



Composers of the Nazi Era: Eight Portraits

Michael H. Kater

Print publication date: 2000

Print ISBN-13: 9780195099249

Published to Oxford Scholarship Online: January 2010

DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195099249.001.0001

Carl Orff Man of Legend

Michael H. Kater (Contributor Webpage)

DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195099249.003.0005

Abstract and Keywords

This chapter begins by examining Carl Orff's anti-Nazi records. It then discusses the factors that influenced Orff's artistic impulses. It describes Orff as a modernist, but an idiosyncratic musician. It narrates the nazification of the cultural institutions in Germany. It discusses that the Carmina Burana success story in the last years of the Third Reich raises again the problem of the National Socialist quality of Orff's music, as it was composed and performed under Hitler, apart from Orff's personal status as a Nazi, on which the evidence is unequivocal. It narrates Carl Orff's successes after the capitulation of the Nazi government. It also mentions the hypothesis of Carl Orff having a mental disorder.

Keywords: Carmina Burana, anti-Nazi records, Carl Orff, Germany, nazification, mental disorder

I

Who was Carl Orff? Who was Carl Orff in the Third Reich? There is probably no modern German composer whose life and career, especially after the Nazi takeover, have been as shrouded in mystery or confusion as his. And this, although an early post-World War II judgment had held that no one could properly evaluate Orff's oeuvre by paying heed merely to his musical persona.¹ Despite this timely warning, the Munich historian of culture Jens Malte Fischer has lamented as recently as March 1995 that Orff's career, especially during the Third Reich, has so far never been examined in depth.² Why then did another Munich historian of culture insist just a few months later that a dissertation on

Orff and National Socialism would yield little original knowledge and nothing sensational whatsoever?³

There are, indeed, **two schools** of thought on the theme of Carl Orff in the Third Reich, one claiming that he was if not a direct **victim of the Nazis** seriously wronged by them and at best tolerated. The other maintains that not only was Orff a **collaborator of the Nazis** and himself a bona fide National Socialist but his music too was symptomatic, particularly of Nazi ideology.

Orff himself consistently said that his work, especially the scenic cantata *Carmina Burana*, was proscribed by the Nazi regime and that he was suspect as a composer and a citizen because he had felt beholden to the idea of a “European commonality” rather than one of narrow-minded German nationalism. **(p. 112)** His use of Latin in *Carmina Burana*, so he asserted, manifested this conviction and hence constituted **an act of opposition**.⁴ Orff’s second wife, Gertrud, has taken this further by contending that Orff always was “a conscious anti-Nazi” and his compositions were “officially not wanted.”⁵ To a greater or lesser degree, colleagues, critics, and scholars alike have reinforced this interpretation over the years, Hans Heinz **Stuckenschmidt** being the first to emphasize, as early as 1946, that Orff, along with Hindemith, Boris Blacher, and Richard Mohaupt, **was barely abided by the Hitler regime**.⁶ Biographer Ernst Krause supported this in 1971, and as respected a musicologist as Carl Dahlhaus in 1982 forbade anyone ever to doubt Orff’s political or moral integrity.⁷ Orff’s composer friend Rudolf Wagner-Regeny, too, echoed Stuckenschmidt when in his memoirs he wrote that for such artists as himself and Werner Egk and Orff, any creative work had been in spite of circumstances, by way of “laboriously hanging on.”⁸ **Orff or Egk**, reemphasized musicologist Ludwig F. **Schiedermair in 1990**, had **nothing to do** with the political or musical *Zeitgeist* of the **Nazi era**, as they had both been neither members nor sympathizers nor fellow travelers of Hitler’s movement.⁹ As recently as 1995 Orff’s chief apologist, Franz Willnauer, demanded that the composer’s oeuvre finally be “set free from the odium of ‘National Socialist music,’” while German historian Reiner Pommerin rejoiced that after May 1945 Orff’s music could be performed again.¹⁰

But how well documented are such acts of anti-Nazi defiance? There is evidence, or, rather, the suspicious lack of it, to suggest that the composer’s anti-Nazi record may not have been as sterling as his protagonists have maintained. Thus why would **Karl Laux**, who had been a music critic in the Third Reich and after 1945 continued to ply his trade as an ostensibly democratic professional in Communist East Germany, **avoid in 1949 any mention of the Third Reich** in a short biographical sketch of Orff?¹¹ And what about other omissions by zealous Orff backers? In 1995, an internationally touring centenary exhibition showed a slate of quotations by or about the master, from 1895, the year of his birth, to 1982, that of his death. Of the twelve dates mentioned, only two were from the era of the Third Reich, and both referred, positively, to *Carmina Burana*. Tamara

Bernstein, a Toronto music critic, jested that she wanted to award to the Orff Foundation headed by Willnauer, which was responsible for the exhibition, the Kurt Waldheim Award for Selective Memory Loss, “for blanking out those 10 pesky years, 1937–1947.”¹² A year later, three full pages detailing Orff’s life and work from 1895 to 1995—appended to the catalog of an Orff exhibition sponsored by the Munich Carl-Orff-Zentrum—devoted barely seven entries to the Third Reich period, missing, in the process, a reference to one of Orff’s more controversial works, the incidental music for Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* of 1939, as did the catalog text itself.¹³

Harsh judgments rendered by interpreters of the other side of Orff’s life bear careful scrutiny. Andrea Seeböhm’s verdict in 1985 that Orff, like Egk (p.113) and Wagner-Regeny, had been a Reinsurer,” was comparatively kind, at about the same level as Harvey Sachs’s opinion that Orff had been “Nazi-sanctioned.”¹⁴ At the end of 1988 some critics experienced a production of Orff’s *Carmina Burana* by the Amsterdam Concertgebouw Orchestra under Riccardo Chailly as *J* Christmas greeting from Nazi Germany.¹⁵ Thereafter, the closer the Orff centenary of 1995 got, the harsher became the accusations. In 1992 came a reminder from the venerable daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* that Orff had been *J* genuine sympathiser of the Third Reich,” and in 1995, in the equally venerable weekly *Die Zeit*, Eleanore Burning declared the composer a member of the *Nazi Party*.¹⁶ The American reviewer Matthew Gurewitsch found it difficult, at first sight, to associate the name of Carl Orff, in the manner of the “thought police,” with Nazism. Possibly he had, however, committed a grave omission. For “the most haunting clue may be a photograph of Carl, age three, holding a tin drum.”¹⁷ Was this irony or malice? Not enough; a New York psychiatrist and Holocaust survivor, on the eve of a double staging of the Jewish Kurt Weill’s *Die sieben Todsünden* and Orff’s *Carmina Burana* by the New York City Opera in early 1997, protested with the exclamation, “After all, Carl Orff was a Nazi!”¹⁸

Was it Carl Orff’s attitude toward the Third Reich or the nature of his compositions that became important in determining whether this composer had been a Nazi? As far as the latter is concerned, attention has centered on his signature piece, *Carmina Burana*, as well as on the music for *Shakespeare’s charming comedy*, because Orff’s new creation has been seen as supplanting the time-honored composition of *Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy*. Thus, in a New York exhibition on culture and politics in Nazi Germany in 1993, it was noted that Orff had *received a substantial amount of money for his music to A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, as a substitute “for the classic version by the vilified Jewish composer Felix Mendelssohn.”¹⁹ In August 1995 Alex Ross wrote in *The New York Times* that “the completely un-scrupulous Orff accepted a commission to write a replacement score for Mendelssohn’s verboten ‘Midsummer Night’s Dream,’ one of the shabbiest acts in musical history.”²⁰

And what about *Carmina Burana* itself, through which Orff was to establish his world fame? Was there something intrinsically fascist in the music, as the Geneva professor of English and Comparative Literature, George Steiner, suggested in 1998: Orff's "*Carmina Burana*" is fascist trash, and can be shown to be so in musical terms"? Or, as music apart from ideology, was the scenic cantata badly crafted? The latter was suggested by Nicolas Slonimsky's contemporary judgment, when he characterized the piece, tongue in cheek, as an "amalgam of heterogeneous neo-medieval, ecclesiastical, ethnic and popular melodic and rhythmic elements, accoutred in bland modalities and marked by a hypnotically repetitive asymmetrical cantillation alternating with monometrical ululation and syncopated hockets."²¹ Sydney musicologist Richard Toop has recently taken this caricature of a critique one step further by arguing that it is "almost (p.114) impossible to debase an overblown, crude piece of music from a Nazi sympathiser with a taste for smutty lyrics."²² Various critics have found *Carmina Burana* "ideologically questionable" or "prototypical of culture under National Socialism"; one said the composition was successful because Hitler himself had seen and liked it.²³ The negative association between Nazism, the music, and the lyrics was graphically conjured up by Toronto musician and writer Elissa Poole, who described the initial chorus of Orff's main composition as "terrifying when the singers spit out their Latin fricatives like powerful jack-booted automatons."²⁴ But how does all this accord with the fact that a Communist, who had been incarcerated by the Nazis, declared in 1946 that "once in the concentration camp, I heard *Carmina Burana*. After that, I actually felt better for several days"?²⁵

As a final consideration, Carl Orff's name to many has become synonymous with fascist art and culture, frequently by way of a rather cavalier prejudgment. In this manner the British musicologist Gerald Abraham has generalized that "the only kind of modernism acceptable in the Third Reich was the rhythmically hypnotic, totally diatonic neo-primitivism of Orff's scenic cantatas."²⁶ Other cognoscenti have insinuated that Orff's music exemplifies "the inhuman face and perverse 'appeal' of National Socialism."²⁷ Most dismissive in recent times has been composer Berthold Goldschmidt's 1994 reference to "this terrible supermarket music of the third-rate Carl Orff."²⁸ Who, then, was Carl Orff?

II

Orff was born in Munich in 1895 into a family of high military officers and scholars. One or two of his immediate ancestors appear to have been very musical; his mother is said to have been an accomplished pianist even as a teenager. It was she who taught preschooler Carl the fundamentals of harmony and how to make the piano sound. But the father, too, played piano, and often there were duets and quartets performed in the home. As a schoolboy, Carl would prefer to walk to the Gymnasium, using his streetcar fare to buy scores. His first musical influences were Bavarian military marches, but in 1909 he came to relish *Der Fliegende Holländer*, and more operas after that. Richard

Strauss and especially Debussy impressed him.²⁹ In 1911 Orff, who had already written a few Lieder to texts by Heinrich Heine and Theodor Storm, published his first song cycle, ten poems by Karl Stieler: *Eliland: Ein Song vom Chiemsee*, opus 12. Still heavily under the influence of Debussy he entered the Bayerische Akademie der Tonkunst in 1912 but found its approach to composition uninspiring and aloof, and so he left. After a stint as a Munich theater Kapellmeister **he was serving on the eastern front by 1917** but was sent home **after having suffered near-lethal shock** in a collapsed dugout. In 1918–19, he was Kapellmeister in Mannheim and Darmstadt. After his return to Munich, he composed his first song cycle based on lyrics by Franz Werfel (1920). Renewed studies in **(p.115)** 1921 with Heinrich Kaminski near Benediktbeuern at the foot of the Bavarian Alps were just as fruitless as his brief acquaintance with Hans Pfitzner in Munich, whose opera *Palestrina* he actually admired, but **Kaminski** introduced **him to late-Renaissance composers** such as Orlando Lasso, Giovanni Gabrieli, and Claudio Monteverdi. It was the latter who triggered a lifelong artistic love affair between Orff and the old masters.³⁰

After 1923, Orff's somewhat narrow Bavarian horizon was widened, as in 1924 he briefly made the personal acquaintance of Bertolt Brecht, whose lyrics offered fresh potential for the composition of songs. The Brecht Cantatas and additional songs based on Werfel's stanzas were to result in 1929–32. These **Brecht works already showed the seminal influence of percussion**, as Orff had begun to conceptualize this medium in the institutional framework of the Munich Gunther-Schule, founded in 1924 by the multi-talented artist Dorothee Gunther from Hamburg, whose partner and collaborator in the school Orff became. Other associates who had joined Orff and Gunther as instructors by 1932 were Gunild Keetmann and Hans Bergese, instrumentalists equally adept at composition. The students were young girls, to be trained in the use of simple, sometimes exotic instruments (with great emphasis on percussion *and* melody), musical improvisation, rhythm, singing, and dance.³¹

Orff owed additional artistic impulses to two typically Weimar cultural institutions. One was the previously mentioned Vereinigung für Zeitgenössische Musik, founded in 1927, as an island of modernism in reactionary Munich, by local chamber musician Fritz Buchtger. Before long, other forward-looking musicians joined this experimental circle: Udo Dammert, the pianist; Werner Egk, the composer (and already a sometime student of Orff); Karl Marx, the composer and choir director and also Orff's student; and Orff himself. From 1929 to 1931 this association organized four separate festivals featuring mostly modern composers but, significantly and no doubt due to Orff himself, the performance also of old masters such as William Byrd and Hans Leo Hassler, sometimes in modern arrangements or stage settings. Among the contemporary **works presented** were those of **Bartok, Haba, Hindemith, Milhaud, Egk, Marx, Schoenberg, and Stravinsky**. Orff contributed "music as an element of dance," from the *Schulwerk* just being created in the Gunther-Schule, and he himself

conducted his own arrangement of Monteverdi's opera *Orfeo*. On a few occasions, Hindemith and his Amar Quartet joined in, and so did the trail-blazing modernist conductor Hermann Scherchen.³²

The handmaiden of these series was the Munich Bach-Verein e.V., which was founded in 1909 by Ludwig Landshoff for the purpose of stilistically faithful reproductions of Bach's works and those of his contemporaries. After Landshoff resigned in 1928, the Bach-Verein was taken over by Edwin Fischer, the famous pianist, while Karl Marx assumed the direction of a refashioned choir. In 1931 Fischer himself gave up the Bach-Verein for the sake of his pianistic career, and in 1932 Orff took over as conductor in the Bach-Verein, with Marx continuing to direct the choir. Apart from its **(p.116)** regular cooperation with the Vereinigung, one of the milestone stand-alone performances of the Bach-Verein was a new rustic-Bavarian arrangement of the *St. Luke Passion* (after a manuscript thought to be in Bach's hand), in which Orff took a major part: first in Munich in April 1932, then in November of that year in Berlin.³³

Both St. Luke events were progressive enough to act as thorns in the flesh of the purists among Baroque-music lovers, in Munich as well as in the capital, and hence they played an important part in identifying Carl Orff as an avant-garde composer.³⁴ Those purists included conservatives of all stripes but also National Socialists, who laid their own cultural-political claim to Bach and the Baroque era.³⁵

By 30 January 1933, then, the grand day of National Socialist reckoning, Carl Orff at age thirty-eight had defined himself as a person, a musician, and, not least, a political being. Orff had proven to be a somewhat shy man with a high intelligence and caustic wit, careful when entering into human relationships, particularly close or permanent ones, including those with the opposite sex. In 1920, he had married the gifted opera singer Alice Solscher, but by 1925, when daughter Godela was three years old they were divorced. Throughout the republican phase, he appears to have had many fleeting unions, particularly with the young women from the Gunther-Schule, who all were dependent on and reportedly worshipped him, but among them there was no steady companion who might have become his wife or the much-needed new mother for his daughter, as the Australia-bound Solscher did not raise the child.³⁶ Beyond early childhood, hardly anything today is known about Orff's ties with his three-years-younger sister Maria.³⁷ And whereas he seems to have enjoyed many professional acquaintances, he really had no close personal friends. His correspondence, even during the Weimar years, when, unlike later, nothing had to remain hidden from state censorship or party scrutiny, betrays a guardedness rarely observed in the surviving papers of other artists of that era. What it does reveal is the portrait of a man who, possibly through the autosuggestion of *sacro egoismo*, thought mainly of himself.³⁸

As a musician until 1933, Orff was a modernist, but an idiosyncratic one, even given the criteria of latitude provided by the Weimar cultural establishment. While consciously accepting as his model of modernity the music of Igor Stravinsky, whose percussive approaches he incorporated into his own creations after 1924, he would have **no truck with other expressions of Weimar modernism**, in particular atonality or anything remotely akin to **the Second Viennese School**, or the **new jazz**. Schoenberg to him was anathema. He remained staunchly diatonic, although, perhaps under the continuing influence of the old masters such as his favorite composer Monteverdi, he was developing a certain predilection for monody.³⁹

Orff's peculiar position as a Weimar modernist is thrown into stark relief by an examination of his dislike of Mahler, Hindemith, and the avant-garde periodical *Melos*, edited at this time by Heinrich Strobel. Mahler, one of the historic pioneers of German musical modernism, was berated by Orff as **(p.117)** the creator of "Unqualified crap." One of Mahler's compositions he characterized as "tense and twisted music, as in the totally amateur opening lines. It represents the nadir of musical misunderstanding to have such insincere non-music published."⁴⁰ In 1932 he **vilified Hindemith** for music written for German youth in Plön. Orff accused him of "obscuring the fundamentals from the beginning with his subjective artistry," leaving "interesting end results" only for the initiated, not those who were supposedly being schooled. Ultimately, Orff thought Hindemith's didactic examples "clever, but without any character, non-pedagogical worm-like music."⁴¹

In 1932, Orff's relationship with Strobel may have suffered from his pronounced vanity and his attendant unwillingness to accept even constructive criticism. In October the composer had responded positively to Strobel's suggestion that he send him something about his *Schulwerk* for *Melos*. But then a not entirely favorable critique appeared in the journal about Orff's choir music—presumably his new arrangement of *St. Luke Passion* as performed in Berlin, indicting, especially, one of Orff's trademarks already at this time: the "dangerous monotony." Wrote Orff, offended, to a friend: I just read in *Melos* a not very fortunate report about my efforts in Berlin.... Although it means well, too much has been misrepresented. Only he who knows my work from the ground up will understand what I am trying to do."⁴² Orff's contribution for the journal never materialized.

