Introduction

Music after catastrophe

Wolfgang Steinecke and Ludwig Metzger

The idea that music might form a counterpoint to aerial bombardment seems, perhaps, an idea that one might attach to conflicts after 1945, at its most obvious in the famous images of a devastating helicopter attack over a Vietnamese beach to the accompaniment of the 'Ride of the Valkyries' in Francis Ford Coppola's *Apocalypse Now* (1979). Yet, as Lepenies puts it, '[t]he music of Richard Strauss remained, in a curious way, a basso continuo to the ongoing work of the destruction of German cities.'[1] It was a particular Strauss, too: that of the nostalgic retreat into the Viennese past, as in *Der Rosenkavalier*. As one survivor recalled, on the evening before the air strike that would almost wholly destroy the city of Darmstadt, he 'listened to some songs on the radio from the sensuous world of the rococo, portrayed in Strauss's magical music'.[2] Similarly, on the night of the bombing raid which devastated Dresden, in a signal to the German fighter pilots who were already in the air to defend against an Allied air raid on an as yet unknown German city, the ground station broadcast waltzes from *Rosenkavalier*. The crew members, well educated in German culture, presumed that this meant the bombing raid was to take place over Vienna, the city of *Rosenkavalier*. By the time they realised that it was the city of *Rosenkavalier*'s première, Dresden, which was at risk, there was little hope of their turning back in time to help prevent the flattening of the city.[3]

The raid on Darmstadt, on the night between 11 and 12 September 1944, remembered locally as the 'Brandnacht', left the city in ruins. From the German perspective, Darmstadt had not been regarded as being at particular risk. Nevertheless, the presence of a major factory of the chemical and pharmaceutical giant Merck and the local technical university, which had trained experts in rocket technology who had worked on the V2 ballistic missile, meant that Darmstadt was listed in the British Ministry of Economic Warfare's *Guide to the Economic Importance of German Towns and Cities*. In

[1] Wolf Lepenies, *The Seduction of Culture in German History* (Princeton University Press, 2006), 2.
[2] W. G. Sebald, *Luftkrieg und Literatur* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 2005 [2001]), 49. An English translation of this volume is published as *The Natural History of Destruction*, tr. Anthea Bell (New York: Random House, 2003 [2001]).
[3] Lepenies, *The Seduction of Culture*, 1–2.

line with the British campaign of 'moral bombing', however, it was not the Merck site, north of the city, which was attacked, but rather the city itself: Darmstadt was practically razed to the ground in the space of a strike which took less than half an hour, as the Royal Air Force tested the strategy which would, in February 1945, have equally ruinous consequences for Dresden.[4]

On the night of the bombing itself, between eleven and twelve thousand people were killed, while seventy thousand were left homeless; 78 per cent of the city centre and 52.4 per cent of the whole municipal area was destroyed. Amongst the buildings obliterated was the family home of Darmstadt's first post-war mayor, Ludwig Metzger, and the building in which the Darmstadt composer Hermann Heiß, who would lead composition courses at the first Darmstadt Ferienkurse, lived.[5] It was estimated that the number of inhabitants of the city plummeted to roughly 51,000 after the bombing, from a total of 115,000 before the start of the war. The first accurate post-war figures number the citizens of Darmstadt, as at October 1946, at 78,000.[6] The Prince of Hesse saw the devastation from his estate some fifteen kilometres away: 'The flare grew and grew until the whole southern sky burned red and yellow.'[7] Unsurprisingly, Darmstadt's cultural institutions were similarly obliterated: in principle no official venue for the presentation of artistic work remained, although the city's cultural life was preserved in limited ways through performances in the few church buildings which survived.

A visiting British scientist, D. A. Spencer, described the devastation in evocative terms in his diary as he passed through the city in the summer of 1945: 'Darmstadt is a city of the dead – literally and figuratively. Not a soul in its alleyways between red rubble that were once streets. Long vistas of gaunt ruins – most only shoulder high. And overpowering silence everywhere.'[8] The German author Erich Kästner, whose work had been burned as a part of 1933's 'cleansing' by fire and who had been effectively banned from any public criticism of the Reich by the Reichsschrifttumskammer (Reich Chamber of Literature), visited Darmstadt too, in April 1946:

