to Jourdan, 16 June 1938 (PSS): “qui avait organisé cette exposition, reconnaissant son erreur de m’avoir mis dans la catégorie de l’ENTARTETE MUSIK et d’avoir sanctionné des doutes provocants sur mon origine formulés en bas d’une reproduction de mon portrait par J. E. Blanche.”
221. Jourdan to Stravinsky, 23 June 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:268 n. 87). Jourdan enclosed several photographs of the exhibition.
222. Stravinsky to Strecker, 25 June 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:268). Concerned about possible fallout, Strecker asked to be kept informed, adding that “a great deal depends upon the response that [Jourdan] promises” (Strecker to Stravinsky, 27 June 1938; translation from SSC 3:268 n. 87); clearly uneasy, Strecker repeated his request in his letters of 2, 6, 13, and 27 July (PSS).
223. Stravinsky to Strecker, 29 July 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:269). Stravinsky seems not to have kept a copy of his letter to Jourdan. On 4 July the composer had had a visit from Jourdan, who hoped for “a positive reaction of some sort” by the middle of the month (Stravinsky to Strecker, 4 July 1938 [PSS]; translation from SSC 3:268).
224. Jourdan to Stravinsky, 4 August 1938 (PSS).
225. The letter to Stravinsky from the French embassy containing a copy of the official German reply is dated 21 September (PSS).
226. Auswärtiges Amt to the French embassy (Berlin), 22 July 1938 (PSS): “Anlässlich der Eröffnung der Ausstellung ‘Entartete Musik’ in Düsseldorf ist ausdrücklich darauf hingewiesen
This is clearly not the apology that had been demanded. But although Jourdan regretted that the statement failed to address the “painful exhibition of your portrait” (i.e., the racial slur), he felt that it implied a “benevolent neutrality” on the part of the authorities. Stravinsky replied that though the response was “not all that we had hoped for, it is nonetheless a dissembled avowal of their gaffe.” To Strecker he wrote that it inspired hope that he would not suffer further “humiliation” in the future. “This,” he commented, “is something.” It is astonishing that in later years Stravinsky chose to forget entirely the German statement, in pursuit of which he had expended so much time and energy: “I lodged a protest with the French Ambassador in Berlin, M. François-Poncet [sic],” he noted, “but nothing came of it.”

Many German musicians, and not only those conductors and theater directors who had made possible his German “rehabilitation,” shared Stravinsky’s dismay at his inclusion in the Düsseldorf exhibition. In fact, worden, daß die Ausstellung sich nicht gegen einzelne Künstler richte, sondern nur gegen bestimmte Kunstrichtungen. Die Auswahl des Materials der inzwischen beendeten Ausstellung erfolgte nach rein fachlichen Gesichtspunkten. Der Komponist Igor Strawinsky war nur als einer der Wegbereiter einer bestimmten musikalischen Richtung, der Atonalität, vertreten.

“Gerade die von der Französischen Botschaft in ihre Verbalnote . . . angeführte Tatsache, daß noch während der ersten Monate des Jahres 1938 ein Werk Igor Strawinskys in Berlin längere Zeit hindurch zur Aufführung gelangte, beweist, daß weder die Person noch das Schaffen Igor Strawinskys in seiner Gesamtheit durch die Ausstellung abgelehnt werden sollte.” (In his letter of 4 August to Stravinsky, Jourdan noted that the statement had been received by the French embassy on 26 July [PSS].)

227. Jourdan to Stravinsky, 4 August 1938. The quotations are from Stravinsky’s letter of 6 August to Strecker, in which he includes lengthy excerpts from Jourdan’s letter (PSS; translation from SSC 3:270). Stravinsky comments, “If we can count on a ‘benevolent neutrality’ . . ., we must now determine how to make the most of this” (translation from SSC 3:270).

228. Stravinsky to Jourdan, 6 August 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:270 n. 90).

229. Stravinsky to Strecker, 6 August 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:270). Strecker was less sanguine. On 9 August, having read only Stravinsky’s excerpts of the French summary, he urged the composer to try to obtain the original text—or, “if this is not available, an official letter” (“oder, wenn dies unmöglich ist, einen Brief als offizielle Unterlage”), along with permission to quote it, should the need arise (PSS). (The translation of this sentence in SSC 3:270 n. 90 is inaccurate.) This letter, Strecker continued, need only indicate that “neither your person nor your work has been denounced and you may count on a benevolent neutrality” (translation from SSC 3:270 n. 90). That Strecker was not optimistic that Stravinsky would obtain either is clear from his letter of 31 August to Hans Rosbaud (Schott’s). Stravinsky was attempting to obtain “a completely unambiguous statement” (“eine restlos klare Stellungnahme”), Strecker wrote, but he doubted the composer would receive anything further.

230. Stravinsky and Craft, Themes and Episodes, 36. (With minor wording changes, the statement also appears in the revised edition: Stravinsky, Themes and Conclusions, 44–45.)

231. While Jourdan’s comment in his letter of 4 August that all German musicians were distressed by the denunciation of Stravinsky is clearly an exaggeration, many Germans, including some who supported the “educational” thrust of the Düsseldorf exhibition, deplored the stridency with which its ultraconservative organizers went about achieving their aim. The dismay of conductors and theater directors who—without arousing official objection—had recently presented Stravinsky’s music to appreciative audiences is noted in Richard Ohlekopf, “Entartete Musik,” Signale für die musikalische Welt 96 (1938): 374–75.
although the composer seems never to have learned of it, in mid-June the Prussian Academy of Arts came to the defense of its honorary member. The date, 19 June, suggests that members of the Academy had already learned of the French embassy’s protest, which had been lodged in Berlin just days before.²³² At a meeting of the Senate and Music Department, Fritz Stein, the director of Berlin’s Musikhochschule, noting that international relations would suffer if an artist of Stravinsky’s stature were subjected to public judgment of this sort, moved that the Academy lodge a protest with Bernhard Rust, the Prussian (and Reich) minister of education; the Senate voted to sustain the motion.²³³ The Academy’s action may have helped convince the Foreign Office to issue, if not the desired apology, at least a halfhearted explanation.