Orff's essays at other levels of the modernist music culture toward the end of the Weimar period were promising but might again have been wrecked by a combination of bad luck and the composer's venal stubbornness. When the renowned International Society for Contemporary Music became interested in featuring Orff's Brecht Cantatas, using the Kittel Choir in Berlin, Orff declined, in distrust of Kittel and thinking of conceptual frameworks for a staging of his own—sometime in 1933. The matter came to naught.⁴³ Shortly before Hitler's

takeover he considered producing Weill's *Die Burgschaft* in Munich, most certainly with the Bach-Verein, but neither Weill's music nor his personality had really been close to his own, and the end of the republic fittingly doomed this enterprise.⁴⁴ Scherchen, whom he knew from mutual tasks within the Vereinigung für Zeitgenössische Musik, performed Orff's new composition *Entrata* at Radio Königsberg, where the conductor was Generalmusikdirektor, in 1930, but Orff always had mixed feelings about this maestro with an equally large ego, who nonetheless considered featuring the Brecht Cantatas as late as January 1933.⁴⁵

Brecht Cantatas, Hermann Scherchen, and Kurt Weill: Were these not props for a politically leftist scenario? In March 1931 Orff strongly protested the impression he had made with some that he was a Communist.⁴⁶ In fact, like many artists, Orff was never moved by politics, although in the republic, where he had his freedom, he tended to the left in the bo-hemian sense of the word, as was in keeping with his antitraditionalist craftsmanship and several of the left-leaning modernists surrounding him on a daily basis. Brecht personally may have impressed him, for sometimes (p.118) he was sporting one of those typically Brechtian leather jackets and caps—hence the misleading epithet.⁴⁷ Scherchen of course was a left-wing Social Democrat. Also left of center were Scherchen's collaborators in Prussia, cultural administrator Leo Kestenberg and youth-music pioneer Fritz Jode, who supported Orff's novel approaches, although Orff sometimes found both less than reliable.⁴⁸

There is no ideological or political discourse between Orff and those left-leaning people to be gleaned from the records; to the composer, only music, music theater, or musical education mattered. But the same holds true for persons in his orbit who were of conservative persuasion or, worse, obvious early backers of the growing Nazi Party and detractors of Weimar democracy. Chief among those were Fritz Reusch, Georg Goetsch, and Ludwig Kelbetz, potential or actual Nazis who after January 1933 filled important posts in the educational system of the nation, particularly through the Hitler Youth.⁴⁹

Significantly, Carl Orff did not reply to a derogatory comment made in a letter by Reusch to him, in June 1932, in which Reusch characterized two mutual acquaintances as synonymous with "bverbreeding, decadence, brains, and commotion," against whom, Reusch wrote, he had "a racist aversion, even if they are not Jews."⁵⁰ Of the men in question, the music pedagogue Erich Katz was Jewish, and Erich Doflein, his colleague at the Freiburg municipal music school, was married to a partially Jewish woman.⁵¹ Clearly, Orff did not connive in racial slurs against his Jewish colleagues and friends, yet neither does he seem to have opposed those, as he kept himself out of any controversy involving anything but his personal life and music. But Jewish friends he had: apart from Katz, the Heidelberg singer Karl Salomon, the Mannheim composer Max Sinzheimer, and

the Frankfurt composer, cellist, and teacher Matyas Seiber, who had founded a jazz class at the Hoch'sche Konservatorium.⁵²

III

After January 1933 the National Socialist regime began coordinating cultural institutions in Germany and nazifying them, a process that was at first haphazard because several agencies at once thought themselves primarily responsible for this. The most visible of these was the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur (KfdK) (Combat League for German Culture) of party ideologue Alfred Rosenberg, which had polemicized against manifestations of Weimar's so-called gutter culture since its inception in early 1929. Because its national headquarters was at the Nazi Party seat in Munich, Orff had already been one of its targets, what with his obvious idolization of the Jewish poet Werfel as well as the Marxist dramatist Brecht and his irreverent modernism as expressed in suspect rearrangements of Monteverdi's music, the *St. Luke Passion*, and his central role in the Zeitgenössische Vereinigung and the Bach-Verein.⁵³

(p.119) Whereas it is clear that in the Weimar Republic Orff was never a dyed-in-the-wool leftist, it is equally clear from all the evidence available that he thoroughly disliked most of the things that National Socialism and the Third Reich came to stand for, before and after Hitler's takeover, and that **he never joined the Nazi Party**. The crudities and banalities of the Nazis, expressed, not least, through their cultural ambitions, were anathema to Orff's arcane sense of aesthetics and his perception of an artist's role. Whatever he may have understood about National Socialist politics, **he found it more convenient**, in what later became recognizable as typical Orffian style, **to look the other way**, so as not to be affected personally. When a Nazi friend, an actor from Brunswick, wrote him months after the caesura of January that it would be in his best interests, including professional ones, to adopt "the great Hitler principles," Orff ignored him. His friend's conviction that Orff's kind of music would be especially suited for the adumbration of "Volkish communal celebrations" at that time left the composer unmoved. In private, he was making fun of the Nazis, as in a letter to an archivist friend in Bamberg, whom he once greeted sarcastically "With severalheils."⁵⁴

The local Munich Kampfbund chieftain was **Paul Ehlers, an old Nazi Party member** and pronounced anti-Semite, who in later years was fond of looking back on "the decades of our fight against the increasing Jewification of the German music establishment," a fight during which he had prayed for the coming of the savior who would throw the defilers out of the temple.⁵⁵ Although Ehlers regarded Orff with as much suspicion as Orff regarded him, he seems to have thought, for a while, that it might be possible to win this exotic but promising composer over to the Nazi side. Moreover, **Orff held a prominent position in the Bach-Verein**, the control of **which was on Ehlers's agenda**, and hence Orff's connivance was considered as within the realm of possibilities. Orff,

on the other hand, had heard—which was undoubtedly true—that not all Kampfbund chapters were equally militant and that individual arrangements with local leaders could be made. Hence, by the middle of 1933 Orff decided to meet with the Munich chapter members to acquaint them with his work, a step which **could not**, however, **stop Ehlers** from increasing his pressure on the Bach-Verein.⁵⁶ Here Ehlers had a more reliable mole in the person of Fritz Buchtger (the founder of the Zeitgenössische Vereinigung), who quickly joined the party, the Stormtroopers, and the Kampfbund itself. By the fall, the entire leadership of the Bach-Verein, including Orff, had been impelled to resign, with Ehlers holding all the strings. Orff agreed to honor conducting commitments until the fall of **1934**, but thereafter **cut his association with the Bach-Verein**, the Zeitgenössische Vereinigung having long been dissolved.⁵⁷

Yet one other reason why Orff had been eager to talk to Ehlers and his circle was his determination to preserve the pedagogical opportunities that so far had resulted in important work toward the **Schulwerk project in the Gunther-Schule**. While the school's day-to-day director, **Dorothee Gunther**, herself had opened the door of this institution **to Nazi influence** by joining **(p.120)** the party and the Combat League, Orff remained interested in retaining control over the various *Schulwerk* publications to be produced and marketed.⁵⁸ In the coming years, he lost interest in Gunther, Keetmann, and the instructional activities of the school as such (which was rinding ever more ways of catering to the Nazi regime),⁵⁹ but held on to two associates who continued to be involved in the emerging *Schulwerk*, the young musicologists Wilhelm Twittenhoff and Hans Bergese.

And so, after the start of the Nazi regime, as Orff's regular activities as conductor and composer were somewhat in limbo, pending a clarification of his relationship to the new powers that be, Orff turned increasingly to the *Schulwerk* both as a source of income and as a means to adapt to the new rulers. Income was important, because **until he became nationally famous in the early 1940s, Orff was notoriously short of money**.⁶⁰ The *Schulwerk* seemed salable because of the Nazi pedagogues' military-inspired emphasis on rhythm and the novelty of the product per se, for the new Nazi culture wardens wanted new German works.⁶¹ Since before 1931, when the first brochure in a broader-conceived *Schulwerk* series had been published, the project was in fluid gestation: written instructions based on Orff's core ideas regarding rhythmic-melodic exercises, improvisation, and the use of a simple, even primitive orchestra, such as gongs, recorders, rattles, and metallophones, dictated by Orff's earlier interest in old and exotic musical instruments.⁶²

Orff gradually came to use his irregular contacts with Ehlers and other members of the Munich Kampfbund to interest Nazi authorities in the *Schulwerk*, attaching great importance to Gunther's new party connections. Not only did he wish the *Schulwerk* to appear as "hot suspect" to the Kampfbund, but, as he advised his publisher Willy Strecker of B. Schott's Sohne in Mainz, the present

circumstances were “Very conducive to its aims,” and it would simply be a matter of letting oneself be discovered by the trend-setting school of pedagogy.⁶³ After unreconstructed Kampfbund scribes had attacked Orff’s didactic mission, especially his **use of exotic instruments**, in their home journal *Kultur-Wacht*, Orff wrote a spirited reply to justify himself. He likened *Schulwerk* exercises to the brand of *Haus-musik* currently in vogue among the Nazis and protested any positive comparison with “atonal music” or jazz—two genres fundamentally condemned by the regime. He then referred the author of the hostile article to Ehlers, with whom he had consulted in the matter, and who had, in fact, a copy of his protest letter on file.⁶⁴

From 1933 to 1937 Orff took care, in conjunction with his publisher, to tailor his *Schulwerk* series as much as possible to the goals of the Nazis, as they then appeared, without, it may be assumed, wanting to falsify any facet of its originally conceived character. **Fortuitously, both Orff’s and the Nazis’ intentions were compatible in several respects.** Apart from an appreciation of *Hausmusik* and a shared aversion to atonality and jazz, there was the mutual appreciation of *Volksmusik*, or **folk songs** thought to resonate within the bosom of the people, and to which the Nazis had imputed *Blut (p.121) und Boden* qualities to which neither Orff nor his publisher appeared to object.⁶⁵ On the contrary: In March 1934, Orff informed Schott that he was just so glad his objectives were “concurrent, to the highest degree, with what is being required today.”⁶⁶ As for his publishers, they desired nothing less than that “every Hitler girl and every Hitler boy should end up contented” with Orff’s *Schulwerk* manuals.⁶⁷ **Orff’s music-pedagogical system, declared spokesmen of Schott a few years later, had become the bedrock of instruction courses everywhere, from conservatories and music schools to educational institutions of the Hitler Youth.** After all, Orff had successfully eclipsed the “exaggerated artistry” of the past decades, as he had striven for a “genuine basis, rooted in race and Volk.”⁶⁸ However, that last statement was considerably overblown. Although, contrary to Orff’s postwar utterings, the *Schulwerk* series continued to be published in several issues until 1939, the **Hitler Youth**, his most hoped-for client, had occasionally mentioned it in its literature but **not officially adopted it because of its relative complexity**, which was unsuited to the coarse music culture of future Wehrmacht soldiers and SS killers to be trained by it.⁶⁹ But neither had other projected uses materialized: within the NS-Kulturgemeinde (NSKG), the successor organization of Rosenberg’s Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur, for special performances in the giant, open-air, Nazi *Thing* stage (to which Gunther, too, wished to direct her energies), the new Dietrich-Eckart Stage in Berlin, or within the specifically Nazi primary-school teacher seminars.⁷⁰ Although the highest Nazi censorship office certified that the *Schulwerk* series was going to be instrumental “especially in this time of political change,” it was simply not true, as Orff asserted in December 1935, that “more and more official places” were becoming interested in the project.⁷¹

Nonetheless, through his efforts for the *Schulwerk* Orff came into contact with several regime-connected persons, some of whom he had actually known before 1933, who now tried to smooth his path to success and would remain his friends for years to come. Chief among them was Wilhelm Twittenhoff, with a recent Ph.D. in musicology, who, after studying with Orff and writing some articles about the *Schulwerk*, joined the Gunther-Schule in 1934, thereupon working mostly with the master. In his post-1945 memoirs, Orff characterized Twittenhoff as a pedagogue who had evolved from the German music youth movement (formerly led by Jode), but he neglected to mention that Twittenhoff was closely tied to the Stormtroopers and the Hitler Youth.⁷² That this Nazi aspect was strategically important to the composer at the time was explained in a letter to Schott in April 1934: Apart from his being favorably disposed toward the *Schulwerk*, Orff appreciated the fact that the young doctor was “in touch with today’s requirements through his current work, and possibly well-suited to our plans.”⁷³ Judging from his writings, Twittenhoff had a clear idea of how music could assume an important role in the shaping of the “communal life of National Socialist youth,” particularly because he was active in several Nazi youth training centers.⁷⁴ Thus it was he who actually tried out *Schulwerk* ideas in regular Hitler Youth camps, such as those in (p.122) Annaberg and Brunswick.⁷⁵ When in 1937 the *Schulwerk*, including Twittenhoff’s own publication in the series, was once again assaulted by members of the Rosenberg clique, Orff and Schott’s editors could rest secure, knowing that Twittenhoff was able to counterattack effectively as an influential leader of the Hitler Youth.⁷⁶ This turned out to be just another case of Nazi infighting.

Besides Twittenhoff, Orff could rely on acquaintances who, in one way or another, were all in a position to galvanize their sympathy for him and his *Schulwerk* into tangible support of one sort or another, from within the new Nazi educational institutions in which they were now functioning. In the teacher-college administration there was Fritz Reusch, Orff’s friend from the republic, who also collaborated closely with Twittenhoff.⁷⁷ Other allies in the pre-World War II phase included Ludwig Kelbetz, originally a fanatical (and at times illegal) Nazi from the Republic of Austria who rose to high rank in the Third Reich’s Hitler Youth and with whom Orff had touched base in preregime days. There was the composer Cesar Bresgen, a Hitler Youth music instructor eventually working out of Salzburg and, last but not least, Orff’s old colleague from the Bach-Verein Karl Marx, who after the Anschluss of Austria in March 1938 landed himself a tenured lectureship in the exclusively Hitler Youth conservatory in Graz.⁷⁸

In April 1937 Twittenhoff, who was about to embark on a regular teaching career at the Hitler Youth conservatory in Weimar, informed Orff that he had had a long talk with his boss, Wolfgang Stumme, formerly a student of Jode and now the chief of all music activities in the Hitler Youth under Baldur von Schirach, regarding the composer’s newest work, the scenic cantata *Carmina Burana*. Although Stumme thought he could do little or nothing for the work in the pages

of Hitler Youth pedagogical literature, part of which he controlled, he personally expressed great interest in it and signaled his intention to attend its world premiere in Frankfurt in June.⁷⁹

Why the need for this? At that time, Orff could still use all the official help he could get. For a few years now, Orff had been busy composing a vocal work with sparse instrumental, percussive accompaniment, which was obviously influenced by Stravinsky's *Les noces* (1923) as well as by Orff's own, earlier exercises for the *Schulwerk*. Melodically, it harked back to the Werfel songs of 1930; Orff himself described its music as one of "static architecture." Instead of a full-blown plot, the mixed choir and three soloists merely suggested the interwoven themes of springtime, joyful brawling and drinking, and sexual pleasure. Experts then and later detected in the piece many of Orff's favorite structural elements: monody, allusions to the *Volkslied*, modal influence, a bareness in phrasing which, combined with repetitive techniques, bordered on the primitive but conveyed at the same time the impression of archetypal, elementary dynamics.⁸⁰

Those qualities of the work were not necessarily non-German, nor could they automatically invoke the wrath of dogmatic National Socialists. But neither were they immediately appealing to non-Germans: The Jewish refugee music critic and musician Abraham Skulsky, for one, found the can- (p.123) tata harmonically "too light ... either not primitive enough or not sufficiently modern: somewhere between the two," as he wrote from Brussels.⁸¹ In the main, the problem was threefold. First, although not even bordering on atonality, the piece was not in the safe tradition of post-Romanticism the Nazis had so far preferred but sounded strangely out of place with its exotic harmonies and rhythms; although his status was improving, Stravinsky in Germany was still suspect to many Nazis, especially Rosenberg followers.⁸² Second, the text of *Carmina Burana* was a mixture of Latin, middle-high-German, and medieval French, anything but the argot of the new regime. Both Orff and Schott knew about this as a potential problem before June 1937. Orff had joked to his Bamberg-based text coauthor, Michel Hofmann, about a year before, that "he one will publish and perform the Burana. 'Un-German.'"⁸³ Willy Strecker of Schott warned that the music was too provocative and the text too Latin; the whole thing was hardly conducive to Robert Ley's "Strength-through-Joy" program. And third, because the plot conjured up Eros, the hybrid language was explicitly sexual, even pornographic. Whereas this might not have presented a problem for some singers, in order to understand what they were singing about most of them were given subtexts with German translations, which embarrassed especially the young girls in the choir. This, in turn, was reason enough for the Nazis, with their bigoted sense of sexuality (and several stage directors fearing them), to object to the work.⁸⁴

Carmina Burana for a time had difficulty being accepted at other German stages after its controversial Frankfurt premiere, particularly because there now was more than just one Nazi agency that could indict it: Rosenberg's chief music critic, Herbert Gerigk, was influential as chief reviewer of *Die Musik* as well as the Nazis' own *Volkischer Beobachter*, both of which immediately published two identical, rather stinging reviews.⁸⁵ There was no telling for the moment how far Gerigk might still be able to go, especially as insiders knew that he and in particular his colleague Friedrich Her-zog had played an odious role in bringing down Hindemith at the turn of 1934.⁸⁶ And as that had happened in collusion with the just-established music-control agencies of Reich Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels, Orff, the editors at Schott, and several sympathetic stage directors and conductors—for example, Karl Bohm in Dresden—were also uncertain about the reactions of President Peter Raabe of the RMK and Heinz Drewes in the Promi's own music supervision department.⁸⁷ Hence, there was apprehension in the years before *Carmina Burana's* premiere and even for a couple of years thereafter, most of it informed by the knowledge of what had happened to Hindemith and *could* happen to Orff, for whatever reason, irrespective of actual music censorship policies in the Reich, which were seldom overt and clear-cut, and irrespective also of the perceivable diminishing influence of Rosenberg's henchmen.⁸⁸

On the other hand, several factors immediately worked in Orff's favor and augured well for the continued success of *Carmina Burana*. One was tied to the nature of the performance itself, officially produced, as it was, by the (p.124) annual Tonkünstlerfest series of the Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein (ADMV) (albeit the last such event under Nazism). None other than Raabe of the RMK was its champion.⁸⁹ Opera director Hans Meissner of Frankfurt and the city's culturally ambitious mayor Fritz Krebs represented a second factor. In the republic, Meissner had been an able avant-garde artist on the political left. After the watershed, like so many, he had opportunistically exchanged membership in the Social Democratic Party (SPD) for that of the Nazi Party (NSDAP) and, as turncoats are apt to do, from 1933 in Frankfurt ostentatiously sought to ingratiate himself with the Nazis, at the same time trying to remain true to his former aesthetic principles: Even contemporaries saw this as an attempt to square the circle.⁹⁰ Thus anything that Meissner sponsored at his (from Weimar days) comparatively progressive Frankfurt opera was really fairly safe from outside interference. This was all the more so because Meissner had the full backing of his employer, Frankfurt's lord mayor and Nazi Kreisleiter Krebs, a high SS officer, who had been a Hitler follower since 1922 and as such a virulent anti-Semite but now also a member of the presidial council of the RMK under Goebbels and Raabe, thus affording Orff double protection.⁹¹