> To all intents and purposes, Darmstadt no longer exists. It was flattened in a twenty-minute attack [. . .] Today the streets have been swept clean, 'scrupulously' clean, one might think. The blasted city lies there like an empty

[4] Elke Gerberding, *Darmstädter Kulturpolitik in der Nachkriegszeit 1945–1949* (Darmstadt: Justus von Liebig, 1996), 17.
[5] See Susanne Király, *Ludwig Metzger: Politiker aus christliche Verantwortung* (Darmstadt: Hessische Historische Kommission Darmstadt and Historische Kommission für Hessen, 2004), 155, and Herbert Henck, *Hermann Heiß: Nachträge einer Biografie* (Deinstadt: Kompost, 2009), 387.
[6] Gerberding, *Darmstädter Kulturpolitik*, 17–19. See also Király, *Ludwig Metzger*, 155.
[7] Quoted in Sebald, *Luftkrieg und Literatur*, 30.
[8] D. A. Spencer, quoted in Douglas Botting, *In the Ruins of the Reich* (London: Methuen, 2005 [1985]), 158.

> jewellery case. The tram goes from one end of the city to another as if across a well-raked graveyard [. . .] The wreck of Darmstadt was the destination of a journey the purpose of which was to establish just how alive a dead city can be. The state theatre has organised two days of premieres in the former orangery [. . .] It may be asserted, without exaggeration, that until now no other city, even one ten or twenty times larger, and no other performance company, even if one were confidently to name many more and many better-known ones, has come up with such an interesting and rich programme.[9]

Darmstadt's rebuilding of its cultural life in the immediate post-war era was striking even at the time, in a world where returning émigrés, like Theodor Adorno, would be astonished by the feverish excitement amongst young Germans for all things cultural and spiritual.[10] Two examples cited by Lepenies give the impression well enough. A letter from Adorno to Thomas Mann, dated 28 December 1949, shows him 'overwhelmed by the passion and seriousness of his students'. These same students refused to take a break in their class because they had not yet fully understood Kant's transcendental dialectics (either that, they demanded, or the class must continue into the vacation: 'How could they relax without having finished Hegel's *Phenomenology of the Spirit*?'). In 1946, Karl Jaspers had described a similar situation to Hannah Arendt: 'We recently heard a superb report on the "idea" in Plato and Hegel, totally abstract, followed by a discussion that was as alive and intense as if we were dealing with the most current of problems.'[11]

Although, in the case of music at least, Adorno was hardly as optimistic about the new Germany as Jaspers (or that utopian vision described in Friedrich Meinecke's *The German Catastrophe*), across Germany there was seemingly a hunger for new thinking and new art. As Gerberding observes, the cultural situation of post-war Germany is best regarded as developing in the way it did 'not *despite* but *precisely because* the circumstances were difficult'.[12] Certainly, few German politicians, in Hesse not least, were not readying themselves to take up the challenge that Lepenies argues faced them: 'To survive the rupture of civilization it had inflicted upon Europe, Germany would have to give up the most German of all ideologies: the illusion that culture can compensate for politics.' As he says, 'this process took a long time'.[13] One of the principal aims, indeed, of the American Information Control Division (ICD) was precisely to demonstrate the fallacy of an assumed superiority of German *Kultur*, even if the Americans did not seem to consider too deeply the long-held division in

[9] Erich Kästner in the *Neue Zeitung*, for which he was culture editor, on 5 April 1946. Quoted in Gerberding, *Darmstädter Kulturpolitik*, 7.
[10] Lepenies, *The Seduction of Culture*, 134. [11] Ibid., 135.
[12] Gerberding, *Darmstädter Kulturpolitik*, 7. [13] Lepenies, *The Seduction of Culture*, 47–8.

German thought and life between the high products of *Kultur* and their almost absolute separation from the everyday products of *Zivilisation*. As Monod describes John Bitter, employed by the ICD in Berlin:

> His job was to serve as a kind of sentinel watching over the birth of artistic freedom. As a music officer, Bitter was to ensure that no works endorsing fascist or militarist ideals were performed, that compositions suppressed in the Third Reich (such as Mendelssohn's) were restored to the concert hall, that artists celebrated by the Nazis were blocked from further performances, that the influence of the state in the cultural sector was minimized, and that German audiences were taught that the music of other nations and cultures was as valid and worthy as their own.[14]

Regardless of what the desires of the Americans may have been, Darmstadt was not unusual in looking to culture to rectify political failings. Moreover, the American sentinels were hardly all-seeing. In terms of the immediate thirst for culture, though, the state of Hesse, and Darmstadt in particular, seemed to represent an extreme case, as Kästner suggested. Indeed, the very particular difficulties of administering the city of Darmstadt had profound significance for what developed there.

