The posthumous publication of Irène Némirovsky’s final manuscript, *Suite française* (awarded the prestigious Prix Renaudot, 2004), proved fortuitous for Némirovsky’s biographer, Jonathan Weiss, NEH/Class of 1940 Distinguished Professor of Humanities at Colby College in Maine. He had unsuccessfully tried to find a French publisher for his book after its completion in 2001. Three years later, however, editors were vying to offer him a contract, and this year an English translation of his biography will be published by Stanford University Press. Weiss’s historically rigorous and deftly woven account of the author’s complexities is an equally timely contribution to the public’s understanding of her life and writings. The biography illuminates most poignantly the drama of Némirovsky’s final work, an intricate tableau of France at the moment of the German invasion and the ensuing military occupation of the capital and the provincial countryside. Reading these two recent publications in tandem, one is drawn to the unspeakable, and indeed unspoken, horror behind the interrupted narrative of *Suite française*, which, when combined with Weiss’s narrative of the author’s life, illuminates Némirovsky’s particular situation and the extremity of her mental distress.

Weiss sifts through the various stages in Némirovsky’s life and the numerous relationships she enjoyed, choices she made, and stories she wrote, with an eye to the important factors of her social class and of her problematic relationship with her Judaic heritage. The latter was, in part, due to what she personally experienced as a conflict between the materialism of her parents (of her mother, in particular) and the spiritual sustenance Némirovsky searched for in her writing. Clearly well-read in Holocaust scholarship, Weiss draws upon many different historical sources in order to corroborate witness testimony and to assess the rapidly changing circumstances that were undoubtedly in the minds of Némirovsky and others around her as they confronted the virulent anti-Semitism of 1930s France, especially the anti-Jewish measures adopted by the French government. As a Jewish White Russian émigrée, she was among the first group of foreign Jews targeted for internment and, ultimately, extermination. Following her deportation, little is known beyond the number of her train convoy (6) and the range of numbers tattooed on the women prisoners who arrived in Auschwitz on July 19, 1942. She is known, however, to have died of typhus one month after her arrival in the camp.

What Irène Némirovsky left behind as perhaps the greatest testament of her life, therefore, are her writings. I concur with Weiss: these writings speak of the “imaginairiness” of her identity—a term that implies her identification with cultural symbols, an historical experience, and signs of belonging, as opposed to deep belief or harmonious symbiosis. I would emphasize, however, the haunting quality of her narrative, including that of *Suite française*. The term “imaginary” with reference to identity is generally accredited to French philosopher Alain Finkielkraut, whose 1980 work *Le Juif imaginaire* (trans. *The Imaginary Jew* 1994) is a reference for scholars of contemporary French Jewry. Similarly, Némirovsky’s autobiography emerges from the lines of her fiction, but any full sense of her as a person is fleeting. More common to her autobiographical narrative are the biting and largely unsympathetic portrayals of Jewish weakness and pain or filial strife, which contrast sharply with the romantic figures of her Ukrainian or French caretakers. Significantly, Weiss has shared that he was drawn to research Némirovsky’s life after reading
David Golder (1929), a lightning rod for controversy over the author’s identity and the anti-Semitic portraits found in her works.

As with the details of her final days, little is known about Némirovsky’s childhood. Much of what is known is to be found in the few interviews she gave following David Golder’s success, which propelled her onto the world literary scene. Her childhood memories show that the trauma of the pogroms under Czarist rule led to the phenomenon of the “imaginary” Jew in Russia long before Finkielkraut coined the term in reference to the French experience of the Holocaust.

France initially appeared to offer safe refuge to the Némirovsky family and to other Jewish and White Russian émigrés escaping the Bolshevik Revolution. After twenty years of residence in France and at the height of her career, Némirovsky, as Weiss describes his book, would come to identify with her country of adoption. Weiss closes his final chapter with an excerpt from what could conceivably have been the author’s last published interview in March 1940. When asked whether she was a French writer or a Russian who wrote in French, she answered: “I want, I hope, I believe to be a writer who is more French than Russian. I spoke French before speaking Russian. I spent half of my childhood in this country and all of my youth and my adulthood up to now. . . . I think and I even dream in French. . . . it is impossible for me to distinguish where the one ends and where the other begins” (cited by Weiss 213; my translation).

Weiss, however, not only develops Némirovsky’s imaginary, or hollow, relationship to Judaism (through her identification with the Jewish experience of persecution and suffering), but he also explores her alienation from her Russian identity. In the biography’s conclusion Weiss rightly identifies Némirovsky as an “imaginary French woman,” “une Française imaginaire,” who had accepted the hateful stereotypes assigned to her national (i.e., Russian) origins and religious background (212). “By interiorizing the image of the French writer that critics reflected back to her in the 1930s, she had increasingly distanced herself from her Russian identity. But when, under the Occupation, she is submitted to the Jewish census, she sees her foreign, ex-patriot status re-emerge; it becomes more and more difficult for her to believe herself integrated in French society.” This analysis sheds light on her personal, hand-written request to Marshal Pétain to be recognized as an “honorable foreigner.” Later, after foreign Jews were targeted for arrest and deportation, her husband Michel Epstein lodged a plea that she be identified as a “French Jew.” (Weiss 213; my translation).

Neither the success of David Golder, which met with criticism from Jews for its stinging critique of bourgeois Jewish materialism, nor her other novels saved her from the cruel disillusionment she experienced under the Vichy Regime. She was portrayed as humane and generous. That these figures are among the meekest and most vulnerable of Némirovky’s characters does not preclude the reversal of roles between hosts and guests.

Significantly, the outsider character of Lucile Angellier is the protagonist of “Dolce.” As a new member of provincial Bussy’s society of notables, she is a curious choice for a heroine, who, though scorned by her jealous and high-ranking mother-in-law, enjoys a privileged status as the wife of a French prisoner-of-war. Feeling no more at ease in the home of the disdainful elder Mme Angellier than does the German commander lodged there, Lucile assumes the dangerous, though sympathetic, double role of rescuer—she shelters a peasant sought by the German regiment for the murder of an officer—and town mediator, negotiating with the regiment’s commander, who is clearly taken with her. In addition to presenting a more complex image of the French resister, Lucile more importantly offers an intriguing metaphor for exile. Judging from the author’s notes for the unwritten last three volumes, Lucile’s ambiguous role would grant her a remarkable degree of mobility and freedom. As an outsider to the internal politics of Bussy (based on Issy-l’Évêque, the small Burgundian town where the author and her family took shelter), Lucile could transcend the social pressures that were imposed and regulated by the provincial bourgeoisie. Lucile is perhaps a combination of the values of the France that Némirovsky cherished and sought to emulate and of Michel Epstein’s moral courage and boundless love for his wife. His passion for her led him to use his German contacts in her defense and, thus, to expose himself to the occupation authorities (he would be deported in October 1942).