In fact it was Krebs who only two weeks after the premiere presented Orff with a money prize of RM500, which, although financially modest, politically was of enormous significance to the composer.⁹² Indeed, the small number of negative

critiques was easily and quickly outbalanced by raving reviews, in Frankfurt and elsewhere, so that still in June Orff could proudly write to Strecker: "Meanwhile you will have read the *Burana* re -ports, ninety percent of which are excellent."⁹³ As Orff was easily able to dismiss the vitriol by Gerigk in the *Volkischer Beobachter*, friends of his were assuring him that "the hoped for, really great success has finally materialized."⁹⁴ In Berlin, influential music critic Edwin von der Null, who as an intimate of Goring a few months later would finagle Herbert von Kara-jan's phenomenal and long-lasting success at the Berlin Staatsoper, assured Orff that he was in touch with Wilhelm Rode, Goebbels's bumbling chief at the propaganda minister's own Deutsches Opernhaus, as well as with the Promi itself.⁹⁵ Also in the capital, Wilhelm Matthes, one of the most vicious anti-Semites among Nazi critics from the Weimar era and an old intimate of Hans Pfitzner, offered to conduct *Carmina Burana* himself, quoting Goebbels's latest speech, according to which "experiments are desirable and critics, apart from being critical, should show their own mettle or whether they can improve upon the things which they are always so fond of criticizing."⁹⁶ Orff was now instantly intent on getting Fritz Stege, the uppermost music critic in the country and squarely in Goebbels's camp, interested in his oeuvre.⁹⁷

Late in 1937, notwithstanding any of the fears the composer or his publishers might still have entertained, *Carmina Burana* really took off. "All things considered," rejoiced Orff in October, I see a silver lining. Berlin es -pecially has made very promising and important offers. And things are moving very well in general."⁹⁸ Early in 1938 the secular cantata was again (p.125) on the program of the Frankfurt opera, and it stayed there into 1939. "It is a constant drawing card."⁹⁹ A disciple of Pfitzner complained to his master that he simply could not understand why *Carmina Burana* was so popular in the city on the Main River, while Pfitzner's *Das Herz* was being so neglected.¹⁰⁰ At the end of 1938, Orff's work played to enthusiastic reviews in Bielefeld; the composer himself was ecstatic.¹⁰¹

After World War II Orff, who through some of his stage plays had found a way with fairy tales, constructed two interrelated legends about the premiere and subsequent fate of *Carmina Burana*. The first, based on the sparse evidence of Nazi disagreement he did have but lacking any basis in fact, was that the work had been banned outright from 1936 to 1940 and had generally been declared "Undesirable" for the entire Third Reich. With -out closer examination, this version of events was thereafter propagated by his hagiographic followers and ultimately helped in spreading Orff's German reputation as an anti-Nazi.¹⁰² To this was tied the second legend that at the time of the scenic oratorio he had informed his publisher Strecker henceforth to forget everything he had composed before 1937.¹⁰³ That the veracity of this story has already been questioned in connection with other music-historical legends of the Third Reich is significant in itself¹⁰⁴; as for verification, I have not been able to receive it either from Schott in Mainz or the Orff-Zentrum in Munich. In any event, the

real reason for Orff's manipulation is not immediately obvious. Now why would Orff, in retrospect, have wished to place such emphasis on the originality and singularity of *Carmina Burana*? The answer is this: because, as the alleged victim of Nazi blacklisting, it would establish him as a creator of anti-Nazi art and hence as an anti-Nazi himself. As post-1937 events were to show, after the catastrophe of 1945 Orff was in dire need of such an alibi.

Because the premiere of *Carmina Burana* had very much pleased Frankfurt's Lord Mayor Krebs, he delegated Meissner, in March 1938, to ask Orff whether he would write music for *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, hence "replacing earlier compositions for Shakespeare's work."¹⁰⁵ This has to be put into more than one context. In the first place, there had been a national competition going on in this area for some time, in which numerous Reich agencies and composers were involved; one of those successfully asked was Rudolf Wagner-Regeny, who had contracted with the Kampf-bund as early as 1934 and whose ersatz piece had been performed publicly a year later.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, as far as Frankfurt was concerned, it lay in the very personal interests of Krebs the anti-Semite to have such a replacement for the Jewish Mendelssohn's music commissioned, for, as he published for everyone to read, he was already of the opinion that through the elimination of Jewry from the cultural life of the German people, "the feats of our cultural institutions not only have not deteriorated, but have markedly improved." This he wanted to see happening on his own turf.¹⁰⁷

Orff consented immediately, presumably because he badly needed the generous advance of RM5,000 that was offered but also because he had himself tried his hand at stage music for Shakespeare's play as early as 1917. Now he (p.126) wished to write something truly suited to the theater, and not as schmaltsy and sugar-sweet as, allegedly, Mendelssohn's famous original.¹⁰⁸ But there was a third, more politic reason. Because in 1938 Orff was still not certain about his place in the regime's cultural establishment, he seized on this opportunity to secure his position via the good offices of Lord Mayor Krebs, who not only had been Frankfurt's local Kampf-bund leader,¹⁰⁹ but now also seemed to back entirely the modern and therefore possibly still suspect endeavors of opera director Meissner, with which Orff could identify.¹¹⁰

At the time, the commission did not sit too well with Schott's principals because they, who continued to support Stravinsky and in their heart of hearts recognized the foolishness of anti-Semitism in the music business, were aware of the potential explosiveness of this issue. He had placed himself in a "hasty wasp's nest" with this music, they cautioned Orff, for would he ever be able to "dispatch Mendelssohn"?¹¹¹ Strecker himself warned Orff that in the past few years several *Midsummer Night's Dream* compositions had been commissioned, with the aim of "putting the non-Aryan Mendelssohn out of business." Currently, three quarters of all the German stages were performing these works and hence the saturation point was near; besides, it was relatively costly to produce

them.¹¹² Offended, Orff replied that he was in a different class than those other *Midsummer Night's Dream* composers, who on the whole had done a less than perfect job.¹¹³ In reality, Orff himself had qualms about the whole thing, for several times he was very close to suffering writer's block.¹¹⁴ Nevertheless, in mid-August 1939 he had mastered the chore, and no sooner was the work finished than he asked Krebs's permission to dedicate it to the city of Frankfurt.¹¹⁵ After its Frankfurt premiere on 14 October Strecker was enchanted, agreeing with Orff's earlier prediction that this incidental music would represent an iteration "from the sugar-sweet to a dry Old English" subject.¹¹⁶ Although Orff was not entirely happy with the artistic direction of the play, he was satisfied that the music itself had been "Very successful," and he was hoping for many more acceptances outside Frankfurt.¹¹⁷ As for Krebs, he also was content. As a consequence of his long-term political goals, within which the "Aryan" *Midsummer Night's Dream* music had prominently figured, an Institute for Research into the Jewish Question at Frankfurt was realized in 1941, under the auspices of his old mentor, Alfred Rosenberg.¹¹⁸ In March 1943 Krebs thanked Orff once again, expressing his hope that many more compositions would flow from his pen, which, too, would benefit "the new Germany."¹¹⁹

The Frankfurt performance had represented Orff's third version of the piece so far, and he was at work on a fourth one by 1941.¹²⁰ Ideally, he wanted that version to be performed in Berlin, but, reportedly, Gustaf Gründgens, who was becoming increasingly disenchanted with the Nazi regime, as Generalintendant of the Berlin Staatstheater was against it, because he did not wish to compromise his traditionally cordial relationship with the Mendelssohn family.¹²¹ A final possibility to have the newest version staged in Leipzig during 1944 foundered in the war's turmoil.¹²²

(p.127) As Hans Maier, once Bavaria's minister of culture under Franz Josef Strauss and presently a member of the Orff Foundation, observed during Carl Orff Year in 1995, Orff should have known not to rewrite Mendelssohn's classic Shakespearean music for Nazi use, even though his main motive may have been a long-standing aesthetic one. Orff should have known that, as Maier put it, "for the Nazis, there was nothing in music that was not, at the same time, also political."¹²³ Other composers, more prominent than Orff, had known this well, among them Pfitzner, who waxed sarcastic about the whole scheme, and Richard Strauss, who grumbled as early as 1935 that "the *Midsummer Night's Dream* has to suffer a terrible, Aryan ersatz music, to the derision of the whole world."¹²⁴

Indications that Orff knew full well that he was doing something distasteful, even morally wrong, can be found less in his regime statements than in his postwar attempts to hone the various legends he had already begun constructing. In so doing, he was using two separate approaches. One was to put

the Frankfurt composition, and equally so the newer version intended for Leipzig and still awaiting a premiere, out of people's minds, at least for the time being. This is shown by a strenuous correspondence he had with Gottfried von Einem, who in 1946–47, without a Nazi record and on the new Salzburg Festival board, had a say in whether the as yet unperformed Leipzig-bound version could be premiered in the Austrian city. Orff counseled "the greatest restraint," so that Einem, several months later, asked the composer whether the work was "a Nazi commission or something like that."¹²⁵ Orff's tortuous explanation, once again employing the aesthetic argument, gave away **his bad conscience**, when he wrote that the piece "naturally is in no way 'tainted,' nor has this particular version ever been produced. In spite of this, certain circles have held it against me that I confronted the Romantic masterpiece by Mendelssohn with an unromantic counterpart."¹²⁶

The other post-1945 approach, several years later, was simply to stress the continuity between his first *Midsummer Night's Dream* composition attempts from 1917 to beyond 1945 in order to make the 1938–44 episodes seem insignificant, or part of an ongoing, unstoppable creative process that had nothing to do with the Third Reich and its anti-Semitism. This is suggested by his postwar memoirs. Significantly, what Orff has listed there beyond the cataclysmic year of 1945 are several renewed and successful attempts at bringing his music for Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* to full stage fulfillment, the logical successors to the 1917 archetype, as if the Nazi interlude had never occurred.¹²⁷

IV

Notwithstanding any legends Orff constructed around the origins and development of *Carmina Burana* in the Third Reich from June 1937, the work became a roaring success after the beginning of World War II. Its **(p.128)** spate of celebrated performances was touched off on 4 October 1940 by a sensational staging under the baton of Dresden's Karl Böhm, who had earlier declined it because of its then still controversial nature.¹²⁸ Strecker and Orff agreed that press reviews on the whole were excellent, even those in regime papers—additional proof that Orff's old party foes were increasingly being pushed against the wall.¹²⁹ In the years to follow, there were providential performances in Essen, Cologne, Mainz, Göttingen, Frankfurt, Göttingen, Hamburg, Aachen, and Münster, the last two under Herbert von Karajan and Hans Rosbaud, respectively.¹³⁰ Even Munich's musical circles, always more on the conservative side, received the oratorio warmly—once in 1942 and then for another long season early in 1944.¹³¹ Particularly memorable were the Berlin stagings under Karajan, after that meteoric conductor had moved from Aachen to the capital, from January 1942 on, at times in conjunction with Egk's *Joan von Zarissa*. Goebbels's uppermost critic Fritz Stege exulted with praise over the often-sold-

out performances, and Orff remarked proudly that the *Burana* had become “the great successful hit.”¹³²

The *Carmina Burana* success story in the last years of the Third Reich raises again the problem of the National Socialist quality of Orff’s music, as it was composed and performed under Hitler, apart from the issue of Orff’s personal status as a Nazi, on which the evidence is unequivocal. Although just as easily posed, the musical question is not easily answered. Apart from the origin of Orff’s music in the culture of Weimar and his own preference for Stravinsky (who, coincidentally, more than flirted with fascism and was an anti-Semite as well), the use of ostinato rhythms, melodic economy, rudimentary diatonicism, repetition and monophony, and thematic allusions to *Volksmusik* and *Hausmusik* all were generically akin to a peculiarly Nazi aesthetic in German music between 1933 and 1945.¹³³ Yet even if pressed, musicologists today show themselves reluctant to identify, in Orff’s music and especially that of *Carmina Burana*, a distinctive “fascist” quality. On the other hand, a few respected scholars, for instance those as widely apart as Albrecht Riethmüller (Berlin) and Richard Taruskin (Berkeley), have admitted that they find the cantata of 1937 quintessential^ Nazi.¹³⁴ Orff’s third wife, Luise Rinser, not too long ago wrote of the attacks by post-World War II music critics, who had called his works anti-spiritual, capable of numbing the listener, of delivering him to irrational powers, thus betraying fascistoid traits. And she added that she could not defend him.¹³⁵

In a recent analysis of music in the Third Reich, works by Orff, Egk, Gottfried von Einem, Rudolf Wagner-Regeny, and Boris Blacher have been subsumed under a special rubric of modernism—of a type the Nazis, and especially Goebbels, actually desired, in order to lend credence and legitimacy to their overall revolutionary intentions in the cultural field and which by its very structure, and not to offend known Nazi aesthetic norms, were sometimes more and sometimes less removed from the criteria that had determined modern music in Weimar. To those criteria belonged, to (p.129) mention only two, a predilection for jazz and a polyrhythmic architecture, neither of them a quality Orff happened to espouse but which younger composers close to him, such as von Einem and Blacher, even Egk, empathized with to variable degrees.¹³⁶

Contemporaries of Orff would have agreed with the sentiments of Rieth-müller and Taruskin, without having put their fingers on any textbook rules or being able precisely to define the *Zeitgeist*. The convinced Nazi educator Reusch wrote to Orff in February 1942—after the composer’s picture had been featured in Goebbels’s intellectually high-brow tabloid *Das Reich*—that “time has worked in favor of *your* spiritual and musical ideas, and what *you* (and Egk) are presently experiencing must represent the climax of your life’s work.” In 1944, Carl Niessen, an expert on modern opera, thought the choreography for Orff’s *Carmina Burana* a new beginning for the German operatic stage, evoking “centuries-old dreams” for a “Visible cantata” in a Scenic space,” in contrast to

what Kurt Weill had once done with the choir, having created a mere “show-business joke” in *Der Zar lässt sich photographieren*: “long-bearded, dotty old men in black coats”—a scarcely veiled reference to Jews.¹³⁷ Oscar Fritz Schuh, the stage director of the Vienna opera and not a Nazi, also thought Orff had created something archetypally new with a music that picked up where the pre-Romantic phase had left off and now was aiming for a style “Which could symbolize *the* salvation of music in general.”¹³⁸ At a different level Willy Strecker, sales figures in his head, thought *Carmina Burana* trend setting, thinking it commercially viable to the point at which watered-down, popularized versions of the kind played in hotel lobbies could create a sort of public demand that would make Orff’s new genre a commonplace commodity (and him, presumably, rich).¹³⁹

The carnal cantata was also performed in Vienna, yet if it did not find the same enthusiastic echo there, it was not for lack of trying or official support. Since August 1940 the Gauleiter of Vienna was former Hitler Youth chief Baldur von Schirach, son of a theater intendant and brother of an opera singer, and something of a poet himself. The Schirach family had been ennobled by Empress Maria Theresa two centuries ago, and so one of Schirach’s ambitions in culture-saturated Vienna was to outdo Reich Propaganda Minister Goebbels as a patron of the arts, featuring what he considered to be truly outstanding German music, traditional but also avant-garde, and always commensurate with Nazi ideology, of course. The traditionalist he chose to champion was Strauss, and the two progressives were Rudolf Wagner-Regeny and Orff. Walter Thomas, by inclination a progressive theater expert but a man who politically sympathized “With the wrong side,” acted as the authorized spokesman of the Gauleiter. No sooner had Schirach and Thomas got to work than they felt the wrath of Minister Goebbels upon them.¹⁴⁰

Orff’s institutional ties with Vienna were firmed up after he had attended the premiere of Wagner-Regeny’s *Johanna Balk* on 2 April 1941, under the protection of the Vienna Gauleiter. Its progressive stage director, Schuh, was **(p.130)** a guest in the Orffs’ Munich home in early July. Three months later a proposition was made, presumably by Schuh and Thomas and with the full backing of Schirach, that Orff conclude a working contract with the Viennese; he was asked to reveal his plans. Orff was in Vienna in the middle of October to finalize the blueprint for a contract, with the “best possible” conditions. The new working agreement was to take effect by 1 April of 1942.¹⁴¹

And this is precisely what happened. According to a letter by Orff to Berlin Generalintendant Heinz Tietjen, Schirach, probably through Schuh, granted the composer a commission for a full-feature work to be premiered by the Wiener Staatsoper; Orff then offered *Antigona*, about which he had already done some serious thinking.¹⁴² This commission became the foundation for a three-year contract, according to which Orff was to be paid RM1,000 per month. The

signatories were Orff on the one hand and Thomas on the other, he on behalf of Schirach's Gau administration in Vienna. The Reich beneficiary was to be the Wiener Staatsoper, which received the right of first refusal. According to the contract of 17 March 1942, Schirach was ceded the privilege of accepting or rejecting an original work proposed by Orff within three months; he also had the prerogative to choose the venue, the orchestra, and the conductor, but only in consultation with the composer. The overriding principle accorded perfectly well with Schirach's new cultural ambitions, "that the support of certain composers is in the interest of, particularly, the Wiener Staatsoper."¹⁴³

True to contract, Orff got to work on *Antigone* and received his monthly RM1,000, starting April 1942; until April 1945 he was to collect RM36,000 exactly.¹⁴⁴ This sum helped him in several ways. He could continue to shore up his monthly income, which had been sagging until the recent good fortune with *Carmina Burana*.¹⁴⁵ It facilitated the Vienna premiere of the scenic cantata which, little cared for by tradition-minded critics and the Viennese public, did become a favorite of Schirach and his wife, who personally got to like the Orff couple, and with whom Orff himself "got along very well." To show her personal sympathies, Frau Henriette von Schirach, the daughter of Hitler's personal photographer, made Frau Orff a gift of Austrian sunflower seeds. In addition, the work quite impressed Richard Strauss, who was then spending time in his Viennese villa in the Jacquingasse, and whose condescendingly benign judgment Orff came to treasure.¹⁴⁶