The state of Hesse itself was (and remains) for the most part a geographical invention of the post-war American military government, following consultations with German civil servants, academics, and émigrés, made up of the larger portion of the former Prussian province of Hesse-Nassau, which encompassed Wiesbaden, Frankfurt, and territory as far north as Kassel and much of the Duchy of Hesse, including the city of Darmstadt itself as well as further territories north of Frankfurt. That portion of the Duchy of Hesse west of the Rhine, including the city of Mainz, was administered by the French occupation forces and became part of Rhineland-Palatinate.[15]

The situation in Hesse was, certainly, seemingly parlous for the arts. In contrast to Württemberg-Baden, which budgeted DM 2 million for its theatre in 1948–9, and Bavaria, which put forward DM 2.5 million, Hesse provided only the comparatively small sum of DM 400,000.[16] Hesse was particularly unfortunate in the way in which the division of the territories which made up the new state had gone. It found itself in possession of not one but three Landestheater, as well as a municipal theatre in Giessen, which was keen to come under central state control. In the event, quite the reverse

[14] David Monod, *Settling Scores: German Music, Denazification, and the Americans, 1945–1953* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 13.
[15] See Michael R. Hayse, *Recasting West German Elites: Higher Civil Servants, Business Leaders and Physicians in Hesse between Nazism and Democracy, 1945–1955* (New York: Berghahn, 2003), 7.
[16] See Monod, *Settling Scores*, 189.

occurred, as the state of Hesse released the administration of the theatres in both Kassel and Darmstadt to the municipal authorities.[17] This move limited the liability of the state with regard to the costs of the theatres, but meant that the influence of central Hessian government was similarly limited. For the most part, in the immediate post-war period at least, Hesse's influence on the running of the arts in Darmstadt (and Kassel) was reduced to acting as a negotiator between the artistic directors, the cities, and the unions. The cultural life of the city of Darmstadt was, so far as Hesse was concerned, largely a matter for the city itself. It is in this context that many of the new initiatives of the early post-war years, not least the foundation of the Darmstadt New Music Courses, must be read. It also lends an additional significance to the words of Julius Reiber, Darmstadt's then deputy mayor, in the *Darmstädter Echo* of 16 January 1946:

> In view of the destroyed city it was stated on many sides that only the procurement of space to build, only the clearance of the rubble, and only the rebuilding were the pressing problems and that, in the current state of emergency, the theatre, the technical university, the schools, in fact all spiritual, artistic, and cultural needs were secondary and irrelevant [. . .] It will take us many years to rebuild houses, but we cannot leave people for that length of time without sustenance for the spirit and its cultural needs.[18]

In view of the relative autonomy under which Darmstadt found itself able to operate, such attitudes were ones on which the city was able to capitalise. The significance of them should certainly not be underestimated, given that Reiber wrote this in the middle of the so-called 'hunger winter' of 1946–7, in which it seemed that the German economy was already trapped in a vicious (and, as Jarausch puts it, 'deadly') cycle.[19] Hesse was, too, critically short of supplies even in comparison with the other German Länder:

> In the Western zones of Germany the maximum daily ration for normal consumers was supposed to be 1,550 calories. In practice it was never as much as this and varied from 804 calories in Hesse to 1,150 calories in the Rhineland. In the British zone the basic ration was 1,048 calories for more than a year after the war. By comparison civilians in Britain got 2,800 calories, German farmers 3,000, and American GIs 4,200 – the highest calorie intake of any human beings in Europe.[20]

[17] Ibid., 106.
[18] Julius Reiber, *Darmstädter Echo*, 16 January 1946, quoted in Judith S. Ulmer, *Geschichte des Georg-Büchner-Preises: Soziologie eines Rituals* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), 94.
[19] Konrad H. Jarausch, *After Hitler: Recivilizing Germans, 1945–1995* (Oxford University Press, 2006), 82.
[20] Botting, *In the Ruins of the Reich*, 168.