Although Irène Némirovsky’s unattached, fluctuating, and sadly transient identity and fame, precariously built upon a collection of identity-building clichés, myths, and stereotypes, allowed her some degree of the flexibility enjoyed by her novel’s protagonist Lucile, the pleasures of Némirovsky’s own existential freedom were fleeting. A happy exile remained only a romantic possibility, realizable exclusively in fiction. This hinted-at ending to Suite française—in which Lucile finds true love with a more modest and compassionate French patriot—is available to us in a salvaged fragment.

Even though, as Weiss discusses in his biography, at the time of Suite française’s conception, Nemirovsky had developed a spiritually rejuvenated Jewish character (Les chiens et les loups, 1940), the anti-Semitism of Némirovsky’s earlier publications and her avoidance of the Jews’ plight in her last novel speak more clearly of a subjective instability on her part. Weiss’s final paragraph describes Némirovsky’s response to an interviewer’s question as to whether she is a French writer or a Russian who writes in French:

This response [communicating Némirovsky’s desire to be a French writer] reveals, in its complexity, the dilemma of this author who died without having re-
solved the ambiguity of her own identity [appartenance]. . . . Beyond her literary corpus of works and her tragic end, Irène Némirovsky will have shown us, in the ambiguity of her relationship to France, the painful difficulty of living in an adopted culture and of choosing one’s own destiny (213-14; my translation).

Compounding the hopelessness of her situation are signs of Némirovsky’s clear understanding of this fact, revealed in the final sentence in the notebook containing the plot sketches for the remaining volumes: “Here the most important and most interesting thing is the following: the historical, revolutionary, etc., facts must be touched upon lightly, while what is to be developed in depth is the day-to-day and affective experience and above all the comedy that this presents” (Suite française 407; my translation). For Némirovsky, exile ultimately meant the impossibility of integration into any of the cultures of her composite identity due to undesirable or condemnable “types” that had infiltrated the medium of socio-cultural communication. Therefore, her literary production provided her the means to explore the various elements of her experience, both those thrust upon her and those that offered her a certain sense of belonging and reprieve. In other words, exile led to an erratic form of mimesis, allowing for greater complexity while destabilizing her identity and leaving Némirovsky vulnerable to life-threatening danger in the context of war. This may explain why she did not look to escape, but rather chose to stay and face the consequences of her faith in France.

For her, the relationship between her Jewish identity and her external circumstances grew so strained as to be no longer viable, a state signified by the complete absence of Jews in the contemporary France that was the setting for her last manuscript. Her final narrative portrays a Jew-less France, foreshadowing the post-war death of Judaism in France and the phenomenon of “imaginary” French Jews. Her initial fear of being seen as a Russian after the German-Soviet pact of 1938 was confirmed when her nationality did become a cause for suspicion; since she was subsequently refused French citizenship, the war meant for her a loss of national identity. However, the scapegoating of stereotyped ethnic, social, or political groups went so far as to incite the beleaguered French nation into complicity with mass murder and to force stateless Jews such as Némirovsky into compliance with their own dehumanization.

Fortunately, through the translation of Weiss’s book, the life testimony of this author will soon gain an American audience, who will, I hope, be able to appreciate the tragic profundity of her writings.


This essay continues the occasional series on anomalous individuals whose situation during or because of the Third Reich cannot easily be categorized, but whose lives provide unique insights into that horrible era and its continuing impact.

THE KLEPPER FAMILY: THE TRAGIC COMPLICATIONS OF A MIXED MARRIAGE

David Scrase
University of Vermont

A mixed marriage during the Third Reich ensured a certain amount of protection for the Jewish partner. Because of his non-Jewish wife Victor Klepper avoided deportation until the last chaotic weeks of the war. When an ominous summons to report came in February 1945, he was saved by the bombing raid, which enabled him to, in essence, go underground. As we saw in an earlier issue of this Bulletin (Spring 2004), the writer Elisabeth Langgässer was saved by her marriage to a gentile, although her illegitimate daughter Cordelia was classed as a “Volljüdin” (fully Jewish) and, after desperate efforts to save her through marriage or adoption, ultimately deported to Auschwitz, where she was able to escape death only through luck and war’s end. Langgässer’s acquaintance, the writer Jochen Klepper, was also in a mixed marriage fraught with complicating factors that demanded desperate maneuverings. Klepper himself was a devout Christian, the son of a Protestant minister, and had studied theology. In 1931 he married the Jewish widow Johanna Stein, who had two children from her first marriage. As they became aware of the increasing danger to the children, Klepper and Johanna were able to arrange for Brigitte, the elder daughter, to go to England—probably on a Kindertransport. After the outbreak of war the couple concentrated on a way to save Renate, the younger child, through emigration to Sweden.

Although, throughout the 1930s, Johanna was protected, to some degree, by her marriage to Klepper, he himself was singled out by the authorities for discriminatory treatment by virtue of “jüdischer Versippung,” i.e. Jewish “tainting” [through marriage]. In 1935, just after the Ullstein publishing firm had been “Aryanized,” Klepper, (the non-Jew) was dismissed from his position. In 1937, just after he had published what soon became his best-known novel, Der Vater, he was expelled from the Reichsschriftumskammer (The Reich Writers’ Chamber), which, in effect precluded any further publications. Ironically, the Führer was known to have respected Der Vater, whose subtitle, The Novel of the Soldier King, reveals that the subject of the novel was Friedrich Wilhelm I, the founder of Prussian militarism and father of Frederick the Great. Indeed, Hitler often presented the work to deserving recipients as a gift.