The continuous triumph of *Carmina Burana* and the propitious relationship with Vienna ran parallel to and sometimes interrelated with other compositional achievements. Orff's penchant for fairy tales and legend that had already attracted him to *A Midsummer Night's Dream* produced the fairy opera *Der Mond*, in Munich under Clemens Krauss in February 1939, and the parable *Die Kluge*, premiered four years later, once again in Frankfurt. There also was *Catulli Carmina*, from a workmanship perspective an inferior sequel to *Carmina Burana*, but with similarly sexual content, which saw its first performance in Leipzig on 6 November 1943. Commercially, it could not ride on the coattails of its by then famous predecessor.¹⁴⁷

(p.131) *Der Mond* was modeled on a plot by the Brothers Grimm, in which four foolhardy boys steal the moon, come to their death, and then keep the moon's company in their second life in the underworld. This play may have been intended for children more than adults, yet it brought grief to its creator, for not only did Orff dislike the production by Krauss, but subsequent stagings were also difficult because of **an alleged pagan, anti-Catholic** animus in the plot (which would antagonize Catholic communities) and psychological problems caused by the appearance of dead people and dark underworld scenes—untimely reminders of lethal bombings and terrifying anti-airraid blackouts.¹⁴⁸

In *Die Kluge*, a clever girl solves three riddles, thereby deceiving the king who has imprisoned her father until, with the last riddle, she reconfirms his love and is kept on as his wife. The piece contained passages decrying the erosion of justice, which could be, and locally were, interpreted by the audience as criticism of the dictatorship. Whether Orff actually intended them as such still must be left open to question; it would have been somewhat out of character for a generally accommodating composer. Besides, Nazi Kreisleiter Krebs once again was glad to have received the work for Frankfurt. After Gottingen's staging during 1944, when university students in the audience clapped, hollered, and booed in obvious approval with the renegade lines, Orff himself remained unmolested by regime charges. Most critics interpreted the plot as not being very serious, more along the lines of a raucously funny comedy. It was a "curious mixture of fairy tale and bur -lesque," wrote music critic Oskar Kaul from Wurzburg, controversial but ably exposing the problems of modern opera direction, and thereby pointing to "entirely new ways of music-dramatical configuration."¹⁴⁹

By 1944 Orff found himself at the pinnacle of a career that had miraculously turned itself around, from one of an impecunious political near victim at the start of the Nazi regime to that of an artistically acclaimed and officially recognized composer. If the Third Reich had had a Stalin Prize, Carl Orff would have received it. In fact, the Reich Music Chamber awarded him a veritable equivalent in the summer of 1942: RM2,000 reserved for composers in prize category 3 of a "fctate subsidy" (category 1 being designed for Strauss, Pfitzner and Graener), which he shared with genuine Nazi composers such as Armin Knab and Wolfgang Fortner.¹⁵⁰ Although there is no proof whatsoever that Orff believed in the ideology of Nazism or approved of the day-to-day politics of the Third Reich, party representatives thought, in June 1942, that politically he was without blemish.¹⁵¹ Indeed, there is incremental evidence that after the success of *Carmina Burana* had converted him to something of an icon in the cultural establishment, Orff profited from various perquisites and privileges the regime had to offer and came close to allowing his name to be used for its devious purposes.

As the money prize demonstrates, this became especially apparent in Orff's relations with the propaganda ministry or its subordinate agencies. In 1941, a directive went out from its press section specifying that hence- (p.132) forth, any of his compositions to be performed should be treated favorably by the critics.¹⁵² Around that time, Schott publishers and Orff both were recognizing the publicity value of a Promi seal of approval; Schott was indeed delighted to report in May that by this time, the ministry had showed itself "Very interested" in the scenic cantata.¹⁵³ RMK President Raabe decreed in February 1942 that Orff not be stripped of his telephone service because of "his significance to the German music establishment."¹⁵⁴ In May 1943 Orff was invited to the ministry to demonstrate his new composition, *Catulli Carmina*; reportedly, this caused

“great enthusiasm,” and “in other respects, too, my talks were extremely successful.”¹⁵⁵ A few weeks later Goebbels’s broadcasting system was scheduling a special feature, I Selection of Compositions by Carl Orff”; more of his music was to be broadcast in the series “The Great Concert—Eternal Music of Europe.” In 1944, Orff belonged among those few German composers “Whom the broadcast network cannot do without.”¹⁵⁶

The year 1944 represents one of ultimate distinction for Carl Orff, as far as the regime was concerned, as Goebbels himself was being made more aware of his compositions and general importance. Reportedly, after Wolfgang Liebeneiner, production chief of Goebbels’s pet film company Ufa, had played the minister a tape with Orff’s music in a Neubabelsberg studio, Goebbels was beside himself that this composer had so far been withheld from him.¹⁵⁷ Rainer Schlosser, chief of theater in the propaganda ministry, and Gauleiter Karl Hanke of Silesia also talked to Goebbels about Orff, and one of the results of these representations was an offer by the minister to Orff to compose special “combat music” for his newsreel service—a service Goebbels was personally watching over like a hawk.¹⁵⁸

In the summer of 1944 Orff’s name was added to that of specially selected German artists who were to be exempt from war service requirements of any kind.¹⁵⁹ By this time Goebbels was eager to meet Orff in person. For on 12 September he recorded in his diary, after having listened to *Carmina Burana* on the radio, that “in the case of Carl Orff we are not at all dealing with an atonal talent. On the contrary, his ‘Carmina Burana’ exhibits exquisite beauty, and if we could get him to do something about his lyrics, his music would certainly be very promising. I shall send for him on the next possible occasion.”¹⁶⁰ Orff was now in the process of riding out the Third Reich in style. In good Orffian fashion, he elegantly avoided one final pitfall when Hans Hinkel, of Goebbels’s Reich Culture Chamber, asked him to contribute, along with other artists, a homily to be published in honor of the Führer, as the patron of German culture, in those final hours of his struggle for the Reich. Orff typically obliged by sending a noncommittal verse, not by himself but by the Romantic poet Friedrich Holderlin, “on the threshold of the year of decision, December 1944.”¹⁶¹ He dedicated it to “Adolf Hitler, the patron of German Art.”¹⁶² Whether he wrote this line with tongue in cheek is not certain, but it is possible; in any event, Orff knew that he had paid his final premium for insurance. Gustaf Gründgens, the great theater director with whom Orff gladly would **(p.133)** have cooperated in the years gone by and who, disillusioned with the regime leaders, had left for the front long ago, had ignored the request. Whereas Hitler placed his contempt for Gründgens on record, he would have found no fault with Orff.¹⁶³

V

In November 1945, six months after the capitulation of the Nazi government, Carl Orff received a letter from an old Berlin acquaintance asking him how things were in Munich. How was the theater scene, was everybody taking up arms against the former rulers?¹⁶⁴ Orff had reason to be worried. At the end of the regime, he had come out on top as one of its major composers. His efforts to sell his educational work to Nazi institutions surely was documented somewhere, perhaps in the Schott firm's archive or in the Hitler Youth files. He had accepted an official commission to replace Mendelssohn's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* music. What had become his most personal work, *Carmina Burana*, ultimately turned into a calling card for the Third Reich.

Although at the end of 1945 the criteria for political and social survival were not yet quite clear to most Germans, OMGUS, to which Bavaria now had surrendered, had already made it sufficiently evident that persons who had compromised themselves under the Nazis had to expect retribution and that those Germans who were to be employed by the Allies in the democratic reconstruction of the country had to be virtually spotless. It was becoming manifest that anyone who desired service with the newly formed bureaucracy had to have a clean slate; persons who were self-employed and continued to be so, as Orff had been, had less to fear. But short of a total and explicit exoneration by the Allies, everyone's career was virtually on hold, and Orff's was no exception.¹⁶⁵

Toward the end of 1945, this posed itself as a crucial question for him personally, for—not for the first time in his life—Orff was considering employment either in a teaching situation at a conservatory or, more likely, as intendant at a municipal opera. One opportunity was the post of artistic director of opera and theater in Stuttgart, but he also wanted to have his new opera, *Die Bernauerin*, which he had begun to work on while on the Vienna Gauleitung payroll, premiered in a properly exposed setting, perhaps in Hamburg or in Munich, under democratic auspices.¹⁶⁶

By a stroke of luck, the newly appointed German bureaucrats, under Wurttemberg's Minister of Culture Theodor Heuss in Stuttgart, came to be in touch with a U.S. supervisory officer who had once been Orff's student in Munich, in 1938–39. Newell Jenkins, with a bachelor's degree in music from Yale, had a colorful background. His grandfather, of an established New England family, had taken up residence in Dresden in the nineteenth century and become court dentist to the King of Saxony. Keenly interested in music, he had become a friend of Wagner. His son, Newell's father, had (p.134) retained his German ties, so that at the age of seventeen Newell himself, who was born in 1915 in New Haven, went to Dresden to learn German and study music in 1932. In 1938 he settled in Munich to study conducting under Orff, after some time in Freiburg, where his teacher Erich Doflein had suggested Orff as an ideal mentor.

Generously supported by his well-off family back in the United States, Jenkins stayed in Munich until the outbreak of war in September 1939. He had obviously become attached to Orff's personality and valued his musical skills, for while still on his return voyage he wrote to the master from Lucerne that now he would have "in America a student, and I also hope a friend, who will pass on the modest bits and pieces that have been stuffed into his small brain, as faithfully as possible." And he concluded that sooner rather than later he would come back.¹⁶⁷

Come back he did, but not without having graduated and after an arduous war path through North Africa and Italy, where he served in the ambulance corps. Eventually, because of his cultural background and his fluent knowledge of German, he ended up as the OMGUS Information Control Division theater and music control officer for U.S.-controlled Baden-Württemberg in Stuttgart, there since the formation of that territory in September 1945, and officially to begin his mission on 1 January 1946. Already in December 1945 he became interested in the fate of his old German friends, Doflein in Freiburg and, aware of the pending Stuttgart stage appointment, Carl Orff in Munich. As for the latter, he had managed to find out through his Munich counterparts that Orff was, provisionally, on an index, until his record had been cleared beyond a doubt.¹⁶⁸

Because Jenkins had a constructive interest in the Stuttgart theater matter but also because he wanted to help his friend Orff clear his name, if at all possible, he obtained permission from his Munich OMGUS colleagues to look him up and discuss the situation. The music and theater officer, with the honorary rank of a Captain of the U.S. Army, arrived with jeep and driver at the Orff house in Munich-Grafelfing on 24 December; they all celebrated Christmas Eve in high spirits, and later the two men moved over to Werner Egk's nearby house. The fact that they reached it unexpectedly late—too late for Egk to produce details of his own compromised situation—suggests that some strategy had meanwhile been discussed between the master and his former student as to how Orff could benefit personally and professionally from the Americans' new presence and how the occupiers, on the whole ignorant of German cultural affairs, in return might make use of Orff's considerable expertise.¹⁶⁹

The problem was how to get Orff's name removed from its provisional place in category 3 of four possible categories: 1, White; 2, Gray-Acceptable; 3, Gray-Unacceptable; 4, Black. Persons in categories 3 and 4 were banned, but if Orff could be moved from 3 to 2, his future was secured. Jenkins therefore tried to search Orff's soul as to some possible anti-Nazi activity; today it may be assumed that he did this honestly and without knowing any details of Orff's involvement, however tenuous, with the Nazi (p.135) regime. Hence, on 7 January 1946, after consulting with his superiors in Bad Homburg, Jenkins sent a letter to the composer outlining the conditions: "If you have truly been active in an antifascist manner and can prove it, you would be of tremendous use not

only to us, the American occupation authorities, but also to the future German reconstruction.” This would apply especially if Orff, as he had not yet decided, were to accept a teaching position. Jenkins drove home his most important point once more: “To examine your own conscience and furnish proof of *active* resistance against the previous government. For those people are scarce, and, as I said, they are of the greatest value to everyone.”¹⁷⁰

When I arrived in Munich to commence research on Orff’s Nazi past, I was told both by his **fourth widow, Liselotte** Orff, and one of his most learned acolytes, Werner Thomas, the officially designated biographer of Orff by the Orff Foundation, that Orff’s name had been cleared immediately after the war by a **U.S. intelligence officer named Jenkins**.¹⁷¹ Curious to learn more, after great difficulty I finally located the American, who after a distinguished conducting and teaching career had retired to Hillsdale in western New York State. Jenkins and I talked for a whole day about Orff, and he remembered him mostly sympathetically. When I asked the crucial question of how Orff had satisfied him in early 1946, with details of an opposition to the Nazis, Jenkins said to me the following: “His proof was that he had worked together with Kurt Huber, they had founded some kind of a youth group.... The danger came when he and some kids or maybe Huber himself were discovered passing out leaflets. Huber was arrested and killed.” Orff, Jenkins continued, had received some help through friends and fled into the mountains, where he stayed until it was safe for him to return.¹⁷²

Since I first presented the results of my interview with Jenkins, the veracity of his statements regarding Orff and Orff’s involvement in the “White Rose” resistance movement of Kurt Huber and the Scholl siblings has been questioned.¹⁷³ But circumstantial evidence supports that **Orff actually told Jenkins what Jenkins claimed he did**. One is a letter penned by Orff’s Swiss friend Heinrich Sutermeister in December 1946, repeating essential details of Orff’s alleged involvement with Huber’s group, details Sutermeister had received from Jenkins during an automobile trip to Wiesbaden. Wrote Sutermeister to Orff: “Finally I heard something more concrete about you. I did not have a clue, about Prof. Huber, of the difficult times you had to endure, persecuted as you were. Your music and your work must have been your only consolation. I remembered very well from that period, when you told me of Gestapo torture methods and then was not aware that you yourself and your best friends had been in the greatest danger.”¹⁷⁴ The other testimony is a letter to the editor of *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* in July 1995, in which a man from Hamburg, apparently a former private student, certifies that in 1946 **Orff had told him in his house in Grafelfing that a certain U.S. officer named Newell Jenkins** was trying to play him up as a former resistance fighter, to the extent that he, **(p.136)** Orff, was having trouble calming the man down. The letter writer’s conclusion that Orff could not have been the one to invent the “White Rose” legend but that, because of his insistence, it must have been Jenkins,

prova n. 1
(per cui Orff
menti a Jenkins)

prova n. 2

makes no sense in light of the fact that in early 1946, Jenkins could not possibly have known about that resistance group unless informed of it by Orff.¹⁷⁵

After another meeting between Orff and Jenkins in Stuttgart early in March 1946, the composer was sent to OMGUS headquarters in Bad Homburg a few weeks later, to be examined on political and psychological grounds. The resultant report of the American experts, dated 1 April 1946, speaks of Carl Orff as an “applicant for licence as composer and orchestra conductor.”¹⁷⁶ Orff, described by the examining psychiatrist Major Bertram Schaffner as “retiring and unobtrusive,” but also as “egocentric” and “diplomatic,” presented a mixed bill of goods. He tried to play down his importance in the Nazi regime by insisting that his music had not been appreciated by it and that “he never got a favorable review by a Nazi critic,” thus squarely lying about Stege and other officially sanctioned journalists. In line with that was his blanket claim that “he was not well thought of at the Propaganda Ministry,” conveniently ignoring the final Nazi years. As the commencement of his great success with *Carmina Burana* he identified its performance at La Scala in Milan in 1942, suppressing the truth about the path-breaking Dresden premiere under Böhm two years earlier and moving himself, his oeuvre, and his civic and artistic responsibilities out of the jurisdiction of the Third Reich. He said that he had received no order from the Nazis to reinvent the incidental music to Shakespeare’s *Midsummer Night’s Dream*, when he knew that he had received an offer and a commission through the offices of Kreisleiter Krebs in Frankfurt and had accepted both. He also testified that he had never collected “a prize or title,” making no mention of the RM2,000 from the RMK and RM500 from Krebs.

On Kurt Huber and the “White Rose,” Orff was conspicuously silent. Whereas he volunteered the information that the professor was killed in Munich in 1943 after he had published music with him and that, indeed, Huber had been “one of his best friends,” Orff mentioned nothing about his own role as cofounder of Huber’s resistance group. At first glance, this appears to contradict Jenkins’s postwar testimony and exposes the American conductor as mendacious. Yet the matter was more complicated. While there is no reason to doubt Orff’s “White Rose” story in early conversations with Jenkins—accounts that Jenkins, for his part, welcomed because they would help his old friend and, in addition, fulfill American and democratic German cultural needs in Stuttgart—Orff himself had decided, till the end of March 1946, to abandon this version of events for two reasons. One was that he did not need it any more, since by that time he had made up his mind, apparently much against Jenkins’s own intentions,¹⁷⁷ to decline the Stuttgart position, which would have made him a public servant and hence would have exposed him closely to political scrutiny for an indefinite length of time. Rather, he wanted to compose and occasionally guest-conduct.

(p.137) This explains why he figured in Bad Homburg as “composer and orchestra conductor.” Second, regardless of whether Jenkins had believed the initial “White Rose” story, Orff must have known that any official version of it, as recorded by his Bad Homburg interrogators, was easily verifiable, for instance through an interview with Clara Huber and surviving members of the group, and that in that case it would have to stand up to reality.