In making decisions that balanced the hunger for culture and very real and present hunger for the basic necessities of life, it was the precise people involved who made it possible for the situation to develop in the way in which it did. Central to this were two figures: Darmstadt's first post-war mayor, Ludwig Metzger, and its first post-war head of culture, Wolfgang Steinecke.

Ludwig Metzger had been an active figure in Darmstadt's political life before the war, predominantly as a lawyer. His political sympathies, too, were eminently clear or, at least, it was certain that he was interested in the carrying-out of the law, even where that might place him into conflict with the National Socialists. In 1935, for instance, Metzger represented four men in a treason case, arguing that the informant from the Sturmabteilung (SA; the paramilitary wing of the National Socialist Party), on whose word the case rested, was an unreliable witness. The consequence was that Metzger's right to act in treason cases was withdrawn; the SA informant's testimony was taken to be true. Events such as this inevitably brought Metzger into conflict with the Nazi authorities, as, for instance, when a stern reprimand was delivered to him indirectly at the beginning of 1942 from the Reichsjustizministerium (Reich Justice Ministry).[21] He was also warned, in the same year, that he was under surveillance by the Gestapo. Understanding that the situation was likely only to deteriorate for Metzger if he remained in Germany, his right-hand man, Ludwig Engel, encouraged him to leave for Luxembourg. In Berlin, Engel had made the acquaintance of Alfred Kulemann, the director of the Deutsche Umsiedlungs-Treuhand-Gesellschaft (DUT; German Resettlement Trust), who, in private conversation at least, did not hide his disdain for Hitler and was seeking lawyers whom he might be able to employ in Luxembourg. After a visit to Kulemann in Berlin, Metzger took over direction of the DUT in Luxembourg. In truth, Metzger was extremely fortunate that his move to Luxembourg left him comparatively politically protected; nevertheless, his general strategy throughout the war years seems to have been to do what was possible 'without placing either himself or his family in danger'.[22] His activity and position as a lawyer had enabled him to do that in Darmstadt until 1942, and this was remembered by many on his return after the end of the war. Though Metzger was later a leading figure in Hessian, national, and European politics – he became education minister for Hesse in 1951, a member of the Bundestag representing the SPD (Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands; German Social Democratic Party) in 1953, and a member of the European Parliament in 1957 (ultimately serving as vice-president between 1966 and 1970) – in the immediate aftermath of the war, his concern was with his home city of Darmstadt.

[21] Király, *Ludwig Metzger*, 86–9. [22] Ibid., 113.

Metzger had passed the last days of the war in Beerfelden in the Odenwald south of Darmstadt and, learning that the city had come under American occupation, made the roughly thirty-five-mile journey home on foot, reaching the city's outskirts on 24 March 1945. On the following day, a Sunday, Metzger attended a communion service held by the protestant clergyman Wilhelm Weinberger in emergency accommodation in the city. Later that same afternoon Weinberger and a Catholic priest, Wilhelm Michel, were asked whom they would recommend to head the civil administration of Darmstadt. Metzger, no doubt in memory in part of his prior activities defending local people against what looked like Nazi persecution, and probably in light of his well-known Christian faith too, was named by both. Metzger was rapidly summoned to the Residenzschloss, where the Americans had established a temporary headquarters, and asked whether he would be prepared to serve as mayor. Although he was certainly aware that he would be called upon to make a large number of unpopular decisions – and would be potentially in thrall to the requirements of American military administration – Metzger agreed.[23]

Metzger was faced with a wide variety of serious day-to-day challenges in terms of bare essentials – food and housing – in Darmstadt, as in Germany more generally, but the rebuilding of cultural life was seen as central. Even if, as Adorno would later opine, 'both cultural enthusiasm and political abstention were the result of collective self-deception', it seemed vital to many to bring about a resurgence in that part of German life which had bound the idea of 'Germany' together, long before the political state existed.[24] As Lepenies observes, '[p]olitics seemed to be discredited forever; a remilitarization of the country was unthinkable, only culture – not least because of the "internal exile" in which so many intellectuals had take refuge – was left with a legitimate past and hopes for the future.'[25] It was in this context, too, that approaches to culture in Darmstadt developed.

In any case, Metzger's approach to culture could hardly be seen as 'neutral', at least not from the perspective of personnel.[26] Metzger relied largely on personal contact and knowledge; the system that developed in Darmstadt, for the initial construction of the city's civil service more broadly, as well as in its culture department, was a function of Metzger's personal network of trusted individuals. The appointment of Wolfgang Steinecke as head of culture for the city was no exception to this.