Stravinsky’s hope that the Düsseldorf “gaaffe” would not be repeated turned out to be in vain, for the “Entartete Musik” exhibition was not confined to that city. Its predecessor, the “Entartete Kunst” exhibition, subsequently went on tour throughout the Reich, and during its appearances in Weimar, Vienna, Frankfurt, and Chemnitz in the spring and summer of 1939 it incorporated material from the “Entartete Musik” exhibition.²³⁴ There is documentary evidence that Stravinsky was included in at least two of these venues.

In his lengthy report on the exhibition as it appeared in Weimar, the critic Otto Reuter noted that it included Hermann Scherchen, who, he sneered, “treated us to Stravinsky’s Histoire du soldat” during the Bauhaus period.²³⁵ His racial attack on the composer he saved for his final sentences: “For anyone who has eyes to see and ears to hear, the ‘Stravinsky problem,’ which caused a real sensation in Düsseldorf, is solved. Whoever saw these unadulterated

²³². That the embassy’s protest became widely known in German musical circles is clear from Strecker’s letter of 21 September 1938 to the composer: “Quite a few people are well informed by word of mouth about your negotiations” (“Von Ihren Verhandlungen ist man ziemlich überall mündlich unterrichtet”) (PSS). Stravinsky’s election to the Akademie der Künste, Sektion für Musik, had been announced on page 242 of the April 1928 issue of the Zeitschrift für Musik (“Persönliches”).


²³⁴. The dates of the combined exhibitions are as follows: Weimar, 23 March to 24 April; Vienna, 5 May to 18 June; Frankfurt, 30 June to 30 July; and Chemnitz, scheduled for 11 August to 10 September, but cut short after the outbreak of war. See Christoph Zuschlag, “An ‘Educational Exhibition’: The Precursors of Entartete Kunst and Its Individual Venues,” in “Degenerate Art,” ed. Barron, 90 and 95. Albrecht Dümmling states that the “Entartete Musik” exhibition had also been planned for Munich (“‘Entartete Musik,’” 90), but there seems to be no proof that it was actually shown there.

pictures will no longer believe that he comes from ‘an old noble Russian family.’ ” Following the Weimar appearance the combined exhibition was shown in Vienna’s Künstlerhaus, where patrons could hear, as illustrations of “degenerate” music, recordings of Histoire, Schoenberg’s Serenade, Op. 24, and Hindemith’s dance pantomime, Der Dämon.236 Since Stravinsky was included in Weimar and Vienna, it seems reasonable to assume that he was also part of the exhibition in Frankfurt and Chemnitz. Indeed, in its final venue a reviewer, without actually mentioning his inclusion, referred to “Strawisky” (sic) as a “degenerate” composer.237

Given the widespread dismay caused by Stravinsky’s inclusion in the Düsseldorf exhibition, one might have expected that he would have been quietly dropped from the subsequent showings. In the case of at least one composer, this did in fact happen. Hermann Reutter, who in 1936 had replaced Wetzelsberger as director of Frankfurt’s Hoch Conservatory, was originally included on a prominently displayed list of “degenerate” composers, but his name was dropped when the exhibition traveled to Weimar.238 Reutter later recalled that music of his had also been planned for inclusion in Düsseldorf, and that it took the intervention of the mayor (in storm-trooper uniform) to have it removed from the display case.239 Similarly, paintings by a number of artists, including the war heroes August Macke and Franz Marc, as well as prominent foreigners Piet Mondrian and Edvard Munch, were removed from the “Entartete Kunst” exhibition after it reached Berlin.240 That Stravinsky, a renowned composer and an honorary member of the Prussian Academy of Arts, remained part of the traveling “Entartete Musik” exhibition suggests

236. “Jüdischer Kunstdilettantismus. Entartete Malerei, Plastik, Lyrik und Musik im Künstlerhaus,” Volks-Zeitung, 6 May 1939. Thus it is very likely that Histoire was among the “degenerate” works that patrons could also sample in the other venues—including Düsseldorf.

237. Chemnitzer Neueste Nachrichten, 10 August 1939. (I am indebted to Christoph Zuschlag for this information, as well as for photocopies of the newspaper articles referred to in the previous two notes above.) Stravinsky seems never to have learned of this further “humiliation.” Although reports of the traveling exhibition seem to have been confined to the local press (Zuschlag, “An ‘Educational Exhibition,’ ” 90), Strecker must surely have been informed. If so, he took care not to enlighten the composer.

238. Erwin Kroll, “Verbotene Musik,” Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte 7 (1959): 314. Reutter’s music had long been the object of attack by ultraconservatives. On 10 February 1933, for example, the Volksischer Beobachter claimed that it contained “all of the characteristics in order to be placed in the category [of] bolshevism in music” (quoted in Steinweis, Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany, 140).

239. See Albrecht Richtmüller, “Komposition im Deutschen Reich um 1936,” Archiv für Musikwissenschaft 38 (1981): 271. The inclusion of music by Hugo Distler in the exhibition was similarly thwarted. See Klaus L. Neumann’s entry on that composer in The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, 2d ed. (2001), 7:382–83, at 382. Reutter’s recollection that his music was removed from the case before the exhibition opened is apparently faulty, for contemporary observers noted the inclusion of his choral work, Der neue Hiob. See the articles reproduced in Dümling and Girth, eds., Entartete Musik, 194–95.

that his enemies were still influential. Despite the protests of highly placed supporters, in the eyes of hardcore conservatives Stravinsky remained “degenerate.”

“Your standing is entirely restored”

As the 1938/39 season was about to get under way, Strecker informed Stravinsky that Düsseldorf had canceled the production of Firebird originally scheduled for that autumn. “This may be a purely local move,” he wrote, “since it would undoubtedly be a little strange for a performance to take place so soon afterwards in the very city in which the exhibition was held.”