For the time being, Orff’s sojourn in Bad Homburg had been successful. He was glad he had duped, first, Jenkins, and then the Captain’s colleagues at U.S. military headquarters. So he returned home and told Jenkins that psychiatrist Schaffner had been / very stupid man” and that he, Carl Orff, was “so much brighter than all the other people about him.”¹⁷⁸ The Americans’ recommendation was that he should be classified as “Gray C, acceptable” and that he ought to be licenced as “composer and orchestra conductor.”¹⁷⁹ Although he had expected a “White classification,”¹⁸⁰ it still meant that from now on, nothing could stand in the path of his postwar social, political, and professional progress. Eschewing not only the directorship in Stuttgart but also any kind of teaching position (which again might have subjected him to harsher scrutiny), Orff was immediately free to look for a German stage to produce his *Die Bernauerin* (which had been completed in January 1946), and free, of course, to compose music for further German productions. *Die Bernauerin*, starring his daughter, actress Godela Orff, in the leading role, was duly staged in Stuttgart on 15 June 1947, exactly one month before Jenkins was set to leave Germany. Plans from the summer of 1946 to produce *Die Bernauerin* in Munich were also approved by local OMGUS authorities. That a special American friend had helped him was in the air: Orff received forthwith requests from other suspect colleagues to have Jenkins intercede on their behalf, requests Orff met with stony silence.¹⁸¹

What, then, about the question of Orff’s “White Rose” involvement, had he told the truth? Whereas the composer had known the Munich scholar for years, his tale to Jenkins about participation in Kurt Huber’s Nazi resistance was more than a Satyr’s game after the end of tragedy,” as Hans Maier has trivialized: It was a blatant lie.¹⁸² Orff and Huber, an associate professor of psychology with an interest in musical folklore, including the Bavarian species, had known each other since the outgoing years of the Weimar Republic.¹⁸³ Toward the end of the 1930s Orff even considered Huber’s close cooperation in the *Schulwerk* project, but his friend was occupied with too many other things.¹⁸⁴ After Huber, who had first lived in Munich-Schwabing, moved to Grafelfing, meetings between the two men became more frequent. Orff tried out *Carmina Burana* on Huber, and later also *Der Mond* and *Die Kluge*. “Carl Orff and my husband enjoyed a really good friendship,” remembers Huber’s widow Clara, “Which expressed it -self especially in musical terms. As far as I can recall, they hardly ever talked about politics.”¹⁸⁵

Hans Maier,
Carl Orff in seiner Zeit
1995: 11

Indeed, politics would not have interested Orff, and especially not the kind to which Huber subscribed. By inclination, Huber, like Reusch, was (p.138) *volkisch* and ideologically akin to the Nazis, although with the passage of time his relations with the Nazi hierarchy soured, mostly for personal reasons. He assigned similar values to the *Volkslied* as did the Nazis, and hence he fitted in with National Socialist cultural planning. In 1935–36 he was to help found a “German School of *Volksmusik* and Dance” in Munich, as a counterweight against “the champions of Marxist tendencies and Jewish products.” In this, the Hitler Youth was to play an important part.¹⁸⁶ Huber believed in musicianship that was “tooted in the soil,” for the purpose of retaining the “purity of genuine German folk art,” in the song of the fathers, “Whose *volkisch* race was congenitally tied to our own.”¹⁸⁷

Although after the beginning of the war the two men continued to meet, sometimes with their wives, their professional contacts were weakening.¹⁸⁸ By the time that Huber actively joined the White Rose student resistance cell in January 1943, the Huber and Orff couples had not been seeing each other for about three months.¹⁸⁹ Orff’s name has never surfaced in conjunction with the White Rose in the critical literature or in memoirs, and Gertrud Orff and Clara Huber have supplied additional assurances in writing that Orff had not been a part of it.¹⁹⁰ In a television documentary of 1995, Frau Huber further insisted that Orff “had not been a member.”¹⁹¹ Although Orff, after the war, claimed that he had known the Scholls and warned them about driving out the demons, this is highly unlikely and merely another attempt at fabricating legends. It is even doubtful that he was aware of the existence of the group, though his friend, the musicologist Thrasybulos Georgiades, was privy to their meetings. George J. Wittenstein, a retired professor of surgery at the University of California in Santa Barbara, informed me in 1997 that he was one of two surviving members of the White Rose inner circle, the editor of the third and fourth anti-Hitler leaflets, who miraculously escaped death. In his recollection, Orff “Was never a member of the White Rose, nor did he and Huber co-found it.” In any event, the student resisters’ sudden arrest and Huber’s own on 27 March 1943 caught Orff by surprise, as Clara Huber noticed one day later, when he came to visit.¹⁹² Huber’s condemnation to death on 8 April and his execution on 13 July certainly frightened Orff, for in the Third Reich everyone could become guilty by association, and hence he vanished for a while in the clinic of an acquaintance in nearby Ebenhausen.¹⁹³

Gli incontri
della Rosa Bianca

Questo dimostra che il suo
presunto nazismo non era
inattaccabile

Orff’s post-1945 legend regarding oppositional activity against the Third Reich must be interpreted in the context of the two other previously-mentioned legends he was constructing at that time: that *Carmina Burana* was blacklisted by the regime and hence the work of a resister and that (to emphasize the singularity of this) all previous works of his did not matter and were to be

shredded by his publisher. All three legends were intertwined and served only one purpose: to establish a pedestal for a spotless Carl Orff in the postwar era.

The matter of the Nazi ban on *Carmina Burana* (at which Orff hinted again during the Bad Homburg interrogation) has already been dealt with **(p.139)** in detail. But it is important to take a second look at Orff's claim regarding the caesura of 1937, a story that was publicly repeated by Wieland Wagner in 1965 on the occasion of Orff's seventieth birthday.¹⁹⁴ The fact that there are several variants of this tale alone makes one suspicious. Ulrich Dibelius, for instance, wrote in 1966 that Orff *told* publisher Strecker to withdraw his earlier works at the time of the Frankfurt *premiere* on 7 June 1937. Five years later, another biographer maintained that Orff had *written* this to Strecker. Yet another version has it that Orff *told* Strecker so after the successful *dress rehearsal*.¹⁹⁵ The origin of the legend is actually traceable to Orff himself, who held, in his so-called *Dokumentation* (a multivolumed memoir interspersed with documents and comments by his acolytes also designed to spread various truths, half-truths, and falsehoods), that he *did tell* Strecker *after the dress rehearsal* in Frankfurt: "Everything I have written so far and which unfortunately you have printed, you may now destroy. With *Carmina Burana* begin my collected works."¹⁹⁶ What Orff added to these monstrous, self-important sentences in 1979 was that they had, meanwhile, been "hiuch cited."¹⁹⁷ As far as can be made out, however, those sentences had never been cited before 8 May 1945, either by word of mouth or in writing. In fact, they could not have been, because Orff continued, after 1937, to be interested in, to labor on and complete, and to offer for performance at least five works he had conceived or begun to craft before 1937: apart from the *Midsummer Night's Dream* music they were *Orpheus* or *Orfeo* (Monteverdi-Orff), *Tanz der Sproden* (Monteverdi-Orff), *Entrata* (Byrd-Orff), and *Die Klage der Ariadne* (Monteverdi-Orff).¹⁹⁸ Some of these he continued to own up to even after May 1945.¹⁹⁹

Orff's manipulation of his own past corresponded uncannily with his ability to **manipulate people**, to suit his very own ends. Both his daughter, Godela, and his third wife, Luise Rinser, have testified that Orff had no qualms about using people for as long as he needed them and then casting them aside, as has his assistant Hans Bergese, who knew him as well as anybody for the entire period of the Third Reich, in May 1946. And in 1958, composer Karl Amadeus Hartmann warned his friend Rinser that Orff "Walked all over people."²⁰⁰ It appears that this tactic complemented **Orff's extreme egocentricity**, observed by Bad Homburg psychiatrist Schaffner; both Bergese and Godela Orff have spoken of his obsessive quest to become famous since youth. All this manifested itself especially painfully when the composer talked to Clara Huber the day after her husband had been arrested. **Instead of comforting her, he started pacing the room, shouting I am ruined! I am ruined!"**²⁰¹

After the war, one of the first persons to be manipulated in this way was Newell Jenkins himself. Jenkins knew far too much about Orff, for instance, his refusal to emigrate during the Sudeten crisis in the fall of 1938, when Jenkins had offered him connections in New York and the chance to start afresh in the United States.²⁰² The fact that Orff could not go then because he was too much rooted in Bavarian soil, as several of his works evinced, was, among others, a legitimate excuse to stay, but Orff was suspicious of Jenkins, in case Jenkins used this reluctance against him, and it was embarrassing at any rate.²⁰³ Jenkins also knew of Orff's initial attempt to rehabilitate himself through the White Rose canard and obviously had not been pleased by Orff's decision not to oblige him in Stuttgart. But on the other hand, Orff was well aware that Jenkins's days in Germany were numbered. So in May 1947, with the culture officer having merely a few weeks left, Orff tried to squeeze him once more, on matters he did not wish to specify in a personal letter to him.²⁰⁴ Yet the meeting does not seem to have materialized, or whatever favors Orff had had in mind from Jenkins were not granted. Already in June therefore, a month before Jenkins left the country, Orff had the bad grace to write to a friend that the officer had adopted "a highly unfriendly attitude" toward him, and by September 1948 his official line had become that although Jenkins had represented "connections," he had been gone "for a long time" and he, Orff, had "never been compelled to use his help."²⁰⁵ Putting Jenkins out of his mind and that of other people as well was the best guarantee that nobody would ever learn of the ruse Orff had once used with that officer, to start his reinvention process.

Jenkins was not Orff's first sacrificial lamb, nor would he be his last. As a rule, whenever something went wrong in his life, it was not Orff's but the other person's fault. "He was extremely sensitive to criticism," remembers Rinser.²⁰⁶ Sometimes the victims did not know they were being blamed. One such artist was Clemens Krauss, who directed and conducted the premiere of *Der Mond* in Munich in early 1939. The consensus then as now is that Krauss, an avant-gardist no more, tackled something modern in his day and for his own taste with great integrity, as best he could, and, all things considered, was successful.²⁰⁷ Although after the war Orff conceded as much and at the time he wrote Krauss an obsequious letter of gratitude, he showed duplicity by attributing everything that he thought had gone wrong in Munich to the conductor, behind his back.²⁰⁸ After the end of the war, it was Hans Meissner who was being dropped. He, who had often annoyed the composer because of his dithering and dallying regarding premieres and other performances while he was still powerful in Frankfurt but had also vigorously championed Orff, by 1945 was interned by the Allies as a formerly instrumental Nazi. He himself and his wife begged Orff to intercede on his behalf, without receiving as much as a polite reply.²⁰⁹ Bertil Wetzelsberger, long Meissner's progressive conductor, to whom Orff owed the premiere of his epochal *Carmina Burana* in June 1937, became the target of Orff's rage after the composer had reason to believe that the less than successful June 1947 premiere

of *Die Bernauerin* in Stuttgart was exclusively Wetzelsberger's fault. Then Orff exonerated Wetzelsberger, for his reading public's benefit, in the partially apocryphal *Dokumentation*.²¹⁰ Orff also abused Bergese, who had collaborated with Orff and Huber on a *Volkslied* series, "Music of the Landscape," eventually published by Schott in the 1940s. Whereas Bergese claims he had actually cocreated the concept for the project and alongside Huber and Orff arranged the songs for piano, **(p.141)** Orff had seen fit to list him on the cover not as coauthor or originator but merely as the arranger.²¹¹

Orff even exploited his daughter, Godela, who as a child was entirely dependent on him, because she was deprived of love and sustenance by her mostly absent mother. She tells of the many fairy tales and fantasies her father tried on her as a child, and which delighted her.²¹² But when she became a young adult and interested in men, Orff would have none of it; he wanted her only to himself. By 1943, the year of Godela's marriage, their relationship had become acrimonious, although Orff wrote to a physician who had treated her in his sanatorium that there existed a "particular harmony between father and daughter," when in fact, according to Godela, he was intent on nothing else but disturbing that marriage.²¹³ Godela Orff, too, maintains that her father discarded her when she did not fit into his plans any longer, most likely after his marriage to Gertrud Willers, and that she felt hurt. The exception was her acting career, which flattered him and his works and hence he supported it; it is significant that she starred in his first postwar production, *Die Bernauerin*, in June 1947, even though Orff himself did not find it in his heart to attend the premiere, to lend her emotional support, because he wanted to show the disagreeable conductor Wetzelsberger a cold shoulder.²¹⁴ By the 1950s, Orff and his daughter were no longer on speaking terms.²¹⁵

Godela admits that as a child she was jealous of the many young women Orff would bring home for trysts, mostly nubile students from the Gunther-Schule, who adored the composer without qualification.²¹⁶ Psychologists could properly analyze what appears to have been an obsession with sex, which expressed itself in *Carmina Burana* and *Catulli Carmina*; Jenkins reports that Orff "always talked about exciting sexual things," and there are indications that he liked to read about them, too.²¹⁷ Not surprisingly, Orff's relationship with women was always complicated; he had no fewer than four wives. According to Luise Rinser, he was in the habit of trying out a new partner while still with the old one, as if for some kind of insurance. When he started courting Gertrud Willers, an attractive and well-off pupil from the Gunther-Schule who was young enough to be his daughter, he was still tied to Maja Lex, an exotic dancer of Italian-Japanese extraction. He married Willers in July 1939 because she promised this restless, narcissistic man emotional and especially financial stability. That marriage failed for good in 1954, because Orff had become interested in Rinser, a war widow of a student of Hindemith and an author, who had once been jailed by the Nazis for the sort of political crime Orff then wished he had committed, but he held on to

Willers almost until the day of his wedding with Rinser. Before that, in 1945, Orff had attempted a relationship with Brigitte Bergese, Hans Bergese's wife and also originally from the Gunther-Schule, who was living with the Orffs in Grafelfing, while Hans himself was still in a prisoner-of-war camp. Brigitte Bergese withstood his advances and turned instead to Egk, not knowing then that Orff was at the same time carrying on an affair with his secretary, who also stayed under what used to **(p.142)** be the Willers' roof. By the time Orff's marriage with Rinser was falling apart in 1958–59, Orff was already intimate with her secretary, Liselotte Schmitz, who lived with them in the farmlike house in Diessen on the Am-mersee and who then became Orff's last wife.²¹⁸

Consider egocentricity, disregard for other people's interests, unwillingness to become personally committed or emotional, tremendous charm and charisma, and bursts of creativity alternating with bouts of disease or lethargy during which work was sluggish (as in the creation of the *Midsummer Night's Dream* music). Moreover, consider extreme moodiness and a talent for making up fantasy, legends, or lies which, as Rinser thinks, Orff himself often came to believe. **What emerges here is the profile of a man who was mentally ill.** Several more clues in his behavioral pattern lead us to conclude that Orff, at least since young adulthood, must have been suffering from manic depression, which strikes so many creative people and, until more recent times, has often gone entirely untreated.²¹⁹ In Orff's case, the cause for what, in medical terms, may have been bipolar II is not known, nor is its severity, yet one of the clues could be the young soldier's near-suffocation experience in the war trench, which evidently caused him to have crying fits and nightmares as a mature adult, led to at least one terribly embarrassing experience with Rinser in public, and produced an overall sentiment of fear. This fear may have been responsible for Orff's often asocial behavior (with his preference for shabby exercise clothes to formal dress), his avoidance of human contact with members of the establishment, in the Third Reich as much as after, and the manner in which he treated former friends in correspondence when he thought they were dispensable or, worse, could embarrass him.²²⁰

spiegazioni pelose

normalmente
asociale

This is especially apparent from his relationship with his former Jewish friends from before 1933, whose letters after the regime change he answered either lackadaisically or not at all. Jenkins tells of how Orff wished to keep from being associated with his old friend Erich Katz when that musician, a former assistant to Freiburg musicologist Wilibald Gurlitt, had been spotted leaving Orff's Munich apartment after a visit with Orff in 1938—around the time of Kristallnacht, which then resulted in Katz's months-long incarceration.²²¹ Granted, the Nazi regime had placed taboos on such social intercourse, but was Orff especially afraid to associate with Jews because **he was himself a "quarter Jew" by Nazi standards**, having told no one about it, including regime authorities?²²²

One final clue bolsters the hypothesis of Carl Orff as a psychically sick man: his **overriding sense of guilt**. Psychiatrist Peter Whybrow writes that guilt feelings are typical signs of depression: "Memories recalled are pre -dominantly sad or associated with guilt."²²³ Luise Rinser remembers how Orff used to be tortured by guilt feelings.²²⁴ Guilt about what? One can only conjecture: during the Weimar Republic, because he had survived the trench cave-in and his comrades had not? during the Third Reich, because his grandmother had been Jewish and he saw himself escaping the horrible fate of former Jewish friends? in the new democracy of Germany, because he had lied about the White Rose to Jenkins?

(p.143) Orff has left testimony of his guilt feelings in the case of three men whose expectations he could not have lived up to by the time they died. To come to grips with this guilt, he wrote letters to each one, as if he were still alive. These letters, in their highly emotional quality, which is rather untypically Orffian, read as if Orff and the men had always been soul brothers. One letter was to Erich Katz, who died in Santa Barbara in 1973, after Orff had made no attempt to resume the relationship. Katz, on the other hand, always acknowledged the friendship and, as Orff was informed by Katz's companion, spoke of him warmly just before his death.²²⁵ Another was to Karl Amadeus Hartmann, the fellow Munich composer who had struggled through the Third Reich as a bona fide opponent of the Hitler regime, and whom Orff had been careful to avoid during that period, yet whose company, as a culture administrator authorized by the Americans, Orff eagerly sought after 1945.²²⁶ "Dear, dear Amadeus," wrote Orff disingenuously in December 1963, "We had quite a different agreement. Since I am so much older than you I thought that I would precede you.... This once was our Bavarian consensus, and as usual we were of one mind."

The third and most significant letter was to Kurt Huber. Already in January 1946, by the time Orff was using the friend's resistance as his alibi, Orff wrote: "Dear and revered friend! Never in my life did I write you a letter. You were there and always close, and to experience your existence was delightful.... Seldom, really seldom did you speak of your own plans ... you were, almost exclusively, listening to my concerns." Orff composed these lines at his wife's Grafelfing house on Ritter-von-Epp-Strasse, which had now been renamed Kurt-Huber-Strasse. The letter was published, in 1947, as the last contribution to an official, commemorative volume honoring Kurt Huber, edited by his widow, Clara.²²⁷ Until his death in 1982, it would serve as Carl Orff's certified proof that he had made amends.

Notes:

- (1.) Karl Heinz Ruppel's preface in Andreas Liess, *Carl Orff: Idee und Werk* (Zurich, 1955), n.p.