As Metzger later recalled, the artist Willi Hofferberth, who was himself born in Darmstadt and, with Paul Thesing, founded the Neue Damstädter

[23] Király, *Ludwig Metzger*, 155–7. [24] Lepenies, *The Seduction of Culture*, 136. [25] Ibid., 146.
[26] Gerberding, *Darmstädter Kulturpolitik*, 37.

Sezession as early as the autumn of 1945, brought Steinecke to the attention of Metzger through the offices of Metzger's trusted aide Ludwig Engel. As Metzger's own memoir recalls, Hofferberth said to him, 'Ludwig, I've got to know a man, a well-known music critic, who would be prepared to work with us in Darmstadt. His name is Dr Wolfgang Steinecke. I think you might be able to make good use of him.'[27] Metzger's description of the meeting he immediately organised with Steinecke gives a strong impression of the character of Darmstadt's future head of culture:

> I asked the man to come to see me and we talked for a long time. He was full of ideas. We needed people like this. He became the city's head of culture. Steinecke was no fiery go-getter, but rather had a sensitive disposition and would often content himself with a gentle 'Mm' when he agreed, but had an unbelievable tenaciousness when he wanted to achieve something. His effectiveness in bringing well-known figures to Darmstadt, without excessive expense, was astonishing. He was aware that we Germans had been cut off from the world not only spiritually but also musically for many years and had little connection or knowledge even amongst ourselves. He was a master of bringing people together, without making a huge fuss about things.[28]

Steinecke's appointment in some senses, then, was quite this simply achieved; he was appointed initially for a trial period from 1 August 1945 until 31 October 1945.[29] At this point, he retained his position as a music correspondent with the *Mittag* in Düsseldorf.

In another sense, Steinecke's appointment was more complex, and bears closer examination. By 23 June 1945, Steinecke had already applied to the city – rather than directly to Metzger – offering his services for work in cultural fields and suggesting that his previous experience made him suitable for work in music programming for the radio, work in the culture department at either municipal or state level, cultural journalism, or a leading position in the theatre.[30] The beginning of a subsequent letter, dated 5 July 1945, suggests that Steinecke received no response to his earlier letter, again lending credence to the idea that Metzger was more interested in personal recommendation than in direct application:

[27] Ludwig Metzger, *Im guten und in schlechten Tagen: Berichte, Gedanken und Erkenntnisse aus der politischen Arbeit eines aktiven Christen und Sozialisten* (Darmstadt: Reba, 1980), 104–5.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Steinecke's *Dienstvertrag* is reprinted in Michael Custodis, *Tradition – Koalitionen – Visionen: Wolfgang Steinecke und die Internationalen Ferienkurse in Darmstadt* (Saarbrücken: Pfau, 2010), 31.
[30] Michael Custodis, '"Unter Auswertung meiner Erfahrungen aktiv mitgestaltend": Zum Wirken von Wolfgang Steinecke bis 1950', in Albrecht Riethmüller (ed.), *Deutsche Leitkultur Musik? Zur Musikgeschichte nach dem Holocaust* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2006), 153.

> On the request of the local American military government, I made myself available for work in cultural areas. My application and curriculum vitae, etc. were, after being checked for any political dubiousness, forwarded on. Since my attempt to come into personal contact with you this way has failed, I would like to provide you in these few lines a brief portrayal of my background and personal circumstances to date, on the basis of which you might perhaps regard a personal conversation as fruitful.[31]

It is clear already here, as Custodis notes, that Steinecke was keenly aware of the importance that a clean political record would have.

Steinecke never undertook a formal denazification process. Nevertheless, he completed a *Fragebogen* (personal information questionnaire) supplied by the city, and dated 4 August 1945, which stated that he had neither been a member of the National Socialist Party nor of any affiliated or similar organisations. This may well have been true, since Steinecke has no entry in the *Zentralkartei* (the central files) of the NSDAP (the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei; the National Socialist German Workers' Party),[32] but his answer to the fifteenth question on the form was arguably not. In this question he said that he had not written or spoken publicly in a political context during the Nazi era.[33] A letter from the Office of the Military Government, dated 1 December 1945, confirmed that Steinecke's *Fragebogen* had been vetted and found acceptable.[34]

While Steinecke's letter to Ludwig Metzger, dated 5 July 1945, did reveal many of Steinecke's activities, it was silent on others. He certainly worked at the film production company Terra-Filmkunst in Berlin between 1941 and 1943, a fact he did not mention. While there is little to tie Steinecke in to any particular activity at Terra-Filmkunst – he was employed first as an 'associate' and later as a 'consultant' – certainly the company produced a number of racist and propaganda films during the period during which he was involved with them, including *Quax, der Bruchpilot* (1941), *Wir machen Musik* (1942), *Die Feuerzangenbowle* (1944), and *Große Freiheit Nr. 7* (1944).[35] The precise nature of Steinecke's work there, though, remains unclear.

He did, however, list newspapers with whom he had worked, naming in particular *Der Mittag* and the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*. As noted above, to say that Steinecke had made no political comment in print during the years of NSDAP rule would be a hard position to defend. Yet, in a certain

[31] This letter is reprinted in full in Custodis, *Tradition – Koalitionen – Visionen*, 104–6.
[32] Fred K. Prieberg, *Handbuch deutsche Musiker 1933–1945* (Auprès des Zombry: self-published, 2004), 6844.
[33] Custodis, '"Unter Auswertung meiner Erfahrungen aktiv mitgestaltend"', 154.
[34] This letter is reprinted in Custodis, *Tradition – Koalitionen – Visionen*, 34.
[35] Custodis, '"Unter Auswertung meiner Erfahrungen aktiv mitgestaltend"', 150–2.

sense, the vast majority of Steinecke's wartime journalistic writings were remarkably cautiously constructed. To be more precise, Steinecke only very rarely expressed anything that might bring him directly into line with the regime in his own words. Almost without exception, Steinecke quoted or gave reported speech in such cases. Reviewing the première of Fritz von Borries's *Magnus Fahlander* (1937), performed as a part of the Niederrheinische Kulturwoche in Düsseldorf, for example, Steinecke suggested that 'the plot, in which a leader [*Führer*] rises from the people themselves in order to set them free, aims to provide a "copy of the immense conflict of our time"'.[36] His review of the *entartete Musik* exhibition, also in Düsseldorf, works in similar ways: 'The exhibition provides an effectively arranged illustration of the diverse manifestations of post-war musical life. Hindemith, Stravinsky, Kurt Weill, and Arnold Schoenberg are represented by numerous rehearsals of their work, alongside "little cultural Bolsheviks" like Alban Berg, [Ernst] Toch, [Karol] Rathaus, [Josef Matthias] Hauer, Hermann Reutter, and others.' Were it not for the words that Steinecke is careful to quote from elsewhere, indeed, this review would barely be worth mentioning. Later in the review, he is cautious enough to place scare quotes around the ostensible subject of the exhibition itself: 'So far as music, even "degenerate music", allows itself to be understood in the context of an exhibition [. . .] a show is taking place here that fulfils its aims in effective and strongly impressive ways, meaningfully extended through the numerous plaques announcing the basic views of the new German musical politics.'[37] Nevertheless, elsewhere Steinecke was less well able to avoid commitment, not least when reviewing the work of his own doctoral supervisor, Friedrich Blume, who published the notorious essay 'Music and Race' in *Die Musik* in 1938, as well as the later *The Racial Problem in Music*.[38] Blume delivered an earlier version of his *Die Musik* essay during the *entartete Musik* exhibition, and it was this that Steinecke was reviewing:

> German music history portrays a string of invasions of foreign artistic expressive forms, but it [German music] somehow remains at the same time thoroughly German in its manifestation. This is an argument, then, that the foreign can be absorbed, without diluting core racial stock. It would be a poor testament to our race if one were to allege that foreign influences could

[36] Prieberg, *Handbuch deutsche Musiker*, 650 (original in *Neue Musikblatt*, vol. 16, no. 31 (November 1937), 5).
[37] Prieberg, *Handbuch deutsche Musiker*, 6844 (original in *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 25 May 1938).
[38] Friedrich Blume, 'Musik und Rasse: Grundfragen einer musikalischen Rassenforschung', *Die Musik*, vol. 30, no. 11 (August 1938), 736–48; Friedrich Blume, *Das Rasseproblem in der Musik* (Wolfenbüttel: Kallmeyer, 1944).