Indeed, few cities followed Düsseldorf’s lead, such that toward the end of September Strecker could assure Stravinsky that the exhibition seemed “already to have been forgotten.” While many conductors were still fearful of programming his music, Strecker noted, Jeu de cartes—the highlight of the 1937/38 season—had just been performed at Leipzig Radio and was soon to be played at Munich Radio and in Karlsruhe (also in concert). The Firebird suite was to be performed at Berlin Radio and in Wiesbaden; the Dumbarton Oaks Concerto, Stravinsky’s newest work, was planned for Mainz and Münster; and Furtwängler intended to conduct Le baiser de la fée (i.e., Divertimento) in Berlin.

The fact that Stravinsky’s music was now occasionally broadcast is significant, for since 1933 German Radio had pursued a cautious course with regard to Stravinsky, neither supporting his music nor banning it outright. True, in July 1934 the radio authorities had declared that there was in principle no objection to his music, but the fact that they did not provide guidelines concerning which works were acceptable did little to encourage performances. And indeed, despite the attention paid to Stravinsky’s music after 1936, radio performances were to remain relatively rare. In 1936/37 the composer was even

241. Strecker to Stravinsky, 1 August 1938 (PSS): “Es kann dies eine rein örtliche Maßnahme sein, da es zweifellos etwas grotesk ist, daß gerade in dieser Stadt, in der die Ausstellung stattgefunden hat, so bald darauf eine Aufführung stattfindet.”

242. Strecker to Stravinsky, 21 September 1938 (PSS; translation from SSC 3:270 n. 91, where the date of the letter is incorrectly given as 21 November). The final sentence of the published excerpt (concerning Stravinsky’s protest) is also misleading: “you have achieved the desired effect, even if the written German response was not all that it might have been” (SSC 3:271 n. 91; emphasis added). The final phrase should read “even without the written document” (“auch schon ohne schriftliche Unterlagen”). Stravinsky still had not received the official German reply, which (as noted above) was sent to him by the French embassy that very day.

243. Not Karlsruhe, as given in SSC 3:271 n. 91.

244. Strecker’s ambiguous wording, “Das ‘Concerto’ wird in Mainz und in Münster durch Rosbaud aufgeführt,” is responsible for the incorrect statement in SSC 3:271 n. 91: “Rosbaud is conducting the Concerto in Mainz and Münster.” The Mainz performance was conducted by Zwißler.
included on a blacklist issued by Reichssender Berlin. That the proscription in his case was not a blanket one, however, is indicated by an annotation, “For further particulars check with [Reichssendeleiter Otto] Frickhoeffer” (“Rückfrage zu halten bei Frickhoeffer”)—yet another example of the lack of clear guidelines that frustrated Stravinsky’s supporters.

On 19 October 1938, in the opening concert of the 1938/39 season, the successful German premiere of the Dumbarton Oaks Concerto was given under Karl Maria Zwirler’s direction in Mainz—a fitting location, since during the previous season (as we have seen) this little city had successfully presented more of Stravinsky’s music than any other in Germany. Even the stridently anti-modernist Zeitschrift für Musik was impressed with the work, declaring the second movement in particular “ein kleines Meisterwerk.” Rosbaud also included the Dumbarton Oaks Concerto in his plans for Münster that season. At the end of August Strecker had informed Rosbaud of the “assurance” (“Zusicherung”) that “Friend Igor” had received from the authorities. Though the response was less than Strecker would have wished, Stravinsky’s music was, he reported, “not banned and may be performed. In my opinion, further enquiries are unnecessary.” Rosbaud was to let him know if he met with any “difficulties.” Rosbaud’s reply reveals the frustration frequently experienced by German musicians who supported modern music. “The Stravinsky affair is characteristic,” he wrote. “No one wants to take the responsibility—a straight answer is nowhere to be found.” His method of late was to ask no more questions “and simply to ignore unofficial reports or attempts at exhibitions of ‘degenerate art.’ ” Perhaps recalling his lack of success

245. The list is reproduced in Rathkolb, Führertreu und gottbegnadet, 26–31.
246. Prior to the rehearsals, Zwirler sent Stravinsky a list of twenty-seven (!) questions about the concerto, to which the composer dutifully replied (letters of 7 and 10 October 1938 [PSS]). On 6 November Zwirler reported that the public had been enthusiastic and the press excellent (PSS).
247. An excerpt from this review was included in Schott’s advertisement for the recently published score in the Neues Musikblatt, December 1938, 14. Ironically, the concerto met with considerable disparagement in certain quarters outside Germany. René Leibowitz, for example, attacked Stravinsky for his “insolent borrowing” from Bach (Esprit, 1 July 1938; quoted in White, Stravinsky, 402).
248. Strecker to Rosbaud, 31 August 1938 (Schott’s). Rosbaud almost certainly learned of Stravinsky’s protest concerning the Düsseldorf exhibition from Strecker in Zurich, where both men attended the world premiere of Mathis der Maler on 28 May, and where Strecker received Stravinsky’s letters of 27 and 30 May. On 27 May Stravinsky sent good wishes to both Hindemith and Strecker for the performance (PSS; see SSC 3:266). Rosbaud was the only German conductor to attend the premiere, which was pointedly ignored by the German press.
249. Strecker to Rosbaud, 31 August 1938: “Die Tatsache genügt auf alle Fälle, daß er nicht verboten ist und aufgeführt werden darf. Man hat m.E. keine weiteren Rückfragen nötig. Sollten Sie irgendwelche Schwierigkeiten haben und die Aufführung seines neuen ‘Concertos’ beabsichtigen, so lassen Sie es mich bitte wissen.” Strecker added, “What a pity that Hindemith is ineligible, since he’s writing one masterpiece after the other” (“Schade, daß Hindemith nicht in Frage kommt, denn er schreibt ein Meisterwerk nach dem anderen”).
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at Frankfurt Radio, he added, “It is better that way, especially when one has freedom such as here in Münster.” The following week Strecker complied with Rosbaud’s request for a copy of the score, commenting, “I think your approach—not to ask for too many particulars—is the only one possible.”