- (2.) Jens Make Fischer, "Vergangenheit, die nicht vergehen will: Carl Orff und das Dritte Reich," *Suddeutsche Zeitung*, Munich, 14 Mar. 1995.
- (3.) Hans Maier, *Carl Orff in seiner Zeit: Rede anlässlich Carl Orffs 100. Geburtstag*, München, Frinzregententheater, 7. Juli 1995 (Mainz, 1995), 4.
- (4.) Orff to Pietzsch, 28 Apr. 1946, CM, Allg. Korr.; Wolfgang Seifert, "... auf den Geist kommt es an': Carl Orff zum 75. Geburtstag—Kommentar und Gespräch," *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 131 (1970), 376; Orff cited in *Neue Musikzeitung* (Apr./May 1975), 3 (quote), and in Fred K. Prieberg, *Musik im NS-Staat* (Frankfurt am Main, 1982), 324.
- (5.) Signed transcript of interview with Gertrud Orff, Munich, 5 Aug. 1992, APA.
- (6.) Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt, "Braune Klänge," *Melos* 14 (1946), 11; similarly idem, "Die Musen und die Macht: Musik im Dritten Reich," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 6 Dec. 1980.
- (7.) Ernst Krause, *Werner Egk: Oper und Ballett* (Wilhelmshaven, 1971), 9; Carl Dahlhaus, "Den Notlügen auf der Spur: Fred K. Priebergs Chronik der Musik im NS-Staat," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 13 Feb. 1982.
- (8.) Rudolf Wagner-Regeny, *An den Ufern der Zeit: Schriften, Briefe, Tagebücher*, ed. Max Becker (Leipzig, 1989), 107.
- (9.) Ludwig F. Schiedermair, *Musiker Schicksale: Aus dem Leben grosser Komponisten* (Berlin, 1990), 236.
- (10.) Franz Willnauer, "Vorwort des Herausgebers," in idem, ed., *Carmina Burana von Carl Orff: Entstehung—Wirkung—Text* (Mainz, 1995), 9 (quote); Reiner Pommerin, "Some Remarks on the Cultural History of the Federal Republic of Germany," in Pommerin, ed., *Culture in the Federal Republic of Germany, 1945–1995* (Oxford, 1996), 9.
- (11.) Karl Laux, *Musik und Musiker der Gegenwart* (Essen, 1949), 181–91.
- (12.) "Carl Orff Remembered ... Courtesy: Carl Orff und sein Werk, Dokumentation. Verlag Hans Schneider, Tutzing," [Fall/Winter 1995], PA Tamara Bernstein; Bernstein quoted in *Globe and Mail*, Toronto, 30 Dec. 1995.
- (13.) Hannelore Gassner, "Chronologie," in Hans Jorg Jans and Wolfgang Till, eds., *Welttheater: Carl Orff und sein Bühnenwerk: Eine inszenierte Ausstellung im Münchner Stadtmuseum in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Orff-Zentrum München vom 6. September bis 3. November 1996* [Munich, 1996]; "Tafel 11 Ein Sommernacht -straum," *ibid.* A similar lacuna already is in Gassner's

"Werkverzeichnis," in Godela Orff, *Mein Vater und ich: Erinnerungen an Carl Orff* (Munich, 1992), 119.

(14.) Andrea Seeböhm, "Unbewältigte musikalische Vergangenheit: Ein Kapitel österreichischer Musikgeschichte, das bis heute ungeschrieben ist," in Liesbeth Waechter-Bohm, ed., *Wien 1945: Davor/danach* (Vienna, 1985), 151; Harvey Sachs, *Music in Fascist Italy* (London, 1987), 198.

(15.) Quoted in Fred K. Prieberg, *Musik und Macht* (Frankfurt am Main, 1991), 277.

(16.) Jorg Bremer, "Heimat haben sie nicht mehr gefunden: Die Note der 'Jeckes': Deutsche Juden in Israel," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 6 June 1992; Eleanore Büning, "Die Musik ist schuld," *Zeit*, Hamburg, 7 July 1995.

(17.) Matthew Gurewitsch, "Cosmic Chants," *Atlantic Monthly* (Aug. 1995), 93.

(18.) Cited in Kim H. Kowalke, "The Brecht Connection," *Stagebill* (Mar. 1997), 10.

(19.) Text for Exhibit 299, "Assault on the Arts: Culture and Politics in Nazi Germany," Exhibition, New York Public Library, 27 Feb. to 28 May, 1993.

(20.) Alex Ross, "In Music, Though, There Were No Victories," *New York Times*, 20 Aug. 1995.

(21.) George Steiner quoted in *Kulturchronik*, no. 6 (1998), 24 (translated from his original statement in *Süddeutsche Zeitung* [Munich]); Nicolas Slonimsky, *Music Since 1900*, 4th ed. (New York, 1971), 674 (2nd quote. This text did not yet appear in the 2nd ed. of 1938).

(22.) Reported on the Internet (amslist@ucdavis.edu) by Craig De Wilde, Senior Lecturer, Monash University, Clayton, Australia, on 30 Apr. 1996 (printout APA).

(23.) Donald W. Ellis, "Music in the Third Reich: National Socialist Aesthetic Theory as Government Policy," PhD dissertation, University of Kansas, 1970, 133 (1st quote); *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 13 May 1994 (2nd quote); *Komponierende Frauen im Dritten Reich: Eine Veranstaltung im Rahmen der Reihe "1933—Zerstörung der Demokratie, Machtübergabe und Widerstand"* (Berlin, 1983), 5.

(24.) *Globe and Mail*, Toronto, 28 Sept. 1996.

(25.) Paraphrased in letter von Einem to Orff, 25 Aug. 1946, CM, Allg. Korr.

(26.) Gerald Abraham, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Music* (Oxford, 1986), 840.

- (27.) Dagmar Kraemer and Manfred Stassen, "Berlin Cabaret," *Kulturchronik*, no. 4 (1992), 45.
- (28.) Berthold Goldschmidt quoted in *Spiegel* (5 Sept. 1994), 208.
- (29.) Godela Orff, *Vater*, 14, 21; Lilo Gersdorf, *Carl Orff: Mit Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* (Reinbek, 1981), 17–24; Liess, *Orff*, 8–10.
- (30.) Gersdorf, *Orff*, 25–46; Liess, *Orff*, 14; Karl Marx in Horst Leuchtmann, ed., *Carl Orff: Ein Gedenkbuch* (Tutzing, 1985), 98–101; Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 8 vols. (Tutzing, 1975–83), 1:65–67; Werner Thomas, *Das Rad der Fortuna: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zu Werk und Wirkung Carl Orffs* (Mainz, 1990), 136–37.
- (31.) Orff to Laaff, 20 Jan. 1932, CM, Allg. Korr.; Gunild Keetmann in Leuchtmann, *Orff*, 65; Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 1:67–68; 2:15, 21; 3:10–15, 115; NG 13:708–9; Wilhelm Twittenhoff, *Orff-Schulwerk: Einführung in Grundlagen und Aufbau* (Mainz, 1935), 28; Thomas, *Rad*, 149–66.
- (32.) Programs, 1. "Neue Musikwoche München 1929" (quote); "Woche Neuer Musik 2.-11. Oktober 1930"; "Festwoche Neuer Musik München 15.-22. Mai 1931"; excerpt from *Munchener Neueste Nachrichten*, Sept. 1929, SM, Kulturamt/143; Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 2:141–42, 196–97; Karl Marx in Leuchtmann, *Orff*, 104; Gudrun Straub et al., *Karl Marx* (Tutzing, 1983), 26–28.
- (33.) [Memorandum, n.d.], "Als der Münchner Bachverei ? ...," SM, Kulturamt/265; Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 2:143, 145, 176; Liess, *Orff*, 23–25; Karl Marx in Leuchtmann, *Orff*, 108.
- (34.) Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 2:152; Heinrich Strobel cited *ibid.*, 176; Orff to Salomon, 14 Feb. 1932 and 18 July 1947; Orff to Reusch, 2 May 1932; Orff to Reinhard, 11 May 1932; Kestenberg to Orff, 31 Dec. 1932, CM, Allg. Korr.
- (35.) Fritz Neumeyer, "Alte Musik in unserer Zeit," *DKW*, no. 31 (1933), 2–3; Reinhold Conrad Muschler, "Hingabe an die Kunst; Wege zu Bach," *ibid.*, no. 34 (1933), 10–11; Harald Busch, "Lanze für den Barock!," *ibid.*, no. 38 (1933), 9–10; Muschler, "Alte Musik im Rahmen ihrer Zeit," *ibid.*, 16.
- (36.) Orff, *Vater*, *passim*.
- (37.) Gersdorf, *Orff*, 16, 24.
- (38.) Orff to Schilling, 9 Feb. 1932, CM, Allg. Korr.
- (39.) Karl Marx in Leuchtmann, *Orff*, 102, 105.
- (40.) Orff to Reusch, 24 Jan. 1932, CM, Allg. Korr.
- (41.) Quotes *ibid.*, and Orff to Preussner, 16 Dec. 1932, CM, Allg. Korr.

(42.) Herbert Rosenberg, "Neue Chormusik," *Melos* 11 (1932), 143 (1st quote); Orff to Strobel, 20 Oct. 1932; Orff to Doflein, 27 Dec. 1932 (2nd quote), CM, Allg. 1.

(43.) Schulz-Dornburg to Orff, 17 Dec. 1932; Preussner to Orff, 21 Dec. 1932; Orff to Schulz-Dornburg, 28 Dec. 1932, CM, Allg. Korr.

(44.) Orff to Salomon, 23 Jan. 1933, CM, Allg. Korr.

(45.) Brosig to Orff, [1932], CM, Allg. Korr.; Carl Orff, *The Schulwerk* (New York, 1976), 114; Inge Lammel, 'Die beiden Berliner 'Scherchen-Chore,'" in Horst Seeger and Wolfgang Goldhan, eds., *Studien zur Berliner Musikgeschichte: Eine Bestandsaufnahme* (Berlin, 1988), 36.

(46.) Orff to Doflein, 6 Mar. 1931, CM, Allg. Korr.

(47.) Orff, *Vater*, 35.

(48.) Jode to Orff, 26 Jan. 1932; Orff to Jode, 19 May 1932; Orff to Reusch, 6 July 1932; Rosendorff to Orff, 21 Sept. 1932; Orff to Preussner, 28 Dec. 1932; Kestenberg to Orff, 31 Dec. 1932, CM, Allg. Korr. See also Leo Kestenberg, *Bewegte Zeiten: Musisch-Musikantische Lebenserinnerungen* (Wolfenbüttel, 1961), 57-58.

(49.) Orff to Reusch, 2 May and 6 July 1932; Reusch to Orff, 20 June and 5 July 1932; Orff to Goetsch, 4 Oct. 1932; Kelbetz to Orff, 10 Sept. 1932, CM, Allg. 1.; Georg Gotsch and Ludwig Kelbetz, *Mannerchor oder singende Mannschaft: Mdannerchor in der Entscheidung* (Hamburg, 1934). Also see Ulrich Günther, *Die Schulmusikerziehung von der Kestenberg-Reform bis zum Ende des Dritten Reiches: Ein Beitrag zur Dokumentation und Zeitgeschichte der Schulmusik erziehung mit Anregungen zu ihrer Neugestaltung* (Neuwied, 1967), esp. 40; Michael H. Kater, "Carl Orff im Dritten Reich," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 43 (1995), 16-17; Kater, *The Twisted Muse: Musicians and Their Music in the Third Reich* (New York, 1997), 138, 147.

(50.) Reusch to Orff, 20 June 1932, CM, Allg. Korr.

(51.) On Katz, see *IBD*, 600; *NG* 9:828; Theo Stengel and Herbert Gerigk, *Lexikon der Juden in der Musik: Mit einem Titelverzeichnis judischer Werke* (Berlin, 1941), 132; Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 103. On Doflein, see *GLM* 2:331. 1's wife was the sister of the by Nazi standards not fully "Aryan" keyboard artist Edith Axenfels (later known as Edith Picht-Axenfels).

(52.) Orff to Salomon, 21 Jan., 14 Feb. 1932, and 18 July 1947; Orff to Sinzheimer, 27 July 1932; Katz to Orff, 18 Aug. [1932]; Seiber to Orff, 12 Oct. 1932; [Günther] to Seiber, 21 Oct. 1932, CM, Allg. Korr; *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 3:201. Also see *GLM*, 7:194, 325-26; Stengel and Gerigk, *Lexikon*, 236, 260;

Michael H. Kater, *Different Drummers: Jazz in the Culture of Nazi Germany* (New York, 1992), 17.

(53.) Alan E. Steinweis, "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The *Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur*," *Central European History* 24 (1991), 402–23; Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, passim; Kater, "Carl Orff im Dritten Reich," 6–8.

(54.) Kupfer to Orff, 21 Dec. 1933, CM, Allg. Korr. (1st and 2nd quotes); Orff to Hofmann, 1 Aug. [1933], in Frohmut Dangel-Hofmann, ed., *Carl Orff—Michel Hofmann: Briefe zur Entstehung der Carmina Burana* (Tutzing, 1990), 13 (3rd quote).

(55.) Paul Ehlers, "Die Musik und Adolf Hitler," ZM 106 (1939), 356.

(56.) Laaff to Orff, 22 Jan. 1933; Ruppel to Orff, 2 June 1933; Doflein to Orff, 16 June 1933, CM, Allg. Korr.; Orff to Strecker, 15 May 1933, CM, Schott Korr.; Orff to Dobereiner, 29 Jan. 1934, BS, Ana/344/I/B/Orff. Also see Alan E. Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reich Chambers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1993), 32–38.

(57.) Orff to Doflein, 25 Sept. and 3 Dec. 1933; Orff to Schmidt, 22 Oct. 1933, CM, Allg. Korr.; Ehlers to Fiehler, 6 Dec. 1933; "Münchner Bach-Verein e.V.: Schütz-Handel-Fest der Stadt München," [for 31 Oct. 1934]; Steidle to Kulturstadt, 9 Feb. 1943, SM, Kulturstadt/265; "Münchner Bach-Verein e.V. im Kampfbund für Deutsche Kultur," program for 1934–35, SM, Kulturstadt/275; Ehrenberg memorandum, 30 Oct. 1935, SM, Kulturstadt/319; BAB Büchtl; Max Neuhaus, "Johann-Sebastian-Bach-Feier," VB, 13 Apr. 1934.

(58.) Orff to Strecker, 15 May 1933, CM, Schott Korr.; Günther, "Erklärung über meinen Eintritt in den Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur," [Spring 1947], CM, Allg. 1.

(59.) Dorothee Günther, "Wiedergeburt des deutschen Tanzes," in Rudolf von Laban et al., eds., *Die tänzerische Situation unserer Zeit: Ein Querschnitt* (Dresden, 1936), 13–21; Prieberg, *NS-Staat*, 325; Kater, "Carl Orff im Dritten Reich," 14–15.

(60.) Kater, "Carl Orff im Dritten Reich," 30.

(61.) Idem, "Das Problem der musikalischen Moderne im NS-Staat," in Albrecht Riethmüller, ed., *Bruckner-Probleme: Internationales Kolloquium, 7.-9. Oktober 1996 in Berlin* (Stuttgart, 1999), 169–84.

(62.) Idem, "Carl Orff im Dritten Reich," 5; NG 13:708–9.

(63.) Orff to Strecker, 15 May, 19 May (1st quote), and 30 Aug. 1933 (2nd quote); Orff to Willms, 25 Mar. 1934, CM, Schott Korr.; Orff to Dobereiner, 29 Jan. 1934, BS, Ana/344/I/B/Orff.

(64.) Hans Fleischer, "Quertreiber an der Arbeit," *DKW*, no. 22 (1933), 11; Orff to Fleischer, 21 Sept. 1933, CM, Allg. Korr. (quote); Orff to Willms, 22 Sept. 1933, CM, Schott Korr. On Nazi-sanctioned *Hausmusik* see Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 130–34; on the Nazi blacklisting of jazz until 1939, see Kater, *Different Drummers*, 29–56.

(65.) Orff to Willms, 7 Feb. 1934, CM, Schott Korr. On *Volkslied* and National Socialism, see Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 135–67.

(66.) Orff to Willms, 7 Mar. 1934, CM, Schott Korr.

(67.) Willms to Orff, 29 Mar. 1934, CM, Schott Korr.

(68.) [Schott Verlag], "Orientierung über Carl Orff," [May 1941], CM, Schott Korr.

(69.) Wolfgang Stumme, "Gemeinsamkeit musikerzieherischer Aufgaben," in idem, ed., *Musik im Volk: Grundfragen der Musikerziehung* (Berlin, 1939), 15; Ludwig Kelbetz, *Aufbau einer Musikschule* (Wolfenbüttel, 1939), 16; Prieberg, *NS-Staat*, 325; Kater, "Carl Orff im Dritten Reich," 17–18. Orff's post-1945 statement regarding his victimization by the Nazis because of their alleged proscription of his *Schulwerk* is in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 3:203, and Prieberg, *NS-Staat*, 324.

(70.) Orff to Strecker, 12 Feb. 1934, CM, Schott Korr.; Schulz-Dornburg to Orff, 7 Sept. 1935; Orff to Reusch, 18 Nov. 1935; Orff to Rapp, 16 Mar. 1936, CM, Allg. Korr.; Günther, "Wiedergeburt," 18.

(71.) Payr, Reichsstelle zur Forderung des deutschen Schrifttums, "Gutachten für Verleger," 10 Apr. 1937, CM, Schott K. (1st quote); Orff to Georgiades, 12 Dec. 1935, CM, Allg. Korr. (2nd quote).

(72.) Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 3:131.

(73.) Orff to Willms, 23 Apr. 1934, CM, Schott Korr.

(74.) Wilhelm Twittenhof [sic], "Jugend und moderne Musik," *Musik in Jugend und Volk* 1 (1937/38), 370 (quote); idem, "Die Lehrgänge für Volks- und Jugendmusikleiter in Berlin und Weimar" (1938), reprinted in Dorothea Hemming, ed., *Dokumente zur Geschichte der Musikhochschule (1902–1976)* (Regensburg, 1977), 122–24; idem, "Rhythmische Erziehung," in Stumme, *Musik im Volk*, 193–205; Twittenhoff to Orff, 29 Oct. 1937, CM, Allg. Korr.

(75.) Reusch to Orff, 22 Aug. 1935; Twittenhoff to Orff, 29 Nov. 1936, CM, Allg. 1.; Orff to Petschull, 12 June 1936, CM, Schott Korr.

(76.) Wilhelm Twittenhoff, *Orff-Schulwerk: Eine Einführung in Grundlagen und Aufbau* (Mainz, 1935); Rudolf Sonner, "Musik aus Bewegung," *DM* 29 (1937), 762–65; Twittenhoff to Orff, 23 Aug. 1937, CM, Allg. Korr.; Petschull to Orff, 19 Aug. 1937; Twittenhoff to Petschull, 11 Sept. [1937], CM, Schott Korr.

(77.) Reusch to Bergese, 5 Nov. 1933, and to Orff, 22 Aug. 1935, CM, Allg. 1.; Fritz Reusch, *Musik und Musikerziehung im Dienste der Volksgemeinschaft* (Osterwieck, 1938); Reusch, "Die Musikerziehung an den Hochschulen für Lehrerbildung im Aufbau der Mannschaftserziehung," in Stumme, *Musik im Volk*, 72–82; Ulrich Günther, *Schulmusikerziehung*, 39–41, 94, 186–87, 189.