Fired from his job and forbidden to publish, Klepper, who had been drafted, was then dismissed from the army in 1941, the year that saw the invasion of the Soviet Union and the establishment of a second front. Klepper thus proved unacceptable as a soldier, precisely when the need for soldiers was greatest—and all because of his “tainted” marriage!
In 1941 Klepper was assured by Frick, the Minister of the Interior, that he would help Klepper find a way to get Renate out of Germany. In December 1942, Frick reiterated his willingness to help with emigration, adding that Renate was doomed should she remain in Germany. Furthermore, Frick warned, Johanna, Klepper’s wife, was also in a precarious position. Efforts were now being made to force the dissolution of mixed marriages, and after divorce, Johanna would face immediate deportation. “Ich kann Ihre Frau nicht schützen,” Frick told Klepper, “Ich kann keinen Juden schützen” (“I cannot protect your wife. I cannot protect any Jew”).

At the Swedish Embassy, Klepper learned that exit visas for all three might prove difficult, and Klepper conceded, at least to himself, that he would remain in Germany if that should prove to be a condition for letting Renate and her mother leave. He reasoned that Johanna would stay, too, so long as the child could leave.

On 9 December 1942, Johanna went to the Swedish Embassy with her papers, while Klepper went to see one Assistant Secretary Draeger, who had prepared the paperwork for Eichmann; Draeger thought Eichmann would authorize the exit visas. A visit to Eichmann in the afternoon revealed that Eichmann was, indeed, inclined to expedite matters, but not unequivocally: “I have not yet given my final word of approval,” Eichmann said, “but I think it’ll all work out.” Klepper was to report to Eichmann at the Security Service (SD) again the next day.

Upon returning from this meeting Klepper made a last entry in his diary:

In the afternoon the hearing at the SD. We are to die—that, too, is in God’s hands—Tonight we will die together. Above us in our last hours is the image of Christ Blessing, who fights for us. Before whose gaze our lives will end.

---
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**E.H. Gombrich:**

**“Once Upon a Time”**

By Melanie Gustafson
University of Vermont

When E.H. Gombrich died in 2001 at age ninety-two his obituaries focused on his contributions to the field of art history. Michael Podro, writing for the British newspaper Guardian Unlimited, stated that Gombrich’s theoretical works Art and Illusion (1960) and Meditations on a Hobby Horse (1963) “have been pivotal for professional art historians,” and the London Times pointed out that his 1950 The Story of Art, published to great acclaim, became “a runaway bestseller.” The Story of Art transformed Gombrich from a self-described “poor foreign scholar” into an author of world renown. It “changed my whole life,” Gombrich told a reporter.

Another book that changed Gombrich’s life was little noted in the obituaries. Like The Story of Art it was written with young audiences in mind. And like that famous text, it appeals to readers of all ages. A Little History of the World, which has just been published in its first English edition by Yale University Press, has only five pages on World War Two and only three paragraphs on the Holocaust. The first edition of A Little History, which was published in German in 1935, had, of course, no mention of what Gombrich calls in this new English edition a “monstrous crime.” So why a review of this book, here, in the Bulletin? My purpose is not simply to recommend the book to readers of all ages, which I most emphatically do, but to tell the story of the book’s initial publication and provide an introduction to Gombrich.

In 1935 Ernst Hans Josef Gombrich became a refugee when he left Vienna, Austria with his wife, son, and parents. Born in 1909, Gombrich was the son of privilege; his father Karl, a lawyer, and his mother Leonie, a pianist and teacher, sent him to the prestigious Theresianum secondary school and introduced him to a wide circle of intellectuals and artists. Ilse Heller, who became Gombrich’s wife in 1936, was, like his mother, a pianist. Indeed, music was an important part of Gombrich’s personal and scholarly life; he himself was considered a fine cellist and his understanding of music informed his theoretical works. Art, music, history, and literature were more important to his upbringing than was religion or an allegiance to Jewish culture. The fact that Gombrich’s parents had converted to what Podro called “a rather mystical Protestantism in an ambiance close to that of Gustav Mahler” mattered little to those in power in Vienna in 1935 and 1936. Gombrich stated in a 1996 lecture organized by the Austrian Cultural Institute: “I used to think I was a Viennese, or an Austrian, but then a large number of my fellow citizens discovered I was a non-Aryan, and they would have treated me accordingly if I had not been out of their reach.”

Was Gombrich Jewish? The easy answer is yes, but in a 1999 radio interview, Gombrich provides a more complicated answer. He poses the question, “How does one define a Jew?” and then responds: “I have been forced to think about this question longer than I have cared to. Jewishness is either a religion, and I don’t belong to it, or, according to Nazi teaching, a so-called race, but I don’t believe in race.” To the interviewer’s question of whether
Jewish tradition could be seen as a cultural force, Gombrich replied: “I don’t believe that there is a separate Jewish cultural tradition. I think the German Jews were largely assimilated. Many didn’t even know that they had Jewish roots….But when one is asked today, one naturally says, Yes, I’m Jewish. The right answer would be, I am what Hitler called a Jew. That’s what I am.”

Gombrich and his family arrived in England just at the moment his first book, *Eine kurze Weltgeschichte für junge Leser*, was published in Vienna. This book was written as much out of necessity as out of a desire to explain history to children. In 1935 no one was interested in hiring Ernst Gombrich, who had just received his doctorate in art history from the University of Vienna. Gombrich’s thesis addressed one of the leading issues of the day, Mannerist architecture, and he had studied with Julius von Schlosser, one of the leading Austrian art historians of the day. But, with or without a degree, Gombrich faced an indifferent and even hostile academy. In a 1979 recollection, Gombrich stated: “These were tense and unhappy times in Austria and the chances for employment for a young scholar were exiguous in the best of cases, and non-existent for students of Jewish extraction.” Hoping to widen his professional opportunities, Gombrich set out to learn Chinese. But then a chance meeting with a publishing friend, Walter Neurath, set Gombrich on a new path. Neurath had just been asked to provide a German translation of an English history book for children and he asked Gombrich if he was interested in the job. After reading the book, Gombrich said he could write a better one and presented Neurath with a sample chapter. Neurath agreed but informed Gombrich that he still needed the finished work in six weeks. Gombrich took up the challenge and six weeks later presented his completed manuscript to Neurath. Soon after, *Eine kurze Weltgeschichte für junge Leser* was published by the Viennese publishing company Steyermühl-Verlag. Soon it was banned by the Nazis for being “too pacifist.” By then, however, Gombrich had moved with his parents, wife and son to England.