For unknown reasons, however, Dumbarton Oaks was not performed in Münster. But at least one performance of the concerto in addition to Zwifler’s German premiere did take place: in March 1939 Hans Schmidt-Isserstedt conducted the work in Hamburg. That same year Schmidt-Isserstedt and the Hamburg Chamber Orchestra made the premiere recording of the work for Telefunken. Further concert performances of Jeu de cartes were given in Bremen, Braunschweig, and Leipzig (Gewandhaus), and at Berlin Radio. Firebird was staged in Leipzig, Dessau, Hamburg, and Duisburg, while Braunschweig offered a new production of Petrushka. Furtwängler performed Divertimento with the Berlin Philharmonic on 12 December 1938 (the only time he conducted music of Stravinsky in Berlin during the Nazi period), and Johann Nepomuk David presented the Leipzig premiere of Symphony of Psalms at the end of November—albeit to mixed reviews.

250. Rosbaud to Strecker, 1 September 1938 (Schott’s): “Die Strawinsky-Angelegenheit ist bezeichnend: niemand will eine Verantwortung übernehmen, klare Stellungnahme ist nirgends zu erreichen. Ich habe mir jetzt angewöhnt, niemanden mehr zu fragen und inoffizielle Mitteilungen oder Ausstellungsversuche mit ‘entarteter Kunst’ einfach zu ignorieren. Man fährt damit am besten, noch dazu wenn man solche Freiheiten hat wie hier in Münster.”

251. Strecker to Rosbaud, 7 September 1938 (Schott’s): “Ihre Einstellung, nicht zuviele Rückfragen zu halten, halte ich für die einzige mögliche.” A score of Dumbarton Oaks had been sent to Rosbaud the previous day.

252. A review of the 10 February 1939 concert indicates that Rosbaud conducted the Pulcinella suite instead (Gerhard Kaschner, “Hinreifende Orchesterleistungen im Musikverein,” Münsterische Zeitung, 11 February 1939). According to H. Ensslin, who reported on the Münster season in the Allgemeine Musikzeitung 66 (1939): 503-4, the performance was a local premiere.

253. The Hamburg performance was announced in the Neues Musikblatt, February 1939, 10. Schott’s royalty statement for the period 10 June 1938 to 1 June 1939 also lists an otherwise unidentified performance in Lübeck (probably by the same forces) (PSS). The recording was issued as Telefunken E2994-5. Zwifler had informed Stravinsky in his letter of 6 November 1938 that he planned to record Dumbarton Oaks for German Radio at the end of the month, but this recording seems not to have been made (PSS).

254. Schott’s royalty statement for the period 10 June 1938 to 1 June 1939. On 28 January 1939 Strecker reported to the composer that “Jeu de cartes was played frequently, and I believe it will turn out to be a real success when the fear of the Kapellmeisters is overcome” (“Jeu de cartes wurde öfter gespielt und ich glaube, es wird ein wirklicher Erfolg werden, wenn die Angst der Kapellmeister überstanden ist”) (PSS).


256. According to royalty sheets from Russischer Musikverlag für 1938 (the final year for which an accounting was sent to the composer), Divertimento was also performed that year in Kiel, Hamburg, and Stettin (PSS). Horst Büttner’s review of the Symphony of Psalms was entirely
Stravinsky’s piano music was featured in at least two recitals that season. Karlrobert Kreiten performed *Three Movements from Petrushka* in Berlin on 13 November 1938, while Kurt Dippner played the Sonata in his Heinrichshofen recital of 9 March 1939. The critic Friedrich Herzfeld praised Kreiten’s “breathtaking” technique and noted approvingly that he was “playing Stravinsky once again.”257 Berlin audiences may also have heard the Concerto for Two Solo Pianos with Hertha Kluge-Kahn and Pál Kiss.258

“I can happily inform you that your standing in Germany is apparently entirely restored,” Strecker reported to Stravinsky at the beginning of 1939. “They play you again, and without any objections.” The full effect would only be noticeable at the beginning of the 1939/40 season, since most programs for 1938/39 had been settled on during the “critical time” of the Düsseldorf exhibition. “Even now you are not officially promoted,” Strecker added, “but if no objections are raised against your works, then the more timid souls will slowly begin to perform you, too.”259 Several cities were interested in staging *Firebird*, Strecker reported ten days later, “among them Düsseldorf!—though only at the beginning of next season.”260 Thus, as theaters and concert organi-

257. Friedrich Herzfeld, “Aus dem Berliner Musikleben,” Allgemeine Musikzeitung 65 (1938): 721. The recital programs are preserved at PSS.

258. See note 140 above. Prieberg claims that the “Berlin premiere” of the concerto took place under the auspices of that city’s Arbeitskreis für Neue Musik, but gives neither date nor performers (Musik im NS-Staat, 298). The work was indeed scheduled by the Berlin new-music group for March 1940 (with pianists Claudio Arrau and Elisabeth Dounias-Sindermann), but it is unlikely that this wartime performance took place. A season prospectus is reproduced in Wolfgang Burde, “Neue Musik im Dritten Reich,” in Kunst. Hochschule. Faschismus. Dokumentation der Vorlesungsreihe an der Hochschule der Künste Berlin im 50. Jahr der Machtergreifung an die Nationalsozialisten, ed. Wolfgang Abramowski et al. (Berlin: Verlag für Ausbildung und Studium in der Elefanten Press, 1984), 58–59. Karlrobert Kreiten was hanged for “defeatism” in September 1943 (see Kater, The Twisted Muse, 221–24). According to Kroll, the pianist Pál Kiss suffered a similar fate (“Verbotene Musik,” 316).


zations looked ahead to the 1939/40 season, the prospects for Stravinsky's music appeared very good. Zwiißer's plans were particularly ambitious. They included *Apollon musagète*, *Oedipus Rex*, and *Sacre*, works that for years had not been staged in Germany. The ever-popular *Firebird* suite was scheduled for Bielefeld (under Werner Gößling), a concert performance of *Petrushka* for Munich (Oswald Kabasta), and *Divertimento* for Essen (Albert Bittner).