(78.) Orff to Kelbetz, 31 Oct. 1933, and to von Tiedemann, 29 July 1938, and to Bresgen, 23 Mar. 1939, CM, Allg. Korr.; Strecker to Orff, 15 Sept. 1937, CM, Schott Korr.; *Musik der Hitler-Jugend* (Wolfenbüttel, 1941), 31; Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 138, 140, 142–46, 149.

(79.) Twittenhoff to Orff, 26 Apr. 1937, CM, Allg. Korr. On Stumme see Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, Chapter 4, *passim*.

(80.) Quotation Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 4:43. See also Liess, *Orff*, 38–39, 44, 50; Ulrich Dibelius, *Moderne Musik, 1945–1965: Voraussetzungen, Verlauf* (Munich, 1966), 80–81; Thomas, *Rad*, 33–51; Hermann Danuser, *Die Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Regensburg, 1984), 214.

(81.) Skulsky to Hartmann, 16 Dec. 1939, BS, Ana/407.

(82.) Joan Evans, "Die Rezeption der Musik Igor Strawinskys in Hitlerdeutschland," *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 55 (1998), 91–109.

(83.) Willms to Orff, 29 Mar. 1935, CM, Schott Korr.; Orff to Hofmann, 12 June 1936, in Dangel-Hofmann, *Orff-Hofmann*, 113; Orff to Bergese, 22 May 1936, PA Bergese; Albert Richard Mohr, *Die Frankfurter Oper, 1924–1944: Ein Beitrag zur Theatergeschichte mit zeitgenössischen Berichten und Bildern* (Frankfurt am Main, 1971), 256.

(84.) Barthe to Meyer-Rogge, 9 Feb. 1938, CM, Allg. Korr.; Strecker to Orff, 15 Sept. 1937 and 9 Sept. 1938; Willms to Orff, 7 Sept. 1938; Menge to Orff, 17 Apr. 1941, CM, Schott Korr.

(85.) Herbert Gerigk, 'Problematisches Opernwerk auf dem Tonkünstlerfest: 'Carmina Burana' von Carl Orff,' *VB*, 16 June 1937; *idem*, "Carl Orffs 'Carmina burana,'" *DM* 29 (1937), 701–2.

(86.) See section II in chapter 2.

(87.) Gail to Orff, 25 Aug. 1937 and [?] Dec. 1938; Strecker to Orff, 6 Apr. 1938, CM, Allg. Korr.; Strecker to Orff, 6 Mar. 1937, 9 June and 13 July 1938; Orff to Strecker, 18 Feb. and 24 Mar. 1938, CM, Schott Korr.

(88.) On censorship and Rosenberg's diminishing politicocultural influence see Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, passim.

(89.) Prieberg, *NS-Staat*, 275; Kater, "Carl Orff im Dritten Reich," 9.

(90.) Eva Hanau, "Carl Orff in Frankfurt am Main: Zur kulturpolitischen Situation der Stadt in den Jahren 1933–1939" (in press for *Musikwissenschaftliches Archiv*).

(91.) Ibid.; *Das Deutsche Führerlexikon*, 1934/35 (Berlin, n.d.), 255–56.

(92.) Krebs to Orff, 24 June 1937, CM, Allg. Korr.

(93.) For Frankfurt, see Friedrich Stichtenoth in *Generalanzeiger*, Frankfurt, 9 June 1937, and Walter Dirks in *Frankfurter Zeitung*, 10 June 1937. Quotation Orff to Strecker, 18 June 1937, CM, Schott Korr.

(94.) Orff to Hofmann, 26 June 1947, in Dangel-Hofmann, *Orff-Hofmann*, 139; Kupfer to Orff, 24 June 1937, CM, Allg. Korr.

(95.) Von der Null to Orff, 4 Oct. [1937] and [Jan. 1938], CM, Allg. Korr. See also Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 59. On Rode, who once planned to dress his opera musicians in drag to humor Ernst Rohm, the homosexual chief of the Stormtroop-ers, see *ibid.*, 29.

(96.) Matthes paraphrased in Strecker to Orff, 18 June 1938 (quote); Orff to Strecker, 8 Mar. 1939, CM, Schott Korr.

(97.) Orff to Strecker, 8 Mar. 1939, CM, Schott Korr.

(98.) Orff to Schmidt, 21 Oct. 1937, CM, Allg. Korr.

(99.) Orff to Schulz-Dornburg, 25 Jan. 1938; Stadtische Bühnen Frankfurt am Main, "Woche der Lebenden" vom 19. bis 26. März 1939," CM, Allg. Korr.; Orff to Willms, 1 Apr. 1939, CM, Schott Korr.

(100.) Eigendorff to Professor [Pfitzner], 19 Mar. 1938, OW, 74.

(101.) Orff to Strecker, 8 Nov. 1938, CM, Schott Korr.; Orff to Sutermeister, 27 Oct. 1938, and to Sacher, 8 Dec. 1938, CM, Allg. Korr.

(102.) Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 4:64, 71 (quote); Pietzsch to Orff, 16 June 1946, CM, Allg. Korr. Repetitions and variations on the theme are in Schiedermaier, *Schicksale*, 241–42; Werner Thomas, "Trionfo' oder Konsum?"

Werkidee und Rezeptionspraxis von Carl Orffs ‘Carmina Burana,’” in *International Journal of Musicology* 1 (1992), 254–56; also see nn. 4 and 5, above.

(103.) See below, near n. 194.

(104.) Albrecht Riethmüller, “Die Erneuerung der Kirchenmusik im Dritten Reich —Eine Legende?” *Der Kirchenmusiker* 40 (1989), 166.

(105.) Meissner to Orff, 25 Mar. and 2 Apr. 1938 (quote), CM, Allg. Korr.

(106.) Prieberg, *NS-Staat*, 156–59; Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 195.

(107.) Krebs quoted in Hanau, “Carl Orff.”

(108.) Meissner to Orff, 31 May 1938; Orff to Meissner, 29 Mar., and to Walterlin, 8 Dec. 1939, CM, Allg. Korr.; Orff to Strecker, 8 Nov. and 8 Dec. 1938, CM, Schott Korr.

(109.) *Führerlexikon*, 256.

(110.) This point is well argued by Hanau, “Carl Orff.”

(111.) Willms to Orff, 12 Apr. 1938, CM, Schott Korr.

(112.) Strecker to Orff, 14 Dec. 1938, CM, Schott Korr.

(113.) Orff to Strecker, 16 Dec. 1938, CM, Schott Korr.

(114.) Orff to Strecker, 14 and 19 Feb. 1939, CM, Schott Korr.

(115.) Entry for 17 Aug. 1939 in “Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch,” CM; Hanau, “Carl Orff.”

(116.) Strecker to Orff, 26 Oct. 1939, CM, Schott Korr.

(117.) Orff to Beierle (quote) and to Lenssen, 20 Oct. 1939, CM, Allg. Korr.

(118.) Hanau, Orff”; Reinhard Bollmus, *Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner: Studien zum Machtkampf im nationalsozialistischen Herrschaftssystem* (Stuttgart, 1970), 122; Michael H. Kater, *Das “Ahnenerbe” der SS, 1935–1945: Ein Beitrag zur Kulturpolitik des Dritten Reiches*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1997), 210.

(119.) Krebs to Orff, 1 Mar. 1943, CM, Allg. Korr. Also see entry for 20 Feb. 1943 in “Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch,” CM.

(120.) *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 8:360–63.

(121.) Ruppel to Orff, 3 June 1941, CM, Allg. Korr.

(122.) Kater, "Carl Orff im Dritten Reich," 20; entry for 17 Mar. 1944 in "Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch," CM.

(123.) Maier, *Carl Orff*, 9.

(124.) Jochen Peter Vogel, *Hans Pfitzner: Mit Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* (Reinbek, 1986), 109; Strauss to von Niessen, 1 May 1935 (quote) and 11 June 1935, RG.

(125.) Orff to von Einem, 6 Dec. 1946 (1st quote); von Einem to Orff, 15 Oct. 1947 (2nd quote), CM, Allg. Korr.

(126.) Orff to von Einem, 22 Dec. 1947, CM, Allg. Korr.

(127.) Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 5:219–33; *ibid.*, 8:360–65; Prieberg, *NS-Staat*, 160; Hanau, "Carl Orff."

(128.) Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 4:71, 195; Strecker to Hindemith, 12 Oct. 1940, PF, Schott Korr.; Orff to Hintze, 10 Nov. 1940, CM, Allg. Korr.
Complicating the tangle of legends further, Hans-Günther Klein writes wrongly as late as 1984, that the Dresden staging was the first one after the Frankfurt premiere ("Viel Kon-formitat und wenig Verweigerung: Zur Komposition neuer Opern, 1933–1944," in Hanns-Werner Heister and Klein, eds., *Musik und Musikpolitik im faschistischen Deutschland* [Frankfurt am Main, 1984], 155).

(129.) Orff to Lenssen, 9 Oct. 1940, CM, Allg. Korr.; Strecker to Orff, 9–10 Oct. 1940, CM, Schott Korr.; Ernst Krause's review in ZM 107 (1940), 722.

(130.) Orff to List, 11 Feb. 1941; Rosbaud to Orff, 15 June 1941; Rosenbusch to Orff, 14 July 1942; Bitter to Orff, 15 Aug. 1944, CM, Allg. Korr.; Strecker to Orff, 2 Nov. 1940 and 4 May 1943, CM, Schott Korr.; ZM 107 (1940), 802; ZM 108 (1941), 488; ZM 109 (1942), 161; MK 1 (1943), 107; MK 2 (1944), 105; Joan Evans, *Hans Rosbaud: A Bio-Bibliography* (New York, 1992), 36.

(131.) "Spielplan der Staatstheater," 31 Jan.–6 Feb., 7–13 Feb., 14–20 Feb., 28 Feb.–5 Mar. 1944, BH, Staatstheater/14395; MK 2 (1944), 63; Hans Wagner, *200 Jahre Munchner Theaterchronik, 1750–1950* (Munich, 1958), 161; Rudolf Hartmann, *Das geliebte Haus: Mein Leben mit der Oper* (Munich, 1975), 174.

(132.) Von Holthoff to Orff, 8 Jan. 1942; Orff to Pitz, 10 Jan. 1942; Tietjen to Orff, 28 Mar. 1942, CM, Allg. Korr.; Orff to Strecker, 24 Sept. 1942, CM, Schott Korr. (quote); Stege in ZM 109 (1942), 64.

(133.) See Kater, "Carl Orff im Dritten Reich," 32–33. Cf. the well-justified warning in Jens Make Fischer, "Vergangenheit, die nicht vergehen will: Carl Orff und das Dritte Reich," *Suddeutsche Zeitung*, Munich, 14 Mar. 1995.

(134.) I have absolutely no problem with calling *Carmina Burana* Nazi music" (Albrecht Riethmüller to author, 15 May 1997, APA); "Aesthetics or not, *Carmina Burana* to me is fascist music" (Richard Taruskin in panel discussion at symposium, "The Politics of Music: Orff, Weill, and Brecht," coproduced by New York City Opera and Works and Process at the Guggenheim Museum, New York, 16 Mar. 1997).

(135.) Luise Rinser, *Saturn auf der Sonne* (Frankfurt am Main, 1994), 94.

(136.) Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 177–239; idem, "Das Problem der musikalischen Moderne im NS-Staat."

(137.) Carl Niessen, ed., *Die deutsche Oper der Gegenwart* (Regensburg, 1944), 86.

(138.) Schuh to Orff, [14 Aug. 1941], CM, Allg. Korr.

(139.) Strecker to Orff, 1 Sept. 1943, CM, Schott Korr.

(140.) Baldur von Schirach, *Ich glaubte an Hitler* (Hamburg, 1967), 214; idem, "Die Sendung der Wiener Staatsoper," in *Das Programm der Staatsoper Wien*, no. 1 (1940–41), 1–3; Victor Junk, "Die 'Woche zeitgenössischer Musik in Wien,'" ZM 109 (1942), 241–47; Oscar Fritz Schuh, *So war es—war es so? Notizen und Erin-nerungen eines Theatermannes* (Berlin, 1980), 64–65; Prieberg, *NS-Staat*, 333; Oliver Rathkolb, *Führertreu und gottbegnadet: Künstlereliten im Dritten Reich* (Vienna, 1991), 68–76; W. Th. Anderman [Walter Thomas], *Bis der Vorhang fiel: Berichtet nach Aufzeichnungen aus den Jahren 1940 bis 1945* (Dortmund, 1947), 151; Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1996), 221–26; Hans Jorg Jans, "Von freundschaftlicher Zusammenarbeit in schwieriger Zeit: Exkurse," in Vana Greisenegger-Georgila and Jans, eds., *Was ist die Antike wert? Griechen und Römer auf der Bühne von Caspar Neher* (Vienna, 1995), 107 (quote); Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 192–94.

(141.) Entries for 2 Apr., 2 July, 2 and 12–17 (quote) Oct. 1941 in "Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch," CM; Orff to Bergese, 18 Oct. 1941; Schuh to Orff, 19 Nov. 1941, CM, Allg. Korr.; Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 193.

(142.) Orff to Tietjen, 14 Jan. 1942, CM, Allg. Korr.; Thomas, *Rad*, 210–11. This modifies my earlier version of events, in which I had written that Orff "accepted, as his first commission, the opera *Antigona*" (Kater, "Carl Orff im Dritten Reich," 23). To avoid misunderstandings: The point is that Orff, not the Viennese, proposed the opera.

(143.) Der Reichsstatthalter in Wien, "Verträge mit den Komponisten Carl Orff und Rudolf Wagner-Regeny zur Förderung ihres künstlerischen Schaffens," sign.

1 and Thomas, Vienna, 27 Mar. 1942, OSW, OBlhV/1200a. I owe my knowledge of this doc. to the director of the CM.

(144.) Signed transcript of interview with Gertrud Orff, Munich, 5 Aug. 1992, APA; 2 (1944), 116. *Antigone* was directed by Schuh at the Wiener Staatsoper in 1949 (Schuh, *Sowares*, 108).

(145.) Signed transcript of interview with Gertrud Orff, Munich, 5 Aug. 1992, APA.

(146.) Orff to Bergese, 23 May 1942, PA Bergese (quote); entries for 5 Feb., 3 Mar. 1942, 2–11 Apr. 1943 in “Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch,” CM; Gertrud Orff to author, Munich, 22 June 1994, APA; Orff to Ludwig, 10 Feb. 1942, and to [Ruppel?], and to Sutermeister, both 8 Mar. 1942; Strauss to Orff, [Spring 1942]; Würth to Orff, 9 Mar. 1943, CM, Allg. Korr.; Orff to Strauss, 10 Feb. 1942, RG; Strecker to Orff, 12 Feb. 1942; Orff to Strecker, 23 Apr. 1943, CM, Schott Korr.; program of Staatsoper Wien for 17 Feb. 1942, facsimile in Seeböhm, “Vergangenheit,” 146; Victor Junk’s review in ZM 109 (1942), 117–18.

(147.) Strecker to Orff, 23 Sept., 23 Oct., and 3 Dec. 1943, CM, Schott Korr.; *MK* 1 (1944), 198.

(148.) Orff to Sutermeister, 16 Oct. 1938, and Lenssen, 29 Oct. 1939, and Liebeneiner, 14 Aug. 1941, and Schuh, 28 Aug. 1941; Krauss to Menge, 4 June 1938; Kraus to Orff, 18 May 1940; Hoffmann to Orff, 15 Nov. 1940; Ruppel to Orff, 9 July 1941; Dollinger to Orff, 5 Mar. 1944, CM, Allg. Korr.; Orff to Willms, 7 Feb. 1939, CM, Schott Korr.; ZM 107 (1940), 796.

(149.) *MK* 2 (1944), 226 (quote). See also Wiek to Orff, 16 July 1944, CM, Allg. 1.; Willy Werner Gotting in ZM 110 (1943), 136–37; *MK* 1 (1944), 188; Paul Hirth in *MK* 2 (1944), 25; W M. Luther in *MK* 2 (1944), 153; entry for 20 Feb. 1943 in “Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch,” CM; Slonimsky, *Music*, 766; Mohr, *Frankfurter Oper*, 394–95.

(150.) “Betr.: Verwendung des Staatszuschusses zur Verteilung an Komponisten ernster Musik,” Berlin, 4 July 1942, BAB Werner Egk. On the Nazi qualifications of Knab and Former see Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 140, 160, 163, 167–71, 173–74, 183, 239.

(151.) NSDAP, Ortsgruppe München-Marsplatz, “Ausführliches Gesamturteil,” 30 June 1942, BAB Carl Orff.

(152.) Ellis, “Music,” 133.

(153.) Orff to Strecker, 22 May 1941, CM, Schott Korr.; Pietzsch to Orff, 31 May 1941, CM, Allg. Korr. (quote).

(154.) ["To Whom It May Concern"], sign. Raabe, Berlin, 20 Feb. 1942, CM, Allg. Korr.

(155.) Orff to Strecker, 26 May 1943, CM, Schott Korr.

(156.) Aulich to Orff, 23 July and 23 Oct. 1943, CM, Allg. Korr.; Scherping to Reichsminister [Goebbels], 25 Apr. 1944, BA, R55/559.

(157.) As told by Orff to composer von Einem (Gottfried von Einem, recorded in interview, Vienna, 30 Nov. 1994, APA).

(158.) Deutsche Wochenschau G.m.b.H. to Orff, 7 June 1944; Theater am Nollendorfplatz to Orff, 17 July 1944, CM, Allg. Korr. On Goebbels's interest in the production of newsreels see Michael H. Kater, "Film as an Object of Reflection in The Goebbels Diaries: Series II," to be published in *Central European History*.

(159.) Entry for 26 Aug. 1944 in *TGII* 13:333; entry for 30 Aug. 1944 in "Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch," CM; Rathkolb, *Fuhrertreu*, 176.

(160.) Entry for 12 Sept. 1944 in *TGII*, 13:466.

(161.) Hinkel to Orff, 15 Nov. 1944, CM, Allg. Korr.

(162.) Enclosure with Orff to Hinkel, Dec. 1944, CM, Allg. Korr.

(163.) Entry for 10 May 1943 in *TGII* 8:264, 12 Nov. and 2 Dec. 1944 in *TGII* 14:206, 331–32, and 4 Jan. 1945 in *TGII* 15:65; see Orff to Strecker, 21 June 1938, CM, Schott Korr. On Gründgens, see Curt Riess, *Gustaf Grundgens: Eine Biographie* (Hamburg, 1965), 228–38.