In London, Gombrich worked for the Warburg Institute (Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg), a research center created out of the personal library of the Hamburg scholar Aby Warburg. In 1933 its then director Fritz Saxl had accepted an invitation from a group of English scholars to move the Institute to London. Over 500 boxes of books, photographs and slides, as well as furniture, were placed on two small steamers. Staff members soon followed, including a new research assistant, Ernst Gombrich, who had been hired to help Gertrud Bing prepare the papers of Aby Warburg for publication. When Bing, the Institute’s third director, retired, Gombrich took over as Director, a position he held from 1959 to 1976. During World War Two, Gombrich also worked for the BBC Monitoring Service, where he reported on foreign broadcasts. This experience became the basis of his 1970 book *Myth and Reality in German War-Time Broadcasts*, which examines how Nazi war-time propaganda created a “gigantic persecution mania” from the idea of a Jewish world conspiracy. According to *New York Times* reporter Michael Kimmelman, “it was Gombrich who dispatched the news of Hitler’s death to Churchill. When an impending announcement on German radio was prefaced by a Bruckner symphony, Mr. Gombrich guessed that Hitler was dead because he knew the symphony had been written for the death of Wagner.”

As Gombrich established himself as one of the pre-eminent art historians of his day, *Eine kurze Weltgeschichte für junge Leser* resurfaced in the offices of Phaidon Press, whose representatives became convinced that there was an audience for a similar book on art. The result was *The History of Art*, which was published in 1950 and eventually translated into twenty-three languages; it sold millions of copies and at the time of Gombrich’s death was in its sixteenth edition. John Russell wrote in the *New York Times* in 1984 that *The History of Art* reads as freshly today as it did when it came out. We know from the first page that Gombrich is not only a learned man but a man of feeling. To read him…is ‘to be carried along by a euphoric mix of propositions ransacked from biology, psychology, semiotics, information theory and art.’ But it is also to be in the company of someone who lives in the present, as much as in the past, and is as sensitive to the vicissitudes of life in the so-called ‘real world’ as he is to the toils and triumphs of library and lecture hall.

One might apply a similar description to the author’s *Eine kurze Weltgeschichte für junge Leser*. In 1985, a German publisher certainly thought the book had all the elements that had made *The History of Art* so popular and brought out a new edition. The publisher’s prediction was correct; its popularity led to translations into seventeen languages.

The first chapter of the new English edition begins: “All stories begin with ‘Once upon a time.’ And that’s just what this story is all about: what happened, once upon a time.” The story starts with the introduction of dragon-like creatures, an Earth without life, and a Sun without earth. Then, as early as the Bronze Age, Gombrich introduces what will be a major theme of the book when he asks his readers: “Do you think much has changed since then?” His answer: “They were people just like us. Often unkind to one another. Often cruel and deceitful. Sadly, so are we. But even then a mother might sacrifice her life for her child and friends might die for each other. No more but also no less often than people do today.” The book ends forty chapters later with Gombrich’s poignant recollection of learning about the “monstrous crime” of the Holocaust. Young readers, he wrote, “should not have to read about such things. But children grow up too, and they too must learn from history how easy it is for human beings to be transformed into inhuman beings through incitement and intolerance.” He continues by stating that “it is of the utmost importance that it should not be forgotten or hushed up.” Like his earlier chapter, this one ends on an optimistic note: “Whenever an earthquake, a flood or a drought in a far-off place leaves many victims, thousands of people in wealthier countries put their money and their efforts into providing relief….Which proves that we still have the right to go on hoping for a better future.”

The English translation and Gombrich’s planned revisions for *A Little History of the World* were still unfinished when he died on 3 November 2001. According to Leonie Gombrich, who worked on the final text with translator Caroline Mustill, Ernst Gombrich was “incredibly depressed” by the attacks of 11 September 2001. “After 9-11,” she stated, “he stopped working and never went back.”


Karel Berman, Reminiscences. Suite for Piano
Pavel Haas, Suite for Piano, Op. 13
Gideon Klein, Sonata for Piano
Viktor Ullman, Piano Sonata No. 7

In 1842, Felix Mendelssohn wrote to a former student, “The thoughts which are expressed to me by music that I love are not too indefinite to be put into words, but on the contrary, too definite.” One may ask: Are the thoughts evoked by experience of the Holocaust too definite to be put into music? If, as Theodor Adorno rather extravagantly wrote, poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric—Paul Celan is a strong witness for the defense —what can we say about music written in the bowels of the Holocaust itself? Should we judge music composed in the camps against different criteria than we judge all other music? Are such creations entitled to a more lenient critical assessment than music composed under happier circumstances?

We can defer these questions, because the music presented in Music from the Holocaust begs no indulgence. The music on this CD (underwritten in part by the Center for Holocaust Studies), masterfully performed by Paul Orgel on the Colodny Steinway in the University of Vermont Recital Hall, can stand proudly on its own merit. While he doesn’t neglect the standard repertoire, Orgel, who graces the UVM Department of Music, has specialized in music by Czech composers and music connected with the Holocaust. The four composers included on the disc, all inmates of the Theresienstadt (Terezin) camp, a Potemkin-like establishment modeled on the Nazis as a “model,” present a range of tonal and atonal styles. Two (Karel Berman and Gideon Klein) were young men in their twenties when they were deported to Theresienstadt; two (Pavel Haas and Viktor Ullman) were in their forties. One (Berman) survived the war. Haas and Ullman were shipped to Auschwitz and immediately gassed. Klein died while a prisoner at Auschwitz, but the exact manner of his death is unknown.

Berman, the sole survivor, had a career as a singer after the war. Recorded performances by Berman in operas by fellow Czechs Janáek, Martinů, and Smetana were available as of December 2005. His Supraphon recording of Vílem Blodek’s short romantic opera “In the Well,” appears to be no longer in the catalogues. The insert to the Orgel recording gives the date of Berman’s death as 1995. Other sources have 1992. Berman’s autobiographical suite Reminiscences, a series of eight programmatic pieces, opens the CD. The nostalgic temper of the first two pieces, Youth and Family Home, is followed by an abrupt swing into the macabre: Occupation (with assertive allusions to marching Germans), Factory - Germany, Auschwitz; Corpse Factory, and related grim themes until the final piece, New Life, relieves the darkness. Three of the more explicit movements were composed at Theresienstadt. The serene first two were composed before, the remaining three twelve years after, the end of the war.

The Berman suite is the only frankly pictorial-programmatic work in this collection. The other works make no explicit claim to depict the inexpressible, although here and there they intimate the composers’ hideous life circumstances. One may question whether the events Berman strives to paint musically are, in fact, pictorially programmable at all. How, indeed, does one compose a musical re-creation of a corpse factory? Some listeners may find the Berman suite the least satisfying of the four compositions.

The Suite for Piano by Pavel Haas is the only work composed entirely before the war, written six years before the composer was deported to Theresienstadt. Haas composed very little during his confinement. Its inclusion in this collection appears to be rather a tribute to a Holocaust victim, than music “from” the Holocaust. Generally serene and jovial, it stands in stark contrast to the other more sober works in the collection.

Gideon Klein was a leader and motivator among the musicians confined at Theresienstadt. He was appointed leader of the Freizeitgestaltung (Leisure Time Committee). Klein’s Sonata, one of a prodigious number of works he composed at Theresienstadt, is a short work in three movements. A surging motif of several notes followed by two slower descending notes is prominent in the first movement and appears from time to time throughout the work. There’s an allusion to this motif in the centerpiece of this collection, Viktor Ullman’s Seventh Sonata, perhaps a tribute to his young colleague, who pushed and prodded others into continuing their creative work in spite of the hellish environment. The lovely second movement adagio opens with an echo of the opening of Alban Berg’s violin concerto. Berg uses a slow eight-note ascent and descent of fifths. Klein deploys the same eight-note shape in about the same tempo, but with a series of sevenths. Although I can’t discover any personal connection between Berg and Klein, the reference—if it was intended as such—is suggestive. Berg’s concerto, written eight years before the Klein sonata, was inspired by the untimely death of the eighteen-year-old daughter of Alma Mahler and Walter Gropius. Was Klein’s evocation of Berg’s elegy intended to mourn other untimely deaths? The mood of the final movement is unambiguously defiant. I doubt that the coarsest camp guard could have failed to appreciate its tone.

In his diary Der fremde Passagier (The Strange Passenger), Viktor Ullman wrote this aphorism: “Kunst ist Natur nach geistlichen Gesetzen, Natur ist Geist nach natürlichen Gesetzen.” (“Art is nature according to spiritual laws; nature is spirit according to natural laws.”) Ullman was a devotee of Rudolf Steiner’s anthroposophy movement, which stressed meditation and awareness as a means of accessing the universal. Art for Ullman was the ultimate manifestation of supra-natural experience and, perhaps, a source of purpose amid the ultimate corruption of nature, namely human depravity. Like Viktor Frankl, Ullman may have discovered meaning in captivity simply by living from moment to moment and attending to “unfinished work.” The Seventh Sonata, intended by Ullman as a symphony, (later orchestrated as the Second Symphony by Bernhard Wulff based on Ullman’s detailed orchestration notes), has been convincingly interpreted as a call to resistance by Michael Wiener, (in his “Rechtliche Grundvorstellungen in der Musik von Viktor Ullman” [Legal Concepts Implicit in the Music of Viktor Ullman]). The fugue of its last movement is interwoven with Jewish, Czech patriotic, and Protestant thematic material. Immediately before the fugue begins, the score declaims the descending major seventh motif associated with the tyrannical King “Overall” of Ullman’s earlier opera (also composed at Theresienstadt), The Emperor of Atlantis.
This stark allusion to tyranny serves, in my view, the same dramatic function as the cacophonous introduction to the Ode to Joy in Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony. Beethoven bridges the gap with “O Freunde, nicht dieser Töne ...” (“O friends, not with these notes …”); Ullman has no bridge, just a fermata. The Ullman fugue corresponds dramatically to the choral Ode to Joy in the Beethoven. Each is the composer’s final answer to moral cacophony: brotherhood and joy for Beethoven; resistance and survival for Ullman. Quite apart from whatever numinous mysteries are embedded in this work, the Ullman Sonata is thrilling music for any listener not encumbered with what Charles Ives called “Rollo ears.”

After repeated hearings of these compositions, we may revisit the corollary to Mendelssohn’s challenge. Are the events of the Holocaust too definite for music? There’s no answer, just as there’s no answer to the “why” of the Holocaust itself. If we’re content to judge the music purely as music, without the Holocaust as a referent, we may sense the souls of its creators, as in searching out a faint star, by not gazing at them head-on. The essence of what Mendelssohn wrote to his student is that the only true explanation of music is the music itself. Should we judge music written in the throes of the Holocaust against criteria different from music composed in “normal” circumstances? Speaking of the Ullman Sonata, Wiener wrote: “Man muß und sollte diese Musik meiner Meinung nach nicht durch eine Mitleidsbrille betrachten; sie ist von sich aus voller Eindringlichkeit, Erhabenheit und Stärke” (“In my view, this music should not, and must not, be viewed through sympathy-tinted glasses; on its own merit, it’s full of urgency, loftiness, and power.”)

Orgel has clearly taken great trouble to learn, perform, and record music by composers generally unknown even to knowledgeable music-lovers. Why did he do it? In his own words, quoted in the Vermont Cynic, “This feels much more meaningful than recording piano music from the standard repertoire that might have been recorded by many great pianists many times before...the idea of giving these pieces a truly first-rate recording carried some urgency for me.”

Whatever impelled him to undertake this important project, all who cherish good music owe him a debt.

Robert Rachlin
Burlington, Vermont

1 Frankl, Viktor E. Man’s Search for Meaning (Rev. and Updated). 1984. New York: Washington Square Press, p. 101: “A man who becomes conscious of the responsibility he bears … to an unfinished work, will never be able to throw away his life. He knows the ‘why’ for his existence, and will be able to bear almost any ‘how.’”


Named both a Newbery Honor Book and a Sibert Honor Book for 2006 by the American Library Association, Hitler Youth: Growing up in Hitler’s Shadow certainly deserves these honors, as well as the overwhelmingly positive reviews it has received from various media in the world of children’s literature. Comprehensive, well-organized information paired with archival photographs, some from personal collections, makes this a book every high school library should have in its collection.

Bartoletti, who won a Sibert Medal for Black Potatoes: The Story of the Great Irish Famine, 1845-1850 (2001), focuses not only on members of the Hitler Youth, but on some of their peers who chose alternate paths. The latter include not only familiar figures like Hans and Sophie Scholl, but relative unknowns like Helmut Hübener, Karl-Heinz Schnibbe, and Rudi Wobbe, three teen-aged friends from Hamburg who listened to foreign news on the radio and circulated leaflets passing on that news. When they were eventually caught, Hübener accepted full responsibility and was executed; his friends, although they endured imprisonment and torture, were eventually released and emigrated to the United States in the early 1950s. Bartoletti also includes histories of Jews like Dagobert Lewyn, who was eighteen when he and his parents were rounded up in Berlin.

The structure of this book is exemplary. It opens with the murder of the young Nazi Herbert Norkus at the hands of a Communist youth group in 1932. Norkus came to symbolize the ultimate “achievement” of Nazi Germany’s youth—to die for the cause. This opening scene leads to a succinct summary of Hitler’s rise to power. As the text continues, it touches on most of the events and facets of the Third Reich, viewed through the perspective of adolescent experience. The ten chapters cover the organization of the Hitler Youth, Nazi education, Nazi persecution of the Jews, preparations for war, the German war machine, the Holocaust, Hitler Youth and resistance, the way boys were used at the end of the war, and the end of the war and its aftermath. The chapter on the boy soldiers contains two of the most wrenching photographs in the book: one, from the Bildarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz Berlin, shows a Volksturm group heading for a defensive position in Berlin. These boys have the eager, open faces of thirteen- or fourteen-year-olds and from the grins on most of the faces it is obvious they have no idea what they are getting into. The non-commissioned officer, however, has the heavy eyes of experience and knowledge. That expression is repeated in the face of a thirteen-year-old prisoner of war, captured during the last days of the war, peering wearily from a photo from the National Archives in Washington.

This well-researched volume is, however, not as perfect as many librarian reviewers have claimed. In one particular case, the flaw works to the book’s advantage: The forward opens with the statement: “This is not a book about Adolf Hitler,” which is true. It continues: “This book is about the children and teenagers who followed Hitler and the National Socialist (Nazi) Party during the years 1933 to 1945,” which is not accurate in that it fails to portray the full scope of Bartoletti’s accomplishment. The book is about something far more important: the experience of children and teenagers who lived in Germany during the years 1933 to 1945. Because the Nazi youth movement, as part of the Nazi
party’s push for totalitarianism, aimed to reach every German youth of “Aryan” descent, it is accordingly a large part of the story. However, Bartoletti also pays appropriate attention to those who were excluded from the Hitler Youth, including those who fell victim to the “euthanasia” effort, as well as resisters of various kinds and Jews, Communists, homosexuals, and most other groups who fell victim to Nazi persecution. The only group she fails to include is the Roma/Sinti (gypsies), a curious lacuna in an otherwise comprehensive work.

Another flaw, one this volume shares with a number of other volumes on the Hitler Youth and Bund deutscher Mädel, is the failure to consider the overall culture out of which these youth movements sprang. Other political parties had organized youth groups—Herbert Norkus was killed by a band of Communist youth—as did organized religions. As Frank Schaal’s account of his childhood, in The Holocaust: Personal Accounts, shows, various Jewish youth groups went on organized outings and cross-country hikes. The problem with Nazi youth culture, as opposed to some of these other groups, was the purpose for which it was created, namely the creation of a totalitarian culture that not only excluded certain other groups, but eradicated them.

My final criticism is that the controversial figure of Daniel Goldhagen is one of the few secondary sources named in the text, and in an especially sensitive context. Following a description of Kristallnacht, Bartoletti writes, “‘That day could have been the day for the German people to rise up in solidarity to support the Jews,’ says historian Daniel Jonah Goldhagen. ‘But they didn’t.’” One could argue that that was one of a number of opportunities for Germans to show solidarity—beginning with the boycott of Jewish businesses. That point aside, given the masterful command with which Bartoletti presents her material, to cite Goldhagen in the text is to grant him an implicit authority that a young audience will be all to apt to accept without question.

Despite these criticisms, Bartoletti has performed admirably, compressing what could be an overwhelming amount of information into a comprehensible form. By using specific examples, often conveyed in the form of first-person testimony, to tell the larger story of the events of World War II and the Holocaust, Bartoletti has increased the meaning of that history for young people. Nazism becomes not some abstract political party that only adults were involved in, but a way of life so many young people. Nazism becomes not some abstract political party that only adults were involved in, but a way of life so many young people welcomed as an outlet for their energies and enthusiasms. At the same time, the text shows how, with its insistence on total control, Nazism eventually alienated other young people, some of whom became Swing Youth who simply wanted to be allowed to be individuals, while others became active resisters of the regime. Bartoletti’s writing makes it easy to draw parallels between young people then and now and will, it can only be hoped, make it easy for a discussion of history to become a discussion of humanity. This book is a fine argument for why it is, indeed, important to remember the past, for those too young, perhaps, to have heard of Santayana.

Katherine Quimby Johnson


A Woman in Berlin. Eight Weeks in the Conquered City does not seem to have any relevance for the Holocaust. As the title suggests, it is about a woman living in the city of Berlin during the occupation by the Red Army. And yet, even though the references to the Jewish fate are few, the book will prove of interest to anyone seeking clarity regarding the Shoah. Any understanding of the Holocaust presupposes a knowledge and understanding of Germany and the Germans. One appeal of Victor Klemperer’s diaries lies in the revelations of life as an assimilated German Jew throughout the twelve years of the Third Reich. Two recent films that were enormously popular in Europe and aroused serious discussion in the US also underscore the thirst for knowledge about life in Nazi Germany. Both concentrate on the closing weeks of the Reich. Both feature Hitler primarily, Blind Spot is an interview with one of Hitler’s secretaries, Trude Jung, who recorded the Führer’s last will and testament in the bunker in April 1945. The other film (which uses some footage from Blind Spot) is Downfall (Untergang). It portrays life (and death) in that same bunker and its environs during those last dramatic days. Both films give a German view and concentrate on the leadership. While Jews, the deportations and mass murders play no role, neither do “ordinary Germans,” to take Goldhagen’s term, feature in any significant way. A Woman in Berlin is the diary of a German woman recorded from 20 April 1945 (coincidentally Hitler’s 56th birthday) until 16 June 1945. It accordingly covers only eight weeks—but what a time that was, especially if you were a woman living in Berlin.

At this time almost every Berliner, indeed every German, knew that defeat was inevitable and imminent. There were the massive air-raids and the carpet-bombing; the Red Army was just outside the city and the bombardment had begun; city amenities and government were in disarray and crumbling fast; and life for the Berliners (largely women with their dependent children and elderly relatives), with the impending arrival of the “Asiatic hordes,” was fraught with danger and horrific threats.

The diarist was a young German woman of intelligence, education, and sharp powers of observation. At the time of writing she was thirty-four years old, had worked as a journalist and in publishing, and had visited and lived in some twelve countries. In addition to the good command of French and English expected of educated Germans, the diarist had some limited Russian acquired during a stay in the Soviet Union. This knowledge of Russian proved significant in the early days of the Soviet occupation.

Klemperer’s diaries of the Third Reich (1933-1941; 1941-1945) give us the experiences in Dresden of an assimilated Jew married to a gentile. The eight weeks of anonymous diary entries are those of a non-Jewish woman in Berlin. While her own experiences are central, she also records those of her neighbors, primarily women. Their apprehension as the Red Army approached encompassed, to be sure, the fear of death or injury, the anxiety and uncertainty concerning food and drink, fuel, and amenities—all matters shared by men. The fear of rape, however, was unique to women. Reports of widespread rape in the eastern part of Germany as the Red Army swept through on their way to Berlin had reached the city, and the women of Berlin awaited the same fate
in great fear and helplessness. It is estimated that between 95,000 and 130,000 women in Berlin and as many as two million German women all told were raped. All women from pubescent girls to grandmothers were potential victims. Few escaped. Many suffered multiple rapes. The diarist describes matter-of-factly but fully her own horrific experiences and the fates of most of her neighbors and associates. Since this was mass rape, in other words, a shared experience, the women discussed their fears and their eventual fate as well as their feelings openly, often more with anger than with shame.

Although not directly threatened by the rapes, the male partners reacted in differing and fascinating ways. When the diarist’s fiancé, Gerd, returned and learned of her experiences, their physical relationship cooled and ended: “But in the night I found myself cold as ice in Gerd’s arms and was glad when he left off. For him I’ve been spoiled once and for all.” On a later occasion, Gerd, in an outburst against all the women in the apartment house, yelled, “You’ve all turned into a bunch of shameless bitches, every one of you in the building....It’s horrible being around you. You’ve lost all sense of measure.”

Given the recent controversy surrounding victim memoirs—Wilkomirski’s Fragments comes to mind—and given the fact that the diarist insisted on anonymity, the question of authenticity arises. This question is addressed by both Hans Magnus Enzensberger, the eminent German poet responsible for this printing, and Antony Beevor, the famous author of Berlin. The Downfall (2002), and Stalingrad (1998), who provides a brief introduction. Both are convinced that the diary is genuine—and for me their arguments are sound. A Woman in Berlin is an impressive and informative document for all who are interested in the German mind and experience during the Shoah, and especially the views of women at war’s end and during the occupation.

David Scrase
University of Vermont

Claudia Koonz Delivers 2005 Hilberg Lecture

Tyler van Liew

At the 2005 Raul Hilberg lecture, Claudia Koonz from Duke University spoke on “Jewry in Nazi Historical Scholarship.” She discussed the major themes of Nazi scholarship, and how scholars sought to justify the actions they took against the Jews and other groups. Koonz provided an interesting perspective on the research and mindset of Nazi scholars. Koonz was an engaging speaker, although unfortunate technical problems proved distracting for the first part of the lecture.

Koonz began by stating the importance of documents. She quoted Hilberg’s “History is an assemblage of salvage.” The turbulence of the Holocaust and the uncertainty of memory make it impossible to create a complete picture of what happened. Documents not only provide concrete accounts of their subject, but they also allow us to understand many things about the society from which they come.

Koonz displayed a document detailing the deportation of 430,000 Galician Jews between 1941 to 1943, as well as a detailed list of the loot acquired in the process. Included in this document were also a few pages of academic discussion about how to solve the “Jewish Problem” in Poland. According to this document, the Nazis believed that the “Jewish Problem” began in Poland, and that it influenced the surrounding countries as it spread throughout Europe.

The basis of Nazi scholarship lay in blind hatred for the Jews and the resulting attachment of blame to them. This racism is what causes people to label Nazi thought “pseudo-scholarship.” Koonz, however, dislikes this label because she believes that its application makes it all too easy to dismiss the involvement of historians in creating a climate that made the Holocaust possible. Further, she believes that all scholarship should be open to re-examination on the basis of its underlying beliefs.

One of the more interesting points of the lecture was the general thought process of Nazi scholars. Considerable resources were poured into racial scholarship during the Nazi era. Racial scholars set out to prove not their premise, but their conclusion, namely that Jewish people were a problem, and that they were racially inferior. While many educated minds questioned whether or not this was legitimate scholarship, wide-spread bigotry and racism easily fueled research. Further, by funding this research, the Nazis sought to legitimize the actions that punished Jews, a punishment that ultimately ended in extermination. Koonz told us that since identification is the first step in persecuting the Jews, racial scholarship became very important to the Nazis. “Jewish blood” is, after all, only a metaphor.

However, Nazi scholarship often ran into problems when no concrete biological difference could be found between “Aryans” and Jews. To reinforce and spread the idea that Jews were different not on the basis of religion, but of race, a biology textbook
from Nazi Germany depicted a Jewish person beside similar pictures of blacks, Asians, etc. This was one of many actions taken by the Nazis to segregate the Jewish people.

Another effort of Nazi scholarship that Koonz recounted was the effort to produce a Jewish history from a non-Jewish perspective. The Nazis believed that social progress came to an abrupt halt in the 1500s when German nobles began to borrow money from Jewish bankers. From then until 1933, German society regressed. 1933 was viewed as the beginning of renewal for German society.

From 1933 on right up until the end of the war racial scholarship flourished in Nazi Germany. Nazi scholars also sought to rewrite history in order to provide a historical background for their “Jewish Problem.” The works of Jews whose goal was to show how great the Jewish contribution to German society was, in order to prove themselves to be good Germans, were cited out of context by Nazis as proof of the extent to which Jews had gained influence over German society.

Nazi scholarship was often inconsistent. On the one hand Nazi scholars wanted to explain completely the nonexistent “Jewish Problem” and to reach a “Final Solution” for to the problem. Yet they also sought to justify their actions to those who were not anti-Semitic. They would often compare their own actions to those of the United States or Great Britain; in so doing, they argued that they were no different from their enemies and that therefore their actions were justifiable. The examples provided by Koonz included Earnest Albert Hooten, an English anthropologist whose study of different facial structures and features included examples of Jewish noses. The Nazis used Hooten’s research as an example to argue that Jews, indeed, were racially different. They also justified their treatment of the Jews by discussing a history of slavery and segregation in the U.S., and would often speak of how terrible it was, thereby implying that their treatment of the Jews was less harsh (before the decision to kill was made, obviously.) The Nazi argument that physically and mentally handicapped people were better off dead followed the same principles as the American and British concept of eugenics, which applied the selective breeding principles of agriculture to human beings.

Koonz finished by returning to the importance of documents. The original document she discussed in the beginning of the lecture told a great deal about Nazi society. The document contained statistics about deportation, a list of loot (which could easily have been a motivation for perpetrators), and the ever-present argument about race. Racial scholarship was an integral part of Nazi society, essential as a justification for their actions, as well for providing “scientific” evidence for the identification and persecution of Jews. This was so important that killing brigades were often accompanied by scholarship groups, who engaged in “salvage anthropology,” collecting the representative items (Torahs, library materials, civil records) of a culture that was being annihilated.

Nazi scholarship took many different forms, each of which led to a different dead end, yet their need to prove their premise about the Jewish dominance of German culture and to derive a solution to their perceived problem caused them to persist in their search for facts. No amount of research would ever convince them that they were wrong in their beliefs; they intended to carry on until they reached a conclusion in their favor. Koonz tells us that the Nazis fueled their racial scholarship in order to “legitimize actions with minimal mental duress.” Koonz provided an inter-

---

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Occasional Papers Available:**

Occasional papers of the Hilberg Lectures of 2000 and 2004 have been published. Omer Bartov, the ninth Hilberg Lecturer, presented “The Holocaust: From Event and Experience to Memory and Representation.” Jill Stephenson, the twelfth lecturer, presented “Two Sides of a Coin: ‘Aryan’ Health and Racial Persecution.” Anyone interested in receiving a copy should contact Holocaust.Studies@uvm.edu or write the Center at 94 University Place, Burlington, VT 05405-0114.

**Summer Course Expands, Explores New Format**

This year the Center for Holocaust Studies offers two opportunities for teachers wishing to enhance their professional development in the subject. The week of 26-30 June “The Holocaust and Holocaust Education for Teachers of Grades K-12” runs for the thirteenth straight summer. As always, it will include presentations by scholars, authors, Holocaust survivors, and camp liberators. Discussions include issues raised by the Holocaust as well as teaching strategies, ideas, and curricular resources. This course is offered through the Department of Education, with cross-listings under Holocaust Studies, World Literature, and Area and International Studies.

At the same time, we will offer an advanced methodology course specifically for teachers and teachers-in-training. “Issues and Approaches to Teaching the Holocaust” offers an in-depth exploration of methodologies for teaching the Holocaust, with a primary focus on teaching and curricular resources. The final project will be the development of a classroom unit on the Holocaust. This course is offered through the Department of Education.

To register on-line visit http://registra.uvm.edu or visit Continuing Education at http://learn.uvm.edu. For more information contact Robert Bernheim at Robert.Bernheim@uvm.edu or (802) 656-3180.
**Events**

Rabbi Wall Lecture  
Wednesday, 22 March  
4:00 p.m.  
Presentation Room  
Saint Michael’s College  

“Henry’s Harmonica: History and Memory in a Genocidal World”  
Dr. Douglas Greenberg  
USC Shoah Foundation Institute  
For Visual History and Education  

Call (802) 654-2578  
or email emahoney@smcvt.edu  
for more information  

17th Harry Kahn Memorial Lecture  

“From Weimar to Auschwitz: Carl Schmitt and the Jurisprudence of Exclusion”  
Robert D. Rachlin  
Monday, 3 April 2006  
4:00 pm  
301 Williams Hall  
University of Vermont  

For more information call (802) 656-3430  

Holocaust Remembrance Week Activities  
Sponsored by UVM Hillel  
21-27 April, 2006  

Field of Flags – UVM Green  
All week  

Litany of Martyrs, 23-24 April  
In front of UVM Bookstore  

Yom HaShoah  
25 April  
Manya Friedman, Holocaust Survivor  
7:00 pm  
Campus Center Theatre  

Candlelight Remembrance Ceremony at the Field of Flags on the Green  
9:00 pm  

Showing of “Passing the Torch” by Jessica Abos, WCAX reporter  
Date, time, location TBA  

The Miller Symposium  

Jewish Life in Nazi Germany  

Sunday, 23 April 2006  

Campus Center Theater  
Billings Student Center  
The University of Vermont  

sponsored by  
Leonard and Carolyn Miller  

Speakers  

Avraham Barkai  
“Jewish Self-Help: The Dilemmas of Cooperation, 1933-1938”  

Michael Brenner  
“Jewish Culture in Nazi Germany: A Reassessment”  

Marion Kaplan  
“Changing Roles in Jewish Families under Attack”  

Jürgen Matthäus  
“Evading Persecution: German-Jewish Behavior Patterns after 1933”  

Beate Meyer  
“Between Self-Assertion and Forced Collaboration: The Reich Association of Jews in Germany, 1939-1945”  

Konrad Kwiet  
Special Scholar  

More information at  
http://www.uvm.edu/~uvmchs/?Page=Events.html
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