The Concerto for Two Solo Pianos was planned for Berlin, as we have seen, and Rosbaud was attempting to secure Soulima Stravinsky for a piano recital in Münster.

Telefunken, for its part, had remained keenly interested in recording Stravinsky's music. In March 1939 Herbert Grenzebach reminded Stravinsky of their discussion regarding *Firebird* and *Petrushka*, which must have taken place the previous year during Stravinsky's visit to Berlin to record *Jeu de cartes.* By June, Grenzebach was hoping to add to the list the much maligned *Sacre*, a work that had not been heard in Germany since November 1934.

“Stricken from the concert programs”

The string of performances that had taken place since 1936 ended when war broke out following Germany’s invasion of Poland on 1 September 1939. On 18 September Peter Raabe, who had succeeded Strauss as president of the Reichsmusikkammer, issued a ban on the music of composers from enemy

261. Zwiißer to Stravinsky, 6 November 1938 (PSS). *Apollon musagète* had received two concert performances in the spring of 1936, however, while a third took place the following year. On 7 April 1936 Hans von Benda reported to the composer that he had conducted the work with his chamber orchestra on 2 April (PSS). He enclosed an otherwise unidentified review by "W. M." ("Wieder einmal Stravinsky. Ein Abend bei Hans von Benda") on which Stravinsky, misinterpreting the date given in Benda’s letter ("2. ds. M.") noted on the review: "Fev. 1936." The second performance was given by the Erlanger Kammerorchester under Erich Limmert and reported in the May 1936 issue of the *Neues Musikblatt* ("Musik und Musiker. Oper und Konzert," p. 10). According to Russischer Musikverlag’s royalty sheets, a third concert performance (otherwise unidentified) took place in Berlin sometime in 1937 (PSS). *Oedipus Rex* had not been performed in Germany since Kassel’s Staatsoper staged the work in November 1932.


264. Grenzebach to Stravinsky, 14 March 1939 (PSS). When Stravinsky was invited to conduct *Petrushka* with de Basil’s Ballet Russe during their 1938 Berlin season, he had hoped that Telefunken would take advantage of his presence to record the work “with the latest technological improvements.” His Columbia recordings, he noted, were now ten years old (Stravinsky to Strecker, 27 February 1938 [PSS]; translation from SSC 3:258).

265. Grenzebach to Strecker, 5 June 1939 (PSS). At Grenzebach’s request, Strecker forwarded the letter to Stravinsky, noting: "Thus you can certainly count on recordings in the spring of 1940, if time and your health allow it" ("Sie können also bestimmt mit Plattenaufnahmen im Frühjahr 1940 rechnen, wenn es Ihre Gesundheit und Zeit erlaubt") (Strecker to Stravinsky, 9 June 1939 [PSS]).
lands. At a “kulturpolitische Pressekonferenz” that took place two days later, specific reference was made to Stravinsky: his name “must be stricken from the concert programs. He is indeed Russian, but has been naturalized in France.” An exception was made for large-scale works already in preparation, but in Stravinsky’s case no one seems to have taken advantage of this provision. Recordings, however, remained available as late as 1942, when the Reichsmusikammer announced that, with a few exceptions such as Chopin and Carmen, “the sale of gramophone records originated by enemy countries, or containing works by authors or performers of enemy status has to cease within the territory of the German Reich.” Even then, a six-month extension was granted in the case of “records containing pre-Bolshevik and French music.”

Stravinsky did not benefit from German record sales during this period. On 2 April 1941 Telefunken informed him that they owed him over a thousand marks in royalties for 1939 and 1940 from his Jeu de cartes recording. Now that restrictions on sending mail to France had been lifted, they requested instructions as to where to send the funds. On learning from Soulima Stravinsky that his father was not in France, Telefunken sent “Friulein Stravinsky” a list of questions. When did Stravinsky leave? Where is he now? Has he acquired citizenship of another country, and if so, which? The royalties were never paid.

“[I] have a lovely new symphony of Stravinsky’s in preparation,” Strecker wrote to Rosbaud shortly before Christmas 1939, “but at present it is unfortunately out of the question for Germany, since Stravinsky is considered French.” Confusion concerning the status of Stravinsky’s music seems to have lingered, however, fed by the sudden (if short-lived) popularity of...
Russian (and even Soviet) music after the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Non-Aggression Pact on 23 August 1939. 272 Although Stravinsky’s naturalization of June 1934 was widely known in Germany, he was still considered a Russian composer; indeed, the perceived Russian (i.e., “national”) character of his music played a crucial role in his acceptance. For this reason it is likely that occasional performances did take place after September 1939. 273 Questions about Stravinsky’s status were apparently still circulating five months into the war, when on 1 February 1940 the president of the Reichsmusikkammer issued a communiqué clarifying the situation: “Several queries prompt me to point out that the Russian composer Igor Stravinsky, who is living in France, is a French citizen.” Thus his music was not to be performed in Germany for the duration of the war. 274

Performances of Stravinsky’s music do seem to have taken place after this date in occupied Paris. The composer himself later noted that “Charles Munch conducted a performance of Sacre at the Paris Conservatoire in 1942.” 275 This must have happened after mid-April of that year, since prior to that date Stravinsky’s racial status had once again become an issue. At this time there was an especially pressing financial concern, for Stravinsky had deposited many of his manuscripts in his Paris bank, and they stood a good chance of being confiscated if he were considered Jewish. 276 Toward the end of 1941, and in accordance with the Statut des Juifs of 2 June of that year, Soulima Stravinsky sent a statement to his father’s bank attesting to Stravinsky’s “Aryan” status. The bank submitted the statement to the authorities, who pronounced

272. But Prieberg is incorrect when he writes that Stravinsky’s music was “especially popular” after the pact was signed (Musik im NS-Staat, 54). His view is echoed by a number of other writers, including Levi, who states that “for a time, Stravinsky was mistakenly identified as a prominent representative of Bolshevik culture” (!) (Music in the Third Reich, 100). Stravinsky himself may be partially responsible for the misunderstanding: “my music was played in Germany up to and even during the war” (Stravinsky and Craft, Themes and Episodes, 36; retained in Stravinsky, Themes and Conclusions, 45).


274. The statement appeared under the title “Stravinsky-Auführungen während des Krieges unzulässig” in the Amtliche Mitteilungen der Reichsmusikkammer 7, no. 2 (15 February 1940): 8. The communiqué was not (as is often stated) an official ban, which, given the earlier pronouncements, would have been redundant.

275. Stravinsky, Themes and Conclusions, 45. See also Prieberg, Musik im NS-Staat, 399.

276. A list of manuscripts held by the Crédit Commercial de France, dated 3 April 1939, is preserved at PSS.
it invalid on the grounds that it did not originate with the composer himself. Only in April 1942 was Stravinsky's racial status finally clarified—after the bank had submitted a copy of the statement Stravinsky had written for Strecker nine years earlier. The letter from the Commissariat Général aux Questions Juives to Stravinsky's bank reads:

I have the honor of informing you that there is no reason to consider M. Igor Stravinsky a Jew. In fact, from the terms of the letter that he addressed on 14 April 1933 to M. Willy Strecker (of which you sent me a photocopy) it follows that his parents belonged to the Russian nobility and were of the Orthodox religion. Besides, neither his surname nor his given name, specifically Russian, establishes against him a presumption of Jewish origin.

Conclusion

By the late 1920s Stravinsky's music had become an established part of the German new-music scene, with the composer being accorded enormous respect by German audiences and critics alike. But because of his high profile, Stravinsky became a lightning rod for anti-modernist opposition. This opposition was to be decisive in the early Nazi period, when the Rosenberg camp took advantage of the general xenophobia to wage a successful intimidation campaign against both the composer and his music. This situation gradually changed as domestic circumstances became more settled. The agents of this change were Stravinsky's German supporters, encouraged and prodded by both Strecker and the composer himself. But for champions of modern music, Nazi Germany's cultural life was a minefield, and Stravinsky's personal appearance, in particular, remained a potentially explosive issue. With the significant exception of the first Baden-Baden festival, lingering opposition (or fear of arousing it) prevented performing engagements, and radio broadcasts of Stravinsky's music, in stark contrast to the Weimar era, remained relatively rare. Still, public performances were widespread throughout Germany after 1936. There were premieres of all of Stravinsky's major works of the 1930s, including two separate productions of the rarely staged Perséphone and the

277. Soulima Stravinsky to Crédit Commercial de France, 8 December 1941; and Commissariat Général aux Questions Juives to Crédit Commercial de France, 3 January 1942 (a copy was sent by the bank to Soulima Stravinsky on 7 January) (PSS).

278. A typed, undated copy of this letter from the Commissariat Général aux Questions Juives to Crédit Commercial de France was sent to Soulima Stravinsky by the bank on 14 April 1942 (PSS): "j'ai l'honneur de vous informer qu'il n'y a pas lieu de considérer M. IGOR STRAWINSKY comme juif. Il résulte en effet, des termes de la lettre (dont vous m'envoyez la photocopie) qu'il a adressée le 14 avril 1933 à monsieur WILLY STRECKER, que ses parents appartenaient à la noblesse russe et étaient de religion orthodoxe. En outre, ni son nom ni son prénom, spécifiquement russes, n'établissent contre lui une présomption d'origine juive."
prestigious European stage premiere of *Jeu de cartes*, while Telefunken provided the earliest recordings of both *Jeu de cartes* and the *Dumbarton Oaks* Concerto. And although Stravinsky’s music disappeared from German concert stages and opera houses during the war years, Schott’s continued to publish his scores, which, like those of Hindemith, remained in the firm’s catalog throughout the Nazi period. Thus in the early postwar period, when Hans Rosbaud and other like-minded conductors set out to reintroduce German audiences to the international world of modern music, Stravinsky’s recent scores, unlike those of Schoenberg or Weill, for example, were close at hand. Thanks to the contacts that had been maintained throughout the Nazi era, the music of Stravinsky was ready to assume a leading role in the musical life of postwar Germany.

Unencumbered as he was by political scruples, it is hardly surprising that after the Nazi takeover Stravinsky wished to continue enjoying the artistic and financial gains that German performances had brought him. But he was not the only prominent foreign composer to profit from performances in Nazi Germany. An instructive example is provided by the case of Béla Bartók. Given his reputation as “easily the most outspoken antifascist” of the modernist composers, it comes as a surprise to learn that Bartók encouraged German performances of his music after 1933—although, lacking Stravinsky’s high profile (and useful German contacts), his music never reached the level of performance enjoyed by Stravinsky. Bartók, like Stravinsky, was also interested in obtaining German engagements. His absence from German concert halls after 1933 was not (as is often implied) for ideological reasons, but rather was due to a lack of engagements. Beginning in February 1935, Bartók was for several years involved in negotiations to perform his Second Piano Concerto with the Berlin Philharmonic in the German capital. In 1937, hoping to

280. See, for example, Vera Lampert, “Bartók, Béla,” sec. 5, “Last Years,” in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (1980), 2:203–5. Lampert writes: “The threat of fascism had concerned Bartók from the first, and he felt obliged to protest against it. . . . After the first performance of the Second Piano Concerto under Rosbaud in Frankfurt (23 January 1933) he never again played in Germany” (p. 203). Lampert’s subsequent statement that in 1937 Bartók “forbade broadcasts of his music in Germany and Italy” (ibid.) is also misleading. Bartók refused to allow transmission of his piano performances over German or Italian radio because neither organization had offered him performing engagements.
combine the proposed Berlin Philharmonic performance with a visit to the Baden-Baden festival, Bartók accepted an invitation to attend the German première of his Music for Strings, Percussion and Celesta, scheduled for 21 March in the spa town. Only when the on-again, off-again Berlin engagement was once again postponed did he cancel his plans to attend the festival.\(^{282}\) Although Bartók categorically (and famously) refused to supply his publishers with proof of his “Aryan” status, he did not allow his convictions to stand in the way of his German prospects. Not until the Anschluss brought the fascist menace close to home did Bartók realize that “there could be no modus vivendi with the Nazis.”\(^{283}\)

A familiar anecdote recounts Bartók’s reaction to the “Entartete Musik” exhibition, in which, as a citizen of a friendly nation, the Hungarian composer did not appear. When Bartók learned of the event, the story goes, he lodged a protest, demanding to be included with his “degenerate” colleagues. Although this “protest” has become a standard item of Bartókiana, there seems to be no evidence that it ever took place. The earliest account is apparently that found in Joseph Wulf’s Musik im Dritten Reich, where, significantly, it appears without documentation; subsequent writers have been content to accept it on face value.\(^{284}\) Bartók’s papers contain no evidence of such a provocative gesture,\(^{285}\) one that might well have resulted in a German ban on performances of his music. And performances there certainly were. The German première of Music for Strings, Percussion and Celesta, for example, was followed by well over a dozen performances of the work—more than in any other country during the composer’s lifetime. Interestingly, at least three of

\(^{282}\) Breuer, “Bartók im Dritten Reich,” 273. Bartók learned of Furtwängler’s Berlin première of Music for Strings, Percussion and Celesta (31 January 1938) just days before the concert. Had he known in time, the composer wrote to Universal Edition from Luxembourg on 29 January, he might have been able to return home via Berlin in order to attend the performance (ibid., 274). The Baden-Baden performance was but the second performance of the work, whose world première had taken place in Basel exactly two months earlier.

\(^{283}\) Ibid., 279. As Breuer reminds us elsewhere, the composer’s well-known statements denouncing fascism were made after the Anschluss (“Bartók and the Third Reich,” 134).

\(^{284}\) Wulf, Musik im Dritten Reich, 372 n. 1.

\(^{285}\) Personal communication with János Breuer, Budapest, 19 October 1995.
these performances took place during the war years: Frankfurt (1940), Dresden (1941), and Berlin (1943).\textsuperscript{286} It is deeply ironic that while the music of the reactionary Stravinsky was banned in wartime Germany, music by the antifascist Hungarian was performed—even after the United States, Bartók's new homeland, entered the conflict.

Stravinsky's and Bartók's desire for German performances was shared by many of their non-German colleagues. Indeed, after the xenophobic early years of the Nazi regime, Germany became something of a magnet for foreign musicians with the necessary racial and political prerequisites. That Germany wanted to resume its contact with international artistic circles was clearly articulated by the country's leading music critics at the time of the first Baden-Baden festival. "The German Volk had to cleanse itself of the intolerable infiltration of foreign elements," explained Friedrich Baser, but it was now ready to resume "on a healthy basis" its mission as "artistic intermediary" to its neighbors.\textsuperscript{287} And how better to signal a readiness to resume cultural relations with one's neighbors than by welcoming foreign composers back to Germany? The extent to which the music of these composers contributed to the cultural life of Nazi Germany remains largely unexamined. A telling example, however, is provided by the annual festivals in Baden-Baden. From 1936 until the outbreak of war, a total of thirty-one foreign composers from seventeen countries were represented. To mention only the best known, these included, in addition to Stravinsky and Bartók: Henry Barraud, JeanFrançois, Jean Rivier, and Florent Schmitt (France); Alfredo Casella, G. F. Malipiero, and Ermanno Wolf-Ferrari (Italy); Conrad Beck and Othmar Schoeck (Switzerland); Arnold Bax and Arthur Bliss (England); Lars-Erik Larsson (Sweden); Marcel Poot (Belgium); Knudage Riisager (Denmark); Miklós Rózsa (Hungary); Josip Slavenski (Yugoslavia); and Bohuslav Martinů (Czechoslovakia).\textsuperscript{288}

What was it about the recent music of Stravinsky, Bartók, and other foreign composers that made it suitable for performance in the New Germany? Contrary to still-prevalent assumptions, there was no single, overarching policy toward new music shared by all Nazi cultural authorities. As was typical in other administrative areas of the Third Reich, music policy was the concern of

\textsuperscript{286} Breuer, “Bartók im Dritten Reich,” 283–84 ("Anhang B") provides a list of German performances of \textit{Music for Strings, Percussion and Celesta}; eight further performances took place in occupied lands (ibid., 271).


\textsuperscript{288} See Joan Evans, ‘‘International with National Emphasis’: The \textit{Internationales Zeitgenössisches Musikfest} in Baden-Baden, 1936–1939,” in \textit{Music and Nazism: Art Under Tyranny, 1933–1945}, ed. Michael H. Kater and Albrecht Riemüller (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 2003), 102–13. Many, if not most, of the foreign composers involved attended the festivals. At the 1936 festival, for example, fifteen of the nineteen (German and foreign) composers represented were present.
functionaries operating within an often bewildering array of competing fiefdoms. The unsurprising result was a situation “riddled with ambiguities, compromises and inconsistencies.” For example, although a tonal orientation was called for and the influence of that Nazi bugaboo “Negro jazz” was grounds for rejection, exceptions did occur. As Kater has shown, a “small, comparatively modernizing trend” benefited the “atonal” composers (and former Schoenberg students) Winfried Zillig and Paul von Klenau. Similarly, works by Boris Blacher that made use of jazz-like inflections were widely performed, though seldom without controversy. What was certainly agreed upon in the “struggle for modernity in music” was the primary importance of the composer’s racial background and political views. Hard-core ideologues were content that new music be written in a late nineteenth-century, neo-Brahmsian style, but less hidebound Nazi leaders agreed with the demand of “culture czar” Goebbels that composers write music that was “modern but not un-German.” Though Goebbels was no more able to articulate specific directives for “acceptably modern” music than were other leading authorities, it is clear that the German composer was expected to develop a modern-oriented yet tonally based musical language, one whose roots were firmly anchored in the country’s glorious musical tradition.

Given the importance of tonal orientation and “national” character, it is not surprising that Bartók’s music occasioned relatively little protest in Nazi Germany, for the works of his that were most often performed were precisely those in which a relationship to folk roots is most explicit. This is clear from the (preliminary) list of German performances of Bartók’s music compiled by János Breuer, in which the composer’s orchestral arrangements of the Romanian Folkdances and the Hungarian Peasant Songs are ubiquitous. Bartók’s music was featured at two of the international festivals in Baden-Baden. Significantly, Music for Strings, Percussion and Celesta (1937) garnered praise for its “most convincing national character,” while the Five Hungarian Folksongs, performed the following year, were praised as “model examples of artistically refined and embellished national art.” Indeed, a marked “na-

291. Ibid., 177.
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“national” character, as revealed in the use of folk-related elements, can be discerned in many of the foreign works performed at Baden-Baden (a point noted with obvious satisfaction by German critics). This is hardly surprising, for much of the music written in the 1930s, both within and outside Germany, employed a tonally oriented, lightly dissonant style, often indebted to folk music. Whether, or to what extent, foreign composers allowed the attraction of German performances to temper their more modernist tendencies is thus difficult to determine. What is certain is that a more accessible style permitted many foreign composers to find an audience for their music in Hitler’s Germany. It also made feasible, after the early Nazi years, Germany’s attempts to reconnect with the international musical world.

As for Stravinsky, we have already noted that critics stressed the “national” orientation of his music. Indeed, “national” arguments on his behalf appeared in both the conservative and the official Nazi press. The strongest of these was written by Richard Ohlekopf, editor of the conservative Signale für die musikalische Welt. In a lead article, Ohlekopf, attacking head-on the charge of “internationalism” that had resurfaced at the “Degenerate Music” exhibition, argued that Stravinsky’s instrumentation, themes, and rhythms all revealed the “national” origins of his music. Stravinsky had indeed been influenced by Paris, Ohlekopf admitted, but at heart he was “fundamentally Russian” (“Ur-Russe”). That German audiences instinctively understood this, he claimed, was evident from the wide popularity of Stravinsky’s music. Das Volk had thus pronounced the verdict, and it had done so “out of a healthy instinct for the national character of this music.”

Ohlekopf’s defense was followed by similar support from Herbert Gerigk, writing in the Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte. Like Ohlekopf, Gerigk argued for a “national” origin for Stravinsky’s music. Given that his comments appeared in an official party periodical, it is not surprising that he prefaced the “national” argument with references to Stravinsky’s “Aryan” background and acceptable political stance. Significantly, his wording—“Stravinsky has always clearly declared himself politically against both communism and liberalism”—echoed the composer’s statement of 14 April 1933, which

pointed out the “atonal” environment of Music for Strings, Percussion and Celesta. For his part, Friedrich Herzog accused Bartók of setting out to destroy all bridges to the past. Bartók’s “intellectual constructions,” Herzog sneered, are as empty as those of “the Jew Schoenberg” (Friedrich W. Herzog, “Europäische Musik in Baden. Das II. Internationale zeitgenössische Musikfest in Baden-Baden,” Die Musik 29 [1936/37]: 497).


suggests that a copy of this by now familiar document was on file at the Amt Rosenberg.296

An examination of the position occupied by Stravinsky's music in Nazi Germany provides a useful case study in the ongoing attempt to illuminate what is still a murky corner of twentieth-century music history. Recent researches have contributed much to our understanding of the place of music in Nazi Germany. But little attention has so far been given to the role played by the music of foreign composers in the country's cultural life. Chief among those composers was Igor Stravinsky. Though pockets of opposition continued to exist throughout the Nazi period, after the early years his music gradually assumed a significant role. This was due in large part to his many German supporters, whose efforts were encouraged by the composer himself. Stravinsky's acceptance was also aided by the greater accessibility of his 1930s works, most of which were performed—and well received—in Germany. Stravinsky was certainly not the only foreign composer to benefit from German performances during the Nazi period. But as the most prominent and influential musical modernist, against whom no racial or political objection could be maintained, he was—until war intervened—the chief beneficiary of Germany's desire to rebuild bridges with its neighbors, and thus to regain its traditional position as a leading musical power.
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Abstract

This investigation of the reception in Nazi Germany of the work (and person) of Igor Stravinsky offers new insights into the issue of modern music in Hitler’s Germany. As the most prominent modernist composer of the period, Stravinsky was the chief beneficiary of Germany’s desire, after the xenophobic early Nazi years, to rejoin the European cultural community. Thanks to the determination of his supporters, and aided by the greater accessibility of his 1930s works, Stravinsky’s music achieved a significant position in the musical life of the New Germany, which it maintained until the outbreak of war. Modern-minded critics articulated the ideological basis for his “rehabilitation”: although rooted in a foreign musical tradition, Stravinsky was an “Aryan” composer with acceptable political views, whose tonally based music revealed suitably “national” qualities.

Many foreign composers, including the antifascist Béla Bartók, shared Stravinsky’s desire for German performances. Whether they allowed this to temper their modernist tendencies is difficult to determine. What is certain is that their tonally based music allowed many (racially and politically acceptable) foreign composers to find an audience in Nazi Germany. It also made feasible Germany’s desire to reconnect with the larger musical world.