(164.) Diehm to Orff, 21 Nov. 1945, CM, Allg. Korr.

(165.) Heinz Trojan and Kurt Hinze, *Beschäftigungsverbot, Vermögenssperre und Sühnemassnahmen nach dem Gesetz zur Befreiung von Nationalsozialismus und Militarismus vom 5. März 1946: Kommentar für die Praxis* (Wiesbaden, 1947); Hajo Holborn, *American Military Government: Its Organization and Politics* (Washington, D.C., 1947), 53–73; Harold Zink, *American Military Government in Germany* (New York, 1947), 92; Lutz Niethammer, *Entnazifizierung in Bayern: Sühnung und Rehabilitierung unter amerikanischer Besatzung* (Frankfurt am Main, 1972), 150–259.

(166.) Rischner to Orff, 2 Dec. 1945; Goetz to Orff, 3 Dec. 1945; Orff to Wilm, 7 Dec. 1945, to Jochum, 7 Dec. 1945, to Rischner, 9 Dec. 1945, and to Goetz, 28 Dec. 1945, CM, Allg. Korr.

(167.) Newell Jenkins, recorded interview, Hillsdale, N.Y., 20 Mar. 1993, APA; Orff to Dubs, 10 June 1938; Jenkins to Orff, 11 Sept. 1939 (quote), and 4 Nov. 1939, CM, Allg. Korr. Also see *Who's Who in American Music: Classical* (New

York, 1985), 290; Nicolas Slonimsky, ed., *Baker's Biographical Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 8th ed. (New York, 1992), 849–50; NG 9:598.

(168.) Newell Jenkins, recorded interview, Hillsdale, N.Y., 20 Mar. 1993, APA; Ulrich M. Bausch, *Die Kulturpolitik der US-amerikanischen Information Control Division in Württemberg-Baden von 1945 bis 1949: Zwischen militarischem Funktionalismus und schwäbischem Obrigkeitsdenken* (Stuttgart, 1992), 118–38; less reliably: Thomas Steiert, “Zur Musik- und Theaterpolitik in Stuttgart während der amerikanischen Besatzungszeit,” in Gabriele Clemens, ed., *Kulturpolitik im besetzten Deutschland, 1945–1949* (Stuttgart, 1994), 55–59.

(169.) Newell Jenkins, recorded interview, Hillsdale, N.Y., 20 Mar. 1993, APA; entry for 24 Dec. 1945 in “Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch,” CM; signed transcript of interview with Gertrud Orff, Munich, 5 Aug. 1992, APA; Brigitte Bergese to author, Leukerbad, 4 Oct. 1995, APA.

(170.) Jenkins to Orff, 7 Jan. 1946, CM, Allg. Korr.

(171.) Non-recorded interviews with Liselotte Orff, Diessen am Ammersee, 18 June 1992, and Werner Thomas (Heidelberg), Munich, 22 July 1992.

(172.) Newell Jenkins, recorded interview, Hillsdale, N.Y., 20 Mar. 1993, APA. 1 was corroborated in a recorded interview Professor David Monod of Wilfrid Laurier University (Waterloo, Canada) conducted with Jenkins in Hillsdale, N.Y., on 6 July 1996. I am grateful to David Monod for making the complete transcript of this interview available to me.

(173.) Werner Thomas, “Ein anderer ‘Carl Orff im Dritten Reich’: Eine Replik auf Michael H. Katers Studie ‘Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,’” paper, International Colloquium, “Zur Situation der Musik in Nazi-Deutschland in den dreissiger und vierziger Jahren,” at Carl-Orff-Zentrum, Munich, 23 Nov. 1994. This had followed my paper, “Selbstgleichschaltung oder Widerstand: Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” a slightly modified version of which was later published as “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich.”

(174.) Sutermeister to Orff, 15 Dec. 1946, CM, Allg. Korr.

(175.) Renatus Wilms in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 15 July 1995.

(176.) Confidential, Information Control Division, ICD Screening Center, Det.H-86, 2nd Mi.Govt.Bn. (Sep), APO 633, U.S. Army, to Chief, Intelligence Section, Office of Director of Information Control, Military Government for Germany (U.S. 1), APO 742, US ARMY, 1 Apr. 1946, David M. Levy Papers, Department of Psychiatry, Cornell University, Medical College, New York. A transcribed copy of the report is deposited in CM and has been made available to me by its director.

(177.) Oliver Rathkolb, "Carl Orff und die Bernauerin: Zeithistorischer Rahmen zur Entstehungsgeschichte, 1942–1947," in program guide, "Volksoper Wien, Saison 1997/98," ed. Klaus Bachler (Vienna, Dec. 1997), 20–21.

(178.) Jenkins in interview with Monod, 6 July 1996, see n. 172. Similarly in Newell Jenkins, recorded interview, Hillsdale, N.Y., 20 Mar. 1993, APA.

(179.) As in n. 176.

(180.) Jenkins in interview with Monod, 6 July 1996, see n. 172.

(181.) Newell Jenkins, recorded interview, Hillsdale, N.Y., 20 Mar. 1993, APA; entry for 19 Jan. and 5 Mar. 1946 in "Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch," CM; Isenstead to Orff, 28 Feb. 1946; Jenkins to Orff, 26 Mar. and 26 Nov. 1946; Preussner to Orff, 26 July 1946; Ley to Orff, 13 May 1947, CM, Allg. Korr.; Evarts to Bauckner, 16 July 1946, BH, Staatstheater/14395; Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 8:363; Slonimsky, *Music*, 837.

(182.) Maier's phrase encapsulates the white-washing efforts of Orff defenders after World War II, especially of the CM and the Orff Foundation, through denial and obfuscation (*Carl Orff*, 11).

(183.) Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 2:126, 207; Karl Marx in Leuchtmann, *Orff*, 101.

(184.) Orff to Georgiades, 12 Dec. 1935; Bergese to Orff, 5 Dec. 1937 and 6 Apr. 1938, CM, Allg. Korr.; Bergese to Petschull, 5 Apr. 1938, CM, Schott Korr.; Maria Bruckbauer, "... Und sei es gegen eine Welt von Feinden!" *Kurt Hubers Volksliedsammlung und -pflege in Bayern* (Munich, 1991), 86–87, 141.

(185.) Clara Huber to author, Munich, 30 Sept. 1993, APA.

(186.) Corr. for 1935–36 in SM, Kulturamt/480, quote from "Denkschrift zur Neugründung und Angliederung der Deutschen Schule für Volksmusik und Tanz am Trapp'schen Konservatorium der Musik," [1935].

(187.) Kurt Huber, "Der Aufbau deutscher Volksliedforschung und Volksliedpflege," in *Deutsche Musikkultur* 1 (1936), 65–73, quotes 66, 68–69. Also see Bruckbauer, *Welt*, passim. On Huber's exploits in Nazi musicology, see Pamela M. 1, *Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler's Reich* (New Haven, Conn., 1998), passim.

(188.) Entries for 9 Feb., 13 Apr., 28 Aug., 18 Nov., 30 Dec. 1941; 1 and 16 Mar., 24 Aug. 1942, in "Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch," CM; Bergese to Orff, 23 Dec. 1940 and 25 Feb. 1942; Orff to Jarosch, 22 Mar. 1942, CM, Allg. Korr.; Strecker to Orff, 10 Mar. and 7 Aug. 1941, CM, Schott Korr.; Bruckbauer, *Welt*, 204.

(189.) Entry for 24 Sept. 1942 in "Gertrud Orffs Tagebuch," CM; Christian Petty, *Studenten aufs Schafott: Die Weisse Rose und ihr Scheitern* (Munich, 1968), esp. 92; Hans-Günter Richardi, "Kurt Huber und Alexander Schmorell vor dem Henker," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, Munich, 13 July 1993.

(190.) Gertrud Orff to author, Munich, 12 Nov. 1993, APA; Clara Huber to author, Munich, 30 Sept. 1993, APA.

(191.) Documentary film, "O Fortuna: Carl Orff," produced by Tony Palmer, Bayerischer Rundfunk/Ladbroke Productions (1995).

(192.) Clara Huber *ibid.*; Orff as quoted in Bert Wassener, "Carl Orff: 'Jeder muss seinen eigenen Weg gehen,'" *Westfalenpost*, 8 Oct. 1960; George J. Wittenstein's quote from his letter to author, Santa Barbara, CA, 21 Oct. 1997, APA. See also Petty, *Studenten aufs Schafott*, 42.

(193.) Gertrud Orff to author, Munich, 7 and 12 Nov. 1993, APA; signed transcript of interview with Gertrud Orff, Munich, 5 Aug. 1992, APA.

(194.) Footage in documentary film, "O Fortuna: Carl Orff," produced by Tony Palmer, Bayerischer Rundfunk/Ladbroke Productions (1995).

(195.) Dibelius, *Musik*, 79; Hugo Wolfram Schmidt, *Carl Orff: Sein Leben und sein Werk in Wort, Bild und Noten* (Cologne, 1971), 8; K. Langrock in *GLM* 6:135. For other variants and simplifications, see Werner Thomas in Wilibald Gurlitt, ed., *Riemann Musik Lexikon*, 12th ed., 3 vols. (Mainz, 1959–67), 2:345; Fred K. Prieberg, *Lexikon der Neuen Musik* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1958), 322; Gersdorf, *Orff*, 87; Martin Konz in *Neue Musikzeitung*, no. 2 (1975), 3.

(196.) Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 4:66.

(197.) *Ibid.*

(198.) See "Gesamtchronologie der Werk- und Wirkungsgeschichte," in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 8:360–66; and the following: Orff to Kurzbach, 20 Jan. 1940, and to Lenssen, 9 Oct. 1940, and to Lehmann, 24 Oct. 1940; Böhm to Orff, 7 June 1939; Pietzsch to Orff, 16 Jan. 1940; Jochum to Orff, 6 June 1940 and 2 Apr. 1942, CM, Allg. Korr.; Orff to Strecker, 18 Feb. 1938 and 24 Sept. 1942; Strecker to Orff, 31 Oct. and 19 Dec. 1939; Willms to Orff, 16 Mar. 1940, CM, Schott Korr.; Strecker to Hindemith, 12 Oct. 1940, PF, Schott Korr.; "Stadtische Philharmonische Konzerte [München] 1941–2: Mozart-Reihe," SM, Kulturstadt/ 177; ZM 107 (1940), 374, 721–22; ZM 108 (1941), 49, 123; ZM 109 (1942), 558; MK 1 (1943), 107, 117, 148; MK 2 (1944), 25; *Frankfurter Zeitung*, 22 Feb. 1943; *Reich*, 9 Mar. 1941; *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 5:209.

(199.) *Melos* 14 (1947), 90, 266, 307, 350.

- (200.) Rinser's statement in documentary film, ? Fortuna: Carl Orff," produced by Tony Palmer, Bayerischer Rundfunk/Ladbroke Productions (1995); Rinser, *Saturn*, 88–89 (Hartmann quoted 96); Godela Orff, *Water*, 55, 84; Bergese to Orff, 9 May 1948, PA Bergese. In a letter to author, Berlin, 19 Oct. 1995, APA, Bergese wrote: Orff usurped everyone, who, he felt, could be of use to him."
- (201.) Orff according to Huber in documentary film, ? Fortuna: Carl Orff," produced by Tony Palmer, Bayerischer Rundfunk/Ladbroke Productions (1995); Bergese to author, Berlin, 19 Oct. 1995, APA; Godela Orff, *Vater*, 84.
- (202.) Newell Jenkins, recorded interview, Hillsdale, N.Y., 20 Mar. 1993, APA; also see Orff to Strecker (2 Aug. 1938, CM, Schott Korr.): "Through my American friends and students I have made several connections 'over there.'"
- (203.) Newell Jenkins, recorded interview, Hillsdale, N.Y., 20 Mar. 1993, APA. 1 the Bavarian quality of Orff's oeuvre, see Ruppel, "Carl Orff und das Theater," [1947], CM, Allg. Korr.; Liess, *Orff*, 79; Thomas, *Rad*, 167–77.
- (204.) Orff to Mein Lieber [Jenkins], 4 May 1947, CM, Allg. Korr.
- (205.) Orff to Lieber Freund, 17 June 1947, and to Meyer, 26 Sept. 1948, CM, Allg. Korr. Jenkins wrote to me on 14 Nov. 1993 (letter APA), that he could not recall the specifics of their disagreement, only that "there was a cloud over our relationship at the end."
- (206.) Rinser, *Saturn*, 131.
- (207.) *JdM 1944*, 129; Hartmann, *Haus*, 149–50.
- (208.) Orff to Krauss, 6 Feb. 1939, CM, Schott Korr.; Orff to Strecker, 25 Jan. 1939 and to Willms, 7 Feb. 1939, CM, Schott Korr. Also see Carl Orff, "Erinnerung an Caspar Neher," in Greisenegger-Georgila and Jans, *Was ist die Antike wertf*, 85.
- (209.) Orff to Strecker, 23 Sept. 1942, CM, Schott Korr.; [Frau] Hansi Meissner to Orff, 15 June and 16 July 1946; Meissner to Orff, 1 July 1947, CM, Allg. Korr.
- (210.) Orff to Lieber Freund, 17 June 1946, CM, Allg. Korr.; Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 6:170. See Godela Orff's interpretation in *Vater*, 67.
- (211.) Orff to Bergese, 15 July 1941, CM, Allg. Korr.; Schott's Sohne to Bergese, 28 July 1941; Bergese to Orff, 9 May 1948, PA Bergese; *JdM 1943*, 48–49; Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 2:126; Bergese to author, Berlin, 30 Aug. 1995 and 11 Mar. 1996, APA; Carl Orff and Kurt Huber, *Musik der Landschaft: Volksmusik in neuen Satzen: Aus dem Bajuwarischen Raum: Lieder und Tanze fur Klavier von Hans Bergese*, Schott Edition Nr. 3569 (Mainz, 1942); Orff and Huber, *Musik der Landschaft: Volksmusik in neuen Satzen: Aus dem Bajuwarischen Raum:*

Zweifache Tanze für Klavier von Hans Bergese, Schott Edition Nr. 3570 (Mainz, 1942).

(212.) Godela Orff, *Vater*, 20–22; her testimony in documentary film, ? Fortuna: Carl Orff,” produced by Tony Palmer, Bayerischer Rundfunk/Ladbroke Productions (1995).

(213.) Godela Orff, *Vater*, 62; quotation Orff to Weidner, 17 Nov. 1943, CM, Allg. Korr.

(214.) Godela Orff, *Vater*, 53, 59, 62, 67–70; Heinrich Strobel, ‘Orffische Zwiesprach: Zur Uraufführung der ‘Bernauerin,’” *Melos* 14 (1947), 297–99; Orff in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 6:169–70.

(215.) Rinser, *Saturn*, 122–23.

(216.) Godela Orff’s testimony in documentary film, ? Fortuna: Carl Orff,” produced by Tony Palmer, Bayerischer Rundfunk/Ladbroke Productions (1995); idem, 216. *Vater*, 15, 29, 45. Also see Orff’s salacious remarks about the girls in *Carl Orff und sein Werk*, 3:114.

(217.) Newell Jenkins, recorded interview, Hillsdale, N.Y., 20 Mar. 1993, APA.; Bergese to Orff, 6 May 1941, CM, Allg. Korr.

(218.) H.-G. Schnell, Rinser’s first husband, fell in 1943 on the Eastern front as member of a punitive battalion. See Günther Albrecht et al., *Lexikon deutschsprachiger Schriftsteller von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1974), 2:221. Also Luise Rinser, *Gefangnistagebuch* (Frankfurt am Main, 1973); Rinser, *Saturn*, 87–99; Brigitte Bergese to author, Leukerbad, 4 Oct. 1995, and Berlin, 7 Mar. 1996, APA; Hans Bergese to author, Berlin, 30 Aug. 1995, APA. 1 relationship is corroborated in Jenkins’s interview by Monod, 6 July 1996, see n. 172.

(219.) Peter C. Whybrow, *A Mood Apart: Depression, Mania, and Other Afflictions of the Self* (New York, 1997); Ronald R. Fieve, *Moodswing: The Third Revolution in Psychiatry* (New York, 1976); George Winokur and Ming T. Tsuang, *The Natural History of Mania, Depression, and Schizophrenia* (Washington, D.C., 1996); Edward L. Shorter, *A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac* (New York, 1997).

(220.) Testimonies of Rinser, Godela Orff, and Liselotte Orff in documentary film, ? Fortuna: Carl Orff,” produced by Tony Palmer, Bayerischer Rundfunk/Ladbroke Productions (1995); Rinser, *Saturn*, 86–131. For the Weimar Republic, see Godela Orff, *Vater*, 23.

(221.) Newell Jenkins, recorded interview, Hillsdale, N.Y., 20 Mar. 1993, APA; Orff to Katz, 2 Aug. 1933; Katz to Orff, 22 July 1933; Kohrs to Orff, [Fall 1938], CM, Allg. Korr.; *IBD*, 600; Eckhard John, *Musikbolschewismus: Die Politisierung der Musik in Deutschland, 1918–1938* (Stuttgart, 1994), 324–35.

(222.) Kater, “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” 30–31. After Jan. 1933, Orff’s corr. 1 two other former Jewish friends, Max Sinzheimer and Karl Salomon, is also either sparse or noncommittal (CM, Allg. Korr.).

(223.) Whybrow, *A Mood Apart*, 11.

(224.) Luise Rinser’s testimony in documentary film, “Fortuna: Carl Orff,” produced by Tony Palmer, Bayerischer Rundfunk/Ladbroke Productions (1995).

(225.) [Ms.] Jaeger to Orff, 12 Sept. 1973; Orff to [the deceased] Katz, 25 Sept. 1973, CM, Allg. Korr.

(226.) Elisabeth Hartmann, recorded interview, Munich, 13 Dec. 1994, APA; letter by Orff of Dec. 1963 [to the deceased Hartmann] printed in *Karl Amadeus Hartmann und die Musica Viva: Essays, bisher unveröffentlichte Briefe an Hartmann, Katalog* (Munich, 1980), 94. Also see text near n. 132, chapter 4.

(227.) Carl Orff, “Brief an Kurt Huber,” 19 Jan. 1946, CM, Allg. Korr. The letter has been published in Clara Huber, ed., *Kurt Huber zum Gedächtnis: Bildnis eines Menschen, Denkers und Forschers, dargestellt von seinen Freunden* (Regensburg, 1947), 166–68.

Access brought to you by: