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The orchestral conductor Heinz Unger (1895-1965) was born in Berlin, Germany and was reared from a young age to follow in his father’s footsteps and become a lawyer. In 1915, he heard a Munich performance of Gustav Mahler’s Das Lied von der Erde conducted by Bruno Walter and thereafter devoted the rest of his life to music and particularly to the dissemination of Gustav Mahler’s music.

This doctoral dissertation is conceived as a contextual biography that explores the manner in which the strands of German Jewish identity converge and are negotiated by a musician who, as a consequence of persecution, lived a sizeable portion of his life in a Double Diaspora (in the Jewish Diaspora as well as exiled from his European home) yet never cut the ties to a German Jewish tradition informed by the strains of a European cultural heritage. It is a work that discusses the process of Jewish emancipation in Central Europe and in so doing sheds light on the complex issues of ethnicity, “race,” nationalism, secularization, and culture and thought as they developed in the modern period and impacted upon Europe and beyond in the first half of the twentieth century. In tracking Heinz Unger’s many movements and activities around the world and covering his eventual emigration to Canada, the work simultaneously probes the manner in which European cultural values manifested themselves in disparate parts of the world. It is also a detailed examination of the values that Mahler’s oeuvre represents and of one
musician’s negotiation of these sites of meaning by way of his commitment to Gustav Mahler’s music.

The first three chapters serve as an extended introduction that in turn surveys Jewish identity in the Diaspora, constructions of Jewish music and their meaning, and the specific cultural significance of Mahler’s music in a German Jewish context. The following five chapters are cast as a biography of Heinz Unger (based on the Heinz Unger Fonds at Archives Canada, Ottawa, Ontario) that explores the manner in which the German Jewish musician understood and expressed his dual identity by way of his allegiance to music.
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INTRODUCTION

"The hero...suffers three blows of fate, of which the third fells him like a tree."

This is how Alma Mahler described the extra-musical significance of the three hammer blows in the finale to Gustav Mahler’s Symphony No.6 ("Tragic"). These words, meant as commentary on the tragedies in the composer’s life, could also describe those of one of his greatest devotees, the German-born Canadian conductor Heinz Unger (1895-1965). Unger, thrice the victim of fate, failed to complete his recording of Mahler’s "Tragic" symphony after suffering a fatal heart attack on February 25, 1965. This blow was but the second struck him by fate; in 1933, the Jewish conductor was exiled from his native Germany after Hitler’s rise to power. The third blow – his posthumous neglect by both the musical community at large and a Jewish community to which he was tied by a faith that remained true throughout his life – still resounds today.

The German Jewish conductor Heinz Unger was born in Berlin on 14 December 1895 and died in Toronto on 25 February 1965. In the almost seven decades that separate these two dates, the man and the musician lived a life full of triumph and tragedy, of the most mundane moments and the most sublime joys. This dissertation is in one respect a biography of this man. Indeed, much of this work is devoted to chronicling Heinz Unger’s life and aims at restoring the musician’s professional achievements to the public consciousness.

But the reasons for writing this biography transcend this most simple plane. Indeed, writing a biography, especially as an academic exercise, is more than simply the chronicling of a life. It is, first and foremost, a choice that must be arrived at after careful
deliberation aware of what is perhaps the most important question of all – WHY? Why indeed was this person selected? What makes him a subject worthy of such consideration? What, in fact, does this historical subject represent? In other words, one must demonstrate the significance of that life and clearly show the reasons for why the entire enterprise was undertaken. I hope this is made clear in the course of this work. Before then, however, I would like to take a few moments to lay out the reasons – the reasons that I hope will become ever clearer in the pages that follow – for choosing to write this work in the manner that I have.

I. Heinz Unger’s life presents an opportunity to better understand the course of modern Jewish history in the Diaspora.

Heinz Unger was born in Berlin in 1895, a Berlin that had grown to become a cosmopolitan centre where German Jews rubbed elbows with non-Jewish Germans on a daily basis. This close interaction between Jewish and non-Jewish segments of the population allowed German Jews to negotiate their identities in a meaningful space and to come to a fuller understanding of who they were, and, perhaps more importantly, who they wanted to be. German Jews had by this time undergone a process of modernization first begun in the 18th century by the father of the Jewish enlightenment Moses Mendelssohn. The emancipation that had taken over a century had arguably finally succeeded in liberating Jews from the shackles of medieval mysticism and they lived lives that were similar to all others. Looking at Heinz Unger’s early life, we will see how far this process had come and be able to see how it affected the core identity and sense of being of one man.
But a grey cloud hung over the “success story” of Jewish emancipation. Significant segments of the non-Jewish German population failed to see these Mosaic Germans as their true brethren and still discriminated against them in subtle (and sometimes unsubtle) ways. Just as importantly, these assimilated Jews still bore (perhaps deep within them) a vestige of a Jewish identity that could not be forgotten. Heinz Unger’s affection for the work of Gustav Mahler was – as we will see in the chapters to come – a manifestation of this “vestigial Jewishness.” This inability to forget his Jewishness was a feature of Unger’s life and a subject that will be explored in the course of this work. It will allow us to understand how Jewish identity transcended community affiliation, my hope being that my work will serve as a corrective to a scholarship that has often privileged the accomplishments of significant community members such as Gershom Scholem and Fritz Rosenzweig as representative of German Jewish sentiment in the first half of the twentieth century.¹ Building upon recent studies such as Todd Presner’s Mobile Modernity, I posit herein that German Jewish modernity is composed not of a symbiosis between the German and the Jewish elements but is best characterized as a mutually reinforcing and inseparable modernity that existed within German Jews and

¹ Fritz Rosenzweig and Gershom Scholem both stemmed from German Jewish families that had effectively assimilated. As young men, both turned back to Judaism, Rosenzweig instrumental in the creation of the Freie Juedische Lehrhaus (“The Free House of Jewish Learning”) while Gershom Scholem remained a vital intellectual force in German Jewry for decades to come. For a closer examination of the Freie Juedische Lehrhaus, see for instance Michal Brenner, The Renaissance of Jewish Culture in Weimar Germany (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1996) wherein the author discusses the Lehrhaus as part of an ambitious and concerted project of Jewish cultural invention. Noah Isenberg explores a similar set of themes in the highly thoughtful Between Redemption and Doom: The Strains of German-Jewish Modernism ( Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1999). A useful compendium of Gershom Scholem’s writing that range through the entirety of his long life and career as a Jewish philosopher and historian can be found in: Gershom Scholem (Werner J. Dannhauser, ed.), On Jews and Judaism in Crisis: Selected Essays (New York: Schocken Books, 1976).
was manifest and experienced in a number of different ways that exceed the bounds of intellectual history.²

Of course, one man cannot represent the course of an entire people. To assert as much would be foolish and would open oneself up to powerful and entirely justified attacks of misrepresentation. Still, as we have learned from groundbreaking works such as Carlo Ginzburg’s *The Cheese and the Worms*, an intensive study of one historical subject – when properly constructed and articulated – can open up an entire universe of understanding that would otherwise have been left unexplored.³ In this work, I employ a mode of conceptualization long overlooked in historical circles, arguing that Heinz Unger’s performance of Gustav Mahler’s music – what in the later chapters of this work I call a performative ritual – opens up a new way of understanding German Jewish identity that would go unnoticed were we to continue to only focus on more orthodox expressions such as speech and writing.⁴ My work is therefore not just a biography but a *contextual biography* – it is a work that aims to not only chronicle the life of Heinz Unger but place him in context and examine the manner in which he negotiated his own German Jewish identity. In some parts of this work, this is clearer than at others. This is for a simple reason: the entirety of a person’s life does not connect with the larger issues of the world around them. Thus, passages of this work do not relate to these larger issues but must in fact connect only to the manner in which Unger conducted himself through his life.

⁴ Such an idea, while novel in history, is not unknown in other fields. Indeed, this is the very approach that Philip Bohlman employs in his musicological study of German Jews in Israel. See: Philip Bohlman, *The Land Where Two Streams Flow: Music and the German-Jewish Community of Israel* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989).
There is certainly a place for larger issues in this work but to skip over other interesting, albeit less "important," episodes would have left us with a less-complete narrative of Unger's life and accomplishments.5

II. Heinz Unger's later years in Canada allow us to view Canadian Jewry through a fresh lens.

During the greater part of the 20th century, the vast preponderance of Canada's Jews were based in the three urban centres of Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg and came from an Eastern European background. The scholarship of Canadian Jewry has paralleled these demographic contours and paid close heed to the members of these tight-knit communities.6 The sheer weight of the numbers and the tremendous significance that these communities have had in the creation and cultivation of a Canadian Jewish ethos has resulted in the voice of those who did not align themselves with these communities to be marginalized or lost altogether. My work, while not being a study of all these lost voices, is a tentative first step in restoring to the Canadian Jewish narrative the voices of the admittedly small number of German Jews that have heretofore not been heard.7 In so doing, I hope that my endeavours will help students and scholars of

---

5 I engage with the subject in this manner cognizant of Jolanta T. Pekacz's understanding that "the cause-and-effect linearity implied the chronological plot is considered a reliable way of ordering the subject’s life, and the author a trustworthy narrator who understands the relationship between the private self and the public world.” See Jolanta T. Pekacz, “Memory, History and Meaning Musical Biography and its Discontents,” in Journal of Musicological Research 23 39-80, 2004. Pekacz's quote is found on page 42
6 While many scholars across disciplines have contributed to the topic, the foremost historian of Canadian Jewry remains Gerald Tulchinsky. His exhaustive work has provided us with a tremendously detailed understanding of Canada's Jewish communities, beginning with their first arrival in Canada to contemporary times. The Tulchinsky work that covers the period dealt with in this dissertation is Branching Out The Transformation of the Canadian Jewish Community (Stoddart, 1998). His most recent work condenses and summarizes his views on the entirety of Jewish history in Canada. See Gerald Tulchinsky, Canada's Jews A People's Journey, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008)
7 In contrast to the situation in respect to Canadian Jewry, there has been a great deal of scholarly works produced on the German Jews in the United States. And while in some respects the conclusions of these
Canadian Jewry to understand that the Jewish Canadian community was not a voice that sounded with only one accent but one that reflected the multitude of experiences in the Diaspora. While I understand that my work falls far short of (and in fact does not intend to) sizeably re-write Canadian Jewish history, I hope that my work will at the very least help lay the groundwork for a fuller understanding of Canadian Jewry and help unsettle/interrupt the continued ossification of a long-established narrative.

III. *Heinz Unger’s accomplishments deserve recognition.*

Heinz Unger forged a successful career in both Europe and the New World, punctuated by a series of setbacks that had the unfortunate circumstance of undermining his legacy. A large part of my dissertation is devoted to bringing to light the conductor’s achievements in the hopes of helping people recognize his impact upon the evolution of musical culture – Jewish and otherwise – in disparate parts of the world.

But music is an ephemeral event, and the many unrecorded concerts over which Unger presided in his lifetime have remained only in the memory of those who witnessed them first-hand. As a consequence, understanding the success of Unger’s career – and his talent as a musician – is largely reliant upon the music critics around the world that the conductor so consistently impressed with his performances. Indeed, the sheer weight of positive assessments reflects very well on the conductor, demonstrating that he was indeed a musical talent. However, recognizing that the talents, dispositions, and expertise of musical critics – to say nothing of potential political and cultural motivations – range across time and space, I have where possible attempted to provide background works apply to the German Jews who settled in Canada, the differences in the demographic and cultural compositions of the Jewish communities in the two countries translate into a sizeably different experience that has not been sufficiently studied.
information on the music critics who must play an important role in our understanding and assessment of Heinz Unger as a musician.

All that being said, in my research I discovered that many of Heinz Unger’s artistic achievements lay collecting dust at Archives Canada. These musical documents represent not only the achievements of this artist but are also premieres and early performances of important music in Canada. Indeed, Heinz Unger is singlehandedly responsible for the premiere of many of Mahler’s symphonies in Canada, an achievement that was recognized at the time but has now disappeared entirely. The fact that the tapes of these historic performances languish in closed archives does a serious disservice to our cultural legacy and fails to allow musicologists and other experts the opportunity of studying Unger’s work first-hand. I hope that this work will help to generate sufficient interest in Heinz Unger to encourage parties such as the CBC to release these valuable sonic resources to researchers and lovers of fine music (and especially Mahlerites) alike.

IV. Heinz Unger’s life makes for a fascinating and interesting story.

History is a discipline that is in constant evolution, subject to the trends of academic inquiry at large. Post-modernism has left us aware that the writing of history is premised upon an ideologically-motivated selection that constructs a narrative that might not necessarily be any truer than another selection that could have been made. Historians are subjective beings and our work reflects this fact. In my view, recent

---

8 I base this statement on Hayden White’s assertion that there exists a group of “semiologically oriented literary theorists and philosophers (Barthes, Foucault, Derrida, Todorov, Julia Kristeva, Benveniste, Genette, Eco), who have studied narrative in all of its manifestations and viewed it as simply one discursive “code” among others, which might or might not be appropriate for the representation of “reality,” depending only on the pragmatic aim in view of the speaker of the discourse.” Hayden White, “The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory,” in History and Theory, Vol. 23, No.1 (Feb. 1984), 1-33.
academic trends have liberated historians to write stories that weave together contested events into our own personal narratives. While fidelity to truth is of course still valued, we have become better aware of the fact that the very nature of “truth” is subject to perspective, thus challenging us to compose works that not only adhere to historical fact but also compose our narratives in ways that entertain readers. While I hope that no-one would cast my work as a fiction, I have no problem with being accused of having written a tale composed of elements that I have selected and privileged.¹ I believe Heinz Unger’s life contains intrinsic interest both as a biography of an interesting person and their life AND as a piece of historical writing that can also reveal unexplored vistas that can educate and open new research horizons. Beyond the sheer significance of Heinz Unger as a means by which to better understand German Jewish identity, his life is an intrinsically fascinating tale of success and woe.

IV. *A biography not of the subject, but of its creator.*

Building upon the aforementioned points and clearly informed by my own biases and experiences, I understand that I have created a work that says as much about its author as it does about its subject. I am a secular Jew. I was born into a Jewish household, attended Hebrew school, was Bar Mitzvahed, feel a kinship with the Zionist cause and the Jewish peoples, and still fondly recall the tales and legends I was taught as a child. At the same time, I do not keep kosher, rarely if ever attend synagogue, and can only read Hebrew at a snail’s pace. The story of Heinz Unger – a man and musician who

---

¹ Here I am inspired and guided by Jolanta Pekacz’s scorn for biographers who refuse to admit their role in the work: “Rather than disclosure of their mediation, musical biographers offer declarations of their scholarly honesty, lack of bias, and truthfulness to primary subjects pertaining to their subjects. As if unwilling to assume authority over the text they produce, biographers present themselves as mere “transmitters” of the verities included in their sources.” Pekacz, “Memory, History and Meaning,” 43.
identified with Jewish culture throughout his life and yet often fell beyond the reach of traditional Jewish communal structures – thus speaks to me deeply. It is the story of all assimilated Jews who feel Jewish yet rarely if ever connect with the community in any formal way. My biography of Heinz Unger, therefore, is not only a contextual biography that speaks of its time and place historically speaking but is a reflection of the here and now.

A further feature sadly marred the period during which I conducted my research. On December 4, 2006, my father suddenly and entirely unexpectedly passed away. He was 69 years old. Heinz Unger was also sixty-nine at the time of his death and, just like my father, died as a result of a heart attack. My research and work was informed by this tragic coincidence and made my work both a labour of love as well as, at times, a terribly painful experience. It also helped me better understand both the subject of my work and my father better. This work is devoted entirely to my beloved, departed father and to all the love and support that he gave me throughout his life.

* * * * * *

While much of this work is structured as a biography, this thesis transcends the purely biographical level and aims to address key issues pertaining to Jewish Diaspora history in the modern period. The first three chapters of this dissertation therefore serve as an extended introduction that helps contextualize the significance of Heinz Unger’s life. I see the first three chapters as concentric circles that bring us ever closer to the main themes in Unger’s life.
The first chapter is a survey of Ashkenazi Jewish identity in the Diaspora during the modern period. I begin with the Jewish Enlightenment, spearheaded by Moses Mendelssohn in the 18th century. In this period, as modern national identities began to be formed, Jews in Central Europe began to question their place in general society. As these German Jews came to see themselves ever more as the countrymen of their neighbours, many of the key features of their pre-modern identity were shed, subsumed and replaced by an increasing similarity to their fellow burghers. In so doing, a process of assimilation was begun that utilized Bildung as its foundational block and key. This transition to a nationalist, non-Jewish identity has for decades been cast as the first step in the attempted creation of a “German-Jewish dialogue,” an experiment that was first decried by significant Jewish philosophers such as Gershom Scholem in the first half of the 20th century.10 This branch of thought extended well into the post-Holocaust period when prominent historians such as Steven Aschheim continued to interpret the attempts at a liberal, Bildungs- inspired assimilation – and the production of a “German-Jewish symbiosis” – as a failure.11 The supposed failure of German Jews to successfully assimilate with their countrymen has been the subject of a vast historiography that more often than not casts the entire enterprise of assimilation as one wherein German Jews

---

10 In a short piece written in 1962, Gershom Scholem accurately notes that he and like minded others recognized the futility of a true German Jewish dialogue early on, proclaiming: “Never did anything respond to that cry, and it was this simple and, alas, far-reaching realization that affected so many of us in our youth and destines us to desist from the illusion of a ‘German-Judaism.’” Scholem also notes that the term “German-Jewish symbiosis” had latterly been introduced into the debate but was merely a new term for what had traditionally been known as the “German-Jewish dialogue.” See: Gershom Scholem, “Against the Myth of the German-Jewish Dialogue,” in Gershom Scholem (Werner J. Dannhauser, ed.), On Jews and Judaism in Crisis: Selected Essays, 61-64. The Scholem quote is to be found on page 62.

11 “Weimar culture’s most vital impulses were informed by an explicit suspicion, even outright negation, of many of the essential postulates that made up the Bildungs tradition.” Steven E. Aschheim, Culture and Catastrophe: German and Jewish Confrontations with National Socialism and Other Crises (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 33. Further discussion of the German Jewish symbiosis – albeit one that casts the symbiosis as a success, if only for the period that it existed – can be found in Paul Mendes-Flohr, German Jews: A Dual Identity (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999).
“turned their back” on their faith and culture and deluded themselves into thinking that they had achieved integration with their fellow countrymen.\textsuperscript{12} What these studies so often failed to recognize – and that historians are only latterly beginning to recognize – is that many German Jews had undergone a re-conceptualization of identity – both cultural and religious – and that their embrace of German culture was not a rejection of Jewishness but a constituent part of a new, multi-layered identity wherein being “German” was just as important as being “Jewish.”\textsuperscript{13}

The first chapter of this work, however, is not limited to the daunting task of coming to grips with the identity and evolution of German Jews in the modern period. Cognizant of Heinz Unger’s movements in the Diaspora, I have also devoted attention to the evolution of East European Jewry in the modern period. The situation of Jews in Eastern Europe was far different than that faced by their Central and Western European co-religionists. While East European Jews certainly changed in the modern period (in respect to religious practice, for instance), they were slower to engage with the wider world, at first remaining in the shtetl and thus at a distance from non-Jews well into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. And while this did not inhibit their engagement with modernity, it most certainly meant that the cultural composition of the community was far more inward-looking than Jews further west. Eastern European Jewry’s inward focus translated in turn into the creation and widespread acceptance of two ideologies – Zionism and Bundism – that provided new answers to the challenges of modernity that significantly altered the


\textsuperscript{13} In \textit{Mobile Modernity}, Todd Samuel Presner mirrors and elaborates on my conception of Jewish and German identities having become intertwined, reflecting that “‘the Jewish’—that which is supposedly differentiated from, outside of, or somehow opposed to ‘the German’—is actually within, if not constitutive of, that which is German.” Todd Samuel Presner, \textit{Mobile Modernity: Germans, Jews, Trains} (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 4.
relationship between Jews and non-Jews.\textsuperscript{14} Zionism, ironically the brainchild of the thoroughly secular (and indeed atheistic) German Jewish journalist Theodore Herzl, made much ground in Eastern Europe and grew to become an ever more significant ideology in the twentieth century, in reality only becoming a significant answer to Jewish problems across the rest of Europe as the Holocaust approached. In Eastern Europe, however, Zionism presented a significant departure for a Jewish population increasingly coming under threat as their Gentile brethren targeted them as the scapegoats for the uneasy transition into a modern society and economy. Bundism, meanwhile, presented the ever-more proletarianized Jews of Eastern Europe with a strategy for coping with social and economic problems as they manifested themselves in Jewish settings. As Jonathan Frankel has pointed out in his magisterial history of the movement’s growth, Bundism provided Jewish workers with a means of creating both a political solidarity against exploitative businesses (themselves often run by Jews) as well as a way of formalizing community structures and creating a socio-cultural movement that spoke their vernacular (Yiddish, as opposed to the Zionist embrace and creation of a modern Hebrew) both literally and metaphorically.\textsuperscript{15}

In surveying the particular strands that the biographical section of my dissertation addresses, I have also taken time to look at the situation of Canadian Jewry in the modern era. The Jewish community of Canada was for the first half of the twentieth century a tight-knit community, one that grew greatly in the first decades of the twentieth century as Eastern-European Jews, fearing continuing persecution, moved to Canada in great

\textsuperscript{14} Of course, a third and less ideologically-derived option – emigration – also existed for Eastern European Jews. That said, many Jews who were adherents of Zionism and Bundism also emigrated to the New World.

numbers and there created a community that recreated many of the features familiar from the old world. The creation of such homogenous and closely bounded communities (often of textile workers) resulted in a cohesive community whose boundaries were clearly delineated by point of origin, language spoken, and, often, an attachment to a leftist leaning Bundism that also bore significant ties to Zionism. These communities, centred in Montreal, Toronto, and Winnipeg, have been chronicled by such scholars as Gerald Tulchinsky who have devoted much of their academic lives to the thorough and rich study of these communities.\footnote{Gerald Tulchinsky, Branching Out: The Transformation of the Canadian Jewish Community (Toronto: Stoddart, 1998).} And while the hermetic (and sometimes parochial) nature of these communities provided many of Canada’s Jews with a space devoid of the persecution that they longed to leave behind, the creation of such closed communities meant that little space remained for the integration of Jews who arrived later in the century. The German Jews who arrived near the middle of the twentieth century, in particular, presented a unique challenge, bringing with them a set of linguistic differences (a language that would painfully confront many Canadian Jews with memories of an all-too-recent recent period during which many friends, family and loved ones had been lost to the Holocaust), a deeply-held and vastly different set of political positions and cultural self-understandings, and a completely different conception of Judaism wherein religious concerns and even communal ties had been jettisoned and all that had been retained was a vestigial connection to “Jewishness.” This work demonstrates that the price to be paid for the creation and maintenance of such tightly-knit communities was the exclusion of German Jews who arrived later, thereby impoverishing our understanding of the plurality of Canadian Jewry for decades.
The “vestigial” connection to Judaism that many Jews of Central Europe bore manifested itself in cultural manners often overlooked. One such area in which identity displayed itself was musical culture. My second chapter therefore draws us ever closer to the starting point of our biography by examining the key positions in the area of Jewish musical history and musicology. In this part of the work, we begin not with Jewish musical practice in biblical times as has been done by so many musicologists who have strived to construct a continuity that serves a teleological underpinning to demonstrate the authenticity of modern Jewish music that consciously exploits Jewish liturgical and non-liturgical modes and motifs. Instead, I begin my discussion with an extensive analysis of Richard Wagner’s pernicious attack “On Jewishness in Music,” a work that railed against the manner in which Jewish composers (even, or perhaps especially, those who were thoroughly assimilated or had even converted to Christianity) were “infecting” the purity of German music. The reason that I have done this is at once both simple and vitally important: I seek to establish that what constitutes the bounds of “Jewish music” is not dictated by a composer’s conscious use of Jewish musical material but by a complex interplay between a composer’s compositional style (sometimes consciously arrived at while at other times entirely subconscious) and the manner in which their music is understood by audiences (admirers and detractors alike). Indeed, my discussion of Jewish music is underpinned by this important fact and I contend that to argue, as Israel Rabinovitch does, that Jewish music be limited only to the work of composers who have consciously used Jewish material is to erroneously and, in fact, short-sightedly exclude a

17 As we will see in the chapters to come, early Jewish explorations and articulations of what constitutes a national music were premised and based upon general intellectual trends in the late 19th century that often sought to define and thus legitimize the nation by way of the construction of a narrative that emphasized that nation’s ancient history and lineage. For a thorough discussion of Jewish musicology, see Chapter 2.
large part of a canon that reflects the plurality of Jewish experience in the modern period.\textsuperscript{18} Thus, while I applaud and in part endorse Philip Bohlman’s theory elaborated in an earlier work that the canon of European art music practiced in Israel by its German-speaking population constitutes a significant part of “Jewish music,” his conclusion that this music represents a distinct canon of its own for the Yekkes only serves to once again artificially bound branches of the Jewish community, whether they be in Israel or in the Diaspora.\textsuperscript{19} My discussion therefore ends not with an endorsement of one or the other position but an awareness of the limits of both, arguing that a more flexible, more holistic interpretation of what constitutes Jewish music is helpful in understanding that the boundaries of what this music is varies according to time and circumstance.\textsuperscript{20} In sum, we have a responsibility to contextualize our definitions and findings, understanding that any definition of what constitutes a “Jewish music” is bound to change with the settings, thoughts and feelings of composers, musical practitioners and audiences alike.

The third chapter picks up where, in a sense, the second chapter leaves off. Having arrived at a more pluralistic and “open” understanding of what constitutes “Jewish music” in the modern period, we begin a detailed exploration of the music of Gustav Mahler and the significance that this composer had on the course of Jewish history in the twentieth century. To achieve a better understanding of Mahler’s significance during the course of the twentieth century, we begin with an exploration of the composer’s life and then continue on to a discussion of the meaning that the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Israel Rabinovitch (A.M. Klein, trans.), \textit{Of Jewish Music: Ancient and Modern} (Montreal: Montreal Book Center, 1952).
  \item Philip V. Bohlman, \textit{The Land Where Two Streams Flow: Music in the German-Jewish Community of Israel} (Urbana, Illiinois Press, 1989).
  \item In recent years, Philip Bohlman has endorsed a similar position. Indeed, the entire subject of Jewish musicology has recently undergone a massive transformation, coming to appreciate that Jewish musical expression is fluid and subject to time, place and circumstance. A fuller discussion of the historiographical transformation that has taken place is taken up near the end of the second chapter.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
composer and his music have borne over the course of the twentieth century. In sum, this chapter helps us not only to better understand the more holistic conclusions arrived at in the second chapter but also provides a better and clearer understanding of why Gustav Mahler represented so much to Heinz Unger and also helps explain how Unger’s affiliation with Mahler transcended the purely aesthetic and sonic planes and became linked to an awareness of his German Jewish identity.

In sum, the first three chapters of the dissertation serve as an extended introduction to the topic and create the solid base upon which the biographical section of my dissertation is built. These introductory chapters therefore allow my work to transcend the purely biographical and transform it into a contextual biography – a biography that is intended to speak not only of its subject but also of the subject’s place in Jewish history of the modern period. This first section of my dissertation represents a significant part of my work in helping us better understand the strands that run through and link key episodes in Heinz Unger’s life. Having thus worked our way through the first three chapters that establish the contours of our biography and have been conceived as concentric circles drawing us ever deeper into Heinz Unger’s cosmos, we now move on to studying Heinz Unger’s life. These chapters are structured chronologically, the divisions conceived as the clearest way of conveying the sweep of a life filled with movement. And, in light of the significance of Mahler’s oeuvre to Heinz Unger, I have selected to tie each chapter to a work of Mahler’s that captures the feeling of that particular phase of Unger’s life. I have moreover subdivided the chapters into the constituent movements of each musical work in order to grant each chapter even greater sense and order. These subdivisions will I hope serve as a way of better understanding
the essence of each episode that I have chosen to highlight as significant in the life of Heinz Unger and how these moments relate to the musician’s career and also to the overarching theme of German Jewish identity.

The first chapter of the biographical portion of my work covers Heinz Unger’s early life, beginning with his birth in 1895 and ending with his exodus from Germany in 1933. In this chapter, we cover his youth, his service in the German army during the First World War, the emergence of his love of Gustav Mahler’s music and his decision to become a conductor, his first successes as a conductor in Berlin, his first travels to the Soviet Union, and his emigration away from Germany at the beginning of the Thousand Year Reich. The musical motif selected to convey the mood of Unger’s early life is, perhaps predictably, Gustav Mahler’s First Symphony, a work whose moods clearly reflect the optimism of a young man, the joy of entering into the musical world, the travails of a time fraught with conflicting strands of identity and life, and ends on a defiant note reflected in Unger’s angry departure from his homeland.

The second chapter begins in 1930, a mere handful of years before Heinz Unger was forced to depart from his Germany. From this starting point, the chapter follows the conductor through his time in the Soviet Union until 1937 when his time there was cut short due to ideological and artistic differences with the authorities, discusses Unger’s life after he chose to settle with his young family in England after 1933, the conductor’s activities during the Second World War, his early – and contentious – travels in Spain following the Second World War, and ends with his successes in the Spanish-speaking world. The wide-ranging nature of Heinz Unger’s activity in these years is conveyed by the musical motif of Mahler’s early song cycle “Songs of a Wayfarer” that mirrors the
moods encountered in a period fraught with sadness, hope and freedom, anger and frustration, and a joy encountered upon discovering a new world of opportunity in Spain and beyond.

The third chapter of the work focusses on Heinz Unger’s settling in Canada. As such, it begins with a discussion of his first appearances on Canadian soil in the late 1930s but focuses on his endeavours to create a career anew after his permanent move to Canada in 1947. After a discussion of the musician’s work with community orchestras and the joyful circumstances surrounding the founding of his York Concert Society, the chapter ends with Unger’s triumphant return to Berlin in 1956. The musical motif underpinning this chapter is Mahler’s powerful Second Symphony (“Resurrection”), a work that, as so often with Mahler’s oeuvre, bears within it a number of moods. The work ends with a powerful hymn of resurrection, a resurrection not dissimilar to the one that Unger encountered in his return to Berlin.

The fourth biographical chapter of the dissertation looks at Heinz Unger’s activity and life spanning the latter half of the 1950s and ends in 1961, the year following the centenary of Gustav Mahler’s birth. Inspired by the intense joy that Unger achieved in that pivotal year, I have opted to use Mahler’s Fourth symphony, described by Unger as a symphony that is like the “‘eye’ of a cyclone, the calm area in the centre of mountainous seas,” as the musical motif to accompany this chapter. However, all was not “peaceful serenity” during this period in Unger’s life; despite the composer’s joy at partaking in the Mahler centenary, the conductor’s happiness was blunted by an ongoing antagonism with the Israel Philharmonic that raised the ire of the Jewish musician who was cast aside, his “Jewish” credentials questioned by those who held sway in Jerusalem. That messy affair
notwithstanding, this chapter is highlighted by the international recognition of Heinz Unger as a leading Mahlerian, a recognition represented in his reception of a Mahler medal and the first in a string of Canadian premieres of Mahler's symphonies that brought to the conductor a joy only dented by the affair with the Israel Philharmonic.

The final chapter of our biography is the longest single entry of our work and covers a period filled with great heights but also the deepest valleys. We begin our discussion with what amounts to a review of Heinz Unger's Jewish networks of affiliation. Thereafter, we travel back in time to explore Unger's role in the "Chicago Affair" of 1949, an episode that caused a deep and permanent fissure with significant portions of the American Jewish community and ensured that Unger would, despite the advocacy of influential Jewish supporters in the United States, never prove successful in an American context. Thereafter, we move on to mention Heinz Unger's involvement with the German Jewish post-war community, and the far more unfortunate circumstances surrounding the cancellation of the YCS' 1961 season. Following that temporary disruption in Heinz Unger's career, we return to look at his final years of activity, punctuated by both successes such as further international recognition as an expert of Mahler performance from the Gustav Mahler society and the Canadian premiere of Mahler's final completed symphonic utterance, his Ninth Symphony as well as setbacks such as troubles with his professional representation and his ultimate demise, ironically while working toward the Canadian premiere of Mahler's Symphony No. 6 ("Tragic").

And thus ends our exploration of Heinz Unger's life and the body of our work. At the end of all this, we have, by way of conclusion, a postlude that revisits the key
themes discussed in the course of the work. We close the work with a brief discussion of Heinz Unger’s forgotten musical legacy, a legacy that, it is hoped, this work will go some way to rehabilitating, and also once more touch upon the main ideas pertaining to German Jewish identity surveyed in the course of this work.
CHAPTER 1

JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE DIASPORA

On a brisk November evening in the nation’s capital, a small group of people gathered together to listen to the distinguished historian of Canadian Jewry Irving Abella speak at a reception to honour him on being named senior fellow of the Vered program of Jewish Canadian studies at the University of Ottawa. Speaking on this special occasion, Abella chose to address a most interesting subject, raising the question of whether Canada’s Jews should be considered as Canadian Jews or as Jewish Canadians. Despite making what might seem to be but a semantic point, Abella astutely and precisely engaged with a question that has plagued students of Jewish history for the last two centuries. For at the heart of this debate lay a vital point – whether Jews are best defined – and define themselves – as a religious group within national communities or as an ethnic group residing in disparate parts of the Diaspora. Despite launching a vigorous and lively debate on that cold evening, Abella and the others in attendance (including the right Honourable Herb Gray, Ret.) tried to arrive at a moderate compromise conclusion befitting the special evening, characterizing Canada’s Jews both religiously and ethnically.

1 Lecture delivered at the University of Ottawa, November 8, 2007.
2 The historian Jacob Katz neatly encapsulates this notion of Jewish identity: “In the first period [the decade of 1760-1770] a Jew might have been designated as English, French, or German depending on his land of residence. At that time, however, this was only a geographical description and gave, perhaps, a hint of some collective characteristics that the members of each respective community may have manifested. A hundred years later, if a person was called a French, English or German Jew, he was taken to belong in some way to both the social units implied in the compound expression: he belonged to one of these nations and was, in addition, a Jew.” Jacob Katz, Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770-1870 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 1.
I begin my dissertation with this anecdote not to shamelessly promote the University of Ottawa’s Vered program but because it neatly encapsulates a key theme of my work – the interpretive flexibility inherent in any definition of Jewish identity. The Jewish people do not represent an undifferentiated block and their historical experience in disparate regions of Europe and the wider world has had a marked influence on the cultural values they have developed and in turn the manner in which they conceive of their identity. Since any attempt to define Jews as either a religious or ethnic group must rely on temporal and geographical particularities that have gone into an understanding of that nebulous notion of identity, I have attempted to divide modern Ashkenazi Jewish development into the two distinct streams that, I argue, have become the core of two distinct Jewish communities, the one informed by the experience of Eastern Europe and the Russian Empire and the other by a development that went hand in hand with the general rise of modernity in the Central-European lands. As we will see, this bifurcation of Ashkenazi Jewry bears a tremendous importance in the Canadian context, so much so that I feel compelled to advance the hypothesis that if one looks to their language, cultural values and historical experience, German Jews of Central Europe in the Diaspora – the Jewish group to which our biographical subject Heinz Unger belongs – bear many of the hallmarks of a unique ethnic identity, distinct from a Canadian Jewish population that stemmed largely from Eastern Europe. This chapter serves as a historical overview that is meant to acquaint the reader with the vicissitudes of Jewish history and experience in the modern era as well as to help us comprehend the sweep of modern Jewish history and so better understand the complexities of the Jewish experience and the factors that

---

3 As noted herein, I am limiting my discussion of herein to the Ashkenazy branch of Jewry. The evolution of Sephardic Jewry is another matter altogether and does not inform our discussion here or in the dissertation more generally.
have contributed to the way in which Jewish identity has developed in Canada and beyond.

I. The Development of German Jewry

Until the 18th century, the vast majority of Europe’s Jews lived in cloistered communities behind Ghetto walls. In this social order, Europe’s Jews maintained age-old traditions and remained distinct from the world around them. In such a setting, there seemed no need for any self-definition that exceeded the traditional bounds of religious and social identification. The German Jews of Central Europe spoke Yiddish, read Hebrew, and structured their communities around the twin pillars of religiosity and community survival.4

The modern conception of national identity (and its offshoot other identities) begins in 18th century Europe with the Enlightenment, a philosophical movement premised upon a new conceptualization of logic, equality, and reason. Enlightenment ideals also sparked a deep re-examination of European Jewry from both within and without. The Enlightenment belief that all humanity was equal prompted both Jews and non-Jews alike to begin to question whether Europe’s Jews should be better integrated with the non-Jews that surrounded them and whether the limitations placed on the Jewish communities as a whole discriminated against the individuals living within these communities. In essence, the Enlightenment tore asunder the Corporatist modes of affiliation that had prevailed in Early Modern Europe and opened a door through which

4 Jacob Katz rightly points out, however, that the points of intersection between Jewish and non-Jewish communities were frequent and many. Nevertheless, the Jewish communities of Europe existed as units within society and each community bore within it most if not all the constituent elements of a free-standing social unit. See: Katz, Out of the Ghetto, Chapter 1: Ghetto Times, 9-27.
both Jews and non-Jews were freed to pursue their goals not collectively but as individuals.

Despite the fact that Christians such as the Prussian Councillor Wilhelm Dohm (1751-1820) were important in the process of Jewish assimilation, the Jewish people were not a passive entity in the debate stimulated by the Enlightenment. On the contrary, they engaged with these ideals and began a process of negotiating and internalizing the values of the Enlightenment. One of the first to do so was a man who would become a leading figure in Jewish emancipation, the Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelssohn (1726-1789). Mendelssohn is today considered widely as the “father of the Haskalah,” the Jewish Enlightenment that was premised upon the Enlightenment more generally and had as its goal the tearing down of walls between Europe’s Jewish and Christian communities. Mendelssohn served as an inspiration to both Jews and non-Jews alike; to Jews because he demonstrated how Jews could not only be tolerated in general society but could even serve as an inspiration and as a model of the Enlightened Mensch, and to Christians because he demonstrated the full extent of the potential latent in German Jewry to become respectable burghers. As the historian A.G. Adler puts it,

5 In his work, *On the Civic Improvement of the Jews* (1781), Dohm “called for new laws aiming at the early, complete emancipation of the Jews.” In essence, Dohm strove to demonstrate that Jewish emancipation was not only a laudable goal that accorded with Enlightenment values of equality but also one that would help propel German development onward, not despite the Jews’ allegiance to the Jewish faith but precisely because of it:

“Who can help but have high respect for the Jew whom no torture or martyrdom can induce to give up his religious laws or, on the other hand, detest the worthless one who for monetary advantage denies his religion and pays lip service to the Christian one? The clinging to the age-old faith alone imparts to the Jews a stability which is a great advantage in the formation of their morality...They are always devoted to the state and often have shown a zeal in danger which could hardly have been expected from members of society so little favored as they.” Dohm, as quoted in Adler, *The Jews in Germany*, 28.

6 Jacob Katz makes a wonderfully nuanced point in recognizing that Mendelssohn did not mean to leave Judaism behind but, rather, to integrate Enlightenment thought into Jewish circles. According to Katz, the writings and actions of Moses Mendelssohn and other like-minded individuals brought “into being a particular Jewish variation of enlightened society that had some contact with [its] non-Jewish counterpart but, on the whole, remained socially aloof and also conceived of themselves as having a special mission – namely, the spreading of enlightenment to the Jewish communities.” Katz, *Out of the Ghetto*, 54.
“Christian sympathizers saw in [Mendelssohn] the living proof of the falsity of the prejudice against the Jews and of the need to improve and bring up to standard the lot of his people, both socially and in civic rights.”

For their part, the maskilim, the advocates of the Haskalah, worked to achieve their goal, educating themselves in secular subjects and aiming to integrate into European society by adopting its “dress, language, manners, and loyalty to the ruling power.” As early as 1778, two of Mendelssohn’s followers – the German Jewish banker and community leader David Friedlander (1750-1834) and his brother-in-law Isaac Daniel Itzig – would take the bold step of creating the Jewish Free School (in Berlin) that taught Jewish students not in Yiddish but in German.

The Enlightenment was not only a set of values and a philosophical system that was developed in a vacuum; the Enlightenment was a system of thought that helped spawn social and political change on a grand scale. Perhaps the most lasting effect is the French Revolution; in what can only be called a totally new notion of governance and societal conceptualization, the French Revolution built upon Enlightenment ideals and brought about a situation in which a nation defined itself fully for the first time. Indeed, the Declaration of Rights of Man (1789), the manifesto at the heart of the French Revolution, enshrined sovereignty as residing in the population itself. The French Revolution did not only create such a situation in France alone, however; Napoleon’s

---

9 H.G. Adler, The Jews in Germany, 24. Along with co-founding the Jewish Free School, David Friedlander endorsed other integrationist projects such as “dry baptism,” an initiative in which German Jews would, on the grounds of shared moral values, undergo a baptism so long as this did not mean having to recognize the divinity of Jesus.
military campaigns spread these ideas across Europe and resulted in the formulation of national identities that at times built upon ethnic, linguistic, and cultural lines and at other times cut across such cleavages.\textsuperscript{10}

In the German lands, particularly, national identity did in fact develop in a heretofore unheard of manner. Prior to the Napoleonic period, the German lands had been divided along the lines of individual kingdoms, duchies, and princedoms inherited from the Holy Roman Empire and the populations of these different regions defined themselves not nationally but locally. With the arrival of French forces and administrators, the rivalries that had for so long kept Germans distinct from one another began to lessen in the face of a new “other.”\textsuperscript{11} Both practically and conceptually, Germans began to question the boundaries of their identities and what traits could qualify one as a constituent of this newly imagined nation.\textsuperscript{12}

As is so often the case, the vanguard of this national re-conceptualization consisted of artists and thinkers. One of the first to discuss the concept of a German nation was the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814). Beginning in

\textsuperscript{10} The noted Napoleon scholar Michael Broers argues that Napoleon did not contribute to the rise of Nationalism across Europe by demonstrating that resistance to Napoleon was strongest in “old order” states such as Britain, Spain and Portugal and that, in fact, the concept of Nationalism was most closely linked to Napoleon and therefore found repellent by much of Europe. I would argue, however, that the steps undertaken to centralize regions to counter Napoleonic gains and to compete in the “new Europe” of the day in and of itself helped create a climate in which Nationalism would soon arise. For Broers’ argument, see: Michael Broers, \textit{Europe under Napoleon, 1799-1815} (Arnold, 1999). Moreover, on a purely psychological sense, the resistance to French Civic Nationalism also spawned an examination of values which, ironically, also led to the advancement of nationalism, albeit one not grounded in the political nation but predicated upon ethnic, linguistic, and cultural bases.

\textsuperscript{11} This is not to say, however, that inter-German rivalries disappeared altogether (a situation exacerbated by Napoleonic support of particular territories at the expense of others) or that the creation of a unified Germany was a historical inevitability. Indeed, Michael Broers points out that Napoleon utilised a “divide and conquer” strategy, often conscripting locals to occupy administrative positions and thereby making whatever conflict arose an internecine matter rather than one that concerned France directly. See: Broers, \textit{Europe under Napoleon}.

1806, Fichte produced his *Reden an die deutsche Nation (Addresses to the German Nation)*, a series of lectures and tracts written while Berlin was under French occupation. In this work, Fichte’s “stated goal is to rouse the German nation from its slumber to assert its freedom and throw off the Napoleonic yoke.” The *Addresses* were more than just a call to arms against French influence, however; they were an articulation of a concept of Nationalism that looked to language and culture as the key determinants of nationality. These notions of language and culture did not arise out of the then-new political articulation of nationalism as in the French Revolution but were instead the markers of an ethnic nationalism that rejected Revolutionary modes of nationalism and were meant to tie Germans together; in reading Fichte’s work, one is ultimately struck by the fact that any definitions of language and culture are merely a cover for what was essentially an ethnic nationalism.

Fichte’s formulation of an “ethnic nationalism” was a new approach to self – and national – understanding that conformed not to Enlightenment ideals but to a new set of precepts – Romanticism – that rejected the Enlightenment’s respect for order and reason and instead privileged the chaos inherent in the soul and the natural world, highlighted by

---


14 The most fascinating aspect of this article is the author’s discussion of Fichte’s linguistic views; particularly, how language is determined by the *Volk* and that the evolution of language is “a continuous non-arbitrary stream out of the actual common life of a people.” (p.344). It is here worth quoting Abizadeh at length: “Fichte cannot tell us what makes a language ursprünglich without making reference to ancestors. Expressive freedom requires the historic language of one’s ancestral people, organically linked with (indeed, arising out of) the people’s ‘own’ historical experiences, uncorrupted by foreign influences — where the notion of foreignness tacitly relies on the over-time boundary of descent that constitutes the Stammvolk. Infiltrated by foreign elements, the national language would lose its anchor in the nation’s history — which, it will be recalled, is subject to a non-arbitrary law — thereby becoming a corrupt and dead language incapable of harbouring expressive freedom. Language must indeed coincide with descent. Abizadeh, p.354.

It should be noted that Abizadeh’s nuanced understanding of Fichte’s position in respect to language could just as easily be applied to Wagner’s discussion of language in his 1850 “Das Judentum in Musik.”
the sense of dislocation in the rapid advance into the modern world.\textsuperscript{15} Romanticism, built upon a concern for emotion and feeling at the expense of Enlightenment logic, therefore carried within its mandate a deep problem; in disavowing the suppression of instinct and impulse, it bore the potential of opening a chasm to the darker side of human nature which, unfettered by logical dictates, was allowed full expression. As Steven Aschheim notes in paraphrasing the German author Thomas Mann (1875-1955), German Romanticism bore within itself a tendency towards “a certain richness...of soul that feels very close to the chthonian, irrational, and demonic forces of life, that is the true sources of life” and which threatened to explode “into hysterical barbarism, into a spree and a paroxysm of arrogance and crime, which now finds its horrible end in a natural catastrophe, a physical and psychical collapse without parallel.”\textsuperscript{16} In Mann’s view, Romanticism was one of the main reasons behind the tragedy that consumed Germany, Germans and German Jews (and indeed much of Europe) during the darkest years of the Nazi regime.\textsuperscript{17}

As the impulse behind the modern German nation-state developed, the definition of its citizenry became ever more critical. It is against this backdrop – this tension between Enlightenment and Romantic ideals – that the manner in which German Jews achieved their “liberation” is best understood. For, while German Jews experienced and

\textsuperscript{15} George L. Mosse richly describes Romantic thought and the context in which it came to flourish in a passage that should be quoted here.

“Bewildered and challenged, men attempted to re-emphasize their own personality. But, since the rate of industrial transformation, as well as its effects, seemed to evade the grasp of reason, and men could not easily make themselves part of the new social order, many turned from rational solutions to their problems and instead into their emotional depths.” George L. Mosse, \textit{The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich} (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1964), 13-14

\textsuperscript{16} Steven E. Aschheim, \textit{Culture and Catastrophe}, pp 5-6

\textsuperscript{17} Mann’s conception of the link between Romanticism and Nazi Germany dovetails with George L. Mosse’s hypothesis that there is a direct link between the intellectual currents of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century and their application in the mid 20\textsuperscript{th} century under the Nazi regime. See: George L. Mosse, \textit{The Crisis of German Ideology}
indeed embraced Romanticism along with their soon-to-be countrymen, the fact that they had achieved their first advances into general society by way of the Enlightenment would mean that they would remain deeply marked by its values, whatever influence Romanticism may have had.

The 19th century philosophy that would most bear the hallmarks of the Enlightenment was Liberalism. As a social philosophy, Liberalism was a comprehensive worldview derived from Enlightenment ideals that stressed freedom in its purest sense and argued that each individual’s freedom could best be attained and guarded by proscribing society’s collective freedom. Germany’s Jews, recognizing that their entrance into general society had come as a result of Liberalism and that it promised them the freedom to fully exploit their strengths and to integrate with German society at large on an equal footing, not surprisingly therefore became Liberalism’s greatest supporters and adherents for the balance of the 19th century and well into the 20th century.

By exploiting the opportunities presented by Liberalism, German Jews had by mid-century made great progress in respect to their right to co-exist with other Germans, a group that they saw as their national compatriots. In the revolutionary year 1848, German Jews were heavily involved in the abortive attempts at the creation of a German state. Indeed, German Jews – numbering approximately 400,000 by the middle of the 19th century and concentrated most extensively in Prussia – had proved so visible that their status occupied a central role in the debates surrounding nation and national identity in the period both before and after 1848.18 The debates did not, however, merely address

---

18 For instance, a seven-day debate over the emancipation of the Jews had been undertaken by the United Diet of Prussia in 1847. According to Adler, the opinions borne by politicians during this debate were varied but can be roughly pigeon-holed into three distinct categories: conservatives who sought to deny Jewish membership in State duties; liberals who took the position that Jews should be entirely emancipated
the Jewish situation; on the contrary, they intersected with and deeply impacted upon the question of German nationhood and national identity. It is no surprise, therefore, that an issue of such importance would not be decisively concluded one way or another in such a short period. Indeed, this debate continued, in one form or another, throughout the 19th century and well into the 20th when it was concluded in wanton acts of violence and culminated in a State-sanctioned campaign of exclusion and, ultimately, extermination.

At the mid point of the 19th century, however, the course of German Jewish history was as yet unclear and it would have been impossible to foresee the cataclysm that would overwhelm Germany’s – and Europe’s – Jews a century later. Germany’s Jewish population, embroiled in the vortex of the debate on national identity in 1848, tended to avoid extreme positions, supporting the liberal position in the greatest numbers and tending towards “a position of complete identification with the German state[s].”19 German Jews advocated such a stance despite the persistence of a discrimination that continued to cause their marginalization even as they sought ever more integration; as the renowned Jewish historian Simon Dubnow (1860-1941) pointed out, “formally, constitutionally-guaranteed equality of the Jews was in force in 1848 in nearly all of the individual states...Actually, however, during the first period following the Revolution, Jews enjoyed parliamentary suffrage only.20

---

19 Adler, The Jews in Germany, 60.
20 Simon Dubnow, History of the Jews: From the Congress of Vienna to the Emergence of Hitler, as quoted in Adler, 63.
Despite the distance between law and reality, German Jews showed a remarkable enthusiasm to demonstrate their devotion to their German fatherland. By the time of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, German Jews were no longer identifying with their French co-religionists but with their German neighbours, utilizing Gentile conceptions of nationhood and identity and displaying greater solidarity with their countrymen than with their co-religionists across national borders. In all, 6000 German Jews fought in the Franco-Prussian War, with 448 casualties and 327 receiving an Iron Cross.

Involvement in the Franco-Prussian War was not the only expression of German Jewish solidarity with their non-Jewish brethren; by the final decades of the 19th century, Germany's Jewish population was no longer self-identifying as German Jews but as Germans of the Mosaic faith. Nor was this only a self-affixed tag; Germans were also ever more often coming to view them in this way as well, and official recognition (i.e. full civil rights) was granted to Germany's Jewish population upon the creation of the German state in 1871.

By the time of the founding of the German Reich, therefore, German Jews no longer cloistered themselves or kept to their own. In so far as religious practice was concerned, ever larger numbers of German Jews identified with the reform movement, a religious movement that was built upon a series of reforms that altered religious practice

---

22 Adler, The Jews in Germany, 75.
23 The full emancipation of Germany's Jews was predicated upon both a century-long campaign for rights as well as the 1869 law of the Northern German Federation which stated: “All restrictions on civic and constitutional rights proceeding from religion are herewith abolished. In especial, participation in state, municipal, parliamentary, and administrative activity should be without respect to religion.” Dubnow's translation, as quoted in Adler, p.78.
to accord with Christian forms.\textsuperscript{24} Indeed, by the last decades of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, German Jews most frequently attended services in newly-built, opulent synagogues that reflected the Jewish community's new-found wealth, sense of achievement and civic pride and in which religious rites ever more similar to Christian modes of observance (such as the incorporation of organs like those utilized in church services, changes in the rabbinical garbs, and using the German language for vast portions of the services) were practiced.\textsuperscript{25}

The official State recognition and the German-Jewish enthusiasm for assimilation does not mean, however, that there were not problems integrating into German society. Europe's Jews had always been prey to bouts of scape-goating and to pogroms (spontaneous persecution and murder) going back hundreds of years. In earlier periods, such anti-Jewish activity had been premised upon religious motivations.\textsuperscript{26} In the modern period, however, Jewish persecution changed drastically. Having foregone their communal and, often, religious modes of affiliation, German Jewry had entered general society. Such a successful assimilation confronted people who harboured anti-Jewish beliefs with a new set of challenges in how to explain the fundamental difference that they felt existed between Jews and non-Jews. Indeed, it is fascinating (and, of course, tragic) to reflect on how the breakdown of traditional, Corporatist modes of community organization resulted not in an integration of peoples of different faiths but in a new epistemological challenge for Europeans who harboured anti-Jewish beliefs to create a

\textsuperscript{24} One of the earliest articulations of Jewish reform was the journal \textit{Sulamith}, founded by David Frankel and Joseph Wolf in 1806. By the mid point of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, the ideas advocated for in reform-minded journals like \textit{Sulamith} had largely become the basis for Reform Jewish practice.

\textsuperscript{25} Richard Cohen, "Celebrating Integration in the Public Sphere in Germany and France," in Michael Brenner, Vicki Caron, Uri Kaufmann, eds. \textit{Jewish Emancipation Reconsidered: The French and German Models} (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 55-73.

\textsuperscript{26} Of course, that was not the sole reason for Jewish persecution. Indeed, persecution and expulsion of Jews was often accomplished by way of these "spontaneous outbursts" but their real goal was often financial; it was a means of seizing Jewish assets.
new mode of thought whereby they could rationalize their intensely-felt and deeply-irrational views in respect to the Jews.

In this dark enterprise, the scientific theories of the mid to late 19th century and the Romantic notions of Volk dovetailed and served as the vehicle for the modern branch of anti-Semitism. In this scheme, a Fichtian concept of the Volksnation was supported and proven by way of Social Darwinism’s distortion of Darwinian science. This formulation served two purposes simultaneously: it served as a means by which the limits of the nation were delineated and thus served to propel ethnically-based Folk nationalism forward; and simultaneously “proved” the essential weakness of the Jewish peoples. Such a new approach served its devotees in brilliant fashion, tying together two disparate philosophies into one tidy package that explained the disorientation that people felt in the rapid change from a pre-modern to a modern society.

The historical event in which these trends most clearly converged was the Dreyfus Affair. In the Dreyfus Affair, the Alsatian-born Captain Alfred Dreyfus, one of the few Jewish officers in the French General Staff, was summarily tried in 1894 on charges of treason and sentenced to life imprisonment on Devil’s Island, French Guyana. Two years later, the identity of the real perpetrator of the traitorous act, Major Esterhazy, was discovered yet the verdict, due to a series of distortions and abuses famously exposed by the French writer Emile Zola in his 1898 article “J’Accuse,” was not overturned until 1906 when Dreyfus was exonerated and reinstated into the French army as a Major. The debate over Dreyfus’ guilt or innocence in the affair, contested between Dreyfusards and anti-Dreyfusards in both France and across Europe, caused many (including the

---

Viennese Jewish yet thoroughly assimilated journalist Theodore Herzl who would come
to be known as the father of modern Zionism) to rethink their positions concerning the
desirability and, indeed, the possibility of Jewish integration into European society. 28
The desperate conclusion Herzl reached – that Europe’s Jews would never be free of
persecution – compelled him to reconnect with the culture if not the religion of his youth
and devote the remainder of his life to the creation of a Jewish State that would serve as a
safe haven for Jews.

None of this, however, can detract from the fact that during the course of the 19th
century German Jews had made great strides towards integration into German society.
By the time of the inter-war Weimar Republic, Germany’s Jews were able to play an
active role in the running of the State and were often the leading luminaries in the
professions and the arts. The liberal politician and lawyer Hugo Preuss (1860-1925), for
instance, was a leading architect of the Weimar Constitution while Jews became eligible
for civil-service posts that had been previously closed to them. 29

Yet some German Jews felt that these gains had been made at too great a cost.
Weimar Germany became a period during which many German Jews began to look to
their Jewish identity as a key component of their sense of self. In so doing, they began to
question the prevailing notions of “German-Jewish symbiosis”, replacing their
enthusiasm for assimilation with a new heightened pride of their Jewish heritage and
culture. The most outspoken and well-known cultural critic of Jewish assimilation was

28 The debate that raged across Europe in regard to the Dreyfus Affair is most extensively revealed in:
The literature on Theodore Herzl and the birth of Zionism, meanwhile, is wide-ranging. Suffice it to say
that the standard narrative (including Herzl’s own) is that the Dreyfus Affair resonated with Jews in a very
personal way and forced many to rethink their positions regarding the desirability and genuine reality of
Jewish integration into European society.
29 Adler, The Jews in Germany, 121.
Gershom Scholem (1897-1982), a German-born Jew who rejected the possible success of a German-Jewish dialogue and decried the late 19th century *Wissenschaft des Judentums* as a corrosive force in the spiritual life of German Jewry.\(^\text{30}\)

The historiography relating to German Jewry – including Scholem’s own writings on the German-Jewish dialogue – often looks to the modern German Jewish experience as a failed experiment.\(^\text{31}\) In large part, this is because of the Holocaust and how this one event virtually destroyed an entire people. Of course, few would quibble with the fact that the Holocaust marks one of the most tragic episodes in 20th century history. However, it is far too easy to cast the entirety of Jewish emancipation in German lands as this “failed experiment” when one looks back through the prism of this one tragic episode. Indeed, in this perspective, the attempts at Jewish re-discovery in the Weimar period take on a colouring of being “too little, too late”; an attempt by German Jews to pull back from emancipation and to re-centre themselves within a Jewish context. And while this is an enticing perspective, it fails to do justice to the reasons for Jewish emancipation in Germany or its success before the tragic sorrow brought upon by the Holocaust. The well-respected historian of Jewry Steven Aschheim, for instance, sets his gaze in just this manner in his wide-ranging, eulogizing essay “Culture and Catastrophe” that poignantly links the culture of Germany – the culture that Jews were so desperate to

---

\(^\text{30}\) Gershom Scholem had been born in Berlin into a Jewish family divided in its belief, his father resisting his desire to study Hebrew or Jewish thought. Scholem’s rejection of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* – a “science” of Judaism – was based on its attempt to legitimize Judaism not as a religious study but as an academic subject like any other.

\(^\text{31}\) Gershom Scholem’s best known work refuting the German Jewish dialogue and symbiosis is “Against the Myth of the German-Jewish Dialogue” a work in which he declares that the dialogue was always one-sided (stemming from the Jews) and that the Germans had little if any enthusiasm for any such discussion or community building. See: Gershom Scholem, “Against the Myth of the German-Jewish Dialogue,” in *On Jews and Judaism in Crisis: Selected Essays* (ed. Werner J. Dannhauser). (New York: Schocken Books, 1976), 61-64.
be a part of — with the ultimate catastrophe of the Holocaust. Writing within this teleology, one cannot help but see the attempts of Germany’s – and Europe’s – Jews to integrate as a desperate attempt bound to fail, bound to lead to the Jewish community’s own demise.

II. The Development of Eastern European Jewry

Having sketched out the position and growth of modern German Jewry (and then, it must be admitted, only in the most cursory fashion), it is now time to turn to Eastern European Jewry and briefly examine this community’s modern history and its own modes of self-definition. In undertaking this task, we fully acknowledge that we are painting in the broadest strokes and consequently oversimplifying the life and history of a community stretching back hundreds of years that was filled with vibrancy and a richness of life that was brutally and suddenly cut short by the Holocaust. Due to the fact that the majority of our work is devoted to German Jewry, however, we will herein supply only a thumbnail sketch of Eastern European Jewry to help orient readers and help them understand the differences between the two communities.

It is in a sense easier to write of Eastern European Jewry because the community, as a result of its place within an illiberal and highly stratified general milieu, changed far less than its Central and Western European antipodes over the course of the 19th

33 The largest pockets of Jews in Eastern Europe were, until the Holocaust, found in Poland and on the western fringes of the Russian Empire, an area known until the 1917 collapse of the Russian Empire as the Pale of Settlement. Sizeable communities could also be found in Romania, Hungary, and Lithuania.

Hundert argues that “a combination of elements in the experience of eighteenth-century eastern European Jews, including the concentration of large numbers, a continuing attitude of superiority to their neighbors, the secure place of and indispensable role played by Jews in the economy of the region, and the general absence of what I call the “beckoning bourgeoisie,” strengthened and deepened a positive sense of Jewish identity. This became the central ingredient of the mentalité of East European Jews and constituted a kind of social-psychological translation of the concept of chosenness…in subsequent centuries, despite ideological, geographical, economic, political, and even linguistic and cultural change, and for all the exceptions that might be cited, the vast majority of east European Jews and their descendants carried this core, even if transvalued, sense of chosenness within them.” Gershon David Hundert, Jews in Poland-Lithuania in the Eighteenth Century: A Genealogy of Modernity (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 4.

Reforms in the early period of Tsar Alexander II’s (r. 1855-81) reign, seeking to “Russify Jews,” did for a short time promise a significant change in the relationship between Eastern-European Jewry and the Russian State and people. By the 1870s, however, such integrationist ambitions were shelved and replaced by an inherent suspicion of Jewry as a corrosive force within the Russian national ethos. See: Gerald Tulchinsky, Taking Root: The Origins of the Canadian Jewish Community (Hanover, NH: Brandies University Press, 1993), 98-99.
important feature of Eastern European Jewish immigrant culture in its moves through the Diaspora: the first was Zionism, the second, Bundism.  

The first, Zionism, was, to put it simply, a movement that aimed toward the creation of a Jewish homeland. Its first modern advocate was Theodor Herzl, an assimilated Austrian Jew already encountered in our discussion of German Jewry and who had gone so far as to entertain conversion to Christianity. In his capacity as a journalist covering the Dreyfus Affair, Herzl had come to the conclusion that no matter how far Jewish emancipation progressed, bouts of anti-Semitism would always mark Jews as distinct and that sudden and disastrous setbacks were not just possible but inevitable. Seeking the creation of a state that would act as a refuge for European Jews, Herzl sought to create a Jewish homeland. Herzl’s conception, despite according with religious and prophetic thoughts of return to a “promised land” granted to the Jews of antiquity by their God, in fact had little to do with such an impulse; such a disparity between pre-formalized Zionist impulses and the Herzl’s vision of Zionism can easily be seen in Herzl’s attempts at finding a geographical space where he could establish his Jewish state, a search that led Herzl to petitioning British politicians for the use of Uganda, an attempt to purchase land in the underdeveloped Argentinian hinterlands, and meeting with the Ottoman Sultan in the hopes of obtaining the most historically appropriate choice for a Jewish homeland – the Ottoman-controlled lands of Palestine.  

37 Of course, a third and less ideologically-derived option – emigration – also existed for Eastern European Jews. That said, many Jews who were adherents of Zionism and Bundism also emigrated to the New World.

38 Herzl’s own writings in respect to the creation of a Jewish nation-state, articulated in detail in Der Judenstaat ("On the Jewish State", 1896) make clear the liberal and secular foundations of the state that he envisioned. As such, its location was secondary to its very existence.
In Herzl’s conception, Eastern European Jews were to serve as the vanguard in the settlement of this new Jewish homeland, an initiative which bore a resonance for many Eastern European Jews who found themselves the target of spontaneous pogroms and systematic persecution within the bounds of the Russian Empire. Many Eastern European Jews, hoping for a better future, embraced Zionism as a political ideology if not as an immediately realizable course of action.

It should be noted, however, that despite Herzl’s appeal to East European Jewry as the Zionist vanguard, the project of Zionism, at least as Herzl conceived of it, was a liberal one. Indeed, the Zionist state as sketched out by Herzl in Der Judenstaat was profoundly marked by liberal conceptions of State-ism. This is one of the main paradoxes of Herzl’s Zionism; Herzl’s Zionist movement was a modern conception of state penned by an emancipated German Jew but was meant to appeal, and indeed succeeded in appealing, to a great many East European Jews whose experience was markedly different from that of the father of modern Zionism. By the same token, Zionism failed to take hold as a dominant ideology in Central Europe during the first decades of its life, a fact that underlines the enthusiasm of Central and Western Europe’s Jews for assimilation and integration with the nation-states in which they lived, at least until it became clear that the direction society was taking would be inhospitable to Jews.

At the dawn of the 20th century, Zionism was but one of the many responses to the “Jewish problem” and appealed most, at least in theory if not in practice, to a substratum

---

39 This paradox played itself out in heated debates at Zionist conventions, especially after Herzl’s death in 1904.
of liberal Jews primarily based in Western and Central Europe. The second ideology that greatly impacted upon Eastern European Jewry was Bundism. In illiberal Eastern Europe (and particularly in the Russian Empire), socialist ideologies resonated strongly amongst the many Jews who lived a meager urban existence shaped by frequent pogroms by Gentiles (often tacitly supported by local and central governments) and chronic economic exploitation at the hands of more affluent, enterprise-owning Jews. This state of affairs resulted in an environment wherein a growing form of militancy and radicalization of ideologies presented a strong draw for many Jews.

The birth of the Bund in 1897 – the same year in which the inaugural Zionist Congress was held in Basel – granted the Jews of Eastern Europe what they viewed as a realistic solution to many of their socio-economic problems. Over a short period of time, however, the Bund became a vibrant form of community affiliation that very quickly began to take on nationalist proportions. The growth of such a socio-cultural community among East European Jewish workers, therefore, became a vibrant form of community and quasi-national affiliation. Moreover, the Bund’s cultural vibrancy persisted until the unfortunate demise of much of Eastern European Jewry during the

---

40 Baron Edmond Benjamin James de Rothschild (1845-1934), a member of the incredibly wealthy and influential French banking Rothschild family, was particularly drawn to the Zionist cause and invested heavily to help propel the Zionist project in the first half of the twentieth century.

41 The Bund’s import as a nationalist movement, however, is hotly contested. Jonathan Frankel insists that the Bund did not at first indicate the existence of a national consciousness. Jonathan Frankel, Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism, and the Russian Jews, 1862-1917 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). Henry J. Tobias, however, posits that the formation of the Bund marked and enabled the growth of a Jewish ethnic community which, for all intensive purposes, meant the creation of a nationalist ethos among Eastern European and Russian Jews. Henry J. Tobias, The Jewish Bund in Russia from its Origins to 1905 (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1972), xv. Zvi Gitelman meanwhile endorses a moderate middle position between Frankel and Tobias, arguing that the Bund’s growth was premised upon a pre-existing Jewish/Yiddish culture that continued to unfold due to the Bund’s vibrancy in meeting explicit socio-economic and nationalist challenges to Jewish labourers. Zvi Gitelman, “A Century of Jewish Politics in Eastern Europe: The Legacy of the Bund and the Zionist Movement” and David Fishman, “The Bund and Modern Yiddish Culture”, both essays in Zvi Gitelman, ed. The Emergence of Modern Jewish Politics: Bundism and Zionism in Eastern Europe (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003).
Holocaust wherein the long-standing conflict between Zionism and Bundism and Hebrew and Yiddish was resolved not because of the inherent superiority of one path or another but merely because of historical circumstance.\textsuperscript{42}

As is widely known and often discussed, the Holocaust resulted in the annihilation of as many as six million Jews, the vast preponderance of those ruthlessly murdered having lived in Eastern Europe. The organized virtual extermination of Western and Central European Jews was a tragedy of naiveté – of a community that until the last remained convinced that no civilized nation such as Germany could systematically set to killing a group of people that had lived amongst them for centuries. The murder of Eastern Europe's Jews was another matter altogether, however. For Eastern Europe’s Jews had only just truly begun to migrate out of the ghetto in large numbers in the early years of the twentieth century, a full half century or more after their brethren to the west. And even then many had chosen to not leave behind the shtetl, the communities of Eastern European Jews divided as to whether one could or even should desire to assimilate.\textsuperscript{43} But as this contest played itself out in the Jewish communities of Eastern Europe, they were overrun and overwhelmed by the tragedy of the Holocaust that made this debate but a moot point.

\textsuperscript{42} Zvi Gitelman, “A Century of Jewish Politics in Eastern Europe. The Legacy of the Bund and the Zionist Movement,” in Zvi Gitelman, ed \textit{The Emergence of Modern Jewish Politics}

\textsuperscript{43} The different varieties of Jewish culture and the contest between modernity and traditionalism present in interwar Poland is most viscerally and poignantly presented in Roman Vishniac’s beautiful photographs of Polish Jewry, Roman Vishniac, \textit{Polish Jews A Pictorial Record} (New York Schocken Books, Inc., 1976)
III. Central and Eastern European Jewry at odds: the Situation in the Canadian Wilderness

It is interesting to note that both of the main trends in the history of Eastern European Jewry — Zionism and Bundism — markedly differed from the manner in which Jews had developed in Central and Western Europe. In Central and Western Europe, the main thrust of Jewish history (and the majority of the Jews in those areas) tended towards assimilative ideologies and practices, while in Eastern Europe the major Jewish historical initiatives were directed either towards strategies that tended towards mass exodus from regions that were inhospitable to Jewish life or were “Jewish answers to Jewish problems” — means by which problems that primarily affected Jewish labourers and these in their orbit were resolved. Of course, one cannot ignore the fact that the militancy and interest in matters relating to class intrinsic to Bundism led a great many Eastern European Jews to embrace the anti-religious ideology of Communism as the answer to society’s shortcomings. Nor can one fail to address German Jewry’s return to Judaic-related themes and introspection in the period between the two World Wars. In both cases, we have initiatives that fail to accord with the general trends of their times or represent serious reversals of the general trends that had theretofore been in place; German Jews (and also French Jews, British Jews, etc.) had, on the whole, been generally assimilationist and only eventually began to question this process and its results, while Eastern European Jews moved further away from their cloistered communities and began to engage with the discussions over the shape of society at large, losing their Jewish particularist worldview.
These anomalies – a cultural-religious revivalism in Central Europe and the embrace of Communism in Eastern Europe – in a sense became the trend in Europe, at a time during which all of society was undergoing a tremendous upheaval on the social, economic and political levels. However, it would be incorrect to view these particular strains as representative of the manner in which Europe’s Jews envisioned themselves or the way in which they acted. Indeed, many German Jews continued to believe in the Liberal assimilationist project while great numbers of Eastern European Jews remained in communities that retained a markedly “Jewish” flavour.

Whatever their personal beliefs and positions, however, the vast majority of European Jewry was lost to the Holocaust. Not all of Europe’s Jews, however, disappeared with the tragedy that overwhelmed Europe in the late 1930s and early to mid 1940s. At the turn of the century, large numbers of Jews from Eastern Europe – motivated to flee their homes in the wake of pogroms such as the Kishineff Massacre of 1903 – had left their homes and communities to start anew in settings they hoped would prove an improvement over the intolerant conditions in which they had lived. Canada was one of the countries wherein these Jews settled. Fortunately, a great many had left in the period before Canada’s borders were closed to immigration as a result of the Depression and its dire economic effects. These Jews, arriving with few if any linguistic skills and a legacy of shtetl-life, chose to form or were forced into closed communities in Canada’s largest urban centres such as Montreal, Toronto, and Winnipeg.

44 The waves of Eastern-European Jews emigrating to Canada had, as Gerald Tulchinsky points out, in fact begun in the 1880s following a series of pogroms stimulated by an anti-Semitism that had seen them being blamed for the assassination of Tsar Alexander II. See: Tulchinsky, Taking Root: The Origins of the Canadian Jewish Community.

45 Some, including Irving Abella, have also argued that Jewish immigration to Canada was severely curtailed not only due to a fear of competition but also anti-Semitism. See: Irving Abella & Harold Troper, None is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe, 1933-1948 (Toronto: Lester & Dennys, 1986).
In these communities, they recreated the contours of their previous lives, working primarily in the garment industry and creating a vibrant, rich community whose borders were – at times – porous yet still clearly visible and, often, closely guarded from both within and without. The large Jewish communities of Canada – based in Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg – largely recreated their social structures on their own, growing organically but also maintaining the flavour of the communities left behind in Eastern Europe.46

The colour of Canadian Jewry, as a consequence of the sheer size and vitality of these largely Eastern European communities, meant that little space remained for other Jews to enter and express themselves within these culturally-bounded communities. This is due to a number of often mutually complementary and interlocking factors, the first and most obvious being that the sheer demographic weight of the Eastern European Jewish migrations to Canada would always outweigh any small number of Western and Central European Jews who chose to abandon their native countries and resettle in Canada. Due to this demographic imbalance, Western and Central European Jews (and, of course, German Jews) would always be a minority within the Canadian Jewish communities and little space could or needed to be accorded to them in the most mundane yet essential matters of language, lifestyle, and cultural habits.

This overlaps with the second point – the cultural and political legacies of the groups were, as we have seen, vastly different. On a political and social level, Eastern European Jews were informed and deeply affected by the communal mobilization spirit inherent in both Bundism and Zionism while German Jews had grown accustomed to interaction with non-Jews and engaged in their experience in their newly-adopted

46 Tulchinsky, Taking Root: The Origins of the Canadian Jewish Community.
homeland in a manner similar to that which they had done in their original milieu; namely, retaining a belief in inherently liberal practices as bearing within them the promise of a brighter future.47

A third point of a seemingly obvious and simple nature need also be made; German Jewry had, by this point in time, evolved into an identity that bore within it a Jewish and a German component. The explicitly Jewish element of this German Jewish identity, however different it may have been to its Eastern European Jewish counterpart, did not pose a significant problem as differing levels of religious observance were to be found within East European Jewish communities across the Diaspora. The German elements of German Jewry were, in the wake of the Holocaust, a different matter, however.48 On the most fundamental level, the very nature of the German language became a visceral and painful reminder of the Holocaust, of the death of so many loved ones and of the traumatic experiences that many Jews (both Eastern European and otherwise) had experienced during those dark years. Thus, it was natural to want to avoid those Jews who either spoke that language or bore a marked German accent in whatever other language they spoke. Indeed, even many German Jews decided to abandon the use of German all together during and immediately following the war years. The German Jewish composer Arnold Schoenberg, in A Survivor from Warsaw (1947), even went so

47 Gerald Tulchinsky notes that “Socialism and Jewish nationalism, which were the vehicles of a complex revolution in the self-understanding of vast numbers of [immigrant] Jews, were brought to Canada in the 1880s and 1890s to become an integral part of the debate on the Jewish future ” Tulchinsky, Taking Root The Origins of the Canadian Jewish Community, 181-182

48 While there is a rich historiography pertaining to German Jews of this period in an American setting, little if any work on the post-war experience of German Jews in Canada has been undertaken Only Alexander Freund’s study of Germans in a post-war Canada touches upon the tensions of this interesting historical area See Alexander Freund, “Troubling Mememes in Nation-Building World War II-Memories and Germans’ Interethnic Encounters in Canada After 1945,” in Histoire Social/Social History 39/77 (2006). 129-156.
far as to use the German language as a musical tool, employing its sounds to explicitly symbolize violence.

The sound of the German language itself was not the only mechanism that triggered a painful reaction in Jews in the post-Holocaust era. Aspects of the German cultural legacy, too, awakened a visceral response in the period following the Holocaust. Heated debate and even outright violence met those musicians who advocated on behalf of performing the music of certain composers who had figured prominently and been (posthumously) adopted as State composers of the Third Reich. In this debate, the music of Richard Wagner took pride of place in being the music most closely connected to the Nazi regime and to Hitler himself. Thus, any who continued to endorse its musical merit were subject to scorn and abuse. Even Jewish musicians who defended German musicians who had remained active in Germany during the Nazi period were attacked, as occurred with Yehudi Menuhin in his defence of Wilhelm Furtwängler. And Furtwängler’s own engagement in the 1949 Season with the Chicago Symphony was – as we shall see later in this work – boycotted to such an extent that the contract was ultimately embarrassedly cast aside in deference to public pressure led by prominent Jewish groups and individuals. All this is to say that being a German Jew was not a comfortable position for many in the years following the Holocaust.

Moreover, the networks of affiliation with which German Jews engaged as well as the sheer nature of their beliefs limited their ability to engage widely with specifically Jewish groups whose primary identification was composed of a self-consciously Jewish

---

49 This debate continued well into the 1990s when the Jewish-Argentinean pianist and conductor Daniel Barenboim performed Wagner’s “Tristan und Isolde” Overture as an encore to his July 7 1991 concert with the Berlin Staatskapelle in Jerusalem. In so doing, he broke the unofficial 50-year ban on the performance of Wagner’s music that had been in place since the founding of the state of Israel and stimulated angry cries from wide segments of the Israeli public and politicians.
posture. In a certain respect this was due to the fact that their social and professional networks in the "old country" had for the most part transcended the bounds of the Jewish community. Their networks of affiliation in the post-war era – deeply affected by their interwar experience as well as a sense of alienation exacerbated by the experience of dislocation brought on by the Second World War – maintained this component, leading them into general society and, in a Canadian context, away from the bounds of the Jewish community. The German Jewish identification with liberalism and an allegiance to the nation-state meant that, upon moving to a new country, German Jews strongly identified with the new state to which they had emigrated, choosing to work towards becoming not members of the Jewish community already established therein but towards becoming good, politically-engaged burghers in their new countries. And while post-war Canadian Jewry had begun, as Frank Bialystock points out, to enter into general society and to engage more actively with the Canadian state and nation, this new engagement was still premised upon a Jewish self-awareness and set of sensibilities far removed from those of the newly-arrived German Jews.

In sum, the integrationist impulse German Jewry was not lost in the move to a new land or a new world. Instead, it was carried into this new context, and marked them as distinct from earlier waves of Eastern European Jews, causing a rift that no common religion could heal. Much as in Europe, German Jews and East European Jews lived as islands unto themselves, separated by differences in historical experience, language, ideology and culture.

50 In their recent work, Deborah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt propose a reconsideration of what constitutes a "Holocaust survivor," arguing that those who managed to escape the concentration camps must also be considered as Holocaust survivors on account of their war-time dislocation and suffering. See: Deborah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt, *Flight from the Reich: Refugee Jews, 1933-1946.* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2009).
This was the landscape and the circumstances with which the subject of this study, Heinz Unger, and many of his German Jewish compatriots were confronted upon immigration. Often unable to find common ground with much of a Jewish community with which they had no experience, language, or sensibility in common, they instead sought out association with Canadians or German-speaking Canadians, an association that only helped to further the distance between German Jews and their Eastern European co-religionists. In the place of a meaningful dialogue with the Canadian Jewish community, therefore, these newly-Canadian, German Jews embedded themselves in Canadian culture more generally and maintained a network of affiliation that transcended borders, linking like-minded and assimilated Jews together according to common interests and codes of already deeply-entrenched behaviour and thought across the Diaspora.

Put another way, the failure of German Jews to embed themselves in the Jewish communities of Canada does not mean that these more recent immigrants from Central Europe had “lost” their Jewishness. Instead, these immigrants negotiated the strains of their Jewish identity in a manner that reflected their assimilationist German Jewish experience and was at odds with the political and cultural positions of the long-established Canadian Jews. The question of how German Jews negotiated their Jewishness, however, is often erroneously confused with an ambivalence concerning their Jewish identities. This dissertation will examine just one such articulation of German Jewish identity, arguing that the manner in which Dr. Heinz Unger explored his identity and constructed his life sheds new light on notions of marginalized Jewish identities in a Canadian context and in the Diaspora more generally. In the course of this work, we will
follow Dr. Unger’s interaction with and negotiation of ideologies, trends and personalities that bore a special significance for German Jews, ultimately arguing that an understanding of Canadian Jewish identity must take into account the historical experience of German Jewry and integrate the experience of this small but important group to fully and accurately represent the true pluralism of Canadian Jewry.
CHAPTER 2
JEWSH MUSIC AND ITS MEANING

In 1952, the highly-influential Jewish editor and writer Israel Rabinovitch (1894-1964) joined forces with Canadian Jewish poet A.M. Klein to publish “Jewish Music, Ancient and Modern,” an expansion of his 1940 Yiddish language text “Musik Bei Yidn.”1 At the time of the book’s release, Rabinovitch was the editor of Montreal’s Yiddish-language daily, the Keneder Odler (“The Canadian Eagle”) and a key figure in Montreal’s Yiddish-speaking Jewish community. In this milieu, Rabinovitch (and Klein, for that matter) served as the voice of a long-established community that continued to wrestle with issues of its cultural and intellectual development, particularly in light of the Holocaust and the trauma that it caused at the time and in the decades that followed. As one of the community’s foremost writers on musical matters, Rabinovitch’s opinions expressed in the publication would have an enormous impact on the manner in which the community expressed itself culturally.2 Moreover, coming as they did from one of the community’s leading intellectuals, Rabinovitch’s views functioned as a key component in the community’s self-definition, setting its boundaries and endorsing or rejecting what was allowed entry into this world. In stating that “Jewish music began only then when Jewish musicians consciously devoted themselves to its creation” he therefore effectively delimited the bounds of Jewish musical expression for an entire community, discounting

---

1 Israel Rabinovitch (transl. A.M. Klein), Of Jewish Music, Ancient and Modern (Montreal: Book Center, 1952).
2 The Jewish Canadian poet (and future translator of Rabinovitch’s work into English some twelve years later) A.M. Klein recognized the work’s importance and reviewed it favourably in the fall of 1940. A.M. Klein, “Music Hath Charm: Review of Jewish Music and Other Essays on Musical Topics [in Yiddish] by Israel Rabinovitch” (11 October 1940), in Usher Caplan and M.W. Steinberg, eds., A.M. Klein: Literary Essays and Reviews (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 19-22.
the work of Jewish composers who did not “consciously” attempt to create Jewish music but were still writing music that was either suffused with a Jewish sensibility or that reflected their own cultural experience.³

If the position held by Rabinovitch had been the view of one or another fringe minority, we might be able to discount it and instead conceptualize Jewish music in a more holistic manner. Rabinovitch’s view was not unique or insignificant, however; not only were his suppositions the utterances of a man in a position of great influence, they also accorded with the views of other Jewish thinkers who were intimately linked to Jewish community structures and thus predisposed to reaching conclusions consistent with their lived experience that failed to do justice to the complexity of the subject of Jewish musicology and, indeed, to what can be called “Jewish art” more generally. However honest and well-intentioned these musicological efforts may have been, the biases that accompanied these explorations reflect the manner in which these mostly Eastern European commentators defined their own relationship to Judaism as a culture and religion. This bias, whether conscious or otherwise, led to the marginalization of a whole set of musicians and music that, despite being of Jewish origin, failed to meet the stringent criteria of Jewishkeit set out by orthodox musical commentators. In such a scheme, only those Jewish composers who reflected the critics’ perceptions of having lived a thoroughly Jewish life were thought of as being able to endow music with a Jewish ethos. In this chapter, we will survey the contours of the Jewish musicological debate, always with an eye towards including less-orthodox and marginalized musical expressions of non-traditional Jewish composers in the definition of “Jewish music,”

³ Rabinovitch, Of Jewish Music, Ancient and Modern, 143.
thereby granting space to a group that has until recently often been excluded from the debate.

I. The Birth of Jewish Musicology: the Politics of Inclusion/Exclusion

The study of Jewish music is a fascinating yet often contradictory chapter in the history of musicology. Through the many inconsistencies, however, one can sight one common motif that reappears in a number of guises throughout: the politics of exclusion. Indeed, both sides of the debate, whether attempting to exclude Jewish music from general trends of European music, or from an attempt to purge non-Jewish elements from Jewish music, have resorted to similar rhetorical modes wherein the “other” plays a central role in the definition of one’s own music.4

The reason for this process of inclusion/exclusion stems from the context in which the first explorations into Jewish music sprung, subsequent developments only serving to reinforce these intellectual endeavors. The notion of a Jewish musicology begins in the 19th century, in an age when the newly-formed or defined nation-states of Europe were in the process of negotiating their essence. To a great extent, the assumptions underpinning the study of Jewish music, and the elements that must be present for a work to be considered Jewish, have stagnated in this rhetorical swamp. A great many of these studies, many written in the first half of the 20th century by Eastern European Jews negotiating their own identities in illiberal atmospheres, have viewed Jewish identity, and also what can be construed as Jewish music, from sources that reflected their own

4 Long after independently arriving at such a conclusion, I discovered that in the introduction to her recent work, Klara Moricz had come to a very similar conclusion. See: Klara Moricz, Jewish Identities: Nationalism, Racism, and Utopianism in Twentieth-Century Music (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2008).
intellectual dispositions and cultural milieu. In turn, these studies were then re-created in the nascent communities of mostly Eastern European immigrant Jews as their development reflected the traditions of Bundism, Zionism, and other forms of primarily East European Jewish collective identity. Yet the majority of these “collective identities” were, situated as they were in the transposition of the shtetl mentality to the Americas (and in particular, Canada), unable or unwilling to comprehend the other forms of Jewish identification with which they were admittedly only rarely confronted. In Canada, particularly, the great number of Eastern European Jewish immigrants compared to their non-Eastern European counterparts meant that little such negotiation needed to occur for the maintenance of the community. Thus, Canadian Jews (primarily of East European extraction) were able to maintain themselves for decades as an island unto themselves, a condition perfectly understandable in light of the anti-Semitism that developed.5 In a Canada where Jews kept to themselves both by choice and circumstance, the musicological inquiries of the early 20th century continued to reflect the reality of an inward-looking Canadian Jewish community and over time ossified into a cultural, intellectual, and musicological monolith that would retain its import long after Jews in other parts of the world had changed their thinking.

As noted above, the idea of a “Jewish music” begins in the Europe of the 19th century. However, the debate over Jewish music begins not with a discussion amongst Europe’s Jews but with the German composer Richard Wagner’s (1813-1883) anti-

---

5 A meaningful set of articles relating to Canadian anti-Semitism can be found in: Alan Davies, ed., Antisemitism in Canada: History and Interpretation (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1992).
Semitic tract *Das Judentum in der Musik*. Wagner’s influential and infamous essay began life as a contribution to the highly-regarded and influential music journal *Neue Zeitschrift fur Musik* (Leipzig) in September of 1850, written under the pseudonym K. Freigedank (“K. Freethought”). The editors of the journal (including the composer Robert Schumann), conscious of the debate that the piece was likely to launch, felt obliged to add a caveat upon its first appearance that both distanced themselves from the opinions expressed therein while simultaneously lauding the contributor’s authority:

> However faulty her outward conformation, we have always considered it a pre-eminence of Germany’s, a result of her great learning, that at least in the scientific sphere she possesses intellectual freedom. This freedom we now lay claim to and rely on, in printing the above essay, desirous that our readers may accept it in this sense. Whether one shares the views expressed therein, or not, the author’s breadth of grasp (*Genialität der Anschauung*) will be disputed by no one.

Despite trying to negotiate a middle-road on the perilous path of freedom of thought and censorship, the editors, perhaps unwittingly, endorsed the views expressed by Wagner and thereby revealed the resonance that Wagner’s words carried in the period.

---

6 The title of the piece, “Das Judentum in der Musik,” is most accurately translated as “Jewishness in Music” but is more commonly translated as “Judaism in Music,” an alteration which lessens the visceral nature of Wagner’s anti-Semitism and paints the diatribe as less of a blatantly anti-Semitic attack (which it most certainly is) and renders it a seeming critique of the formal aspects of Jewish religiosity in music. I begin my discussion of Jewish music cognizant of Klara Moncz’s assertion that “Wagner’s essay was so influential that rehashing his ideas became an obligatory ritual in every discussion of Jewish music.” Needless to say, I have continued this tradition, coming to the same conclusion as Moncz that “the invocation of Wagner did not serve as a shibboleth, for opinions about his ideas hardly differentiated anti-Semites and the proponents of Jewish music .author of all stripes have readily endorsed his essentialist views of Jewish composers.” Klara Moncz, *Jewish Identities Nationalism, Racism, and Utopianism in Twentieth-Century Music*, 4-5

7 Richard Wagner (William Ashton Ellis, trans.), *Judaism in Music*. William Ashton Ellis’s 1891 translation of Wagner’s article, is used exclusively through this work.
In its specificity, Wagner’s article was a searing, vitriolic attack on two composers of Jewish descent, Felix Mendelssohn (1809-1847) and Giacomo Meyerbeer (1791-1864). In respect to Mendelssohn, Wagner declared:

>The washiness and whimsicality of our present musical style has been, if not exactly brought about, yet pushed to its utmost pitch by Mendelssohn's endeavour to speak out a vague, an almost nugatory Content as interestingly and spiritedly as possible. Whereas Beethoven, the last in the chain of our true music-heroes, strove with highest longing, and wonder-working faculty, for the clearest, certainest Expression of an unsayable Content through a sharp-cut, plastic shaping of his tone-pictures: Mendelssohn, on the contrary, reduces these achievements to vague, fantastic shadow-forms, midst whose indefinite shimmer our freakish fancy is indeed aroused, but our inner, purely-human yearning for distinct artistic sight is hardly touched with even the merest hope of a fulfilment.

Viewed on its own, Wagner’s ire in this extract seems to be limited to what he considered to be Mendelssohn’s shortcomings as a composer and his influence in the creation of the musical style of the day. Yet the reasons for Mendelssohn’s failings (as well as the majority of the article) are permeated with a crude racialist essentialism:

>By what example will this all grow clearer to us—ay, wellnigh what other single case could make us so alive to it, as the works of a musician of Jewish birth whom Nature had endowed with specific musical gifts as very few before him? All that offered itself to our gaze, in the inquiry into our antipathy against the Jewish nature; all the contradictoriness of this nature, both in itself and as touching us; all its inability, while outside our footing, to have intercourse with us upon that footing, nay, even to form a wish to further develop the things which had sprung from out our soil: all these are intensified to a positively tragic conflict in the nature, life, and art-career of the early-taken FELIX MENDELSSOHN BARTHOLDY.

---

8 Felix Mendelssohn was a renowned German composer of the Romantic period. The grandson of Moses Mendelssohn, Felix Mendelssohn was baptized in 1816 along with the entire family. As a composer, his fame spread across Europe, especially in England where he made numerous appearances and where his music has always retained its popularity. Giacomo Meyerbeer was a Jewish-born German composer best known for his operatic compositions. Meyerbeer was a highly popular and successful composer, his fame somewhat eclipsed after his death.

9 Wagner, Judaism in Music.

10 Ibid.
We thus see how Mendelssohn’s supposed failings as a composer do not stem from his particular shortcomings as a composer but come as a consequence of his alienation from genuine German culture due to his Judaic identity, an identity that could not be “wiped away” even after conversion to Christianity and a life lived divorced from Jewish cultural or religious specificities.

A similar type of attack is levied against the Giacomo Meyerbeer. In this attack, however, Wagner goes beyond merely exposing the alleged weakness of that composer’s art, instead castigating him for his machinations in convincing others that his work is indeed artistry:

A far-famed Jewish tone-setter of our day has addressed himself and products to a section of our public whose total confusion of musical taste was less to be first caused by him, than worked out to his profit... There is no object in more closely designating the artistic means he has expended on the reaching of this life's-aim: enough that, as we may see by the result, he knew completely how to dupe; and more particularly by taking that jargon which we have already characterised, and palming it upon his ennuyed audience as the modern-piquant utterance of all the trivialities which so often had been set before them in all their natural foolishness... 

We thus see how the author moves into a mode that highlights the composer Meyerbeer’s alleged attempts at “duping” the opera-going audiences who fail to comprehend the supposed banality of the composer’s art. In this manner, Wagner highlights the ages-old charge – an allegation that would reach its apex (or nadir, if you will) with the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and the subsequent claims of a Jewish-Bolshevik axis that controls the world – that Jews were consciously distorting the patterns of the world (often those of an economic nature) in a manner reminiscent of Shakespeare’s Shylock. Moreover, according to Wagner:

11 Wagner, Judaism in Music.
In fact, this composer pushes his deception so far, that he ends by deceiving himself, and perchance as purposely as he deceives his bored admirers...Under the burden of this self-deception, which may not be so toilless as one might think, he, too, appears to us wellnigh in a tragic light: yet the purely personal element of wounded vanity turns the thing into a tragi-comedy, just as in general the un-inspiring, the truly laughable, is the characteristic mark whereby this famed composer shews his Jewhood in his music.12

Meyerbeer’s failings not only demonstrate his own shortcomings as an artist; they serve to indicate the “truly laughable” nature of the Jewish character. Wagner’s pronouncement of the failings of particular Jewish artists is not the main problem in this work, however. It is, rather, Wagner’s linkage of the shortcomings of particular figures to Jewish stereotypes that marks his tract as anti-Semitic.

The further one ventures into Wagner’s article, the more abhorrent do the attacks become. After exposing the shortcomings of the Jewish composers he wishes to condemn, Wagner moves on to more general issues, portraying Jewish history, emancipation, and characteristics in a blatantly anti-Semitic voice. Despite perhaps correctly noting that one of the reasons for the emancipation of the Jews lay not with any particular affection for them as a people but because of an allegiance to Liberalism and “human justice,” he cannot prevent himself from then expressing his disgust at the people who the Germans have so magnanimously helped emancipate:

[T]he isolation of the Jews has been held by us a challenge to the exercise of human justice, for just so long as in ourselves the thrust toward social liberation has woken into plainer consciousness. When we strove for emancipation of the Jews, however, we virtually were more the champions of an abstract principle, than of a concrete case: just as all our Liberalism was a not very lucid mental sport—since we went for freedom of the Folk without knowledge of that Folk itself, nay, with a dislike of any genuine contact with it—so our eagerness to level up the rights of Jews was

12 Wagner, Judaism in Music.
far rather stimulated by a general idea, than by any real sympathy; for, with all our speaking and writing in favour of the Jews' emancipation, we always felt instinctively repelled by any actual, operative contact with them.\textsuperscript{13}

In Wagner's conception, then, while the emancipation of the Jews was a laudable goal in and of itself, such an occurrence bore the unsavoury side-effect, if you will, of bringing into closer contact a group of people towards whom he and many other Germans had a marked distaste.

Having alluded to the German distaste for the Jewish parts of their population, Wagner then embarks on an exploration of the reasons for his (and reputably, others') distaste for the Jews of Germany. Herein, he highlights two reasons that explicitly mark the Jew as distinct from other Europeans. First, he discusses how Jews bear a marked difference from other European peoples: "The Jew... in ordinary life strikes us primarily by his outward appearance, which, no matter to what European nationality we belong, has something disagreeably foreign to that nationality."\textsuperscript{14} Of course, Wagner cannot hasten but to add a further anti-Semitic slander, calling the Jewish appearance as symptomatic of the Jew being an "unpleasant freak of Nature."\textsuperscript{15}

The second reason for the Jew standing outside the German nation, his speech, is more fully formulated by Wagner because it expressly relates to the Jew's inability to create art that speaks in a \textit{Volkish} vernacular. It is here, therefore, that Wagner connects his observations of allegedly Jewish communicative shortcomings with the reasons for why this is so:

In particular does the purely physical aspect of the Jewish mode of speech repel us. Throughout an intercourse of two millennia with

\textsuperscript{13} Wagner, \textit{Judaism in Music}.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
European nations, Culture has not succeeded in breaking the remarkable stubbornness of the Jewish nature as regards the peculiarities of Semitic pronunciation. The first thing that strikes our ear as quite outlandish and unpleasant, in the Jew's production of the voice-sounds, is a creaking, squeaking, buzzing snuffle: add thereto an employment of words in a sense quite foreign to our nation's tongue, and an arbitrary twisting of the structure of our phrases—and this mode of speaking acquires at once the character of an intolerably jumbled blabber (eines unertraglich verwirrten Geplappers); so that when we hear this Jewish talk, our attention dwells involuntarily on its repulsive how, rather than on any meaning of its intrinsic what.16

The Jew, in Wagner's conception, could learn to speak in a manner which resembles more "natural" articulations but could not ever fully shed his Semitic mode of speech. Thus, while the Jew might be able to express themselves in a manner comprehensible by his European "other," he would never be able to escape his own history and enter the German Gemeinschaft:

Never does the Jew excite himself in mutual interchange of feelings with us, but—so far as we are concerned—only in the altogether special egoistic interest of his vanity or profit... Though we well may deem it thinkable that in intercourse with one another, and particularly where domestic life brings purely-human feelings to an outburst, even the Jews may be able to give expression to their emotions in a manner effective enough among themselves: yet this cannot come within our present purview, since we here are listening to the Jew who, in the intercourse of life and art, expressly speaks to us.17

Of course, this verdict has consequences reaching far beyond merely the artistic expression of Jews and has a major bearing on the alleged inability of the German Jew to ever enter into serious dialogue with German society writ large. However, as it relates to our discussion of Jewish music and its relationship with other music, we will end our

16 Wagner, Judaism in Music.
17 Ibid.
discussion of Wagner’s exploration into Jewish music with a quote that encapsulates the
German-Jewish musical dialogue:

Now, if the aforesaid qualities of his dialect make the Jew almost incapable of giving artistic enunciation to his feelings and beholdings through talk, for such an enunciation through song his aptitude must needs be infinitely smaller. Song is just Talk aroused to highest passion: Music is the speech of Passion. All that worked repellently upon us in his outward appearance and his speech, makes us take to our heels at last in his Song, providing we are not held prisoners by the very ridicule of this phenomenon. Very naturally, in Song—the vividest and most indubitable expression of the personal emotional-being—the peculiarity of the Jewish nature attains for us its climax of distastefulness; and on any natural hypothesis, we might hold the Jew adapted for every sphere of art, excepting that whose basis lies in Song.¹⁸

In Wagner’s rhetorical structuring, therefore, the music written by any Jewish composer is bound to stand outside the German canon. Such a conception is, of course, both absurd as well as historically inaccurate; many of the compositions that best represent the highest artistic achievement of German musical culture were in fact written by composers of Jewish birth. Thus, the same parochialism that will be discussed later in the chapter (in respect to the manner in which Jewish composers are included or excluded from a Jewish canon) is expressed by Wagner as he attempts to exclude the works of composers that do not meet his blatantly anti-Semitic, exhaustive standards of German (or, in a larger sense, European) art.

II. The Debate Evolved: Jewish Musicology from Within

Wagner’s mid 19th article “Judaism in Music” is, seen through modern eyes, a thoroughly reprehensible and tragic articulation of anti-Semitism. It is, however, also an examination that attempted to delineate the bounds of German music, albeit at the

¹⁸ Wagner, Judaism in Music.
expense of purging its “Jewish” elements. The exclusionary rhetoric that Wagner employed is reflected in many of the Jewish explorations of what constitutes its own people’s music. Admittedly, the racial element does not appear in the same manner but there is a similar exclusionary rhetoric at work, a rhetoric that casts out certain composers not only for their failure to consciously synchronize their artistic efforts with what are deemed as genuine expressions of Jewish feeling but (as we shall see) sometimes also because the composer simply stems from a milieu which is deemed insufficiently “Jewish.” As in Wagner’s exclusionary formulation, these composers – and by extension musicians – of Jewish birth are treated by certain Jewish musicologists as “beyond the pale” – as bearing within them a set of qualities which are immutable and will forever mark them as divorced from a Jewish milieu.

The studies of Jewish music bear a further similarity to Wagner’s polemic: at their heart, they are attempts at the self-definition of a cultural group in a period marked by strong currents of epistemological uncertainty; that is, they are attempts to work through issues of collective identity and delimit that cultural group’s sense of itself during major historical crises. In the case of Wagner’s work, “Judaism in Music” was a tract written in the wake of the revolutionary year of 1848, a time during which German-speaking Central Europe was undergoing a series of upheavals (the rise of the Liberal State, for instance) that were to change German self-perceptions as they negotiated the strains of a period which would culminate in the creation of Germany in 1871. In the case of Jewish musicology, meanwhile, the latter part of the 19th century and on to the middle of the 20th century was a period in Jewish history during which Jews were wracked by a series of upheavals (the rise of a modern anti-Semitism, Pogroms, collective displacement, and the
Holocaust) throughout which Jews were constantly re-appraising their identities in respect to their neighbours, to say nothing of themselves or the bounds of their own communities. It comes as no surprise therefore that a great many of the studies of Jewish music undertaken by Jewish scholars bore intentions and goals similar to those of their 19th century German-speaking counterparts: to categorize music and conscript it as an ally in the quest for a sense of self that would serve as an element of identity-building.

It is this very impulse that lies at the heart of Israel Rabinovitch’s study mentioned at the outset of this chapter. Rabinovitch’s Of Jewish Music, Ancient and Modern espouses the idea that only that music that had been consciously crafted by Jews and bore marks of biblical cantillation and other ancient Jewish musical modes can truly be classified as “Jewish” music. It is this attempt to rediscover the roots of “Jewishness” and, coincidentally, to purge Jewish music of external influences that obsessed Rabinovitch so deeply. For, as he says:

This, surely, is the power of these melodies, rooted in the Jewish soul, that with but a single touch upon the delicate string, they render the contemporary Jew at one with the generations of the past.

Rabinovitch’s text is a fascinating “time-capsule” of Jewish musicological thought in a time and place once removed from its Eastern European Jewish roots that nevertheless espouses views entirely in keeping with utterances made a half century earlier halfway around the world. Indeed, Rabinovitch’s work is suffused with the spirit of a type of musicological inquiry and informed by many of the debates inherited from the “old

---

19 Rabinovitch, Of Jewish Music, Ancient and Modern, 1952.
20 Ibid., 137.
world.”21 In sum, while we can appreciate Rabinovitch’s text for its contribution to the study of Jewish musicology, we are distressed by its inflammatory rhetoric and its alienation of a great many Jewish musicians who do not fall within his tightly-bounded definition of “genuine” Jewish music.

Israel Rabinovitch’s treatise on Jewish music was not, as suggested above, the first work of its kind. Indeed, Rabinovitch took much of his inspiration from Abraham Idelsohn’s pioneering work of Jewish musicology, *Jewish Music: Its Historical Development*.22 In this volume, Idelsohn, a Russian-born Jew generally considered the father of Jewish musicology, summarized his views on Jewish music as a continuity. Idelsohn had also been the first to attempt a systematic collection and categorization of Jewish melodies near the turn of the 20th century, a project that resulted in the 10-volume opus *Catalogue of Jewish Hebrew Oriental Melodies* that served as the source of inspiration for numerous Jewish composers seeking to write explicitly Jewish music.23

These self-consciously Jewish composers, most stemming from the Russian Empire, had

---

21 To cite but one example, Rabinovitch relights the embers of a decades-old feud, castigating the highly-regarded Jewish musician and musicologist Lazare Saminsky as “anti-Yiddish” for suggesting that Jewish song and music was influenced by other sources and therefore not as “pure” as the Jewish musicologists that Rabinovitch so admired (such as Abraham Idelsohn) believed them to be. And while Rabinovitch should be lauded for recognizing the vitality of modern Jewish music, his aggressive – and outdated – resumption of hostilities is disappointing to witness. Lazare Saminsky (1882-1959) was a Russian-born Jewish musician who became one of the first members of the Society for Jewish Folk Music. After a period of study at the St. Petersburg Conservatory between 1906 and 1910, Saminsky became a highly regarded composer in Russia before moving to the West after the Russian Revolution of 1917. He moved to the United States in 1920 and by 1924 had become music director of the Temple Emanu-El Synagogue in New York, a position he would hold for the next 34 years. Saminsky’s views on the inauthenticity of folk sources (and the resulting feud with Joel Engel) are discussed in Neil Levin’s authoritative notes to the Milken Archive CD “Jewish Music of the Dance.” Neil W. Levin, “Jewish Music of the Dance,” (Naxos, 8 559439)

22 Abraham Idelsohn, *Jewish Music: Its Historical Development* (New York, Dover Publications, Inc., 1992 (originally published 1938)). Idelsohn (1882-1938) was born in Latvia (then part of the Russian Empire) and trained as a cantor. He emigrated to Palestine in 1905 before settling in the United States in 1922.

23 Abraham Idelsohn’s *Catalogue of Jewish Hebrew Oriental Melodies* (also known as the *Thesaurus of Hebrew-Oriental Melodies*) was published in ten volumes and first appeared in print between 1914 and 1932. Originally published by Breitkopf and Haertel (Leipzig) and reprinted by Ktav Publishing House (New York) in 1973.
come together to create the *Gesellschaft fur Judische Volksmusik* (the Society for Jewish Folk Music) in St. Petersburg, Russia in 1908, forming a group that, in the words of noted Jewish Musicologist Neil Levin, was a “school of musicians, ethnologists, folklorists, and other intellectuals in Russia who, during the first decade of the 20th century, attempted to establish a new Jewish national art music based on ethnic, as well as religious, heritage.”

Idelsohn wrote *Jewish Music* near the end of a life devoted to the study of Jewish music and as such it stands as a major accomplishment, a tract that summed up his life’s work. In this highly-influential book and in his codification of Jewish melody, Idelsohn essentially created a canon of Jewish liturgical and folk music, surveying its development from the biblical period all the way up to the twentieth century.

In the introduction to the work, Idelsohn declares that his aim was to follow Jewish music’s “history as a tonal expression of Judaism and of Jewish life.” We are thereby immediately confronted with the greatest problem of Idelsohn’s work – how does one define “Jewish life”? As one works one’s way through the lengthy volume, one comes to see that Idelsohn’s parameters for “Jewish life” are built upon a set of value-laden circles that decrease in importance as one moves away from the Temple, the Ghetto and on to general society in which Jewish musicians exist. Moreover, Idelsohn exhibits a bias that favours Eastern European Jewry at the expense of developments in Central and Western Europe. Notably, Idelsohn displays a marked intolerance for some elements of the Jewish Reform movements of Central Europe:

---


Free-thinking, irreligiosity, enthusiastic belief in humanity, made some Europeanized and free-thinking Jews here and there in Central Europe believe that the source of their misery as Jews lay in their seclusion from modern European culture and in their adherence to an ancient Asiatic religion[...] A bitter hatred arose in their hearts against Judaism and Jewish customs...

In the above-quoted passage Idelsohn is in truth referring only to what he calls the “Ultra-Reform” movement. This movement, first practiced in Hamburg, sought to extensively remodel Jewish liturgical practice along lines similar to Christian rites, calling for the adoption of Rabbinical vestments modeled on Christian styles, the introduction of an organ in the Synagogue, and the emulation and, sometimes, outright adoption of Christian music such as Protestant chorales retrofitted with Hebrew words. However, as one navigates Idelsohn’s text, one comes to realize that that his scorn is not reserved only for “Ultra-Reformers” but applied to other, more moderate reformers also. Even Vienna’s famous, reform-minded Cantor Solomon Sulzer (1804-90) is not spared Idelsohn’s vitriol. Despite being praised for his artistic integrity and sincerity, Sulzer is ultimately characterized as a man who had failed the Jewish faith:

He did not recognize the Jewish musical inheritance as an echo of the living Jewish soul. To him it was merely a body of song that had somehow become national and as such was sacred to the Jew.

---

26 Idelsohn, Jewish Music, 233
27 Here it should be noted that the celebrated Jewish composer Herbert Fromm, by tracing the use of the organ (albeit primitive models) in Jewish antiquity, defends the use of the organ in modern liturgical practice. See. “The Organ in Jewish Worship,” in Herbert Fromm, On Jewish Music (Self-published, 1978), pp 63-66
29 Idelsohn, Jewish Music, 251
In condemning Sulzer, Idelsohn attributes to the Cantor a position that is refreshingly free of mythologization, recognizing that music takes on significance not because it "echoes" a soul but because, in its use, it assumes significance only by eliciting an emotional response over time. Thus, in attempting to besmirch Sulzer, Idelsohn assumes a stance that oversimplifies matters, revealing a mentality that futilely finds fault with the organic change to which music is subject over time.

But it would be unfair to attack Idelsohn too vigorously. For, whatever the shortcomings of his book, Idelsohn attempted to enter upon his enterprise with an open mind. In the introduction to his important work, Idelsohn rails against the very tactic that he falls victim to later, explaining how one cannot adhere only to an ancient articulation of music as a monolithic source of authenticity:

[I will] try to point out the influence that the foreign music of the environment exerted upon Jewish music, and seek to explain the principles according to which certain foreign elements were incorporated until they become organic parts of the musical body.  

Yet here too, even in attempting to be fair-minded, Idelsohn reveals his biases, for, in describing foreign influences, he reveals his belief that there is in fact a genuine core of Jewish music upon which is laid millennia of foreign influences. In trying to trace the historical development of Jewish music, then, he adopts a paradoxical position, attempting to recognize and validate the "foreign elements" in Jewish music while also adopting a curious "curate's egg" mentality for those musical elements that predate the incorporation of foreign elements and thereby creating, if you will, a hierarchy of authenticity.

---

Idelsohn’s search for authenticity continues into other parts of his work as well. Near the end of his pioneering work, Idelsohn begins to discuss the interplay of Jewish music and what he considers European art-music. In one of the final chapters of his book, entitled “Artistic Endeavors,” Idelsohn broaches his subject in a superficial manner, devoting the most space to the aforementioned Society for Jewish Folk Music and praising the work of Joseph Achron (1886-1943), one of the St. Petersburg circle’s most successful composers, whose work exhibits “the Jewish-Oriental fiery temperament [...] in masterly fashion.”31 Idelsohn then reveals his disdain for music and musicians who do not meet his stringent requirements, dismissing the German (and admittedly non-Jewish) composer Max Bruch’s Kol nidre Concerto for Cello and Orchestra (Op. 47), as a work that “displayed a fine art, masterly technique and fantasy, but not Jewish sentiments.”32 And just to ensure that the reader understands his point, Idelsohn concludes, “[i]t is not a JEWISH Kol nidre which Bruch composed.”33 Apparently, even Jewish themes and inspiration are insufficient if they do not coalesce into a work that accorded with Idelsohn’s expectations of genuine Jewish art, a type of composition that could only be achieved by Eastern European Jewish composers. It is worthwhile here to quote Idelsohn at length:

Quite different [to Bruch’s work] are some of the artistic endeavors by Jewish composers of Eastern Europe. Out of the nucleus of the motive, they develop an artistic composition. Saturated with Jewish sentiments, they feel the emotions which gave birth to these tunes with the intense and profound sense of artists; and they try to pour these sentiments into artistic moulds.34

31 Idelsohn, Jewish Music, 467.
32 Ibid., 466.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
More surprising, yet entirely consistent with his East European parochialism, is Idelsohn’s rejection of Ernest Bloch’s music. Ernest Bloch (b. Geneva 1880- d. Portland, Oregon 1959) was a Swiss-American composer who was raised in a Jewish milieu. Following his Bar Mitzvah at the age of 13, Bloch turned away from Judaism, seeking instead to embed himself within the liberal and humanist sentiment of the time and portraying himself in 1900 (at the age of 19) as “certainly not a believer, nor an atheist either.”

By 1906, however, Bloch’s Jewishness had been reawakened. As he himself describes it in a letter to his friend and collaborator Edmond Fleg:

My dear friend...I have read the Bible—I have read fragments about Moses. And an immense sense of pride has been surging within me! My entire being reverberated. It is a revelation. I shall find myself again in this—I could not continue reading, for I was afraid. Yes, Fleg, I was afraid of discovering too much of myself, of feeling everything which had gradually accumulated, glued to me, fall away in one sudden blow; of finding myself naked again, naked within this entire past which lives inside me, of standing erect as a Jew proudly Jewish...and of no longer being able to stand the conditions in which I live...

Not only did Bloch identify with Jewry as a part of his cultural identity, however. Many of his compositions are suffused with traditional modes and motifs. Writing on Bloch’s Violin Concerto (1938), violinist Zina Schiff argues that the work bears numerous Jewish hallmarks, including “the same interval (fifth) as in the beginning of both the Vidui [Contrition] and Simchat Torah [Rejoicing] in Baal Shem [which] is also a traditional

---

35 Bloch’s words are from a letter to his parents written in 1900, defending his sister’s right to have her son baptized as a Calvinist. See: David Z. Kushner, “Religious Ambiguity in the Life and Works of Ernest Bloch” http://www.biu.ac.il/hu/mu/min-ad04/BLOCH-1.pdf (accessed Nov. 2, 2007).

36 Ibid., 3. The author cites the original source as an extract from Suzanne Bloch, program notes for a performance of the Sacred Service at Lincoln Center, New York, on 7 December 1969, p. 2.
interval for blowing the shofar, the ram’s horn, on the High Holy Days of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.”

In light of Bloch’s use of Jewish musical intervals progressions and inspiration, it is shocking to discover Idelsohn rejecting Bloch’s oeuvre as lacking in Jewish qualities. In this connection, perhaps it would serve us best to allow Idelsohn’s words to speak for themselves:

Ernest Bloch’s music is designated “Jewish.” Its Jewishness, however, consists in an abundance of augmented steps, and, according to the opinion of some, in a certain heavy melancholy. But, these characteristics are NOT exclusively Jewish, for all the Semitic and Tartarian peoples have the same characteristic step, and as to the melancholy impression Oriental music makes on the Occidental hearer, we have seen in the course of our discussion that such an impression is based upon the difference of taste of Orientals and Occidentals. At best, Bloch’s music may be said to have a touch of Orientalism...

If Bloch’s music is disavowed by Idelsohn as not Jewish despite possessing Jewish musical elements, Jewish inspiration, and being written by a Jew (albeit one who had borne an ambivalence about that definition), then the conclusion that we are forced to draw is that, for Idelsohn, only those Jews who stemmed from Eastern Europe could genuinely be writers and creators of “Jewish” music. Moreover, the fact that Idelsohn so emphatically rejects Bloch’s work, a body of work that we must remember was, at the same time as well as shortly after Idelsohn’s attack, put forth as the best example of “Jewish” concert music by even such orthodox voices as that of Israel Rabinovitch, only serves to reinforce the subjectivity of the parameters of the debate over just how and why certain music can be considered Jewish music at all.

---

37 The *Baal Shem* to which Schiff is referring is Ernest Bloch’s *Baal Shem* (Three Pictures of Chassidic Life) for Violin Solo and Orchestra (1923). Zina Schiff, liner notes to Ernest Bloch (Violin Concerto; Baal Shem; Suite Hebraique) (Naxos 8.557757) 2000, 2.

Given all this, it is no surprise that art music is given short shrift by Idelsohn. Indeed, it is only in the penultimate chapter of his book that Idelsohn undertakes an exploration of what he calls “The Jew in General Music.” Exemplifying his contempt for those Jews who have exceeded the bounds of what he considers “Jewish,” this chapter is but seven pages long and treats the subject of concert music created by Jews as an afterthought. The main question raised by Idelsohn is “whether or not Jewish musical sounds vibrate in their compositions or in their performances; whether they brought to the music of the general world a distinctively Jewish contribution.” In exploring this question, Idelsohn begins with a list “of the most important and successful musicians of Jewish extraction” that includes a great many Jewish musicians from across Europe, though the majority of these are, significantly, from Central and Western Europe. To arrive at his answer, Idelsohn argues that “almost none of them had been reared in a distinctly Jewish environment, or had been given a positive Jewish education and knowledge.” In light of his general stance, Idelsohn unsurprisingly concludes that:

On examination of their creations we discover not a single element that bears Jewish features that might be reckoned a distinctly Jewish contribution...Neither by their motives and form, nor by their style and spirit, can they be identified [as Jewish].

---

40 Ibid., 471.
41 Some of the most significant composers discussed (and dismissed) by Idelsohn are: Giacomo Meyerbeer, Felix Mendelssohn, Gustav Mahler, Ernest Bloch, Arnold Schoenberg and Erich Korngold. The full list appears on pp. 472-473.
43 Ibid., 474.
This, despite having discussed how some of these composers, Fromental Halevy (1799-1862) and Anton Rubinstein (1829-1894) for instance, had both used Jewish themes in their compositions.\textsuperscript{44}

Idelsohn also disavows the theory that "the Jews are revolutionaries in music, that they destroy established forms and are the protagonists of all that is new and ultra-modern."\textsuperscript{45} To deconstruct this argument, he puts forth a list of Jewish composers who were conservative in nature such as Felix Mendelssohn, Fromental Halevy, Karl Goldmark (1830-1915), Joseph Joachim (1831-1907), Ignaz Moscheles (1794-1870), and Anton Rubinstein. And while he is correct in assessing these composers as musically conservative, he misses the possibility that the musical vanguards of the period (such as Arnold Schoenberg, Erich Korngold and of course Gustav Mahler) stemmed from a particular socio-cultural milieu in which Jews were indeed proving to be creators of a bold and new music that departed from established compositional modes. Ultimately, the discussion in these pages is therefore nothing more than a cursory look at a genre of music that Idelsohn clearly feels is not worthy of serious inquiry and certainly does not exhibit the "Jewish" qualities that are found in his twin poles of major interest, liturgical or folk-inspired music.

\textsuperscript{44} Fromental Halevy was a French composer born to Jewish parents, best known for his opera \textit{La Juive} (1835). Anton Rubinstein was a Russian composer, conductor and pianist born to Jewish parents in Moldova. Early in his life, his entire family converted from Judaism to Russian Orthodoxy. Rubinstein was founder of the Saint Petersburg Conservatory yet still found time to compose extensively, writing a great number of works in all genres.

\textsuperscript{45} Idelsohn, \textit{Jewish Music}, 475. Here Idelsohn is paraphrasing (and rejecting) a theory put forth by historian Heinrich Berl in his work \textit{Das Judentum in der Musik} (Stuttgart, 1926). Berl considered himself a "non-Jew with Zionist conviction" in the preface to this work, a fact confirmed by both Moricz as well as Sander L. Gilman, "Are Jews Musical? Historical Notes on the Question of Jewish Musical Modernism and Nationalism," in \textit{Modern Judaism}, Volume 28, Number 3 (2008), pp 239-256. Interestingly, Moricz and Gilman judge Berl entirely differently, the former considering him sympathetic to the cause of Jewish music while the latter viewing his positions as echoing those of the great anti-Semitic ideologue (and son-in-law of Richard Wagner) Houston Stewart Chamberlain.
Yet to try to turn back the clock, as Idelsohn does – to try and forget the evolution of Jewish history and, especially, to marginalize the sentiments of the many Jews who continued to bear their Jewish identity while at the same time having assimilated – was a tactic that was bound to cause an enormous rift in the Jewish world. Moreover, it was, to say the least, problematic to try and write out of Jewish history those Jews who did not define themselves in the manner that Jewish musicologists such as Idelsohn and, later, Rabinovitch did as a consequence of their own formative experiences as Jews in Eastern Europe.

The theme that ties Idelsohn’s work together is his view of Jewish music as a continuity and his means for comprehending such a continuity is his endless search for “authenticity,” an authenticity that is only achievable by a select number of Jewish composers that share his own artistic convictions. Ultimately, Idelsohn’s work is not a work about Jewish music but about his understanding of Jewish music, an understanding that reflects his time and place. In sum, Idelsohn’s work is a particularist (one might even say parochial) work wherein the bounds of what is Jewish music are strictly bounded and patrolled. As the inheritor of Idelsohn’s musicological, cultural and intellectual weltanschauung, Rabinovitch was to a large extent informed by the same sensibilities, a set of convictions that he resurrected in the New World.

III. Broadening the Debate: the Musical Contributions of German Jewish Musicians, and a new Subjectivity

The ideas set forth by Abraham Idelsohn in the first half of the twentieth century and later adopted by Israel Rabinovitch represent some of the most extreme and
exclusionary Jewish musicological positions concerning the limits of Jewish music. Other musicologists, however, have fallen into a similar trap, seeing the group that they are studying as a readily definable and monolithic structure. Despite bravely attempting to expand the limits of what can be considered Jewish music, they have all too often become excessively concerned with the interests of their group and in the process undermined the significance of important studies that could have contributed much to advancing the cause of Jewish musicology. This unfortunate circumstance has not only plagued scholars looking at Eastern European Jewish communities and their music; Philip Bohlman, in his study of Israel’s German-speaking musical community, adopts a similar particularistic view.

Over the course of many years, Bohlman has been intimately involved in the study of music, Jewish and otherwise. At the end of the 1980s, Philip Bohlman completed his fascinating study of the German Jewish community of Israel. In *The Land where Two Streams Flow*, Bohlman posits that the German Jews resident in modern Israel represent a cohesive and unique ethnic group. Moreover, he suggests that the canon of Central European Art Music serves as this group’s “ethnic music” and is thereby one of the means by which this particular group of Jews expresses its collective cultural identity.

Bohlman’s argument is an intriguing if at first counter-intuitive one. In the first instance, it seems to run counter to the once commonly-held idea that art music, and expressly the Central European canon heavily laden with Austro-German works, is a musical space devoid of abstract meaning and instead bears significance only as

---

47 Ibid.
“absolute music.” The forms used in this music are the evolution of a long process wherein form had become a paramount concern. The symphony, for instance, was codified to traditionally include only four movements, the first movement relying heavily on Sonata form to develop its musical ideas. The movements which follow provide greater latitude in terms of freedom of form but still, these movements are also reliant on a standardized order and tradition. And while the Romantic period witnessed a movement towards a “personalization” the symphony – as per Hector Berlioz’s (1803-1869) *Symphonie fantastique* (1830) – and where the structure began to take on a greater flexibility – Gustav Mahler’s symphonies, for example, often rejected the standard pattern of the Austro-German repertoire, employing an unorthodox number of movements, tempo markings and structures – the symphony remained as the Olympus of classical musical utterance, being the ultimate form of absolute musical expression. To argue, therefore, as Bohlman does, that the Central European art music canon – and the symphony in particular – bears an element of ethnicity seems at first a difficult case to make.

Philip Bohlman’s scheme also seems to contradict the emancipatory process of German Jewry. As we have seen, the process that resulted in German Jewish emancipation from behind Ghetto walls (or, as some would have it, the protection of those selfsame walls) caused a massive change in the nature of the Jewish communities of Central Europe. The German Jews of Central Europe began to dress like their neighbours, engage in similar business and leisure activities, and generally follow a similar set of nationalist precepts and adopt the values of their fellow citizens. This “universalization” of the German Jew resulted in such a profound – and rapid –
transformation that many felt these Jewish assimilationists could no longer be seen as “Jewish.” In the process, German Jews went from being German-speaking Jews to being Germans of the Mosaic faith. Bohlman’s view, in insisting on the persistence of a unique German Jewish ethnicity wedded to a music that represents its values, at first glance thus runs counter to Jewish emancipatory universalization as well as the German nationalization that simultaneously occurred.

After some reflection, however, Bohlman’s claims are not as strange as they might at first seem. In the first place, musicologists have in the last decades contested the idea of an “absolute music” devoid of extra-musical values. Moreover, the very values that at first served the cause of Jewish emancipation and “universalized” German Jews might very well have become ossified and taken on a rigidity that served to demarcate cultural boundaries. Being rigidified into a code of their own, the values of liberalism and humanism may have over time come to serve as the means by which German Jews defined themselves. Indeed, it has been noted that the German Jewish community’s stalwart belief and adherence in liberalism and the success of their integration into German society is one of the reasons that more Jews did not emigrate from German-speaking lands before the Holocaust – they steadfastly – and as it happened, tragically –

48 Until at least the 1960s absolute music (i.e. non-programmatic music) was widely believed to hold no meaning beyond its essence as pure music. In the last few decades, however, this idea has been debated and largely discarded, musicologists now arguing that even absolute music bears meanings that might in fact not have been present at the time of its creation (as “national music,” for instance). See, for example: Daniel Chua, Absolute Music and the Construction of Meaning (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999). The eminent German musicologist Carl Dahlhaus even argues that “absolute music” bears temporal and geographical boundaries, “originating in German romanticism” and thereby bearing specific extra-musical meaning. See: Carl Dahlhaus (Roger Lustig, trans.), The Idea of Absolute Music (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).
believed until the last that anti-Semitism was a thing of the past and that they would be treated equitably, not as Jews but as Germans.49

Adding weight to Bohlman’s theory is the fact that a great part of the liberalization of German society was achieved by way of a devotion to music. In homes throughout the German-speaking lands, Jew and non-Jew alike were awakened by Bildung, the notion that self-improvement lay in the realm of education and the practice and achievement of culture. In this process, music played a central and decisive role. The Central European Art Music canon established in the course of the 19th century might have became a key component of identification and assumed a tremendous cultural significance. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that this music, despite perhaps at first lacking any extra-musical meaning, over time assumed an extra-musical significance and became the music of a generation and of the culture which it spawned.

Transposed to Israel, Central Europe’s German Jews were confronted with a culture alien and foreign, a language that they often failed to understand fully and a set of sensibilities that did not accord with their own. In moving to Israel, German Jews encountered a culture vastly at odds with their own, a pioneer culture where not Enlightenment learning but a connection with the land was paramount and a key component of a newly-emerging national identity.50 So too was the background of their new countrymen different, a great many of Israel’s population stemming from an illiberal


50 “For the Zionists, the millennia of Jewish existence in the Diaspora were conceived as a process of relentless persecution and as a condition of moral and cultural decline, something that only a return to the ancient homeland and to a robust life of the soil could reverse.” Joe Cleary, Literature, Partition and the Nation-State: Culture and Conflict in Ireland, Israel and Palestine (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 81
Eastern Europe so different from their old Central European homeland. German Jews, with little to bind them to their new Jewish compatriots, therefore retreated into their own culture, making music and establishing cultural institutions that spoke to them in a very personal manner.  

This same cultural bifurcation – the division between German and East European Jews – played itself out around the world. German Jews, displaced by the rise of Nazism in the middle part of the 20th century, settled not only in Israel, but also in the Americas and in such countries as South Africa and Australia. The greatest concentration of Jews settled in the United States, some staying in the already established Jewish community of New York while others continued on to the warmer climes of Southern California where the weather and lifestyle better suited their tired bodies, minds and souls. Indeed, southern California became a veritable outpost of German Jewish artists – Bruno Walter and Arnold Schoenberg to name but two – all living within close proximity of one another and continuing to practice an art that had evolved into a form of cultural expression. But not all of Central Europe’s Jews went to California – a small number of German Jews, a mere handful compared to the many of the already long-established Eastern European Jews of Montreal, Toronto, and Winnipeg – settled in Canada where they attempted to create communities in a manner that suited their needs and desires. The subject of our biography, the German Jewish conductor Heinz Unger, was, as we shall

51 Neil Levin notes the sense of displacement felt by Central European Jewish composers upon their arrival in Israel: “Despite their welcome in the y’shuv as refugees from the persecutions in or related to the Third Reich, many of them felt a sense of cultural displacement for some time. Maintaining a clutch on links to their common European musical heritage – in the guise of formal structures, techniques, compositional devices, and performance forces – could provide an effective balm for the trauma of cultural disorientation.” Neil Levin, Sacred Services from Israel (Naxos 8.559452), 2006, 3-4.

52 The Jewish Austrian conductor Georg Tintner (1917-1999), for instance, left Vienna after the Anschluss, emigrating to New Zealand in 1940. He became a citizen of New Zealand in 1946 and had a long and successful career in New Zealand and Australia until 1987 when he moved to Canada and became director of Symphony Nova Scotia until his tragic death in 1999.
see, one of this small cadre of German Jews who sought to acculturate themselves to
Canadian existence while at the same time also preserving the cultural values and
practicing an art that he had learnt as a young man in Germany and that, in Bohlman’s
view, would be considered a form of ethnically-based artistic expression.

Philip Bohlman’s conclusions, therefore, provide us with an interesting
perspective from which to view the debate over Jewish music, showing us that the folk-
based Eastern European Jewish musical tradition is but one of the ways in which Jewish
music can be understood and that a case can be made for seeing the Central European Art
Music canon as an alternate manner of defining Jewish music. Laying out a chronology
and a set of positions that cover the Jewish musicological debate, at least as it unfolded
within the bounds of Israel, Bohlman suggests that the Eastern European Jewish musical
position was only one strand of this debate and one that moreover failed to appeal to the
many Jewish composers who had already come under the spell of the other trends
prevalent in Western art music. In discussing the work of Stefan Wolpe (1902-1972), a
German Jewish composer who often wrote compositions informed by Serialism,
Bohlman reveals but one of the many examples of discordance between the branches of
musicological inquiry derived from an Eastern European milieu and the practice of
modern Israeli and other Jewish composers. Indeed, many other composers also wrote in
a more “universal” style that in one way or another may have been inspired or informed
by Jewish themes or history but did not explicitly use the musical modes which had been
defined as “Jewish” by Eastern European musicologists.

However persuasive Bohlman’s work, this notion of the “universalization” of
music ultimately sinks his theory. For, however ossified and monolithic German-
speaking Jews were supposed to have become, the key element of universality remains. True, these values may have become rigidified over time, but a key component of the German Jewish identity lay in the fact that these people did not view themselves as a distinct group divorced from their co-citizens in whatever land they may have settled. And, as enticing as Bohlman’s formulation is in an ethnological sense, it fails to fully explain the myriad ways in which non-devout Jews confronted and negotiated their identities despite continuing to pledge an allegiance to their Mosaic faith. No, Bohlman’s theory – at least the theory that he set out in 1989 – however intriguing it may be, still fails to do justice to Jewish artists’ ability to reinvent themselves to survive and succeed in disparate cultures and societies.

Had his 1989 work *The Land Where Two Streams Flow* been Bohlman’s final utterance in respect to Jewish music, we could have neatly (albeit frustratingly) cast his work aside. In the intervening two decades, however, Philip Bohlman’s thought has undergone a maturation that points to a way past the frustrating models of inclusion/exclusion that for so long ruled inquiries relating to Jewish music. In his earlier work, Bohlman perpetuated a set of suppositions inherited from a century and a half of musicological inquiry. More recently, however, Bohlman has abandoned such a way of thinking, at once rejecting the pervasive dichotomy of inclusion/exclusion shaped by research conducted into community structures and embracing the idea that all spaces represented different – albeit equal – negotiations of Jewish identity. In his most recent
work, Bohlman has shifted his focus away from trying to define what constitutes Jewish music and instead working toward understanding how it was created.\footnote{\textquotedblleft I am interested not so much what Jewish music has been assumed to be, but rather with how such assumptions acquire an ontology of their own.	extquotedblright Philip Bohlman, \textit{Jewish Music and Modernity} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 78.}

Philip Bohlman's most recent work comes at the end of a period during which, quite suddenly, the study of Jewish culture and identity underwent a tremendous transformation that provided us with an opportunity to refine our approach. In the last decade, the entire historiography has undergone a shift wherein scholars have come to recognize the plurality of Jewish culture and experience and began to examine the subject in such a way that erodes limiting definitions and has even brought into question the very nature of the discipline, dismissing the once too common reliance on community structures and bringing back into the narrative the experiences of individuals that transcend communal definitions and modes of conduct.\footnote{See: Mathew Baigell, Milly Heyd, \textit{Complex Identities: Jewish Consciousness and Modern Art} (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2001); David Biale, Michael Galchinsky, and Susan Henschel, \textit{Insider/ Outsider: American Jews and Multiculturalism} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998). We are indebted to Klara Moricz who, in the introduction to \textit{Jewish Identities} (2008), brought these interesting studies to the author's attention.}

In truth, such a path toward a more holistic understanding of Jewish music had long lain dormant. As long ago as the late 1950s, the musicologist Arthur Holde, while still endorsing the existence of an “authentic” Jewish music, warned against the exclusion of music created by Jews that did not meet the stringent criteria set forth by Idelsohn and Rabinovitch.\footnote{Arthur Holde, \textit{Jews in Music: From the Age of Enlightenment to the Present} (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959).} Holde acknowledged the by-now well-established existence of a set of biblically-informed musical modes but did not exclude compositions that did not adhere to these principles as “un-Jewish.” Instead, Holde allowed a space wherein less orthodox composers are also allowed entry into the Jewish musical canon, postulating for instance
that the avant-garde composer Arnold Schoenberg’s music qualifies as Jewish not because of his treatment of biblical themes but because of the “intellectual content of his system.” And while some may question his approach in including composers and their compositions into a Jewish musical canon, Holde at least refreshingly recognized that there exist a myriad number of ways in which composers of the Jewish faith or of Jewish descent exhibit and negotiate their beliefs and transform them into music, absolute or otherwise.

Though long forgotten, Holde’s work therefore serves an important function: in recognizing cultural plurality, it helps open the parameters of the debate and to move us away from a Jewish musicology that for too long was grounded only upon the activities and views of particular Jewish communities and allows us instead to include the strains of Jewish [musical] identity from across the Diaspora. By opening up the parameters of the debate, we arrive at a more broad-minded and inclusive definition of “Jewish music.” In this new scheme, far greater latitude is allowed for the manner in which composers exhibit their “Jewishness.” The musical system of atonality developed by Arnold Schoenberg, for instance, becomes a manifestation of a questing musical spirit in which his musical principles are a marker of his sense of alienation from the surrounding non-Jewish milieu.

As we struggled our way through the problem, Holde’s conception – one in which the subject was privileged and replaced rigid models – provided us a way through an epistemological impasse. However, it also presented us another set of problems, leaving us with little to solve the question of what might allow us, for example, to still recognize the great many approaches that the assimilated Jewish composers of the turn-of-the-

56 Holde, Jews in Music, 343.
century and beyond took in regards to their compositional art as Jewish in any significant way. Indeed, as we recognized how foolhardy it was to search these compositions for Jewish “markers” and motifs that are drawn directly from Jewish music, the problem that emerged was how we might overcome the challenge of explaining how these compositions can in any meaningful way still be considered “Jewish.” After long and careful deliberation, I concluded that the best option that lay before us was to search *through* these compositions for a sensibility, for a “sense” that these works are Jewish. In this approach, instead of looking to, for instance, the klezmer music in the third movement of Gustav Mahler’s First Symphony as an example of “Jewish music” – a claim often made by those, like Max Brod, who have most ardently sought to include Mahler’s works in the Jewish canon of music – we should look at Mahler’s oeuvre holistically, not seeking out only the particular elements that *might* be Jewish but see his works as the expression of a composer who had stemmed from a Jewish milieu but did not discriminate between Jewish and non-Jewish sources of creative inspiration. And while Mahler’s work bears a spiritual questing that, according to the conductor Otto Klemperer, transcended the limits of particular religions, we still hear in Mahler’s compositions an instability – a “lurchiness” – that, like Schoenberg, suggests a discomfort not only with the symphonic form but also a discomfort in society and a sense of being an outsider that puts us in mind of Franz Kafka’s characteristic quip that “[most Jews] who began to write German wanted to leave Judaism...but with their little hind legs they were still glued to the Jewishness of their fathers and with their little front legs they found no new ground.”57

57 Arnold J. Band, “Kafka: The Margins of Assimilation,” in *Modern Judaism*, Vol. 8 No. 2 (May 1988), 139-155. The quotation from Kafka appears on page 144. Numerous commentators have posited that the
While enticing, this approach left us floundering, for we had returned to the same subjectivity that had been so ruthlessly and purposefully exploited by Richard Wagner in "Jewishness in Music." Cynics and critics will therefore say that approaching the subject with such an open mind is a dangerous exercise that opens us up to charges of a slippery subjectivity in which all things can be seen as Jewish if one "feels" it to be so. Moreover, such an approach might be misunderstood as bearing the danger of introducing anachronistic viewpoints and opinions into our interpretations and clouding our ability to see things clearly as they introduce to our argument Jewish values that have only accrued over time. While, for instance, Gustav Mahler was victim to frequent anti-Semitic attacks in his lifetime and his music was understood to bear a "Jewish" meaning by a relatively small band of supporters and musicians in the early part of the twentieth century, Mahler's music only truly entered the canon of Jewish musical canon in the second half of the twentieth century, after his cause was taken up by musicians and musicologists who came to see the composer's art as bearing a post-Holocaust Diasporic meaning.58

Whatever the particulars of Mahler's case, the idea that Jewish music does not represent an undifferentiated block and is not a "timeless" canon but subject to change over time is germane to our discussion. Indeed, the notion that what constitutes a

---

58 Most prominent among this group of musicians was the American conductor Leonard Bernstein. His understanding of Mahler's meaning, as well as the fate of Mahler's music in the period following the Second World War, will be developed more fully in the chapter to come.
“Jewish music” changes over time and according to circumstance, its reception, and the debate that it engenders is one of the elements that seems to be lacking from the majority of older musicological debates. I feel this to be a most important point that has too often been overlooked and has only recently reintroduced into the debate by such scholars as Philip Bohlman. Thus, we should see that, whatever a composer’s reception in his time, the manner in which that composer and his oeuvre has been treated through time has a significant impact on the manner in which we today see that composer’s work. To cite but one example, in his time, there were few who saw Mendelssohn’s work as bearing any particular “Jewishness” and indeed his compositions seem free of any elements that could be considered to be Jewish. However, the manner in which he has been viewed over the last century and a half (beginning with Wagner’s attack on the composer and his work due to its “Jewishness” and continuing on to his exclusion from the art music canon during the Nazi regime) gives us sufficient evidence that Mendelssohn was indeed a “Jewish composer” and that his work is Jewish, not because of its compositional elements but due to its reception.59

Our goal in this chapter was to engage in a discussion of what constitutes “Jewish music” and to survey the state of the historiography pertaining to Jewish music. To do so, we examined the manner in which Jewish music has been understood in a variety of contexts – Germany, Russia, Israel and Canada – during the modern period. We have noted that until very recently the prevailing paradigm in this debate – whatever the context – has been the idea of inclusion/exclusion, of finding the limits of what

constitutes Jewish music. In so doing, we have referenced certain commentators, musicians and musicologists – Richard Wagner, Abraham Idelsohn, Israel Rabinovitch, Phillip Bohlman, and Arthur Holde – and brought to light their particular lines of argumentation and theories concerning Jewish music. We have explored these commentators’ arguments and found their limits, pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of each of their arguments.

All that remains is for us to summarize our own positions in respect to the debate. I do not for one moment question the existence of a Jewish musical canon. However, we must recognize that this canon has been formed by way of a process of invention that has come to privilege certain “authentic” features such as, for instance, inherited biblical modes. In trying to establish the authenticity of such a canon – and also to establish the importance of contemporaneous musical developments and lines of inquiry – a great many Jewish composers and their compositions have been excluded from what constitutes an “authentic” Jewish music canon. In doing this, Jewish musicologists of the past, despite their sincerity, have unfortunately done us a disservice. In more recent times, musicologists and scholars devoted to Jewish studies, coming to recognize the subjective processes by which articulations of identity and culture come to be, have begun to deconstruct these processes and granted us a manner of including more personal, more subjective narratives into the discourse. Music, as an integral feature of identity formation, changes with time and place and the exclusion of musical utterances of more recent eras and of disparate contexts deprives us of an understanding of the richness as well as the vicissitudes of the modern Jewish experience. I end this chapter with a plea – a plea and a hope that is being met only latterly – that we continue to build
upon recent studies and in so doing come to view the subject of Jewish music more holistically. And as even the author sees reflections of himself in his texts, perhaps we should see the process that leads the author to examine this story in and of itself as part of our continually expanding – and entirely subjective – understanding of Jewish music. If viewed in this way, then, we see this work not as a new departure but as part of an exploration that is continually in evolution. The biography of Heinz Unger and his affiliation with the music of Gustav Mahler – the story of a thoroughly assimilated yet avowedly Jewish musician being inspired by a composer of Jewish birth – presents us therefore not with a rupture point but a wonderful opportunity of viewing Jewish music and Jewish identity from a fresh perspective.
CHAPTER 3
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GUSTAV MAHLER

The subject of our biography in the chapters to come is not Gustav Mahler but Heinz Unger. No discussion of Heinz Unger or his life and work, however, can begin without a close examination of the conductor’s favoured composer, Gustav Mahler, not only due to the centrality of the composer in Unger’s professional life but also because of the tremendous significance that the composer bore in the conductor’s personal, deeply-felt association with his German Jewish identity, the reasons lying in a multifaceted discussion that encompasses not only Heinz Unger but also the hotly-debated aspect of Mahler’s “Jewishness.”

Heinz Unger viewed himself as Gustav Mahler’s apostle for the entirety of his life.\(^1\) As he was fond of recounting, Unger first heard Mahler’s “gospel” in Munich, at a 1915 performance of *Das Lied von der Erde* conducted by Mahler’s own protégé Bruno Walter.\(^2\) Unger’s immediate enthusiasm for Mahler’s music triggered a change in his life path. Repeating the manner in which Heinz Unger himself often explained this sudden life-shift, his wife explained that “during his studies in Munich, Heinz Unger went to a performance of Mahler’s *Das Lied von der Erde* by Mahler’s friend and disciple, Bruno Walter. It was at that moment that Heinz Unger decided to become a conductor.”\(^3\) Heinz Unger’s decision to become a conductor was more than just a vocational choice,

---

1. Heinz Unger was not the only musician to utilize this turn of phrase in respect to Mahler’s music. Indeed, it seems to have become a sort of convention to refer oneself as an “apostle” if one prized Mahler’s music. Significantly, not only did Bruno Walter consider himself a Mahlerian apostle, but so did Arnold Schoenberg after hearing an early performance of Mahler’s Third Symphony.
3. “A Short Biography of Dr. Heinz Unger” (written by his wife). LAC, MUS 56, Box 4, File 69.
however; his decision gave coherence and meaning to his life and, as he often said, “awakened his soul.” It also, as he would explicitly disclose on only a few occasions in his life, connected with both his Jewish and German identities simultaneously. In this chapter, we will begin with a biographical sketch of Gustav Mahler to help orient the reader and then continue with a discussion of the views of Mahler’s “Jewishness” that connects this debate with the previous chapter’s discussion of Jewish music. In so doing, we intend to establish the reasons for why Mahler and his music were so culturally significant to Heinz Unger and his fellow German Jews. In undertaking a detailed discussion of Gustav Mahler’s life and work, as well as the meaning that the composer’s oeuvre has borne (and accrued) through the course of the 20th century, we hope to demonstrate that Mahler’s music represents a significant branch of Jewish expression.

Gustav Mahler was born on July 7, 1860 in the small town of Kalischt, a German-speaking enclave of the Austrian Empire situated in the modern-day Czech Republic. Mahler’s father was an alcohol distiller and merchant, a profession that, according to noted musicologist Eric Werner, marked Mahler’s father as a Bestandjude. As such, Mahler’s father (and his family) occupied a particular place in Moravian Jewry’s unofficial caste system, belonging “to the lower caste of a strictly observed and preserved order of precedence.” Mahler’s family was a part of the Habsburg Empire’s “increasingly assimilated Jewish petit-bourgeoisie [sic]” a setting that, in Werner’s colourful definition, made Mahler “a provincial petit bourgeois.”

---

5 Ibid.
6 The first quote is from: Peter Franklin, “Gustav Mahler,” in Grove Music Online. Eric Werner’s characterization of Mahler appears on p.261 of “Felix Mendelssohn—Gustav Mahler: Two Borderline Cases of German-Jewish Assimilation.”
Emperor Franz Joseph’s mobility decree of 1860, the Mahler family moved to the nearby Moravian market town of Iglau where they became a part of a thriving German-speaking Jewish community. By 1875, Gustav Mahler had moved on to Vienna where he continued his musical studies, first in piano performance and soon thereafter turning to composition as his primary subject.  

Following the completion of his studies, Mahler was ready to begin his professional life as a musician, moving throughout the German-speaking world and securing conducting posts in ever more important musical centres, in Ljubljana (1881), Olomouc (1882), Vienna (1883), Kassel (1883), Prague (1885), Leipzig (1886), Budapest (1888) and eventually obtaining his first long-term appointment in Hamburg from 1891 to 1897. Throughout this time, Mahler was building his reputation as a conductor first, and as a composer second. Still, by 1888 Mahler had premiered his First Symphony under his own baton in Budapest, first as a programmatic five movement work, then as a four movement symphony with the “Blumine” movement excised and the explicit programme that had served as an aid to listeners removed. During this period also, Mahler had retained his nominal allegiance to his Jewish heritage.

By 1897, Mahler’s fame and reputation had grown to such an extent that he was being considered for the greatest post in the Habsburg Empire, the position of court conductor of the Vienna Opera. This position, however, required Mahler’s conversion to Catholicism, a conversion that was a concession to a long-standing and deeply ingrained

---

7 Mahler's studies in harmony were with Robert Fuchs and in composition with Franz Krenn. His studies in piano performance had been with Julius Epstein. Peter Franklin, “Gustav Mahler,” in Grove Music Online.

8 Peter Franklin notes that the programme to aid comprehension was in fact only added to the symphony's second performance in Hamburg and not present at its Budapest premiere. Peter Franklin, “Gustav Mahler,” in Grove Music Online.
tradition of Viennese anti-Semitism.\(^9\) At the same time, the very fact that Mahler was considered for the position demonstrates the great strides undertaken in respect to Jewish emancipation since the dawn of the 19\(^{th}\) century; despite the ever-present anti-Semitism in the Habsburg capital, Mahler authority Henry-Louis de La Grange opines that “[t]he fact that the Emperor had none the less appointed a provincial Jew as the head of the most prominent cultural institution of the empire reveals an astonishingly liberal frame of mind.”\(^10\)

As Gustav Mahler’s letters to his family demonstrate, the Mahler family had long since lost its explicit affiliation with the Jewish religion and any explicitly Jewish culture.\(^11\) Nonetheless, severing the ties with his Jewish heritage proved a difficult matter for Gustav Mahler. As Eric Werner notes:

> Mahler, though long estranged from Judaism, admitted (in conversation with the critic and journalist B. Karpath [sic]), that the decision to convert to Christianity had been very difficult. He described this step as ‘necessary for self-preservation.’\(^12\)

---


\(^11\) Stephen McClatchie, ed. The Mahler Family Letters (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). In reading through this vast collection of letters, there is nary a mention of any Jewish content whatsoever. Indeed, there is hardly any reference to religion whatsoever. Holiday seasons, however, are referred to by their Christian nomenclature (end of year celebrations, for instance, are not referred to as Hanukkah but as Christmas).


It should be noted that the journalist to which Werner refers is in fact Ludwig Karpath (1866-1936), a music critic and friend who initially supported Mahler and then later turned against him. In light of the fact that Karpath seems to have been intimately familiar with many hidden aspects of Mahler’s life (his affair with the opera singer Anna von Mildenburg and his unannounced departure from Hamburg to assume control of the Vienna Opera, for instance), it is entirely reasonable that he was close friends with Mahler and would have been privy to his innermost thoughts concerning his conversion to Catholicism. The most
It seems that Mahler, despite having long ago ended any affiliation with the Jewish faith or culture per se, continued to view himself as a Jew, a fact confirmed by numerous statements made – or attributed to him – throughout the course of his life.\(^\text{13}\) Mahler, though no longer a practicing Jew or involved with the Jewish community in any significant way, still considered himself Jewish, a self-definition that would have surely made his conversion a painful one he underwent with great reluctance.

It would be foolhardy, therefore, to read too much into Mahler’s conversion and extrapolate or conclude that he embraced Catholic dogma at any point. As the famed, Jewish-born German conductor (and also a convert to Catholicism, a conversion that he would renounce later in life) Otto Klemperer (1885-1973) points out:

[Mahler] was absolutely religious, only not a believer in dogma.
He was born a Jew and he was baptized by the time he was in Hamburg. To become director of the Vienna Court Opera it was

\[^\text{13}\] Potentially spurious examples can be culled from any number of sources ranging from Alma Mahler’s own (admittedly often approximate) memories to direct quotations attributed to him. According to musicologist Talia Pecker Beno, the most significant document pertaining to Mahler’s view of his own Jewish origins comes in the shape of his 1899 meeting in Prague with Cantor Magnus Davidsohn that is recounted in full later in this chapter.

---

\[^\text{13}\] Potentially spurious examples can be culled from any number of sources ranging from Alma Mahler’s own (admittedly often approximate) memories to direct quotations attributed to him.
absolutely necessary to be a Catholic. But he was never a Catholic in a dogmatic sense.¹⁴

Even the manner in which Mahler expressed his religious and spiritual convictions in his music reveal a problematic relationship with the religious instincts that he bore within him. We can therefore confidently assert that Mahler lived a life wherein organized religion, Jewish or Catholic, played a very minor role but was still suffused with a constant spiritual quest.¹⁵ As the English writer and critic Neville Cardus points out in a metaphor that would not have sounded out of place in a novel by Franz Kafka, “Mahler’s faith, not as steadfast or definable as Bruckner’s, was one symptom among others of his search for anchorage in a world in which he ran down corridor after corridor seeking he knew not what.”¹⁶

Neville Cardus’s rather vague and metaphorical postulation seems accurate, at least in a general sense. Cardus’ insights regarding Mahler’s faith, however, appear alongside language that often resorts to a crude racial reductionism that – in our post-Holocaust world – strikes us as extremely uncomfortable to read. Indeed, Cardus’ formulation of Mahler’s “Jewishness” is remarkably similar to the type of criticisms leveled against the composer by anti-Semitic Nazi musicologists a few short years later, a

¹⁴ Peter Heyworth, Conversations with Klemperer (New York: Faber and Faber, 1985), 36. Otto Klemperer was a German-born Jewish conductor of great renown and is today still considered one of the pre-eminent conductors of the 20th century. Early in his career, he was known as a champion of new music while later in life he became ever more devoted to the more standard Central European art music canon. Klemperer met Mahler in 1902 and remained his friend and supporter throughout Mahler’s life and beyond. Interestingly, Otto Klemperer was also the father of the American actor Werner Klemperer (1920-2000) who is best remembered for his role as Colonel Klink in the TV sitcom Hogan’s Heroes. Klemperer’s assertion that Mahler rejected religious dogma (whether Jewish or Christian) is confirmed by a letter from the composer to his wife, sent December 1901 in which he states that “all religious dogmas [...] lead directly to misunderstanding, to a flattening and coarsening, and in the long run to such distortion that the work, and still more its creator, is utterly unrecognizable.” Alma Mahler (Basil Creighton, trans.), Gustav Mahler: Memories and Letters (New York: The Viking Press, 1969).

¹⁵ His dear friend and disciple Bruno Walter once wrote that “spiritual longing...constituted the central thread of his life and work.” Bruno Walter, Gustav Mahler (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), 19.

rhetorical strategy inspired by the fountainhead of anti-Semitic musicology, Richard
Wagner’s mid 19th century anti-Jewish pamphlet, Das Judentum in der Musik. Yet we
are caught in a paradox of sorts, finding ourselves at one and the same time embracing
ideas such as those espoused by Arthur Holde that Mahler’s music is “Jewish” because of
“the emphasis and the tendency toward sharp contrasts which reveal certain basic Jewish
characteristics”17 while wanting to reject Neville Cardus’s observation that Mahler’s
music was “egocentric” or “bears a nervous ‘tic’” because this painfully reminds us of the
type of notion that was put forth by racially-derived criticisms of his work as both a
conductor and a composer.18

However wary we must be of Cardus’s crude simplifications, his observations do
point us toward the fascinating topic of racially-derived notions of Mahler and his work.
For, however distasteful these ideas are to us living in the post-Holocaust age, ideas of
this sort were perfectly acceptable rhetorical structures and modes of music criticism in
the pre-Nazi era. Indeed, these types of commentaries and criticism would have been
very familiar to Mahler living in fin-de-siècle Vienna. Even the Jewish American
journalist and music critic Paul Rosenfeld, writing only a few short years after Mahler’s
death, would note the influence that the composer’s milieu would have had on his work:

For if Mahler’s music is pre-eminently a reflection Beethoven’s, if
he never spoke in authentic accents, if out of his vast dreams of a
great modern popular symphonic art, out of his honesty, his
sincerity, his industry, his undeniably noble and magnificent traits,
there resulted only those unhappy boring colossi that are his nine
symphonies, it is indubitably, to a great extent, the consequence of
the fact that he, the Jew, was born in a society that made Judaism,
Jewish descent and Jewish traits, a curse to those that inherited
them. The destiny that made him Jew decreed that, did he speak
out fully, he would have to employ an idiom that would recall the

18 Neville Cardus, Gustav Mahler: His Mind and His Music, 26.
harsh accents of the Hebrew language quite as much as that of any
tongue spoken by the peoples of Europe. It decreed that, whatever
the history of the art he practiced, whatever the character of the age
in which he lived, he could not impress himself upon his medium
without impregnating it with the traits he inherited from his
ancestors.19

In Vienna, Mahler, despite his conversion to Catholicism, continued to experience
an anti-Semitism that, in varying degrees, would be an aspect of his experience for the
remainder of his life and would, as Rosenfeld suggests, be responsible for some of the
alleged musical shortcomings of Mahler's music. Yet in his youth Mahler had been as
thoroughly German and as nationalist as his contemporaries; as a young man, he had
been involved with nationalist student organizations.20 Despite this thoroughly German
upbringing and partaking in the nationalist culture of the period, he nevertheless
struggled to escape from anti-Semitic insinuations, reproaches and attacks, a state of
affairs that led him to famously declare "I am thrice homeless, as a native of Bohemia in
Austria, as an Austrian among Germans, and as a Jew throughout the world. Everywhere

19 Paul Rosenfeld, Musical Portraits: Interpretations of Twenty Modern Composers (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, Inc., 1920), 161. Paul Rosenfeld (1890-1946) was an American journalist and music critic. He was born and raised in New York State in a German-Jewish family, and obtained his graduate degree in Journalism at Columbia University. While Rosenfeld was in sympathy with Mahler and recognized the composer's plight, his conclusion that Mahler's work was still-born because of his Jewish heritage and corresponding world-view is still clearly deterministic, even commentators in support of Mahler's work (and who shared his culture) could not help but resort to race to explain elements of the composer's life and work.

20 In his days as a student in Vienna, Mahler was involved with the Leseverein der deutschen Studenten Wiens ("Reading Society of Vienna's German Students") that professed strongly nationalist sentiments. See Peter Franklin, The Life of Mahler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 39-42. Franklin disputes Mahler's membership in the society but not with the fact that he may have borne an allegiance to its nationalist principles. Morten Solvik also explores the nationalist student societies that Mahler was involved with (and indeed helped found) during his student days. “In 1878 Mahler joined the so-called Pernerstorfer Circle, a group of young thinkers that promoted a pro-German blend of artistic idealism and social change. A few years later he cofounded the Saga Society, a gathering of friends whose activities included recitations of the Nibelungenlied, the Edda, and other German sagas. The mission of the Society emphasized living in the spirit of the German medieval hero in the hopes that a 'new world view should come into being, an artistic, poetic one opposed to the modern scientific one' in the hopes of founding a 'new and magnificent culture'” Morten Solvik, “The literary and philosophical worlds of Gustav Mahler,” in The Cambridge Companion to Mahler (Jeremy Barham, ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 21-34. The quote is from page 23.
an intruder, never welcomed."\(^{21}\) Despite (or perhaps more likely because of) his experience of feeling like an intruder into a world into which he could never truly gain admission, Gustav Mahler the composer was able to write an opera of works that were unique and whose legacy is still felt to this day. These works uncomfortably situated themselves in respect to the German symphonic repertoire, at once both indebted to the masters of the past such as Beethoven and Brahms while also brazenly steering a different trajectory, a fresh course that appropriated popular tunes and idioms and retrofit these into symphonic structures that burst with new life. As the eminent conductor and scholar Leon Botstein characterizes it:

\[\text{[A]s [Mahler's music] moved from point to point, both the expert and the lay listener would fail to find in it a satisfying homage to the formal traditional expectations associated with sonata form and symphonic structure and, therefore, the attendant extramusical implications.}^{22}\]

As a result of Mahler's transcendence of standard symphonic form, the composer's works were met with unabashed enthusiasm by some and scorn from others. Mahler's works divided public opinion and viscerally spoke to their audiences, eliciting violent reactions both positive and negative. Mahler's advocates, therefore, were fated to be seen as prophets of a new musical order, one in which the modern and new mixed rambunctiously with the romantic and old. Mahler, too, was a man and artist that blended these worlds within him, writing music inspired by the past (such as Das Knaben Wunderhorn, a collection of songs based upon a body of folk texts collected and edited

\(^{21}\) This quotation has become Mahler's most famous utterance, though the time and place of its genesis is not entirely known. It may have in fact only been attributed to Mahler by his wife Alma. Alma Mahler (Basil Creighton, trans.), Gustav Mahler: Memories and Letters (New York: The Viking Press, 1969), 109.
by Achim von Arnim and Clemens Brentano in Heidelberg between 1805 and 1808) that also stretched the bounds of tonality, audience comprehension and the feelings of the time.

Despite the debate over the value of Mahler’s music, a large part of the hostility to Mahler the musician lay not with his musical experimentalism per se but in the manner that this experimentation – whether as composer as composer or conductor – represented his “innate Judaism,” an element that the anti-Semitic newspaper Reichspost drew attention to immediately upon Mahler’s appointment as Conductor at the Vienna Court Opera in April 1897, remarking that “the Jew’s press will see whether the pangirics with which they plaster their idol at present do not become washed away by the rain of reality as soon as Herr Mahler starts his Jew-boy antics on the podium.”

Mahler’s conducting was seen as fierce, passionate and meticulous but also as mannered, fastidious, and unnatural – all accusations that bespoke of stereotypes of the neurotic Jew that circulated widely during his decade-long tenure at the helm of the Court Opera. Mahler’s music, too, was branded as “Jewish,” exploiting vulgar music of the time as well as “unnaturally” speaking a German that no true German would speak; as the anti-Semitic music critic Rudolph Louis would state:

If Mahler’s music would speak Yiddish, it would be perhaps unintelligible to me. But it is repulsive to me because it acts Jewish. This is to say that it speaks musical German, but with an accent, with an inflection, and above all, with the gestures of an Eastern, all too Eastern Jew. So, even to those whom it does not offend directly, it cannot possibly communicate anything. One


does not have to be repelled by Mahler’s artistic personality in order to realize the complete emptiness and vacuity of an art in which the spasm of an impotent mock-Titanism reduces itself to a frank gratification of common seamstress-like sentimentality.\textsuperscript{25}

However crude Randolph’s critique, it is fascinating that such a verdict was seconded by so sympathetic observer as Max Brod who, in attempting to make his case for Mahler’s musical genius, noted that the composer’s music did not seem to speak in an organically German voice, pointing out that “it may be that Mahler’s music, though apparently German, is instinctively recognized as non-German – which is indeed the case.”\textsuperscript{26} To all concerned, whether in favour or against Mahler’s art, the composer’s music bore something that marked it as lying outside the German “norm.”

Yet what accounted for Mahler’s music lying outside the bounds of this German norm remains unclear. Perhaps a large part of this was something not in the music but in the views concerning the man himself. Indeed, Mahler the man was deemed Jewish and has been acknowledged as such not only by his critics but also by supporters, musicologists, and cultural critics ranging from Max Brod to Theodore Adorno. Even more significantly, those closest to Mahler echoed and endorsed this view; Mahler’s own wife, the elusive, beautiful and enigmatic Alma Mahler-Werfel, saw her husband as Jewish all his days, a verdict that Mahler himself, if we are to believe his widow, endorsed:

\begin{quote}
His sincerity told him that neither his skepticism toward Jewish religion nor his baptism could by any means make him forget his Judaism. And he did not want to.\textsuperscript{27}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{26} Max Brod, \textit{Israel’s Music}, (Tel Aviv: “Sefer” Press Ltd., 1951), 31.

\textsuperscript{27} Alma Mahler, as quoted by Max Brod in \textit{Israel’s Music}, 34.
Alma Mahler’s view of her husband's connection to his Jewish identity and Jewish culture is supported by weighty testimony from the eminent Mahler biographer and scholar Henry-Louis de La Grange. In his magisterial biography of Mahler’s life, de La Grange notes in detail the Jewish singer and cantor Magnus Dawison’s first meeting with Mahler in Prague.28

In the afternoon, walking in the street near the theatre, he heard someone behind him call out: ‘Heil Konig Heinrich!’ Thinking it was a fellow-singer pulling his leg, he turned round and found himself face-to-face with Mahler. The great man was friendly and relaxed, asked him about himself, and then invited him to the Blauer Stern Hotel, where he was staying, for a cup of coffee and a chat. Over coffee Mahler reminisced about Prague, which he had known since his earliest youth as the capital of the country in which he had been born. Dawison told Mahler of his musical studies, and his early ambition to become a synagogue cantor like his ancestors. Mahler, with an impatient frown, commented: ‘But then you would have been lost to the world of art!’ Dawison was reflecting that Mahler, a Jew after all, could rarely have been in a synagogue, when suddenly Mahler asked him to come into the hotel music-room and sing him something in Hebrew.29

The rest of the encounter, in Dawison’s own words, also bears repeating, despite its length:

I complied, with joy in my heart. I first sang him a composition by one of our synagogue authors. Mahler thought it had too little musical content. Then I asked him if I might now improvise on the basis of words of prayer. He agreed. I quickly ran up and down the scale, and then began to sing. I sang with all my heart and soul, I put in all the Jewish Weltschmerz, but also all the meaning of the words. The master listened. And as I came to the end, the old day of Reconciliation prayer: ‘Do not forsake us when our strength falters’, he whispered in a dry voice: ‘Yes, that is religious! That’s how I heard it as a child, sung by the old prayer-leader in the

28 De La Grange notes that Dawison [or Davidsohn] was born in 1877 in Beuthen, Oberschlesien and later became a cantor at Berlin’s Fasanenstrasse Synagogue. Dawison also sang the bass-baritone part in a Prague performance of Beethoven Symphony No. 9 in early June 1899, most likely conducted by Mahler himself. The meeting seems to have taken place in May 1899 but the exact day, according to de la Grange, is difficult to determine. See: Henry-Louis de La Grange, Gustav Mahler; Vienna: The Years of Challenge (1897-1904), 174 (footnote 30).
29 De La Grange, Gustav Mahler; Vienna: The Years of Challenge (1897-1904), 173.
village synagogue.' He sat silent for a while, lost in thought. Suddenly he sat down at the piano and began to play. To improvise. I heard phrase for phrase the melody that I had used, and which I could not have repeated since I had only improvised it. It had become something quite different. He clothed the heavy minor in other, wonderfully blossoming harmonies. And I sat spellbound, thinking only how much our religious worship would have gained if only he, the great man, had not turned away from it and from all that he regarded as a frustrating burden. And yet it is not a burden, but precisely what gives content and value to Jewish life! It was as if he was still struggling to get over a violent emotional shock. Our conversation was at an end. He shook me warmly by the hand, and said simply: 'I shan't forget you.'

Henry-Louis de La Grange sums up this significant episode by noting that, "Magnus Dawison's unique testimony seems to prove that Mahler, despite his conversion and his loss of contact with the faith of his youth, had by no means forgotten his experiences in the Iglau synagogue." I agree with de La Grange’s verdict but would argue that this encounter reveals more than just the fact that Mahler still remembered his Jewish youth. Indeed, I would say that it also captures the essence of the difficulty that conversion may have caused Mahler, the layers of repression that were melted away by his contact with the Jewish musician with which he shared an obvious connection. It also speaks to the distance between the positions of those that remained attached to the Jewish community outright like Dawison who saw Mahler’s secularization and conversion as a loss and the diametrically opposed view of Mahler who saw the waste in keeping talented musicians like Dawison from sharing their gift with the rest of the world.

Mahler did not only connect with and reminisce with members of the Jewish community but also found much in common with other German Jews who had left the Jewish temple behind. Indeed, it is fascinating to note that many of Mahler’s musical

As cited in de La Grange, Gustav Mahler; Vienna: The Years of Challenge (1897-1904), 173-174.
31 De La Grange, Gustav Mahler; Vienna: The Years of Challenge (1897-1904), 174.
supporters and admirers shared a social and cultural position very similar to his own. In the field of conducting, a great many of his staunchest supporters were the product of that same emancipated and assimilated Jewry as Mahler had been. In this respect, a selective list could be compiled: Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer, Klaus Pringsheim and of course Heinz Unger. In the realm of musicology and musical criticism too, defenders of Mahler's musical weltanschauung were also Jewish: Franz Schreker (1878-1934), Paul Bekker (1882-1937), Richard Specht (1870-1932), and Alfred Einstein (1880-1952). And though some might suspect that this assemblage of German Jewish admirers of Mahler's art is a modern conflation, nothing could be further from the truth; it is, rather, reflective of a distinct German Jewish sensibility that tied these figures together. Moreover, not only did these characters move in similar circles and therefore share a bond amongst themselves; even prominent German musicians perceived them as a distinct group within German musical circles. The German composer and conductor Hans Pfitzner (1869-1949), for instance, wrote what Otto Klemperer referred to as a "violent attack" on Paul Bekker and then, in his 1926 book Die neue Aesthetik der musikalischen Impotenz ("The New Aesthetic of Musical Impotence"), led "a violent assault on the Jews for their destructive influence on music."
Gustav Mahler’s shared world-view with Jewish personalities even transcended the immediate realm of music. In the final year of his life, Mahler sought to meet with the Jewish Viennese father of modern psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). After numerous missed appointments, Mahler finally met with Freud, the therapist engaging in a four hour “walking consultation” with the composer while vacationing in the Dutch university town of Leyden. Alma Mahler, the composer’s wife at the time, noted many years later that Mahler decided to consult Freud after coming to the realization that “he had lived the life of a neurotic,” a veiled reference to the psychosexual problems Gustav Mahler had suffered with his wife. Whatever the fascinating particulars of their long discussion, the fact that Mahler sought out Freud so near the end of his life – the composer would die on 18 May 1911, after a long battle with heart disease that had been exacerbated by the stress of his work and the grief brought on by the death of his much loved first daughter in 1907 – suggests a common world-view arising from a turn-of-the-century Vienna in which Jews, converted or otherwise, played
a prominent role. In meeting with Freud, Mahler reveals the existence of a synchronicity in world-view with a fellow assimilated Jew from Vienna. In sum, despite his conversion to Catholicism, Mahler continued to be seen – and perhaps to see himself – as part of a Jewish (or at the very least “post-Jewish”) milieu for all his days.

In light of the way that Mahler’s contemporaries had recognized – for better or for worse – the composer’s “Jewishness” (manifest in both the man and the musician) and that this discourse had continued in the first decade after Mahler’s passing, it would have been exceedingly difficult for Heinz Unger to not have been aware of the legacy or specific Jewish cultural meaning of Gustav Mahler and his music. For, in his devotion to the music of Mahler, Unger was deeply affected by the aforementioned musicologists Richard Specht and Paul Bekker’s analyses of Mahler’s music and had worked with both Otto Klemperer and Bruno Walter in professional and musical capacities that involved the performance of Mahler’s music. Thus, while organized religion had played (and would continue to play) a decidedly small role in Heinz Unger’s life, the music of Mahler spoke in a vernacular that affected Unger deeply, a language that appealed to Unger not only as German but also as Jew. Indeed, in a letter sent many years later to Mrs. Mark Levy, his friend, the wife of his legal counsel, and at the time a promoter of Unger’s campaign to obtain a concert with the Israel Philharmonic, Unger makes clear the relationship between his affection for Gustav Mahler and his own Jewish identity:

The year 1960 will bring the 100th Birthday of Gustav Mahler, one of the most important composers of Jewish origin, to whose music

---

35 John L. Kuehn, “Encounter at Leyden: Gustav Mahler Consults Sigmund Freud.”
36 As already discussed, Bruno Walter’s 1915 Munich performance of *Das Lied von der Erde* marked the beginning of Unger’s love affair with the music of Mahler. Heinz Unger and Bruno Walter cultivated a life-long friendship and remained in correspondence throughout their lives, even after emigrating to North America. Heinz Unger also worked with Otto Klemperer, leading the off-stage band in an early performance of Mahler’s 2nd Symphony with the Berlin Philharmonic in the early part of the 1920s.
as you know I have devoted my whole life. No doubt that the Israel Philharmonic will do something on a grand scale about this Centenary. It would have made me proud to make this the occasion of my belated first appearance in Israel...  

It is in the very paradox of German Jewish identity – of being at once German and Jewish, yet often falling outside the bounds of either group – that both Mahler and a young Heinz Unger were caught and bound them, along with so many of their assimilated brethren, together. For, however much Mahler has been seized upon as a latter-day Jewish icon, to present Mahler as a “Jewish” composer alone is to misrepresent the composer as well as to go against his view of himself as “emancipated.”

Nevertheless, this did not prevent prominent Jewish cultural players and institutions from claiming the composer as their own. In the wake of the Israeli victory in the Six-Day War against its Arab neighbours in 1967, for instance, Leonard Bernstein led a performance of Mahler’s Third Symphony in Israel, with the texts sung in Hebrew.  

One wonders how Mahler would have greeted the performance of his symphony in a country to which he bore no significant allegiance (despite living in the same city that had spawned the father of modern-day Zionism, Theodore Herzl, Mahler never once espoused any opinions on the idea of a Jewish homeland) and in a language that the composer would have seen as decidedly foreign. Bernstein, however, was a Jew from a different time and place and looked back to Mahler as a significant part of his cultural heritage. As Botstein puts it, “For Bernstein, Mahler had pioneered a vision of a diaspora for Jews that, after defeat and tragedy, had ultimately found fulfillment in post-1960

---

37 Letter from Heinz Unger to Mrs. Mark Levy, dated June 5, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
America.” To Bernstein, the history of the Jews was a continuity that led to his own experience. In marked contrast to the Bernstein performance of Mahler’s Third Symphony in 1967 that served a set of explicitly Zionist and Jewish goals that had become virtually indistinguishable in the post-war period, Unger’s desire to conduct Mahler’s music in Israel did not mean to serve as a negation of the composer’s bifurcate German Jewish identity. After all, Unger did not call Mahler a Jewish composer but referred to him only as a “composer of Jewish origin,” an origin that significantly affected his character and art but was not contrary to his embrace of German culture.

Thus, while the German Jewish symbiosis has often been denied (most notably by Jewish commentators of the time like Gershom Scholem or more recently by historians such as Steven Aschheim), the strands of self-awareness that constituted German Jewish identity were not at odds with one another, nor did they present a significant conflict. Rather, the German Jewish identity was built upon a dialectic of interaction and growth in a time and place where German Jews had integrated into German society while at the same time retaining aspects of their formerly-religious identity, albeit an identity that had become, depending on one’s position, either enriched or impoverished by German notions of Bildung and had appropriated aspects of German culture as social and cultural signifiers of its own.40

---

40 Botstein, “Whose Gustav Mahler? Reception, Interpretation, and History,” 8
40 For a fuller discussion of the German Jewish appropriation and embrace of “German” culture, see Philip Bohlman, The Land Where Two Streams Flow: Music and the German-Jewish Community of Israel. (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989). The tension in this German-Jewish relationship is commented upon by commentators of the period (Gershom Scholem, for instance) and, more recently, Steven Aschheim who finds the idea of German-Jewish symbiosis as flawed. See: Steven E. Aschheim, “German Jews beyond Bildung and Liberalism: The Radical Jewish Revival in the Weimar Republic,” in his collection of essays entitled Culture and Catastrophe: German and Jewish Confrontations with National Socialism and Other Crises (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 31-44.
To remain true to the spirit and historical experience of German Jewry – the Jewry that included Gustav Mahler and Heinz Unger, as well as countless others – we must therefore strike a delicate balance that transforms Mahler into neither a solely Jewish or German composer. Indeed, however deeply we may question Bernstein’s conclusions and however much we may be aware of the discontinuities in Diasporic Jewish history that have been papered over in the wake of the Holocaust and subsequent examinations of Jewish identity and artistic-cultural expression, to go to the other extreme and to ignore the vestiges of Jewishness that persisted in his character and music, however, would also be a mistake. Instead, one must view the composer as occupying a place within both canons of identity, representing at once both German and Jewish sensibilities yet being fully neither.

Just as importantly, one cannot approach the subject without taking into account, as the aforementioned discussion relating to Leonard Bernstein’s understanding of Mahler suggests, the layers of meaning that have been built upon Mahler’s music in the nearly 100 years since his passing. As the eminent Mahler-scholar and musician Leon Botstein points out, Mahler’s fortunes have risen and fallen parallel to historical events in the course of the past century, Bernstein’s views suggesting, for instance, that the embrace of Mahler as a Jewish composer served a distinctly important and immensely cathartic purpose beginning in the 1960s as Jews began to confront and negotiate the specter of the Holocaust. In the German-speaking world, too, Mahler has assumed a role shaped by the Nazi period:

Serious traditions of skepticism and doubt articulated by Mahler’s contemporaries have been swept away, in part because they

---

41 Talia Pecker Berio, “Mahler’s Jewish Parable,” 89.
possess a bad odor owing to some presumed guilt by association with pre-1933 anti-Semitism and the Nazi attack on Mahler's music. The sanctification and canonization of Mahler since the end of World War II have assumed characteristics compatible with the ideology of reparations. His music and reputation have benefitted from a form of cultural "Wiedergutmachung," particularly in Germany, vis-à-vis the historical role of Jews in pre-1933 German Speaking cultural and musical life.43

Despite serving as a paradigmatic figure representative of a particular era and its horrors, Mahler has also been a figure whose popularity has transcended specific meaning. Botstein astutely points out that a close affiliation with the particularities of history played an important role in the resuscitation of Mahler precisely because of the generalizing aspect of historical memory arising from those self-same particularities, declaring that “the erasure of memory among listeners caused by discontinuities in history and the shifting manner in which musical traditions were transmitted from one generation to the next permitted Mahler to function as a powerful normative expressive medium devoid of stable meaning.”44

The question, of course, arises as to why Mahler has achieved such a widespread popularity in the post-war period while other composers of his time have faded into obscurity. There are a myriad number of ways to answers this question, ranging from the merely technological (the widespread availability of high fidelity recordings45) to the musicological (the demise of serialism and the resurgence in the popularity of what we today call Neo-Romanticism), and on to the more profound. Perhaps the most interesting

44 Ibid., 14.
45 Botstein, informed by Hermann Danuser and Kurt Blaukopf, suggests that the availability of high-fidelity recordings provides the listener "a vast-sounding narrative" that becomes "an intimate, private narrative." Botstein, 15.
reason, made explicit by Botstein, is Mahler’s relationship with the modern mind and his synchronicity with modern sensibilities:

[I]n an age when reading and writing are construed as finding and uncovering webs of entanglements and locating processes of transference well beyond literal meanings and authorial intentions, Mahler’s musical texts, through heterophony, extreme contrasts, and episodic surface structure, offer an open-ended and nearly inexhaustible source.46

Thus, while Botstein’s understanding of the reason for Mahler’s modern popularity is tied to what we now call post-modernism, the very ambiguity that makes it able to conform to post-modern sensibilities is what will continue to allow for Mahler’s music to be reinvented by successive generations of listeners and thereby transcend the dangers of this or that “ism.”

The very malleability of the meaning of Mahler’s music suggested by Botstein, however, presents us with the particular challenge of ignoring the layers of meaning that Mahler’s music has accrued in the 100 years since his death if we are to truly understand the manner in which Heinz Unger – along with his fellow assimilated Germans of the Mosaic faith – viewed Mahler’s music upon hearing of it in the early years of the last century.47 For, while we know that Heinz Unger viewed Mahler’s music through a prism that transformed it into an expression of his simultaneously-held and overlapping Jewish and German identities, we are still limited when speculating on the precise balance of these values in Unger’s understanding of Mahler’s music or whether there were any

47 At the commencement of her work on the role that the critique of Gustav Mahler’s music played in the understanding of Jewish identity, Karen Painter explicitly declares that “Gustav Mahler was the most important composer in the Austro-German anti-Semitic literature not only during his lifetime but also in the decades after his death.” She continues, saying that “understanding the nature of the [anti-Mahler] arguments…also sheds light on the positions of Mahler’s advocates.” Karen Painter, “Jewish Identity and Anti-Semitic Critique in the Austro-German Reception of Gustav Mahler, 1900-1945,” in Perspectives on Gustav Mahler, 175-6.
particular works or moments that expressed one element more than the other. In a sense, though, this is a moot point – the importance lies in the very fact that the composer’s music appealed to Unger at once as both German and Jewish, and therefore reflected the German-Jewish assimilative discourse common to them both. Near the end of his life, as Heinz Unger was honoured by the West German Government for his achievements over half a century of service in the field of music, Unger spoke of his understanding and appreciation of the German culture that informed Mahler’s music:

> Germany always was for me not only the country of Beethoven, of Brahms, the country of Goethe, Lessing, Hans Sachs and Walter von der Vogelweide. It was and always will always remain also the country of Felix von Mendelssohn, of Heinrich Heine, of Albert Einstein, the country of the “Magic Horn” romanticism and of Faustian poetry, which inspired the composer Gustav Mahler to his greatest creations. 

Mahler, therefore, was a composer who had arisen out of a German world of which Unger always saw himself an integral part. According to Unger, Mahler was simultaneously also a composer who was part of a lineage of German Jews who had contributed to the advancement of German culture by way of their own unique contributions. These contributions came to be symbols not only of their integration into German society at large but a defining feature, a badge of honour so to speak, for their own German Jewish identity, an identity which was premised upon, defined, and delineated by their success in general society. In Heinz Unger’s view, Mahler was a German but also much more than that – he was a German Jew, a particular type of species that had built upon German culture and had helped bring it to full flowering.

Yet not all commentators have been so willing to allow Mahler to occupy the in-between, a space neither wholly Jewish nor wholly German that characterized the

---

48 LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
German Jewish experience. As we have seen earlier in the chapter, Mahler has become a symbol for the enduring nature of the Jewish Diaspora in the post-Holocaust period. As such, Mahler has been appropriated as a Jewish cultural icon and his work endowed with a particular Jewish meaning that he would have found, to say the least, surprising. One wonders, for example, what Gustav Mahler would have thought of Max Brod’s characterization of the elements that recur in his music (the incessant march rhythms that he views as symptomatic of Mahler’s identification with Hassidic music a melody unassignable to either a major or minor key; a tendency toward the use of a quick leap or a striking rise in the melody; and a repetition of small parts of motifs with a pressing intensity) as features that denote the “Jewishness” of his music.49

This is not to say, however, that the elements and characteristics ascribed as Jewish in Mahler’s music are fabricated or artificial. Indeed, only the most cynical or jaded commentator would argue that Mahler’s work is devoid of Jewish elements. However, while to our modem ears Mahler’s music is suffused with a “Jewish” quality—the same quality that commentators both for and against his craft since his time have spilled copious amounts of ink debating—trying to discern what those particular elements are often leaves us frustratingly unable to fully define or characterize them.

The difficulty in finding an appropriate manner by which to recognize Mahler’s “Jewishness” is perhaps what has led commentators to provide explanations that “feel” right yet possess little actual content. Musicologist Talia Pecker Berio, for instance, has employed a vague metaphor (albeit one inspired by Mahler’s own view of his work) to make her case, arguing that best way of linking Mahler’s oeuvre to “Jewishness” is by thinking of Mahler’s world as a matrix, a “living cavity that absorbs and transforms the

elements that flow into it [resulting in] an individual whole that must be appraised on its own grounds and in relation to its context.” In essence, what Berio is suggesting is that we view Mahler as Jewish not because of any particular musical elements but because his art is coloured by a set of Jewish pre-notions inherited and transformed by a great artist into intangible but forceful expressions of a time during which Jewish assimilation was at its apex but was already being threatened by strong currents of anti-Semitic thought and action.\(^{51}\)

Berio’s metaphor is convincing, but perhaps not in the manner envisioned by the musicologist. In trying to persuade us of Mahler’s “Jewishness,” Berio instead convinces us that Mahler was an artist who, because of circumstance, created a music that is at once both Jewish and, for lack of a better term, “post-Jewish,” a sonic world that draws into its orbit not only Jewish elements but also elements stemming from other non-Jewish sources whose use would have made little sense even half a century earlier. Moreover, Berio’s framework for an organic conceptualization of the Jewishness in Mahler’s work puts us in mind of a much earlier articulation of a similar set of ideas. As far back as 1921, the musicologist Paul Bekker had spoken of how Mahler’s symphonies created their own musical universe:


\(^{50}\) Berio, “Mahler’s Jewish Parable,” in *Mahler and his World*, 92.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., 93.
In the above-quoted passage, however similar the language and metaphoricalization employed by Bekker is to that later used by Berio, Bekker fails to attribute anything particularly Jewish to Mahler’s “Tonal universe.” In an earlier passage, however, Bekker posits that there is indeed an element that made Mahler’s view of nature unique and thus distinct from that of the Austrian, Catholic composer Anton Bruckner (1824-1896):


Bekker, a product of the same assimilationist world as Mahler, notes the existence of a Jewish intellectual strain that runs through Mahler’s work and posits that this intellectualism is what marks Mahler’s music as “Jewish.” In identifying the feature that he believes to reveal a Jewish sensibility in Mahler’s music, he, like Berio so many decades later, only proves the existence of a shared set of values and ideas circulating in the German Jewish intellectual community that underlay and expose the existence of a particular and shared German Jewish world view.

Paul Bekker’s identification of a strain of intellectualism that runs through Gustav Mahler’s oeuvre is an interesting point that has been latterly picked up by the

---

52 Paul Bekker, *Gustav Mahlers Sinfonien* (Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1921), 28. “[Mahler’s] orchestra is not a republic, not a sum, no organized multiplicity, that shapes the superiority of will to unity. It is this unity by nature, it is a sound phenomenon from within. It is a tonal cosmos, in which innumerable live impulses unfold, take over, penetrate, and yet each always draws life and strength only from this overall appearance. This cosmic sound comes from the new view of today’s music events that sees it as something actually natural, something elementary, as pure emotional manifestation.” Translation by the author.

53 Ibid., 19. “Mahler went to the symphony with the same naivety of the musical nature as people like Bruckner. But he had an advantage over him: he combined the naivety of an Austrian musician with the thinking, ordering intellect of Jews, and – he already knew Bruckner's work, when he started.” Translation by the author.
musicologist and cultural critic Theodore Adorno. In his highly-influential “Mahler: a Musical Physiognomy,” Adorno discusses many aspects of Mahler’s music and meaning, not limiting himself to discussion of the composer’s “Jewishness” but displaying a magisterial grasp of Gustav Mahler as a totality.\textsuperscript{54} He too, however, recognizes the intellectual impulse that underpins Mahler’s music and marks it as Jewish, writing “what is Jewish in Mahler does not participate directly in the folk element, but speaks through all its mediations as an intellectual voice, something non-sensuous yet perceptible in the totality.”\textsuperscript{55} Adorno, in attributing the basis of Mahler’s Jewishness in the intellectual and “non-sensual” sphere of his music, echoes Paul Bekker’s verdict and sees the composer’s intellectualism as a key feature of his “Jewishness.”

Though Adorno agrees with Bekker in claiming that the element that most clearly cast Mahler and his music as Jewish is the intellectualism of the composer and its manifestation in his art, Adorno would wisely never have gone so far as to cast Mahler as solely a “Jewish composer.” Indeed, Adorno would have been loathe to accept the conclusions of musicologists and cultural critics who have appropriated Mahler for themselves and turned him into a Jewish composer. As he himself noted, “the attempt to deny it [Mahler’s Jewish element] in order to reclaim Mahler for a conception of German music infected by National Socialism is as aberrant as his appropriation as a Jewish nationalist composer.”\textsuperscript{56} In his nuanced understanding of Mahler’s life, music, and significance, Adorno recognizes that the composer is neither fully Jewish nor German; instead, he lies on the peripheries of both spheres, in an overlapping space that has become contested over time.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 149.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
In acknowledging the Jewish elements that appear in Mahler’s music while simultaneously rejecting the labeling of Mahler as a “Jewish composer,” we are, along with the reader, left to wonder how best to characterize Gustav Mahler and his music. And while the idea that the “Jewishness” of Mahler’s music is borne in its intellectuality possesses argumentative strength, pursuing only this line of reasoning discounts another element that is just as important – the natural world. Earlier in the chapter, we noted Otto Klemperer’s idea that Mahler was an anti-dogmatist as well as a deeply spiritual man. While recognizing that Mahler did not seek to find answers to his spiritual questing in either the Judaism of his youth or the Catholicism to which he converted, we failed to provide an answer to where the highly spiritual composer found his answers to spiritual questions. I suggest that Mahler found his answers in nature, a nature that he sought to recreate – and I believe succeeded in recreating – in his music. As is obvious to anybody who has spent any time listening to Mahler’s compositions, the natural world – a world that Mahler considered at once “terrifying, great and also lovely” – plays a significant part in much of his music.\(^{57}\) Mahler’s affection for the natural world bears the imprint of German Romanticism, a connection unsurprising in light of Mahler’s devotion to German culture. However, the connection between Romanticism and its role in dismantling of pre-modern social structures and hierarchies (ironic, in light of Romanticism’s rejection of “modern” French Enlightenment ideals) and granting a space for the growth of a Liberalism which served as the basis for Jewish emancipation has gone unstudied. I would argue that Mahler’s romantic attachment to the natural world is an expression and

\(^{57}\) Julian Johnson, “Mahler and the Idea of Nature,” in Perspectives on Gustav Mahler (Jeremy Barham, ed.), 23-36. Mahler’s quote appears on page 24. In true post-modern academic style, Johnson’s central thesis in this article is that Mahler’s idea of nature in his music is not meant to be a representation of the natural world but a discourse upon it.
reflection of his adherence to a mode of thought that allowed him at once to progress into
the general society that surrounded him as well as to recede from its frustrations and
complexities.58

Echoing Otto Klemperer’s observation that Gustav Mahler was anti-Dogmatic
despite being a highly religious person, we should consider Mahler as a religious person
who, instead of remaining true to any form of organized religion, embraced nature in a
manner that, although never articulated as such, can best be characterized as Pantheistic.
Despite the fact that Pantheism does not strictly play a part in either Christian or Jewish
thought, the idea has played a significant part in both of these religions. St. Francis of
Assisi, for instance, reveled in the natural world. Even more germane to our discussion is
the Judaic understanding of Pantheism, a fact that begins with God’s very creation of the
world.59 The extension of this, that the natural world is a representation and reflection of
God, means that Pantheism – or a retreat into the natural world – bore a strong attraction
to Jews who had rejected traditional religious dogma yet felt a spiritual pull regardless.60

Once he began his professional career, Gustav Mahler had little time during the concert
season itself to dedicate to his first love – composition. Mahler, therefore, spent his
summers at his retreat in the upper Austrian town of Steinbach am Attersee, composing
music that was inspired by the beauty of the natural world that surrounded him. These

58 We shall, for the time being, ignore the irony evident in the exploitation of nature as a means of entry
into the urban modern centres in which those nature-lauding expressions were performed.
59 In a volume written long ago, the Vicar of Otford, Kent John Hunt notes that there were two branches of
Jewish Pantheist thought represented in the writings and philosophy of the Greek Jewish philosopher Philo
(20 BCE-50 CE) and also in Cabbalistic thought. Referring to Cabbalistic thought, Hunt writes “The whole
conceivable universe of being, spiritual and material, is one. It proceeded from One, and the process of this
processions is the subject of the metaphysics of the Cabbala. It shows how all spirits and spirit worlds are
on the one side blended with God, and how on the other they flow out into the visible world, and are
connected with it.” John Hunt, Pantheism and Christianity (London Wm. Isbister, Limited, 1884), 85
60 In his youth, Ernest Bloch, for instance, would also turn to Pantheism as a mode of understanding his
spiritual longing whilst rejecting the dogma of the Jewish faith. Of course, Bloch would in time turn back
towards the Jewish religion. See David Z. Kushner, “Religious Ambiguity in the Life and Works of Ernest
Bloch” http://www.biu.ac.il/hu/mu/min-ad04/BLOCH-1.pdf (accessed Nov 2, 2007)
times – these moments spent in communion with nature – accounted for the happiest moments of his life, representing the times at which his neuroses faded away and he was at peace, having found the answers to the mysteries of life and creation. Mahler’s apostle Heinz Unger bore a similar love of nature throughout his life, seeking out mountaintops, and visiting the Fjords of Norway in his travels. Gustav Mahler and Heinz Unger, two German Jews who bore an ambivalent relationship with Judaism as a religion, felt strong spiritual impulses that were sated in communion with the natural world. And while neither would have defined themselves as Pantheists, their shared love of nature reveals a significant component of their identities, at once German, Jewish and, perhaps just as significantly, Romantic. This serves as another connection between the two men, Mahler the composer and Unger the conductor.

In our previous chapter’s discussion of Jewish music, we noted Philip Bohlman’s fascinating and contentious theory that Israel’s German-speaking Jews – the Yekkes – are an ethnic group unto themselves and that the Central European art music canon serves as that group’s “ethnic music.” In that discussion, we ultimately concluded that, whatever the strengths of Bohlman’s theory, its emphasis on particularity ran counter to German Jewry’s self-understanding. Cognizant of the limitations and contradictions of our discussion herein, I would like to close this chapter by claiming that Mahler and his music stand as one of the greatest expressions of Central European musical Romanticism, a Romanticism of the natural world divorced from modern dogmatism and suffused with a spirit of pantheism that runs counters to any attempts to claim Mahler as a composer of this or that particular group or ideology. That said, the genius of Mahler’s art did not come about despite the conflicts of the period in which he lived but precisely because of
the frissons of the age. Occupying a unique position between and simultaneously in the midst of the particularities of Germanness and Jewishness, Mahler’s music is one of the final expressions of a culture and a world that would soon be engulfed by an anti-Semitic Nazi ideology that attempted to exorcize the Jewish elements that were a vital part of Central European and German culture. Gustav Mahler’s music was therefore not only the last in a long line of musical development to which Unger felt tied; it was also Der Abschied, the strains of a Farewell that viscerally and vitally brought Unger memories of his world, a world in which he actively saw himself not as a German or Jew but as a German Jew, prior to his forced emigration in 1933.
CHAPTER 4

A THOROUGHLY GERMAN YOUTH, EARLY TRIPS TO THE SOVIET UNION, AND AN UNFORTUNATE EXILE (1895-1933)

Musical Motif: Symphony No. 1 in D major. At age 20, Gustav Mahler had only one aim in life: to become a composer. But since the ‘infernal judges’ of his time had decided otherwise, he had to prove his talent in another field. And so, at 20, Mahler threw himself into the profession of orchestral conductor with a seriousness and an ardour bordering on the fanatical. For four years he gave up composing, his activities in the theatre affording him not the slightest respite. He took up the composer’s pen again only by the force of an unhappy love affair. It seemed that love alone, and particularly disappointed love, was the stimulus which, at that time, could induce the young Mahler to ‘find the way back to my true self through composing.’

I. Langsam. Schleppend. Wie ein Naturlaut. [Slow. Dragging. Like a sound of Nature]. Few composers have succeeded in evoking so poetically and with such simple means the romantic magic of nature’s awakening: its birdsongs, its legendary hunting horns and distant fanfares. We can almost see the young Mahler here, as he has described himself—a child, lost interminably in his dreams, all alone, motionless, in the heart of the forest, in a trance, listening to the slightest sound from near or far.

Born to liberal, middle-class parents, Heinz Unger entered this world on December 14, 1895 in the picturesque Berlin suburb of Charlottenburg. His birth certificate, dated December 21, 1895, exhibits no surprises. His parents, Jakub Unger, a lawyer, and Karolina Unger, née Kann are identified as being of the Mosaic faith, an appellation used to convey the Jewish identity of German Jews in a culture wherein the majority of Jews had accepted their status as German citizens whose only difference from the remainder of the populace, at least in theory if not in practice, was their observance of

---

1 Henry-Louis de La Grange, “Symphony No. 1.” In light of the lack of discussion of Mahler’s Symphony No. 1 and the Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen by Heinz Unger, I have selected some of the most authoritative sources to speak in Unger’s stead and characterize the significance of these works as they relate to the conductor’s life. The commentaries utilized to introduce each of this chapter’s sections are by Henry-Louis de La Grange and appear at http://www.andante.com/profiles/Mahler/symph1.cfm. The commentaries for Chapter Two’s Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen are by H.F. Redlich and Deryck Cooke and incorporate lengthy passages from Mahler’s own song texts. The commentaries used in the final three chapters are by Heinz Unger himself.

2 Ibid.

3 LAC. MUS 56, Box 4, File 69.
and identification with a different religion.\textsuperscript{4} Of course, many Jews had long ago lost their explicitly religious affiliation with Judaism but had remained Jewish nevertheless, a reality underscored by the cultural values that they shared as well as the periodic discrimination that they experienced. And while the surname Unger suggests that the family had in all likelihood originally emanated from Hungary, there are no extant sources such as family genealogies to verify this fact. Interestingly, the name that Heinz Unger's mother assumed upon marriage is famous in another regard that prophetically suggests the central role that music would play in Unger's life: legend has it that it was the singer Karolina Unger, one of the quartet of vocal soloists in that evening's performance, who placed her hand upon Ludwig van Beethoven's shoulder and delicately turned the long-deaf composer around at the 1824 Viennese premiere of his 9th Symphony so that he could see the ovation that his new work had received.

Little else is known about Unger's heritage or childhood. Indeed, one of the few other details we know is that a young Heinz was raised as an only child on account of having had a brother pass away at the age of five from a sudden illness shortly before his own birth.\textsuperscript{5} However, since this family tragedy occurred before Heinz Unger's own birth, it is doubtful that this event would have affected him except to have what might have been over-indulgent and over-protective parents. All told, his family life and upbringing seem to have borne all the trappings of a comfortable upper middle-class existence; Heinz Unger's father was a "highly respectable lawyer" and his mother an "accomplished pianist, but not a professional musician," both surely keen on ensuring for their surviving


\textsuperscript{5} Heinz Unger never noted this. The only record of this having occurred is in a letter written by his wife many years later. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12.
child a happy, comfortable home. The family’s ability to achieve this comfort was surely predicated upon the hard work of Heinz Unger’s parents. As Heinz Unger’s future wife, Hella Unger, would put it many years later: “The family background was one of comparative ease and culture. His father was a renowned lawyer with a good income and the family lived in comfortable circumstances.”

A product of a thoroughly mittlestand milieu, Heinz Unger’s childhood was spent in a period during which the great gains that had been made in Jewish emancipation over the course of the 19th century were allowing for an ever-fuller Jewish participation in German life. Even as early as the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, German Jews were allying themselves not with their co-religionists across the border but with their own countrymen. The subsequent unification of Germany under Otto von Bismarck did nothing to reverse this trend, instead marking the moment at which German Jews were finally granted the same legal rights as their countrymen. And while the Dreyfus Affair of the early 1890s had exposed an alarming racialist rhetoric in Germany as well as across Europe, the advancements in social status achieved by Jews went a long way to allaying the fears arising from this event.

Still, the German branch of the racialist rhetoric brought to light during the Dreyfus affair could not entirely be dismissed. In Germany, many nationalist groups, even those whose membership consisted largely of the intelligentsia and students, were markedly racist and displayed an eagerness to blame any perceived social ills on the Jews in their lands. Surprisingly, however, a great many of these nationalist groups included

---

6 LAC, MUS 56, Box 4, File 69.
7 Ibid.
8 Sylvia Cresti, “German and Austrian Jews’ Concept of Nation, Culture and Volk,” in Rainer Liedtke David Rechter, eds. Towards Normality? Acculturation and Modern German Jewry (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 271-290
numerous Jewish (or formerly Jewish) members who saw this rhetoric as part of a perfectly reasonable discourse that correctly interpreted their contemporary circumstances and compelled them to redouble their efforts to become “real” Germans and become an integral part of the Volksgemeinschaft. Moreover, any members of these fraternities who may have been troubled by the aggressive language employed were assuaged by the fact that these groups primarily sought to create a strong national ethos, a goal that many Jews and converted Jews identified with. To go beyond this, and to project onto these groups a position that conflates their outlook with that exhibited during the Nazi period decades later is an ahistorical and teleological line of reasoning that fails to take into account the many other possible directions which Germany could have and indeed did take in the years leading up to the Third Reich.\(^\text{10}\) It would be more correct and certainly more useful, therefore, to discuss not what came after but before – for these nationalist arguments were indeed a blend of numerous strands of 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century intellectual currents, built upon a foundation of Herderian Romantic Nationalism mixed with a healthy dose of racialist discourses of the period.

All that said, Heinz Unger pursued what was a pleasant and, it must be admitted, predictable youth. Surely at his father’s insistence, he had early on embarked upon a course of studies that would lead him towards a career in law. As a youth, he undertook studies at the Mommsengymnasium in the city of Charlottenburg, home to Berlin’s largest surviving royal palace and an independent city until 1920 when it was incorporated into Gross-Berlin (Greater Berlin). As expected of a university-bound son of a respected professional, he completed his Gymnasium studies, obtaining his school-leaving diploma.

\(^{10}\) This is not to say, however, that these positions were entirely distinct or that Nazi ideology was not influenced and informed by the ethnic nationalism of the post-unification period. Whatever the similarities, however, we must still guard against their ahistorical conflation.
in 1914. He then continued his post-secondary education, beginning his legal training at the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universitat of Berlin, continuing on at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universitat in Munich and finally returning to Berlin to complete his studies, obtaining his doctorate in law from Berlin’s Wilhelm II University in October 1917.

According to his own account, however, Unger’s future life course was fundamentally altered by a single event. In November 1915, while a law student in Munich, Unger attended a concert featuring Gustav Mahler’s *Das Lied von der Erde*, conducted by the composer’s close friend and disciple Bruno Walter. That single evening – that single event that could not have lasted more than two short hours – proved to be a rebirth for Unger, the beginning of a new life and the first entry in a personal mythology that Unger would construct and cling to for the rest of his life; as he would often recount, enraptured and swept away by the performance that he witnessed, Unger decided that he did not want to follow in his father’s footsteps and assume the “highly respectable” career as a lawyer that he had been working towards. Instead, he decided there and then to devote his life to music and spread “the gospel of Mahler.”

As could be expected, however, Unger’s impulsive decision to alter his life course was not met with great enthusiasm by his parents. Despite the German Jewish admiration for the arts and for music in particular, music was not seen as a sufficiently secure existence or acceptable choice by the parents of a child who was meant to have become a lawyer just like his father. As his future wife would remember it many years later:

11 LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 23.
12 The information on the universities at which he studied and obtained his legal degree is found in LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 23.
His parents were against their son's decision to become a professional musician. This was not thought of as an “up to the mark” livelihood for the only son of well to do parents.\footnote{LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, file 12.}

The arts in general and music in particular were seen as a fundamental aspect of the Bildung (“self-development”) process that was key in the development of a well-educated citizen, a stage through which one passed as they became a good German but was not deemed a suitable career choice for the only son of a respectable and respected lawyer. The son of a respected lawyer was meant to become a highly-educated professional himself. In short, to become a common musician was not a sufficiently serious occupation.

As a means of compromise and to avoid familial disharmony, therefore, Heinz Unger promised his parents that he would complete his legal studies and only thereafter pursue a course of musical studies, thereby having a stable career to fall back upon if his interest in music did not develop in the manner that he envisioned. But, given Unger’s tremendous enthusiasm, there was little chance that anything would dissuade him from a life in music. Still, Heinz Unger remained true to his word, completing his legal studies and only thereafter beginning his musical studies. However, this was only the case in the strictest sense; even while pursuing his legal studies, Hella Unger points out that “his musical education and studies took up the major part of his time as a student.”\footnote{Ibid.} While in Munich, Heinz Unger approached Bruno Walter and cultivated a friendship that lasted until the very end of Walter’s life many decades later; they would walk together and discuss music, much as Bruno Walter had done with Gustav Mahler himself, years earlier in Vienna.
Heinz Unger's world, then, seemed one of limitless possibilities – he had obtained his degree in law, had discovered a great love of music that he wished to devote his life to, and had a long life to look forward to. Unger, aware of the opportunities that Germany had bestowed upon him, looked for a means to show his appreciation. He would soon get his chance. In the summer of 1914, Europe descended into war after the assassination of Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo heightened tensions that had been building on the continent since at least 1870. Like so many of his Jewish compatriots, Unger joined the German war effort to display his “true loyalty to the German fatherland.” In so doing, he became one of the 100,000 out of a total population of 550,000 Jews in Berlin that joined the army during the First World War. In this endeavour, he must have been affected by the nationalistic furor of the period, an enthusiasm that was reflected by the Central-Verein and the Verband der deutschen Juden that called on German Jews to “devote [their] faith and bravery to the fatherland above and beyond the call of duty [and] rush to the flag!” Eager to prove his worth to the fatherland, Unger served his country heroically, honoured with an Iron Cross for his service with the Brandenburg Battalion in the last two years of war.

As the archives are mute as to Unger’s activities early on, we know nothing of his war experiences or of his observations thereof. It is possible that Unger, like many

---

16 Ibid., 167.
17 Ibid., 166. It should be noted that, while the myth of war enthusiasm has been brought into question by numerous scholars like Roger Chickering, the standard (albeit perhaps overly-simplified trope) is that German Jews were excessively enthusiastic about the war as it provided them with an opportunity to prove themselves as vital, heroic components of the German nation. See: Roger Chickering, “‘War Enthusiasm?’ Public Opinion and the Outbreak of War in 1914,” in *An Improbable War: The Outbreak of World War I and European Political Culture Before 1914* (Holger Afflerbach and David Stevenson, eds.) (Berghahn Books, Ltd., 2007), 200-212.
18 Due to the destruction of the Prussian Army records during the Second World War, there is no way of ascertaining the number of Iron Crosses awarded; guesses put the number in the millions.
German Jews, experienced the low-level anti-Semitism that, by this time, many German Jews were accustomed to. Perhaps, however, he was spared this fate and paid little heed to the systemic anti-Semitism that convinced Germany’s Ministry of War, motivated by the claims and shrill cries of anti-Semitic nationalists, to conduct a headcount (Judenzahlung) to determine whether German Jews were indeed contributing to the war effort in sufficient numbers. Indeed, despite the sour taste that the war experience left in the mouths of many German Jews, there is nothing to suggest that Unger experienced any type of activity that would dent his patriotism or negatively impact upon his German identity. Instead, those early years would mark Heinz Unger as German and contentedly so, his Germanness being an integral component of his identity, no matter how much he traveled, or what he would be forced to leave behind in the volatile years to come.

II. **Kräftig bewegt, doch nicht zu schnell** [Vigorous and lively, but not too fast]. This is undoubtedly the most rustic of all Mahler's Scherzos in Ländler form, but it is also one of the most enjoyable...the shadow of Bruckner can be glimpsed here, no doubt because the Ländler and waltzes come from the same Austrian folklore sources.

Heinz Unger was not Austrian. Rather, he had proven himself German through and through, taking part in German life at school, at university and on the battlefield. Heinz Unger was a living breathing being of his time and place, a young man forging a life true to the movements of his time. Rustic? Not quite. Of the people? Certainly.

His commitments to his parents and his fatherland met, Heinz Unger was finally free to pursue his chosen path and openly work towards beginning his career as a musician. He thus embarked upon the formal musical training that his new vocation required, undertaking a general course of musical studies in Berlin at the famous

---


Stern'sche Conservatory with Wilhelm Klatte and Theodor Schoenberger in theory and Eduard Moerike and Fritz Stiedry in conducting, obtaining a State Music Teacher's Diploma of Prussia.\(^{21}\)

Then, fresh from his musical training, Heinz Unger was ready to make his professional debut. His first conducting experience had come in 1915 when he had successfully led a Berlin-based amateur orchestra in a reading of a part of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony.\(^{22}\) Leading a professional orchestra, and the Berlin Philharmonic no less, before the public and critical eyes was another matter altogether. Despite the enormous pressure that such a situation bore, Unger nevertheless did not choose to mark his debut with an undemanding set of works. Instead, he chose to lead the Berlin Philharmonic in works by his most beloved composer Gustav Mahler, a first concert showcasing Mahler’s First Symphony taking place on 13 September 1919 and a second concert on 19 September 1919 in which he conducted Das Lied von der Erde.\(^{23}\) In these two appearances, Unger immediately proved himself a conductor of great talent and even greater promise. The music critics of the day responded with a series of reviews that

\(^{21}\) Helmut Kallmann, “Heinz Unger” in *Encyclopedia of Music in Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 943. The Stern Conservatory had been founded in 1850 by Julius Stern, Theodor Kullak and Adolf Marx and had assumed the Stern name by which it was to be known in 1856. While there is no way of definitively proving that Unger matriculated from the Stern Conservatory, one can speculate that his studies were undertaken there as all the musicians with which he studied were affiliated with that famous Berlin institution. Further weight is added to this argument by the fact that his own mentor Bruno Walter had studied at the Stern Conservatory and it seems entirely reasonable to hazard a guess that Walter would have encouraged Unger undertake his studies there.

\(^{22}\) Helmut Kallmann, “Heinz Unger,” in *Encyclopedia of Music in Canada*. Unfortunately we have no further details pertaining to this concert; we know neither the particular section performed nor even the orchestra that Unger had led. And despite his taking a further five years to arrange his professional debut, Unger would always cite 1915 as the year for the inception of his career.

\(^{23}\) The companion piece to the first concert was Wagner’s *Faust* Overture while the second concert opened with Gluck’s *Iphigenia in Aulis* Overture. Mention should also be made of the fact that the second concert coincided with what was dubbed as a “Mahler woche” by the popular press, a week in which Unger’s performance of *Das Lied* was accompanied by a performance of Mahler’s Second Symphony led by Unger’s close friend and mentor Bruno Walter. Indeed, Walter’s support could not have but helped Unger secure his first performances with the Berlin Philharmonic. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 51.
revealed a great enthusiasm for Unger’s art. The praise, coming from a full range of newspapers across the political spectrum, spoke glowingly of the young Heinz Unger’s podium debut. Heinz Unger was, from the very beginning of his professional career, seen as a musician who bore the potential to one day rise to be a conductor of the first rank.

The acclaim that met Unger’s first professional engagements came as no surprise to Unger, however; since 1915 he had felt that music was his true calling. Nevertheless, his success must have come as a great relief to himself and his family. The extent of his triumph, moreover, assured him the support of the venerable Berlin Philharmonic, a state of affairs that would lead to a close affiliation with that esteemed organization over the next 13 years. The beginning of the 1920s signaled an ever-closer relationship that led to

---

24 The musicologist Max Chop, writing for the Signale für die Musikalische Welt, noted that the young jurist Heinz Unger (for that is how he was known, and not yet as a conductor per se): "Ein junger Jurist unternahm es, den Befähigungsnachweis als Orchesterdirigent zu erbringen und darzutun, dass die künstlerische Begabung bei ihm eine urkraftig quellende, mit gebieterischer Kraft sich geltenmahnende sei...Jedenfalls ist die akademische Vorschulung eine treffliche Bildungsbasis für eine ganze Reihe ausgezeichneter Musiker geworden. ("A young lawyer undertook to bring proof of his capability to perform as an orchestra conductor, and show that the artistic talent in him is an elemental force swelling with imperious force and applicable... Regardless, this academic preparatory training is an excellent educational base for a range of fine musicians to come."). Translation by the author. Max Chop, “Dr. Heinz Unger,” Signale für die musikalische Welt, 17 September 1919. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 51.

The respected musician, pedagogue and music critic Leopold Schmidt, writing in the Berliner Tageblatt, a newspaper for which he had written since 1897, echoed Chop’s praise for Heinz Unger’s achievement: "Einen jungen Dirigenten, Dr. Heinz Unger, konnte man mit Interesse beobachten. Wie er Die Philharmoniker Wagners Faust Ouverture und Mahlers D-Dur-Sinfonie spielen ließ, zeugte von musikalischer Reife und Gestaltungsvermögen. Und das alles mit den Allüren eines Routiniens und einer selbstbewussten Sicherheit, die beinahe Besorgnis erweckt. Dr. Unger, von Hause aus ein Jurist, soll zum erstenmal ein Orchester leiten. Ist dem so, dann liegt allerdings ein starke Begabung vor. ("One could observe with great interest a young conductor, Dr. Heinz Unger. How he had Wagner’s Philharmonics play the Faust Overture and Mahler’s Symphony in D major, proves his musical maturity and capability to create. And all this with the characteristics of an experienced conductor and self conscious security, which almost gives reason to worry. Dr. Unger, actually a lawyer, is supposed to be conducting an orchestra for the first time. If so, then we found a very strong talent."). Translation by the author. Leopold Schmidt, “Untitled,” Berliner Tageblatt (No.435), 16 September 1919. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 51.
engagements in the Berlin Philharmonic’s *Konzerte des Anbruch* series between 1920 and 1922.\(^{25}\)

Further successes were to come. Even with the constellation of talent assembled in Berlin at the time – a roster that included Wilhelm Furtwängler, Otto Klemperer, and Bruno Walter, among others – Heinz Unger was able to not only eke out a living conducting but to also become an important figure in the Berlin musical world.\(^{26}\) By 1925, Heinz Unger had established himself as a permanent fixture at the Berlin Philharmonic, the orchestra – the Berlin Philharmonic had been formed as an autonomous collective wherein the orchestra’s musicians themselves administered the orchestra’s own activities – having sufficient faith in his abilities and drawing power to devote to Unger an entire concert series. These concerts, established under the auspices of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, began in the year 1925 and remained a fixture of the Berlin Philharmonic’s season until 1933 after which Unger was suspended due to the arrival of a new set of cultural policies and regulations set out by the Nazi regime that assumed power on 30 January 1933.

This, however, is to move too far ahead, for even in the early part of the 1920s Unger was showing signs of developing into a leading musical talent. Central in Unger’s development was his continued allegiance to the works of Gustav Mahler. Following on the heels of his professional debut in Mahler’s First Symphony and *Das Lied von der*...
Erde, Unger's next performances with the Berlin Philharmonic (bar a single excursion into the world of Mozart on 20 March 1920) were of Mahler's Fifth Symphony and the song-cycle *Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen* in a concert held on 29 April 1920. This concert was then followed by a repeat performance of Mahler's Fifth Symphony on 9 September 1920, this time the program also including the *Kindertotenlieder* song cycle.

So great was Unger's devotion to the works of Mahler that he was at once recognized as a pivotal figure in the dissemination of Mahler's music and invited as a special guest to the Mahler-fest held in Amsterdam between May 6-19, 1920, hosted by another of Mahler's disciples, the Dutch conductor and director of the *Concertgebouw Orchestra*, Willem Mengleberg (1871-1951). The Mahler festival represented the first integral cycle of Gustav Mahler's symphonies but it was much more than a series of concerts; it was also a gathering where all the leading figures in the Mahlerian universe (musicologists, musicians and admirers) came together to reflect upon and discuss the meaning of Mahler's art surrounded by the strains of the composer's wondrous yet still largely unfamiliar music. It also represented the first major musical gathering after the cataclysm of the First World War, music critic Oskar Bie noting the special extra-musical significance of the event:

We were intoxicated. Was this still the same bloodstained world? At some point we will all return to our homes, yet we will not forget this moment. When we speak about the war, we who were once enemies experience the same scornful twitch in face and hands. But when we think back to the moment of Amsterdam, our

---

27 In a letter to the Vice-president of the Concertgebouw Orchestra written 5 July 1958 whose purpose it was to see if he might be granted the opportunity of conducting a Mahler work with the Concertgebouw in conjunction with the Mahler centenary of 1960, Heinz Unger writes: “As a very young man I belonged to the officially invited guests of your Mahler Festival of 1920. This honour was bestowed on me because in my very first season of subscription concerts with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra (1919/20) I had the courage to devote all my four programmes to different symphonies of the composer with whose works I am still to-day most closely associated: Gustav Mahler.” LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
eyes light up with that glowing expression through which we understand and unite.\textsuperscript{28}

Unger, we can imagine, breathed deep in this rarified company, feeling honoured to have been invited to such an event and carried away by both the music in which he was enveloped as well as the spirit of peace and universal understanding that figured so prominently at the event.

In the wake of the Mahler-fest, Heinz Unger was buoyed by his recognition as a Mahler specialist, an honour that spurred him on to further triumphs as well as provided the directors of the Berlin Philharmonic with the confidence that their faith in Heinz Unger was not misplaced. Unger was consequently contracted to conduct two further performances of Mahler's works in 1921. The first concert, held on February 11, was a concert devoted to the dark and mysterious Seventh Symphony. The second concert, held on December 2, was an early performance of Mahler's early and hitherto underappreciated work \textit{Das klagende Lied}.\textsuperscript{29}

The reception accorded to Heinz Unger's work in these early years of his career is generally positive, few if any comments reflecting negatively on Unger's musical interpretations of the works he chose to conduct, whether they have been Mahler's compositions or otherwise. Still, it is obvious that Unger's burgeoning directorial career

\textsuperscript{28} Oskar Bie, "A Second Letter from Amsterdam," as quoted in \textit{Mahler and His World} (ed. Karen Painter), pp.367-368. (originally printed in the \textit{Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten}, 25 May 1920). Oskar Bie (1864-1938) was a journalist and newspaper editor who devoted himself to the coverage of the arts. Bie was progressive in his views, the journals that he ran reflecting this position. He was also an early supporter of Gustav Mahler's music. Details on Oskar Bie from \textit{Mahler and his World}, pp.358-59.

\textsuperscript{29} Despite the existence of earlier works, \textit{Klagende Lied} ("Song of Lamentation") was the first work that Mahler recognized and designated as his Opus 1. The work was written between 1878-1880 and revised extensively in the subsequent decades, the composer excising the work's first part of three. Until recently, the work was known in its revised bipartite form. In recent times, the first movement Mahler excised has been reintegrated into the work, making it a more balanced structure. Though no longer a rarity, it was rarely performed for a large part of the 20th century.
was built primarily, explicitly, and even self-consciously on his expertise in the Mahlerian sound-world.

In the midst of all this professional success, another significant event was to occur in Heinz Unger’s life. In October 1923, Unger married his long-time sweetheart and childhood friend Johanna (“Hella”) Wolff.30 There is no evidence to suggest that the wedding between Heinz Unger and the woman who would prove to be his devoted love and life-long partner seems to have been no more than a simple civil ceremony.31 Even if this is the case – and one cannot discount the possibility that the documents that may have proved otherwise could have very well been lost in the family’s flight from Germany that would follow some years later or been destroyed during the Nazi period – such a civil wedding devoid of religious overtones, however, was not unusual by this point in German Jewish history, many German Jews having lost their explicitly religious affiliation. Thus, it should come as no surprise that the wedding of two German Jews might have had only a civic shape and no religious component whatsoever. Still, the very fact that Heinz Unger married a Jewish woman – and one that he had known since his youth – constitutes a marked affiliation with a Jewish culture and milieu, for a great number of German Jews were no longer marrying denominationally and were, instead, choosing to intermarry with non-Jews.

There is every indication that the life of Heinz Unger and his young bride was a comfortable one, at least in the absence of any evidence that financial troubles played a part in their lives. Indeed, it is also safe to hazard such a guess of relative financial

---

30 The state certificate of marriage is signed October 13, 1923. MUS 56, Box 4, File 69. Their marriage would produce one child, a daughter by the name of Ines, born 28 April 1928.
31 This is not to say, however, that a religious union did not occur. Indeed, the documents that may have proved otherwise could have very well been lost in their flight from Germany that would follow some years later or been destroyed during the Nazi period.
stability due to another fact: the Unger family was a two-income family. Heinz Unger, as we know, was a regular conductor in Berlin and, as his career blossomed, abroad. His wife, taking advantage of the new freedoms that the Weimar Constitution afforded to women, had also finished her studies around the time of their marriage, completing her studies and embarking on a career in dentistry.\textsuperscript{32}

Free from financial burdens and deeply in love, Heinz Unger and his young bride lived what seemed to be quite contented lives in the musical capital of Germany, both engaged in regular work that they loved. As the years would prove, theirs was a genuine partnership, a relationship full of love, mutual support, and understanding. This is not to say, however, that they lived a reclusive life, devoid of social interaction. On the contrary, evidence suggests that they had an active social life and a vibrant social network.\textsuperscript{33} The 1920s are remembered as a time of gay socializing, of parties, of celebration and of optimism and the Ungers were not immune to this social trend. On 27 January 1926, Heinz Unger and his wife hosted a benefit at Berlin’s Kaiserhof Hotel – a costume party replete with two jazz bands and a list of eminent list of special guests – to raise funds for the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, the society under whose name Heinz Unger’s regular concerts with the Berlin Philharmonic operated. Whether or not the event was a financial success is not known, nor is it important. What is clear is that the

\textsuperscript{32} According to Hans Joachim Hahn, “the Weimar Constitution placed women’s education on equal footing with that of men.” Hahn also cites the figures for the number of women working in the public sphere in which a university degree was required; “by 1925, women accounted for 100,000 teachers, 2,572 medical doctors, 4,000 dentists, 2,720 pharmacists and 1,000 chemists.” B. Beuys, Familienleben in Deutschland, (Hamburg: Reinbeck, 1980). As cited in: Hans Joachim Hahn, Education and Society in Germany, (Berg Publishers, 1998).

\textsuperscript{33} Unfortunately, the Unger family’s exodus seems to have resulted in the loss of any correspondence from the period. Moreover, since Heinz Unger and his wife lived in close proximity to a great many musicians and friends, it is perfectly understandable that their interaction would not have resulted in a vast inventory of physical correspondence but would have occurred face-to-face. Even then, the many musicians with whom Heinz Unger maintained a relationship in the years to come (Wilhelm Furtwangler, Bruno Walter, Fritz Stiedry, Hugo Strelitzer and Wladimir Vogel and even Oskar Morawetz) seems to indicate that he was part of a vast social network of musicians during his life in Berlin.
event brought many of the leading lights of the Berlin art world together and that Heinz Unger and his wife must have been intimately connected with the Berlin social scene to plan, coordinate and succeed in hosting such an event.\textsuperscript{34} By the middle to latter 1920s, Heinz Unger had seemingly established himself professionally in Berlin and his life seemed full of further promise as his star ascended and shone ever brighter.

III. Feierlich und gemessen, ohne zu schleppen [Solemn and measured, without dragging]. This grotesque Funeral March is certainly the most fascinating movement of the four. Its originality surprises us even today and strikes us as prophetic in many respects. No wonder it upset and scandalised the audiences of the time. The canon ("Frère Jacques" in the minor) is introduced by a double bass solo in its highest register. It is then taken up successively by the bassoon, the cellos, the tuba, then by various instrumental groups. The sounds are 'disguised and camouflaged', just as Mahler wanted them to be. Then everything is interrupted by the entry of the 'Musikanten' (street musicians) who, with their popular refrains and Bohemian glissandi, introduce an element of deliberate 'banality' and 'vulgarity'. Street music, simple and unadorned, intrudes here for the first time in the sacrosanct domain of the symphony. One can easily understand why the guardians of musical propriety were profoundly shocked.\textsuperscript{35}

By the mid 1920s, Heinz Unger had firmly established his reputation in Berlin. Not only had he regularly featured on the podium of the Berlin Philharmonic but he had also expanded his activities to founding and directing the Caecilienchor, an in-house choir that he and others used in concerts requiring greater numbers of voices. Along with his ever-expanding commitments with the Berlin Philharmonic and the Caecilienchor, the enthusiastic young conductor had also begun to travel abroad, conducting concerts

\textsuperscript{34} The special guests and artists at this reception/party included: cellist Max Baldner, the painter Lilli Dreyfuss, Ernst Fritsch, popular actor Alexander Granach (1890-1945, born Jessaja Granach in Austrian Galicia), the painter Franz Heckendorf (1888-1965), painter Willi Jaeckel, painter Anton Kerschbaumer (1885-1931), Jaap Kool, the violinist Alma Moodie, the actor Joseph Plaut (1879-1966), pianist Artur Schnabel and his wife and lieder singer Therese Schnabel (1879-1959), painter Eugen Spiro (1874-1972), and Rose Walter. One cannot help but read meaning into the fact that a great portion of these artists (and presumably friends of the Ungers) were of Jewish descent. In light of Rabbi Gunther Plaut’s [rabbi at Toronto’s Holy Blossom Temple during the 1960s] relationship with Heinz Unger, one cannot help but wonder if their relationship in Canada so many decades later was kindled by a common connection in the Berlin of the 1920s by way of Joseph Plaut. MUS 56, Box 3, File 46.

\textsuperscript{35} Henry-Louis de La Grange, “Symphony No. I.”
across Europe as well as in other parts of Germany. None of these voyages, however, could compare with the simultaneous excitement and trepidation he must have felt when he received an invitation from the cultural State Institute of the Ukraine to conduct a series of concerts in the Ukrainian cities of Kiev, Kharkov, and Odessa. On that first "thirty-six-hour journey from Berlin to Kiev" aboard a train in the dead of winter, Unger noted "the impression I had of travelling into the unknown...neither then nor at any time afterwards could I rid myself of the feeling when travelling eastwards that I was giving myself up to something incalculable."

By 1924, the Russian Revolution that had changed the course of Russian and world history had been long resolved, the horrifically bloody civil war that pitted "Red" supporters of the Revolution against foreign-backed counter-revolutionary "White" forces had come to an end, and Vladimir Ilyich Lenin’s audacious New Economic Policy (NEP) had been in place for three years. The young Soviet Union, however, was far from a prosperous or contented land; on his first walk through the streets of Kiev, Unger witnessed with horror the plodding march of a people beaten down by the hardships of the past decade, a people devoid of life whose funereal tread would not have seemed out of place in the third movement of Mahler’s First Symphony:

What had I seen? A grey mass moving through the town; driven by some invisible force. Could these be human beings? I tried to look into their faces, and shrank back. They had the grey faces of tired, beaten animals, and seemed eyeless -- and yet it was perhaps

---

36 Unfortunately, all record of these travels have been lost and we must be content in knowing that Unger appeared in Vienna during the 1920s, leading the Vienna Symphony Orchestra in Mahler’s Symphony No. 1. Having attained such an important engagement, however, we can quite safely speculate that he had worked elsewhere in Central Europe during the early stages of his career.

37 Heinz Unger, *Hammer, Sickle and Baton* (London: The Cresset Press Ltd., 1939), 3. Heinz Unger’s admittedly subjective memoir of the period is one of the very few sources we have relating to his time in the Soviet Union. For a fuller discussion of the work and its reception at the time of publication, see Chapter 5.

the eyes which were the most tragic feature. They were tired eyes that desired to see no more; they were smileless, joyless. There was nothing human in them.\textsuperscript{39}

Unger’s belief in the spirit of humanity was, within the hour, virtually shattered by this heart-breaking sight and he “fled back to the hotel, vowing never to set foot in the streets again.”\textsuperscript{40}

And yet Unger, despite this most distressing first exposure to the Soviet Union and his distaste for the hypocrisy he witnessed in the supposedly classless system in which only some could buy luxury, would return to the Soviet Union almost annually for the next thirteen years. But how could this be the case? What could convince a man so shaken by his initial experiences to return to a country that he found so viscerally painful? The answer to that question lies in Heinz Unger’s optimistic spirit and his conviction that music could be a truly uplifting experience and that a concert, as “an expression of the human spirit” could bring relief and joy to this mass of downtrodden and miserable people.\textsuperscript{41} Heinz Unger, therefore, felt it his duty as a representative of humanity to bring relief to these joyless people exactly as he felt he had after his second concert in Kiev when he would note how he “felt certain now of the opportunities for art which offered themselves here.”\textsuperscript{42} Like the street music that interposes itself and brings relief to the funeral marchers in Mahler’s First Symphony, Unger felt that he could play a role in helping these people return to life. In total, Heinz Unger conducted a half dozen

\textsuperscript{39} Unger, \textit{Hammer, Sickle and Baton}, 11.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 13.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 33.
concerts in the Ukraine on that first trip – in sum, these were a half dozen opportunities to bring joy to the lives of those downcast Ukrainians he had witnessed in the street.\footnote{43}

In early spring 1926, Heinz Unger would make his second trip to the Soviet Union, this time dividing his time between Leningrad and Moscow.\footnote{44} And on this trip, Unger would have the good fortune of seeing the May Day celebrations, witnessing these seemingly spontaneous expressions firsthand and being swept away by the “genuine enthusiasm” that he thought he had witnessed.\footnote{45} Yet even this – “the first really favourable impression which I received in Russia” – would be spoiled a mere twenty four hours later. Invited to the house of an old Russian musician friend whom he had known in Berlin, he learned that the euphoric scenes he had witnessed – a celebration in which “the entire population seemed to be taking part” – was made “to order.” His friend, a trusted old colleague, explained to him the sinister truth, informing him that “as every institution, great or small, provides its own procession – every factory, hospital theatre, waterworks, and so on – it’s easy enough to check up on those who take part.”\footnote{46} Unger, for the first time overjoyed with the life he thought he had seen in the Russian people, had had his hope dashed:

\footnote{43 The total number of concerts – two in Kiev, presumably two in Kharkov and a further three in Odessa (including a “special” concert held for factory workers at their place of work) – is solely an approximation based on the concerts Unger suggests in his memoir.}
\footnote{44 Boris Schwarz notes that guest artists had begun to appear in the Soviet Union in 1921. By the mid 1920s, this trickle of foreign experts in society – musical or otherwise – had become a flood. “Foreign artists were invited to perform in Russia; often they brought a new repertoire and so provided a new stimulus...Among guest artists who visited the Soviet capitals, orchestral conductors predominated. Most of them belonged to the Austro-German school. Even in Tsarist days, Russia had imported many foreign conductors. Now, after years of isolation and weakened orchestral discipline, the foreign visitors revived vanishing traditions, renewed the repertoire, and brought new excitement to the Russian musical scene. Among the guests were Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer, Pierre Monteux, Hermann Scherchen, and William Steinberg.” Heinz Unger is not mentioned in this context but was one of this wave of Austro-German guests. Boris Schwarz, \textit{Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia, 1917-1970} (London: Barrie & Jenkins Ltd., 1972), 43-44.}
\footnote{45 Unger, \textit{Hammer, Sickle and Baton}, 55-57.}
\footnote{46 Ibid., 59-60. Unfortunately for us but quite astutely, Unger never makes clear who this friend was.}
I shuddered. Something that had appealed to me as a demonstration of organized spontaneity was now proved to be one of organized compulsion, and my companion’s last words hinted at an abyss of fear and suspicion that haunted every citizen in the country. Was this the free land I had fancied?  

Unger’s every attempt to see the Soviet system with optimism and trust was being dashed by what he saw and heard. 

Heinz Unger’s negative impressions were reinforced by the dogma of the day as it pertained to the realm that he loved most dearly – that of music. Here too, Unger was unsettled by the manner in which musical history was being recast and revised to ensure that all music performed would be deemed sufficiently “revolutionary.” True, there were new works – such as Alexander Mosolov’s “Iron Foundry” (1927) and Arthur Honegger’s “Pacific 231” (1923) that easily fit the bill, filled as they were with cacophonous noises befitting of the revolution and modernity – but new music could not alone fill the programs of Soviet orchestras lest audiences stay away from these novelties. Thus, the music of earlier times was seized upon as “being beyond time and politics” and therefore acceptable. The music of “the last half of the last century or so,” however, posed a greater threat and this “forbidden zone of dangerous or bourgeois music” (including the music of Wagner, Brahms, Mendelssohn, Tchaikovsky and Chopin) was initially forbidden until popular outcry forced a reconsideration – and a reformulation – in which the composers of the era were recast as revolutionaries: 

Every epoch had had its open and secret revolutionaries. If this was so, then even the last century, rotten with capitalistic slavery as it was, must have had them...why not seek out the revolutionary spirit in the art of the past, in the works of composers – even in

---

47 Unger, *Hammer, Sickle and Baton*, 60.
48 Heinz Unger mentions these two works as examples of “modern” music. Unger, *Hammer, Sickle and Baton*, 64.
49 Ibid., 66.
their lives? Not a few of these had amazed their contemporaries by introducing new elements into music, that were likely to be understood only by a later generation. Were they not all revolutionaries in the true sense, and therefore worthy to be hailed as heroes of the Soviet Union?\(^{50}\)

Needless to say, Unger was far from pleased by an inventiveness that proved to be an all-too-obvious example of ideological manipulation. Feeling that "politics had encroached on the domain of art" and that this categorically ran counter to his view that art should be free of such political interference, Unger concluded that he could no longer work in such a climate.\(^{51}\) He thus left the Soviet Union after his scheduled six appearances in Leningrad and a further concert in Moscow convinced that he would not return to the USSR again, heading away from the Soviet-Finnish border, and knowing that he was, in his own words, "a rotten individualist."\(^{52}\)

As once before, however, Unger second-guessed himself and decided to return to the Soviet Union. His decision to do so was buoyed by his "surprise and relief that economic recovery and growing political security...were having their effect on the country’s culture" and that as a consequence "political tyranny in matters of art was being relaxed."\(^{53}\) The second half of the 1920s was an immensely rich period in Soviet culture. Inspired in part by the revolution but also by the foreign artists that brought with them new ideas, Soviet artists sought to capture this enthusiasm and wrote original (and often

\(^{50}\) Unger, *Hammer, Sickle and Baton*, 66-7.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., 69.

\(^{52}\) Unger describes himself in this manner on page 81 of *Hammer, Sickle and Baton*. His concerts in Leningrad included Anton Bruckner's Ninth Symphony on at least one occasion and he was asked to repeat that symphony in Moscow but declined on account of limited rehearsal time and opted instead to conduct Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, a work that the musicians in Moscow would have been far more familiar with.

\(^{53}\) Unger, *Hammer, Sickle and Baton*, 85. Of course, we now know that the Soviet Union of the late 1920s and early 1930s were far from a place where great freedoms were allowed. Compared to the repression and culture of fear that was to come in the mid to late 1930s, however, Unger's comments are most certainly close to the mark.
quite adventurous) works that looked expectantly towards a future full of promise. Unger summarized his views on the period by calling it “the most marvelous period I ever experienced in Russia.” Yet even in this effusive praise, a thin vein of criticism can still be perceived. Indeed, Unger conceded that this “golden age” of opportunities applied only to “foreign engineers, architects and artists” whose political creed was paid no heed. All this while the Soviet leaders “had purged away nearly everyone who could not prove that his very grandmother had been in the revolutionary movement.” Apparently, Unger was a “rotten individualist” after all.

No matter, for Heinz Unger was living a Russian life free from political interference and this was for him the most wondrous of times. Unger, displaying what in hindsight strikes us as a tremendous naivete, would even argue that this freedom of artistic expression stemmed directly from Stalin himself:

At a time which proved to be decisive in this thriving period, Stalin is said to have made the momentous remark that his favourite opera was Tchaikovsky’s “Queen of Spades”. The remark was momentous because up to then, as has been said, Tchaikovsky had been regarded as the most bourgeois of composers [...] these words were to become a landmark in the Soviet art policy of those days. They sanctioned a state of affairs which [...] definitely released the Arts from the political bonds which had hitherto imprisoned them. These words meant, in effect, that all music was open to performance.

Heinz Unger’s characterization of this period as one of complete artistic freedom is not, of course, accurate; all sorts of limits were placed on the arts and on life as a whole. Even he would encounter interference later in the summer of 1928. In that

---

54 “Stimulated by the influx of musical ideas, encouraged by the tolerant view of the Soviet government, Russian musicians – composers, conductors, musicologists, and performers – joined forces to explore modern music, both foreign and Russian.” Schwarz, Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia, 45.
55 Unger, Hammer, Sickle and Baton, 92.
56 Ibid., 93.
57 Ibid., 88.
season, Unger returned to the Ukraine to conduct a series of summer concerts in Kiev and Kharkov. At one of these concerts in Kharkov, Unger was asked to reverse the final two movements of Tchaikovsky’s Sixth Symphony (“Pathetique”) so that the concert would not “end with such a destructive and pessimistic slow movement as the lamentable fourth one of this symphony.” The conductor, unwilling to rewrite Tchaikovsky’s work, decided on a compromise:

As for Tchaikovsky’s “Pathetique”... it was of course performed in its proper order, but it had changed its place in the programme, and now came at the beginning instead of at the end of the evening: an arrangement which apparently made it ideologically more digestible.

At this point of his life in the Soviet Union, Heinz Unger was still willing to compromise with the authorities so long as this compromise did not fundamentally run counter to his convictions.

Unger’s positive view of Soviet matters in 1928 – the “Pathetique” episode notwithstanding – helped him decide to return to the Soviet Union the following summer as well. This time, however, his trip took him neither to the cosmopolitan centres of Leningrad or Moscow nor to the more geographically Western Ukraine but to the Azerbaijani capital of Baku. In August 1929, Unger conducted a total of 10 concerts in the space of just over a fortnight. Unger also took the opportunity of visiting Tiflis, Georgia on this trip and came away duly impressed, not by the city but by its people:

I discovered that Tiflis was the only place in whole of the Soviet Union where one could look at one’s fellow-men without being

---

59 Ibid., 99.
60 Unger mentions that eight of these concerts were with “one of the more famous Russian orchestras” but does not indicate which one that might have been. Unger also notes that a further two concerts were held for Baku’s workers. *Unger, Hammer, Sickle and Baton*, pp.105-6, 121-2. In light of the fact that the following year he would return to the region with the Leningrad Philharmonic, it is entirely reasonable to guess that this might have been the orchestra with which he appeared that summer.
repelled by what one saw. Here were no grey masses moving dully along grey streets...Here for the first and only time I saw that I was surrounded by other human beings...Here every face, whether you liked it or not, wore its own personal look; and everyone you met in the street, even the most ragged, appeared to be, if not a personality, at least an individual.\(^\text{61}\)

In this part of the Soviet Union, the air, to say nothing of the streets, was filled with a humanity that had been lost in other parts of the Soviet Union.

It should come as no surprise, therefore, that Heinz Unger expectantly looked forward to the prospect of returning to the Caucasus. In the summer of 1930, Unger was engaged to conduct ten concerts with the Leningrad Philharmonic in Kislovodsk. So pleased had he been with previous year’s trip that Heinz Unger was eager to share this beautiful part of the world with his wife and so she accompanied him, for the first time, on a trip to Russia. What should have been a beautiful trip with his lifelong love soon became memorable in a very different manner altogether; after the fifth of the concerts arranged, Heinz Unger fell terribly ill. A good thing it was then that Unger was accompanied by someone who could take care of him, for he soon discovered that his illness was no ordinary cold but scarlet fever, a disease that had been ravaging the city for weeks and that, in such an underdeveloped part of the world as he was in, bore the distinct possibility of proving fatal. As it was, Unger persevered, not because of the hospital in which he was treated – which he found wonderful, “the wonder being in this case that I left it alive” – but because of his wife’s care and his own “strong constitution.”\(^\text{62}\)

Heinz Unger did in fact survive this ordeal but his bout with the serious illness did not fail to leave its mark. Indeed, scarlet fever may have left him with two very serious

\(^{62}\) Ibid., 143.
conditions that would plague him for the balance of his life. First, it seriously weakened
his heart, leaving him exposed to the heart problems that would manifest themselves later
in his life. Second, it seems to have had the almost catastrophic professional effect of
causing him partial deafness, a serious liability if one's work consisted of creating sonic
landscapes with an orchestra. Nevertheless, Unger persevered and continued his work for
a further three and a half decades, his hearing compromised but his skill in leading an
orchestra more than overcoming any auditory shortcomings. Heinz Unger's devotion to
music was total, and no illness or infirmity would prevent him from doing his life's work.

With great ferocity]. This movement, in sonata form, is the only big dramatic movement
in the symphony. The principal theme, expressing determination, pride and warlike
ardour, is one of those ascending motifs that, in all Mahler's works up to the Lied von der
Erde, appear every time he wishes to suggest aspiration to transcendence and to a higher
order...

The form of this Finale is difficult to grasp at first, but it fascinates us today with its
violent outbursts of conflicting emotions... What is astonishing about this symphony is of
course the novelty of its style and instrumentation, but even more the way it turns its back
on contemporary trends, and in particular the world of Wagner, a composer whom
Mahler idolised, in order to return to the sources of German romanticism, the novels of
Jean-Paul and the tales of Hoffmann as much as the songs of Schubert and the operas of
Weber.63

After his harrowing summer of 1930, Heinz Unger returned to Germany where
other events would soon overtake his own personal difficulties and present an even
greater risk not only to himself but also his family. Seeking to recover from his bout with
illness, Heinz Unger embarked on a pleasure cruise to the Azores, Madeira and the
Canary Islands. On this cruise, he once more met the “well-dressed, educated people” of
the type he felt he had almost forgotten during his dark years in the Soviet Union. Yet

63 Henry-Louis de La Grange, “Symphony No. 1.”
even on this idyllic cruise, Unger felt ill at ease; years later, he would recall how on this voyage he felt that things were changing, that “these glorious days filled me with an instinctive dread that never again should we enjoy such a happy, light-hearted time together.”

Heinz Unger could not have been more correct in his assessment of the changes to come. In the September 1930 Reichstag elections, the National Socialist party, led by Adolf Hitler, won over 100 seats for the first time in the party’s history. Still on board his cruise, Unger’s sense of dread was confirmed when he received word of “the results of some German elections” in which it was announced that “the Nazi Party had gained new seats in the Reichstag, bringing the number to over one hundred.”

Unger’s fellow passengers seemed, in his eyes, rather unconcerned by the results, making “their choice between dream and reality.” Heinz Unger, already alerted to the dangers of extremism and totalitarianism from his time in the Soviet Union, reflected with sadness upon Germany’s new course, at once recognizing that this set of events might signal a significant change for the worse in the direction that his homeland was taking.

The Nazi victory, however, did not have an immediate effect upon Heinz Unger or his career. In his last three years resident in Germany, Unger’s career continued to develop. Often at work at the podium of the Berlin Philharmonic, Unger continued to conduct works both old and new.

---

64 Unger, *Hammer, Sickle and Baton*, 185.
65 Ibid., 186. While Unger does not make clear the exact time of which he is speaking, we know that Unger is referring to the Reichstag elections of 14 September 1930 in which the number of seats won by the Nazi party rose sharply, from 12 seats held to 107.
66 Ibid., 186.
67 Heinz Unger opened the 1930-1931 *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* season on 16 October 1930 with a concert that consisted of Mozart’s Symphony No. 38 (“Prague”) and Gustav Mahler’s *Das Lied von der Erde*. The vocal soloists in the Mahler were Sarah Charles-Cahier (Alto) and, in one of his final appearances, Jacques Urlus (tenor) (1867-1935). Peter Muck’s authoritative source on the history of the
Any events of a musical nature were overshadowed by politics, however. In 1929, the stock market – driven by post WWI optimism and speculation – had crashed, sending shockwaves around the world. The ensuing steps taken by governments around the world – increasing tariffs and pursuing other protectionist initiatives – had brought on a world-wide depression and signaled the beginning of an era – the Great Depression – in which millions were left deprived of their livelihoods, eking out an existence as best they could. Germany was perhaps hardest hit by all this, the German economy virtually coming to a standstill as international loans were recalled and the German economy ground to a halt, leaving millions unemployed. The desperation of Germans exposed a dangerous current of anti-Semitism that had never disappeared but had not resonated during sound economic times. The sharp downturn in the circumstances of the average German, however, left them reeling and looking for both answers and for scapegoats to blame for their problems. The ideals of the Nazi party, once an ideology that truly

Berlin Philharmonic erroneously lists Ms. Cahier simply as Charles Cahier. Peter Muck, *Einhundert Jahre Berliner Philharmonisches Orchester: Darstellung in Dokumenten* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1982), 245. The second concert of the season, meanwhile, included the Berlin premiere of Ernest Bloch’s epic-rhapsody “America.” Muck, *Einhundert Jahre Berliner Philharmonisches Orchester* 245. For whatever reason, Unger’s 1930-31 season with the BPO was limited to two engagements, the other two concerts of his society being led by guest conductors; on 15 January 1931, Igor Stravinsky appeared in a concert that included his suites from *Pulcinella* and the *Firebird* as well as the “eight pieces for small orchestra” while on 19 March 1931 the music director of the Bremen Philharmonic Orchestra Ernst Wendel (1876-1938) led a program that included Richard Strauss’ *Don Juan*, Beethoven’s Fifth Piano Concerto (“Emperor”) and Brahms’ Fourth Symphony. In the following season, Heinz Unger continued his pattern of sprinkling novelties in amongst the more familiar fare on his programs. On 15 October 1931, he led the first concert of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* series, a concert that consisted of J.C. Bach’s *Sinfonia in B*, Beethoven’s *Piano Concerto No.1* (Georg Betram, piano), and Bruckner’s vast and spiritual Eighth Symphony. The second concert of the season, held on 10 December, was a potpourri of sorts, including a series of arias by Bruch (from *Achilleos*) and Verdi (from *Don Carlos*) sung by the redoubtable Sigrid Onegin, orchestral music from Prokofiev’s *Opera The Love of Three Oranges*, Saint-Saens’ *Piano Concerto No.2*, and Tchaikovsky’s *Sixth Symphony*. The novelty on the program was the Berlin premiere of Cesar Franck’s Symphonic Poem for Piano and Orchestra “Les Djinns.” The fourth concert of the season was even more interesting, including Ernst Toch’s “Bunte Suite für Orchester” placed between two war-horses: Brahms’ Violin Concerto (played by Carl Flesch) and Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony. This concert was held on 3 March 1932 and opened with Mozart’s *Maurerische Trauermusik* in honour of the passing of the influential musicologist Walther Schrenk. Ernst Toch (1887-1964) was an important Viennese-born composer who, on account of being Jewish, left Europe after the rise of National Socialism and settled in California where he lived out the balance of his life. All information pertaining to the 1931 concerts is to be found in LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 47.
appealed to only a fringe of the disenfranchised and desperate, now resonated with a
force that must have surely sent chills up and down the spines of all German Jews. In
sum, the economic crises led to a sharp rise in the popularity of the Nazi party, a
popularity that built on a base of anti-Semitic rhetoric that had never disappeared, even as
German Jews – now significantly integrated into the fabric of German life – had ascended
to the heights of political, cultural and intellectual leadership of the Weimar Republic. In
fact, their continued devotion and direction in the liberal Weimar structures worked
against German Jews who could now be singled out by Nazis and other anti-Semites as
having directed Germans towards their misery.

The time was ripe for Adolf Hitler to rise. In the presidential elections held on
March 13, 1932, the incumbent – and ailing – President Hindenburg received the greatest
number of votes (18,651,497 or 49% of the vote). However, his failure to secure an
absolute majority meant that an electoral run-off was required between himself and the
second-place candidate, Adolph Hitler, who had secured over eleven million votes
(11,339,446) or 30% of the total. That run-off occurred on 10 April 1932 and the results
confirmed the results of the first round of the election: Hindenburg obtained 53% of the
vote (19,359,983) and the majority that he required to remain in charge. However, that
election also confirmed the rise of the Nazi party as Germany’s second party: in the run-
off, Hitler built upon his success of the first round and increased his share to 36.8% (or
13,418,547 votes cast outright). Hitler’s popularity signaled the demise of the Weimar
Republic for, as the economic situation worsened and Hindenburg proved unable to
maintain control of Germany, Hitler would be the man to whom the great war legend
Hindenburg would turn to help restore order. Events in the coming months would show
the folly of Hindenburg’s belief that he could control Hitler and exploit him for his own – and for Germany’s – gain; by the beginning of the following year, Hitler had outmaneuvered the aging Hindenburg and swept into the seat of power on 30 January 1933.68

The first month of 1933 marks the commencement of what was supposed to be Hitler’s thousand year Reich. It also marks the midpoint of Heinz Unger’s final season with the Berlin Philharmonic, the beginning of his last year resident in the country of his birth and a most ironic twist of musical fate; on the first day of 1933, the German Jewish conductor Heinz Unger led the Berlin Philharmonic in a New Year’s day concert of arias by Hitler’s favourite composer Richard Wagner, sung by another Jewish musician, the Bass Wilhelm Guttmann.69 Indeed, the 1932-33 season was to be a significant one for the conductor, not only recognizable in hindsight but also at the time; Unger’s final Berlin season had begun with a rousing all-Mahler concert consisting of three orchestral songs and ending with Mahler’s final completed symphonic statement, his Ninth Symphony.70

68 According to a German Bundestag study conducted in March 2006, “the NSDAP emerged as the strongest party [in the elections of 31 July and 6 November] with 37 4% (230 seats) and 33 1% (196 seats) respectively. In the July election it [the NSDAP] sent shock waves reverberating through the political landscape by more than doubling its number of votes, its relatively small loss of 4 3 percentage points in the November election did little to blunt the impact of the July vote.” Administration of the German Bundestag, Research Section WD1, “Elections in the Weimar Republic,” (March 2006), 2 http://www.bundestag.de/htdocs_e/artandhistory/history/factsheets/elections_weimar_republic.pdf (accessed November 2, 2009) The discrepancies between the dates and numbers is accounted for by the “much-debated dual system whereby both the Reichstag and the Reich President were elected by direct popular vote.” Detlev J K. Peukert (Richard Deveson, trans.), The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity (New York: Hill and Wang, 1987), 38 Nevertheless, the numbers are all presented in Peukert’s magisterial account of the Weimar Republic, pp 262-268.

69 According to Michael Kater, Wilhelm Guttmann was one of the last Jewish-German musicians working in the Third Reich, dying during a concert in Berlin in 1941. Michael Kater, The Twisted Muse: Musicians and their Music in the Third Reich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 100

70 The three orchestral songs were “Revelge,” Ich bin der Welt abhanden gekommen,” and “Um Mitternacht.” The soloist was baritone Alexander Kipnis. The concert was held on 13 October, 1932 MUS 56, Box 3, File 47. This concert also represents the last time that Unger would conduct Mahler on
On March 2, 1933, Unger conducted what would be his farewell concert with the Berlin Philharmonic. On this occasion, three works were performed. The middle work on the program was Weber’s Konzertstück No. 1. Bracketing this composition were two works that, with the benefit of hindsight, leap out as greatly ironic or fitting; the concert began with the Jewish-Austrian composer Arnold Schoenberg’s *Pelleas und Melisande* while the concert ended with two pieces by Richard Strauss – *Burleske* and *Till Eulenspiegel’s Lustige Streiche* – a composer who would be intimately linked with the Nazi regime in the coming two decades. Moreover, the programming of *Till Eulenspiegel* – a work wherein an impish character mocks the pretensions of those around him and thereby erodes their authority – takes on an extra meaning in light of the events swirling about Germany and Unger at the time. True, Unger may not have meant anything by it at the time, but we can only wonder how much he may have identified with the title character of the piece.

And so ended Heinz Unger’s time in Germany. With the rising Nazi influence on Germany and with the coming apocalypse written in very clear language for all to see, Unger gathered his family and left Germany, the country in which he had been born and raised, the country that he had served, respected and loved. The country that betrayed him and all those like him. The future for Unger lay not in Germany, but in England, in Spain, in Canada, and beyond.

---

German soil for over two decades and one of the last examples of a German performance of Mahler’s music before Nazi prohibitions against this “non-Aryan” composer would come into force.
CHAPTER 5

EUROPEAN EXODUS (USSR, ENGLAND, SPAIN, AND THE WORLD, 1933-1954)

Musical Motif: Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen (Songs of a Wayfarer). *Both [the Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen and Symphony No. 1] vividly reflect youthful passions and the first collision with the traditional inertia of the 'world of yesterday'; both are autobiographical and programmatic...both create a new musical idiom out of the elements of discarded romantic conventions; both are inspired by a new conception of folky tunefulness...Mahler’s ‘Fahrender Gesell’ is a near relation of Wilhelm Muller’s melancholy hero in Die Winterreise. In both cases the unhappy lover is being jilted by his sweetheart, whose marriage to another man plunges him into despair and whose ‘blue eyes’ send him out on the road.*

I. “Wenn mein Schatz Hochzeit macht” (“When My Darling Has Her Wedding”)

Wenn mein Schatz Hochzeit macht,
frohliche Hochzeit macht,
ahb’ ich meinen traurigen Tag!
Geh’ ich in mein Kammerlein,
dunkles Kammerlein,
Weine! Wein’!
Um meinen lieben Schatz!
...

Singet nicht! Bluhet nicht!
Lenz ist ja vorbei!
Alles Singen ist nun aus!
Des Abends, wenn ich schlafen geh’,
Denk’ ich an mein Leide!
An mein Leide!

When my love becomes a bride,
becomes a happy bride,
that will be my saddest day.
I’ll go into my little room,
gloomy little room,
weeping, weeping for my love,
for my dear love.
...

Do not sing, do not bloom;
spring is dead and gone.
Singing’s done for ever now.
At evening, when I go to sleep,

---

I'll think upon my sorrow,
upon my sorrow.2

The year is 1933. On 30 January 1933, Germany was wedded to the new German Reich – a marriage intended to last a thousand years. Heinz Unger, German but also Jewish, had been suspended from Germany’s musical association – the Reichsmusikkammer – and forced to abandon his work in the advancement of German culture and quit his native land. His hollow optimism aside – as he would quip, “political developments in my home country unexpectedly provided me with considerable spare time in 1933” – Unger was left homeless and without direction, a jilted lover become a wanderer in a world turned upside down.3

Invited to conduct a series of summer concerts in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and Baku (Azerbaijan), he therefore accepted the offer, but only after considering it carefully and deciding that it provided him the “splendid opportunity of surveying artistic conditions in Soviet Russia as a whole, and of learning something of what had been accomplished there during the two years which had passed since I had last seen it.”4 Of course, what Unger failed to note is that this invitation also meant an opportunity to work after having lost his main source of income with his suspension from German’s Reichsmusikkammer and his forced exodus from his Berlin home and beloved Berlin Philharmonic.


---

3 Unger, Hammer, Sickle and Baton, 187.
4 Ibid.
“Russia [that] had become... a very remote place” in the three years that had elapsed since his last visit – came at a time when a new level of artistic freedom had been attained. Unger would go on to describe this two month long tour as “the most agreeable surprise in every respect which I experienced in all the years of my work in that country,” a positive experience that erased, at least for the time-being, many of the setbacks and disappointments he had experienced in earlier years.

At the end of this successful tour, Heinz Unger was offered not one but three permanent offers of employment simultaneously: a position as Musical Director of the State Opera in Tiflis, as conductor of the Radio Orchestra in Kiev, and conductor and music-master of the newly-founded Leningrad Radio Orchestra. If these offers had come in the years of Unger’s disillusionment with the Soviet Union or at a time when he could have returned to Germany, perhaps he would not have undertaken the task. Coming as they did at a time when he was no longer able to work in Germany and in the wake of a highly satisfactory trip to the Soviet Union, he decided that here were opportunities that surely deserved to be explored. After careful deliberation, he decided on the position with the Leningrad Radio Orchestra – “the least interesting of the posts offered” – because “the international situation being what it then was, it seemed to me

---

5 In a detailed discussion of the period, Boris Schwarz describes the climate and debates of the time, noting the pleasure with which these developments were greeted by those working in the field of music. Nevertheless, Schwarz points out that the abandonment of musical modernism led to “a general retreat into rose-coloured ‘realism’” that in turn resulted in a “plateau of safe conservatism” that reflected the “new respectability” of Soviet life in the first half of the 1930s. Boris Schwarz, Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia, 1917-1970, pp. 109-116. Heinz Unger’s quote appears on p.186 of Hammer, Sickle and Baton.

6 Unger, Hammer, Sickle and Baton, 188.

7 Ibid., 189. The Leningrad Radio Orchestra had been founded as recently as 1931 and was a vital organ of musical culture for the remainder of the century until the present day. Its highlight was the premiere of Dmitry Shostakovich’s Seventh Symphony (“Leningrad”), debuted on 9 August 1942 while the city was under German siege. After WWII, the activities of the orchestra were merged with those of the Leningrad Philharmonia. In the post-Communist period, the symphony society of Leningrad was renamed the St. Petersburg Symphony Orchestra and remains to this day one of the most important and well-respected ensembles in the world of music.
better to be as near a western frontier as possible, so that in the case of any emergency it
would be easier for me to rejoin my family, who had just made their home in England."
Once he had accepted the post, Unger became aware of the correctness of his decision.
Not only was he given the opportunity of overseeing the growth of a new orchestra, but
he was also conscripted into work with a number of other local organizations including
the Leningrad State Choir, the Opera-Studio section of the Leningrad Conservatoire, and
the Leningrad Philharmonic. In sum, the variety of work that Unger undertook soon
washed away any lack of enthusiasm that he had initially felt for the position offered him.

Ironically, the one area in which he was under-worked at the beginning of his
tenure in Leningrad was with the Radio Orchestra itself, the institution that had been the
impetus for his move to Leningrad in the first place. The reason for this amusing – if not
totally surreal – eventuality stemmed from a telling example of bureaucratic disorder in
which the orchestra had been created before any consideration had been given to where it
might perform. The orchestra therefore had no concert hall of its own in which to stage
performances! Heinz Unger consequently had to wait eighteen months to conduct his
Leningrad Radio Orchestra in its first public concert, and that performance was in fact
held “not in their own hall, but rather in that of one of the other Leningrad institutions.”

9 Ibid., 191. Unger mentions that there was more than enough work to go around for the many conductors
working in the city, including the Austrian Fritz Stiedry (1883-1968), the German Jewish Oskar Fried
(1871-1941) and a great many Russian conductors. Boris Schwarz confirms Unger’s verdict, even noting
10 Unger, *Hammer, Sickle and Baton*, 194. Unger suggests that the reason for the delay in the Leningrad
Radio Orchestra’s first public concert under his direction was “jealousy between institutions of the same
communist state.” In time, he came to understand who in fact was behind blocking the development of the
Radio Orchestra: “I learned that it was my old friends of the Leningrad Philharmonic Orchestra who were
doing all they could to prevent certain halls being at the disposal of the Radio Direction for public
The hurdles the conductor faced in trying to develop the Leningrad Radio Orchestra did not, however, prevent him from filling his schedule with wide-ranging and meaningful work. Indeed, his time in Leningrad proved a fertile artistic period in which Unger took great joy:

At that time I was conducting on average about ten times a month in the different Leningrad institutions, and whatever the difficulties to be overcome, was not the mere fact of these ten nights a thing to rejoice at? Whatever the stupidity and the prejudice which I might have to fight, every time I lifted my baton I was nearer to fulfilment. To have arrived at last to conducting for the masses almost everything, from Bach’s “Matthew Passion” to Beethoven’s “Ninth Symphony”, from Mozart to Mahler, from Berlioz to Strauss, and from Scriabin to Delius was something of a triumph; and at last I had achieved the state of mind in which I could hope to make my work a lasting success.1

Heinz Unger’s happiness did not last long, however. In 1936, the artistic climate in the Soviet Union markedly changed course after Stalin attended a performance of Dmitri Shostakovich’s opera Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk.2 Scandalized by the theatrical goings on (including an on-stage violation of the lead heroine and her ultimate demise as she throws herself into a river) and the music written to express events, Stalin walked out of the performance and shortly thereafter an article appeared in Pravda that not only

---

1 Unger, Hammer, Sickle and Baton, 215. A part of that joy must have come from playing a part in the Russian discovery of Mahler’s music. As Inna Barsova notes, “throughout the decade [1920s] and the 1930s, Mahler’s symphonies and songs were performed in Leningrad and (less frequently) Moscow by Heinz Unger, Fritz Stiedry, Hans Steinberg, Albert Coates, Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer, Alexander Zemlinsky, Joseph Rosenstock, Vaclav Talich, Eugen Szenkar and Jascha Horenstein, and by such Soviet conductors as Aleksander Gauk, Karl Eliasberg, Natan Rakhlin, Nikolay Rabinovich, and Evgeny Mravinsky. Inna Barsova, “Mahler and Russia,” in The Mahler Companion, ed. Donald Mitchell and Andrew Nicholson, pp.517-530. The quote is from p. 526, Barsova citing the original source of the information as Sollertinsky’s “Khronograf ispol’neniya proizvedeniy Malera i Bruknera v SSSR,” in Pamyati I.I. Sollertinskogo, vospominaniya, materialy, issledovaniya, ed. Ludmila Mikheyeva (Leningrad and Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1974), 232-4. In light of the dearth of information pertaining to Heinz Unger’s years in the Soviet Union, this passage accounts for the only list — albeit undetailed — of Unger’s repertoire during this period.

2 Lady Mcbeth of Mtsensk was triumphantly premiered in Leningrad on 22 January 1934 and, according to Schwarz, “was hailed as a great achievement of Soviet culture.” Boris Schwarz, Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia, 1917-1970, 119. For a fuller discussion of the opera, see Schwarz, pp.119-32.
signalled the end of the opera’s run and would result in a harrowing period of terror for the composer but also brought into question what kind of music best reflected Soviet ideology. The answer, as it turned out, was music that was written in an idiom that would be easily grasped by Soviet concert-goers. Unger neatly summarized the new dictates as a “war against modernity.”

This war was not waged on the artistic level alone, however. The war against “modernity” in music (it really was, more precisely, a campaign against modernism) was only a part of a general campaign of Stalinist repression following the December 1, 1934 assassination of the Leningrad Communist Party leader Sergei Kirov. Kirov’s assassination launched a chain of events that would result in a series of purges that ravaged Soviet society and brought with it fear, paranoia, terror, all culminating in a state philosophy of Soviet nationalism that was both aggressive and xenophobic in nature.

Heinz Unger had already encountered such a climate once before, in Nazi Germany. Indeed, in his memoirs Unger was not shy in pointing out the similarities he

---

13 The article that appeared in Pravda was entitled “Chaos instead of Music.” To this day, we are unsure of the author of this attack on Shostakovich, though it is often claimed that Stalin had a large part in the composition of the work. Schwarz notes: “[The] article [was] unsigned which gave [it] the standing of official policy pronouncements, and it was revealed in 1948 that [it] was written on instructions from the Party’s Central Committee. Whether Stalin personally was involved in giving these instructions, whether Zhdanov was the actual author of the articles, cannot be ascertained though these facts were widely rumoured.” Boris Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia, 1917-1970*, 122.

14 Unger, *Hammer, Sickle and Baton*, 225. Echoing Unger’s position, Boris Schwarz provides us with information on Stalin’s preferences in the realm of opera, noting that Stalin’s requisites for a “good” Soviet opera were “a libretto with a Socialist topic, a realistic musical language with stress on a national idiom, and a positive hero typifying the new Socialist era.” Boris Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia, 1917-1970*, 123. Needless to say, Shostakovich’s *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* met none of those requirements.

saw in these ideologically-opposed yet equally aggressive, repressive, and dangerous regimes:

At first one heard phrases which reminded one of the Germany of 1933...Whereas the Nazis had turned such slogans as these upon people who had been their fellow-citizens, the Soviets used them against the thousands of foreign experts from all over the world, who were now working in their country. Years ago they had travelled miles to seek them out. Glowing promises had been made to induce engineers, artists, architects, etc., to help to build up a new civilisation and a new culture for Russia. These times were now over.¹⁶

Unger knew well where the type of rhetoric and the resulting prohibitions of the time would lead. Having seen what had become of his German homeland, he was highly sensitive to pronouncements of excessive nationalist pride and also well aware of the infringements of his freedom on both the artistic and personal level that he had already faced and would continue to face were he to remain in the Soviet Union. By 1937, Unger had become disillusioned by a political system that brought with it a terror that turned its citizenry into a duplicitous, terrified masse of non-humanity. Having lost his patience with this system, Unger was transformed into a ticking time-bomb, ready to explode at the slightest affront. The inevitable explosion came one day as he entered the hall of the Radio building in which he had worked for years and where, despite familiarity, the guards continued to insist upon following a protocol he felt dehumanized him, a protocol by which Unger felt "increasingly humiliated" and a "human being no longer."¹⁷ On a day like any other, Heinz Unger finally rejected this useless, choreographed ritual,

¹⁷ Ibid., 267.
entering into a physical confrontation with a guard “as if he were the personification of all the stupidity against which I had striven for thirteen years.”

Heinz Unger’s outburst at the Leningrad Radio building signalled the end of his relationship with the Leningrad Radio Orchestra and the Soviet Union. Near the end of April 1937, the conductor was still carrying a contract for a series of approximately twenty summer concerts in Moscow, Baku, Kislovodsk and Sochi. Unger, however, had seen enough, deciding that he did not wish to return to the Soviet Union. Thus, when reunited with his family in England a few weeks later he “learned that the Soviets had refused [him] a visa to return to their country,” he was not remotely upset by the news. Instead, he was relieved that his years of surreal oversights, of absurd, politically-motivated prohibitions, and harrowing ordeals at the hands of the Soviet government and cultural institutions were at an end and that he would not be obliged to return to the Soviet Union. A chapter in Heinz Unger’s life, at once both rewarding and frustrating, had come to an end.

II. “Ging heut’ Morgen uber’s Feld” (“I Walked Across the Fields This Morning”)
Surely one of the most remarkable passages of No. 2...is the delightful tone-painting reflecting the wayfarer’s fleeting pleasure on passing through a meadow sparkling with the dewdrops of early morning.

After his exile from Germany in 1933, Heinz Unger had settled with his family in England, choosing London as his new home. For the next four years, however, Unger would spend considerable amounts of time in the Soviet Union, deeply immersed in the music scene in Leningrad and beyond. The end of his time in the USSR in 1937 must

---

18 Unger, Hammer, Sickle and Baton, 268.
19 Ibid., 271.
20 Ibid., 273.
21 H. F. Redlich, Bruckner and Mahler, 179.
have brought with it both sadness that this period in his life and career had ended so poorly as well as the relief of not having to return to a country that had brought him such tremendous stress.

But what was the conductor to do now? Exiled from his native Germany and barred now also from the Soviet Union, Heinz Unger had to once again rebuild his career in a new country. A new land and a new set of opportunities opened up before him, surely bringing with it great excitement as well as the anxiety of beginning anew. Like the young Wanderer in Mahler’s *Lieder des fahrenden Gesellen*, Unger travelled across the landscape and arrived at a country free from the oppressive weight of his recent experience:

Auch die Glockenblum’ am Feld
hat mir lustig, guter Ding’,
mit den Glockchen, klinge, kling,
ihren Morgengruss geschellt:
“Wird’s nicht eine schöne Welt!? 
Kling, kling! Schones ding!
Wie mir dich die Welt gefällt!
Heia!

And the harebells in the field
told me merry, cheerful things,
with their bells, a-ting-a-ling,
rang their morning greeting out:
‘Won’t it be a lovely day?
Ting! Ting! Lovely thing!
O but how I love the world!
Hola!’

Heinz Unger’s first engagements in England proved to be the first tentative steps in a successful relationship that would last until his move to Canada following the Second World War. On November 21, 1936, Unger conducted his first concert with the Northern

---

Philharmonic Orchestra in an evening of standard symphonic fare. Unger’s debut with the Northern Philharmonic put him in elite company; in that same season, the balance of the Northern Philharmonic’s Saturday concerts were conducted by the notable British conductors John Barbirolli, Sir Hamilton Harty and Malcolm Sargent. And then, fresh from a debut success with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, Unger returned to England to conduct a second NPO concert in January of 1938 in which he “renewed the excellent impression made on his previous visit early last season.”

The favourable impression made by Unger in his first concerts with the Northern Philharmonic Orchestra virtually guaranteed that he would be a frequent guest with the orchestra. So fruitful and popular did the partnership prove that by 1940 Unger had become the orchestra’s principal conductor and music-director, even going so far as to conduct all of the orchestra’s concerts in 1944. In the space of six years, Unger had become one of Britain’s pre-eminent conductors and cultural luminaries. As had been the

---

23 The concert consisted of Mozart’s Symphony No.35 (K.385), Edouard Lalo’s Symphonie Espagnole, for Violin and Orchestra, the Polka and Fugue from Jaromir Weinberger’s opera Schwanda the Bagpiper, a series of violin solos performed by the guest soloist Samuel Dushkin, and Tchaikovsky’s Fourth Symphony. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 48. The Northern Philharmonic Orchestra was an orchestra based in Leeds that had been created in 1935, having changed its name from the Leeds Symphony Orchestra (est. 1908) in that year. Due to artistic discontinuities, the Northern Philharmonic Orchestra was disbanded after the Second World War and reconstituted in 1978 as the English Northern Philharmonia. It continues to function today as the Orchestra of Opera North.

24 John Barbirolli (1899-1970) was one of the eminent British conductors of the twentieth century. He was conductor of the New York Philharmonic between 1937-1942 and then assumed command of the Halle Orchestra (Manchester) which he led between 1942 and 1970. Sir Hamilton Harty (1879-1941) was a British conductor and composer who held the post of conductor of the Halle Orchestra from 1920 to 1933. He was knighted in 1925 and had long career conducting in England and abroad. Malcolm Sargent (1895-1967) is also one of the most renowned British conductors of the 20th century, having worked with all of England’s major orchestras during his career. He became conductor of the famous Proms concerts, serving in that capacity between 1948 and 1967.

25 The repertoire for the January 28 concert was wide-ranging, comprising: Schubert’s “Italian” Overture, Liszt’s Piano Concerto No. 1, Beethoven’s Symphony No. 7, the Mahler-completed Entr’acte from Weber’s Opera Die Drei Pintos, a selection of piano solos performed by the guest soloist Cyril Smith, and ending with Bizet’s L’Arlesienne Suite No. 2. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. The praise for Unger’s conducting comes from the uncredited Yorkshire Post article “The Northern Orchestra,” The Yorkshire Post, January 24, 1938. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. For details pertaining to the TSO concert, see Chapter 6.
case in Germany and the Soviet Union earlier on, Unger’s artistic talent would lead him to success in his adopted English home.

As the war years loomed, however, much remained to be done before Unger would become a recognized star in Britain. Nevertheless, securing his position as part of Britain’s cultural landscape, a task that called for what would prove to be both arduous and rewarding work, was suggested early on by a commonality of liberal views between himself and the English; Unger’s denunciation of the Soviet system in his memoir of life in Soviet Russia *Hammer, Sickle and Baton* (published 1939) was well-received in Britain.²⁶ The views expressed in his book signalled Unger’s status as a proponent of liberal values and an enemy of authoritarian regimes such as those that had arisen in Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia and that had gone on to formalize their relationship in the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact that very year – a step that took the USSR out of the British camp and positioned them as a potential adversary in the coming apocalypse in which Britain would be so soon involved. Heinz Unger’s opinions and world view, albeit those not of a Briton but of a German Jew only settled by circumstance in England, were synchronous with the British cultural climate of the time, quickly transforming into a mutual understanding that could only help to solidify his place in the British artistic world of the period.

At the same time, *Hammer, Sickle and Baton* resonated in corners of the Jewish world. Amongst the attention that the book garnered in England was a review of the

²⁶ The *Times London* noted that “[o]ne sometimes suspects him of verbal exaggeration, but the bitterness of his criticisms is not difficult to understand” while the critic for the *Daily Telegraph* called *Hammer, Sickle and Baton* “an excellent book, well-written, humorous and truthful, [that] cannot fail to delight all who have not sold their birthright for a mess of ideology.” “Music Since the Revolution,” *The Times London Literary Supplement*, 22 July 1939. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. “Musician in Russia,” *The Daily Telegraph*, 16 May 1939. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. The book was reviewed by nearly every major and minor newspaper across England.
work by the *Judische Welt-Rundschau*. In this review, the contributor’s interest was piqued by the travails of the “Jewish Conductor” Heinz Unger in his contest with Soviet authorities over musical ideology and lay particular emphasis upon Unger’s battles on behalf of Gustav Mahler’s music. The writer then closed his review by asking for Unger to present Mahler’s music in Palestine: “Es ware gut, Unger in Palestina, dessen Menschen ganz geöffnet für die seelische Welt Mahlers sind, Mahler spielen zu hören.” Clearly, Unger’s battles for the acceptance of Mahler meant a great deal to Jews other than himself and also revealed a mutual outlook on the Jewish significance of Gustav Mahler’s music.

III. “Ich hab’ ein gluhend Messer” (“I Have a Glowing Knife”)

Ich hab’ ein gluhend Messer,
ein Messer in meiner Brust,
O weh! O weh! Das Schneid’t so tief
In jede Freud’ und jede Lust,
so tief! so tief!
Es schneid’t so weh und tief!

Ach, was ist das für ein boser Gast!
Nimmer halt er Ruh’,
nimmer halt er Rast!
Nicht bei Tag,
nicht bei Nacht, wenn ich schlief!
O weh! O weh! O weh!

I have a red-hot knife,
A knife in my breast.

---

27 The *Judische Welt-Rundschau* was the successor to the *Judische Rundschau*, the official weekly of the *Zionistische Verein für Deutschland* that had been published between 1897 and 1938. Suspended by official Gestapo order after *Kristallnacht*, the newspaper was reorganized as the *Judische Welt-Rundschau* and was published in Paris and printed in Tel-Aviv for a short time before suspending operations. See: Abraham J. Edelheit, Hershel Edelheit, *A History of the Holocaust: A Handbook and Dictionary* (Westview Press, 1994), 378.

28 “It would be good to listen to Unger in Palestine, whose people are completely open to Mahler’s soulful world.” Translation by the author. “Ein Dirigent in Russland,” *Judische Welt-Rundschau*, June 23, 1939. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74.
Woe’s me! Woe’s me!
It cuts so deep
into every joy and every bliss,
so deep! so deep!
It cuts so sharp and deep!

Ah what a cruel guest is this!
Never grants me peace,
ever grants me rest!
Not by day,
not by night, when I’d sleep.
Woe’s me! Woe’s me! Woe’s me! 29

In the fall of 1939, Europe descended into war for the second time in the century. For the next 6 years, Europe and the rest of the world were plunged into a conflict that would destroy millions of lives and snuff out the lives of both young and old. The event which triggered this apocalypse was Nazi Germany’s invasion of Poland in September 1939. The invasion of Poland was the “red-hot knife” that plunged into Europe’s breast and launched the world into the despair that Hitler’s aggressive foreign policy had ominously been pointing to for many months and years.

Despite being German, Heinz Unger bore no sympathy for the Nazi leadership or its aggressive foreign policy. Having been a target of Nazi discriminatory policy beginning in 1933, Unger very well knew the extent of Hitler’s ambitions and the dangers that they posed. 30 And while he seldom if ever spoke out about the war, it is clear from his later writings that he considered Nazi Germany an abomination, a monstrosity thrust upon the “real” Germany. In 1965, just weeks before his untimely death, he would speak of this period as “those years of darkness,” a period during which:

29 Text and translation from: Deryck Cooke, Gustav Mahler: An Introduction to his Music, 32.
30 Having left Germany early on, Unger did not experience first-hand the majority of the repressive measures passed by the Nazis against Jewish Germans. Nevertheless, having family and friends remaining there would have allowed him to keep abreast of the negative developments taking place.
those who held power temporarily in the country which I, like
generations of my ancestors, had considered home, deprived me on
account of my race of the right to continue in my profession, and
when I, to escape worse, left the country with my family. Every tie
broke in those evil years.\footnote{Heinz Unger’s acceptance speech
upon being awarded the West German Commander’s Cross, January 1965. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16. For a fuller discussion of the event itself, see Chapter 8.}
Unger clearly saw this period as an aberration, a break from both the pre-war and post-
war Germanies that was entirely devoid of legitimacy. Indeed, Heinz Unger was so
angered and disgusted with Nazi Germany that he refused to speak the German language
during the war years.

Heinz Unger displayed his sympathies not only in speech but also by way of his
professional activities, helping those most acutely affected by the war as best he could.
In the winter of 1940, Heinz Unger formed the West London Amateur Orchestra, an
orchestra of some 40 or so musicians that was, according to The Synagogue Review,
“composed of a majority of German Jewish Kulturbund workers, talented refugee
amateurs and a few English music students.”\footnote{S.F.C.H. [contributor’s true identity unknown], “The West London Amateur Orchestra,” The Synagogue Review, August, 1940. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. According to the Edinburgh Evening News, the West London Amateur Orchestra was “[a]n amateur orchestra, formed from among the most famous musicians of Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia, who are now refugees in Great Britain.” This may have been a case of hyperbole, perhaps on the part of Unger himself. “Exiled Musicians,” Edinburgh Evening News, Winter 1940 (exact date unknown). LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74.}
The orchestra, which held its rehearsals
every Tuesday at the West London Synagogue’s Stern Hall, held at least three concerts in
its short-lived existence.\footnote{The West London Synagogue was founded in 1840 and was Britain’s oldest Reform Synagogue.}
The first of these concerts, held on 28 January 1940, was a
concert in which £6 6s. 4d. was raised for the West London Hospitality Committee for
Refugee Children.\footnote{“A First-Class Conductor,” The Jewish Chronicle, 2 February 1940. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74.} The community-based orchestra’s premiere outing included a
standard set of works from the Central European musical canon: Schubert’s “Italian”
Overture, two Mozart serenades, Beethoven’s First Symphony, and Brahms’ Zigeuner

\footnote{2008-04-01 11:13:53 GMT}
And while Heinz Unger's West London Amateur Orchestra was clearly an amateur ensemble – its inexperience revealed by its "wrong entries" – any signs of the orchestra's inexperience could easily be overlooked by concert-goers because the orchestra did not aim at being a first-class ensemble but, rather, served as a community association which could help relieve the strains and stresses of Central European émigrés adjusting to a new life in England and also to provide relief to refugees and those impacted by the war.\textsuperscript{36}

To that end, the West London Amateur Orchestra continued its policy of staging concerts for charity. Two further concerts were held, the first on 4 February 1940 and the second on 27 July 1940. These two concerts continued the Orchestra's policy of helping those in greatest need, the particular associations that it chose to assist being determined by Unger's life experience. The orchestra's second concert, held on 4 February, was an event in support of The Finland Fund that closely resembled the programme from the first concert but added what must have been, considering the circumstances, a stirring rendition of Sibelius' \textit{Finlandia}.\textsuperscript{37} As had been the case with the charitable organization in whose name the first concert had been held, Heinz Unger chose to contribute to a

\textsuperscript{35} The concert reviewer noted that the Brahms Lieder were sung with "consummate artistry" by Miss Erika Storm. R.S.E. [contributor's true identity unknown], "West London Amateur Orchestra," The Synagogue Review, March 1940. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. Little is known about the singer Erika Storm; she is, however, mentioned as having performed in a series of lieder events in the period between 1941 and 1943 while in exile in England. Significantly, the works cited as having been on these concerts were all by Jewish composers who had come to be "forbidden" \textit{[Entartete]} in Nazi Europe: Gustav Mahler, Ernst Krenek, Wilhelm Grosz, Arnold Schönberg and Egon Wellesz. Jutta Raab Hansen, \textit{NS-verfolgte Musiker in England: Spuren deutscher und österreichischer Flüchtlinge in der britischen Musikkultur} (Hamburg: von Bockel, 1996).

\textsuperscript{36} S.F.C.H. [contributor's true identity unknown], "The West London Amateur Orchestra," The Synagogue Review, August, 1940. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74.

\textsuperscript{37} In the words of the Association's Chairman Lord Phillimore, "The Finland Fund was formed on a strictly non-party basis with the specific objects of succouring the sick and wounded and affording relief to civilians who suffered owing to the invasion of their country." The president of the Fund was Lord Plymouth. Session of Parliament: Relations with Finland, 22 July 1941. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1941/jul/22/relations-with-finland
cause that he felt dearly towards — this time, the plight of the small nation of Finland battling against the Soviet juggernaut that he had come to detest after his many years of working in the repressive Soviet system. A further concert was held on 27 July 1940, this time the proceeds (a total of £10 10s.) going to the Selbsthilfe Deutscher Ausgewanderter.38

Along with these concerts for charity, Heinz Unger attempted to alleviate the general suffering of others by providing succour with his music-making. During the war years, Unger carried on an intensive schedule, travelling in his adopted country of England to conduct concerts with an array of the finest orchestras in the land. His primary orchestral instrument, however, remained the Northern Philharmonic. As already noted, Unger had by 1940 become the orchestra’s principal conductor and music director. Alongside concerts in the orchestra’s home city of Leeds, the conductor regularly led the orchestra around England, holding concerts in large and small cities alike.39

The 1942 season was the year during which Heinz Unger solidified his reputation as a leading artistic talent in Britain.40 On the local scene, he was quickly becoming a

38 The music for this concert is not known beyond the fact that Mozart’s Eine Kleine Nachtmusik was included on the program. S.F.C.H. [contributor’s true identity unknown], “The West London Amateur Orchestra,” The Synagogue Review, August, 1940. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. According to the Edinburgh Evening News, two further concerts in aid of the British Sailors’ Society and the University College Hospital were arranged but there is no record of these events in Unger’s fonds so we cannot be sure if the concerts were ever actually held. Little is known about the Selbsthilfe Deutscher Ausgewanderter except that it was “a project of a self-taxation of German immigrants for the benefit of fellow exiles in need.” As noted in Max Jammer, Einstein and Religion (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999), 112.

39 “The Northern Philharmonic is one of the seven National Orchestras to receive the grant from the Government, administered through the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (C.E.M.A.) to give performances of orchestral music in [communities] where such is not frequently provided.” B.L. “Orchestral Concert at the Ritz,” Barnsley Chronicle, 2 October 1943. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74.

40 That growing reputation did not, however, prevent the odd misunderstanding; on his debut with the City of Birmingham Orchestra in October 1942, Heinz Unger was dubbed a “Russian conductor” as a result of
legend, the man who had galvanized a theretofore directionless orchestra into a solid musical troupe able to express its creativity under his inspiring leadership. Speaking of one of the many successful concerts of that season, the *Yorkshire Post* would report:

> Mr. Heinz Unger’s conducting from memory added visible proof of a mastery of this work that was amply demonstrated in sound by the clarity of his orchestral effects. There were moments of abandon which, with an orchestra less sure of its ground, would have verged on recklessness. That they were carried off with such élan is of itself a tribute to the quality of Mr. Unger’s direction.\(^{41}\)

By the end of 1942, Heinz Unger had become a source of community pride – a flag-bearer for high art and a man capable of taking the minds of concert-goers away from the hardship and misery of war. Moreover, his travels with the Northern Philharmonic during the war years helped fulfill the cultural needs of a nation defiantly opposing Nazi terror and aggression.

Heinz Unger did not limit his conducting activities to leading “his” Northern Philharmonic, however. Unger’s rising star in the British musical firmament also meant that ever greater opportunities would come his way. He thus also graced the podium of England’s more famous orchestras and, by the middle of the war, was a frequent guest conductor with more storied orchestras such as the London Philharmonic Orchestra.\(^ {42}\) Indeed, in the winter of 1943-44, he led the LPO on a cross-country tour that included

---

\(^ {41}\) The particular work being referred to was Tchaikovsky’s Fourth Symphony. Also on the program were Mendelssohn’s “A Midsummer Night’s Dream” Overture and Clifford Curzon performing Mozart’s Piano Concerto No. 27 in B flat. H.H.W. “Leeds Sunday Concert: Mr. Heinz Unger’s Conducting,” *Yorkshire Post*, 28 December 1942. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74.

\(^ {42}\) Unger’s upturn in fortunes with the London Philharmonic began in 1943 and extended through the remainder of the war years. The London Philharmonic Orchestra was founded in 1932 by the conductor Sir Thomas Beecham (1879-1961) and is considered as one of Britain’s if not the world’s greatest orchestras, still thriving today.
stops in Coventry, Nottingham, Leicester, and, of course, London. These visits to large and small cities alike were greeted rapturously by both press and audience who regaled Heinz Unger for his artistry. Even the orchestra was impressed by his musical gifts, a point not missed by England’s finest musical critics:

After one of Dr. Unger’s rehearsals the orchestra applauded him enthusiastically. Such demonstrations are generally reserved for the actual concert and are then made by the audience and not by the orchestra.

Here was surely a sign that Unger’s talents were recognized not only by concert-goers and music critics but perhaps by those harshest of critics: the musicians themselves.

With such a stellar ensemble at his command, Heinz Unger could begin to devote his attention to the cause he held dearest: proselytizing for Gustav Mahler’s music. As early as 1941, a full two decades before the Mahler revival that was to come in the 1960s, Unger was advocating Mahler’s cause by including the composer’s works on his

---

43 In each of these concerts, a similar program was repeated with minimal changes, the touring program almost always including Brahms Fourth Symphony. Works with a guest soloist and/or another shorter overture or symphony usually took up the bulk of the first half of the concerts. That said, it should also be noted that on some occasions made a point of programming less popular material, as was the case on 16 January 1944 when the concert included Anton Bruckner’s Fourth Symphony (“Romantic”), the work of a composer that, judging from reviews, had yet to be accepted in England. On more than one occasion, Unger also programmed Elgar’s Violin Concerto, a work that was still deemed “modern” decades after its composition and premiere by the remarkable young violinist Yehudi Menuhin. In the winter and spring season of 1944, Unger conducted the LPO in approximately 20 concerts, with nine concerts in January alone. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74.

44 In Nottingham, Unger was praised his “assurance and attention to detail” while in Bristol the praise for the conductor was even more effusive:

“This gift is Dr. Heinz Unger, a real performer and conductor on [sic] the orchestra. Musical understanding, depth of feeling, sensitiveness, rightness of tempi, beauty of phrasing and control of his instrument are all displayed by this Master of Music.”

M.E. “Brahms Artistry,” Nottingham Journal, 13 January 1944. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74; M.A., “A Master of Music: Heinz Unger and the L.P.O.,” Western Press, Bristol, 27 January 1944. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. The Nottingham concert was held in Nottingham’s Albert Hall on 12 January 1944 and included Mendelssohn’s Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage Overture, Schumann’s Piano Concerto (with Eileen Joyce as soloist), and Brahms’ Fourth Symphony. The Bristol concert was held at Colston Hall, on 26 January 1944, the second of two concerts held by Unger and the LPO on the same day (the first being a lunchtime affair). The evening concert consisted of Mendelssohn’s “Calm Sea and prosperous Voyage” Overture, Grieg’s Piano Concerto (with Eileen Joyce as soloist), and Brahms’ Fourth Symphony.

programs. The conductor pursued his personal holy grail of audience acceptance to Mahler’s art very wisely: instead of overwhelming his audiences with Mahler’s longer symphonic works in their entirety, he would include either shorter pieces or selected movements from the symphonies. On 21 February 1942, at a Northern Philharmonic concert that was particularly well-attended because of the presence of the renowned British pianist Dame Myra Hess (1890-1965), Unger closed the program with the Andante from Mahler’s Second Symphony.\(^{46}\) In September of that same year, he conducted the London Symphony Orchestra in a concert that included Mahler’s highly-emotive orchestral song cycle, *Songs of a Wayfarer*.\(^{47}\) That performance of Mahler’s music was greeted with great acclaim to a packed house, the *Cavalcade*’s music critic brazenly asking for “more Mahler, please.”\(^{48}\) Heinz Unger’s campaign for Mahler was quickly earning friends across the country.\(^{49}\)

\(^{46}\) The works performed at the 21 February 1942 matinee concert were: Weber’s *Oberon* Overture, Schumann’s Piano Concerto (performed by Dame Myra Hess), Dvorak’s Eighth Symphony and the aforementioned Mahler excerpt. “Dame Myra Hess in Leeds,” *Yorkshire Post*, 23 February 1942. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74.

\(^{47}\) The full concert consisted of: Mendelssohn’s *Athalie* Overture, Mahler’s “Songs of a Wayfarer,” Tchaikovsky’s Romeo and Juliet, Brahms’ Third symphony and Glinka’s *Russian and Ludmilla* Overture. The program was performed on September 6 at the Orpheum in the London Borough of Barnet. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. The London Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1904 and its conductors have included leading luminaries of the 20th century including Hans Richter (1904-1911), Arthur Nikisch (1912-1914), Thomas Beecham (1915-1916), Albert Coates (1919-1922), Willem Mengelberg (1930-1931) and Hamilton Harty (1932-1935). In the postwar period, its conductors have included Pierre Monteux, Andre Previn, Claudio Abbado, Michael Tilson Thomas and Colin Davis. The LSO’s principal conductor today is the Russian conductor Valery Gergiev.

\(^{48}\) The uncredited reviewer was referring also to Adrian Boult’s presentation of Mahler at an LPO concert earlier that summer. “More Mahler, Please,” *Cavalcade*, 21 November 1942. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74.

\(^{49}\) On 3 March 1945, Heinz Unger also led a concert of Gustav Mahler’s *Das Lied von der Erde* with the Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra. The Yorkshire Post’s music critic was quite moved by Unger’s presentation of “this most intricate, butlastingly beautiful, score” by “the most authoritative representative Mahler has in this country.” E.H.W., “Dr. Unger Conducts Mahler Work at Liverpool,” *Yorkshire Post*, 5 March 1945. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52. Meanwhile, the Liverpool media, despite acknowledging Unger’s “very sympathetic and sensitive rendering,” was less impressed by the performance, saying that it “was lacking of the sunset radiance, the subtlety of atmospheric detail, the depths of passionate and poetic emotion which saturate Mahler’s score,” blaming not the conductor but the orchestra’s inability, after limited rehearsal time, to fully absorb Mahler’s style and idiom. “Philharmonic Concerts: ‘The Song of the
By 1944 Heinz Unger was working towards what would be one of the highlights of his career – the British premiere of Mahler’s Fifth Symphony. He approached this goal in the same manner that he had used to pique British interest in Mahler earlier in the war: by introducing portions of Mahler’s work into his concerts. By the 1944-45 season, Unger was regularly programming the Adagietto from Mahler’s Fifth Symphony into his concerts with the LPO. On 21 October 1945, he premiered the entire symphony to a rapturous though admittedly small audience (the hall was only “three-fourths full”) and a curious critical community assembled to hear the work at London’s Stoll Theatre. Though earning an ovation, the work’s success was limited by unfamiliarity and an orchestra straining under the burden of a work still unfamiliar to them. Despite the

---

The first such instance of this seems to have come at an LPO concert held on 28 December 1944 at Colston Hall Bristol, the local press greeting the performance as one in which “the grace and beauty of this movement was fully expressed.” M.A., “L.P.O. Festival Week: Programme of Serious Music,” Western Daily Press, 29 December 1944. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52. Unger programmed the Adagietto at least nine times before premiering the entire work, suggesting that the conductor felt that this movement was the emotional centrepiece of the entire symphony.

In an un-credited review of the performance, the critic mentions that Heinz Unger made “a number of cuts in the Scherzo and Finale of the Fifth.” One wonders whether this was Unger’s decision or the consequence of a “corrupted” score that he was using. In light of his familiarity with Mahler’s music, one gets the impression that these cuts were made by Unger himself, perhaps in hopes of making a more favourable impression with British concert-goers. “Mahler and the Concert Season,” New Statesman, 27 October 1945. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52. Mahlerites might also be interested in the eminent Mahler musicologist Donald Mitchell’s observation that “the orchestra’s first horn, at the end of the second movement, took up his place (his seat) at the front of the platform, alongside – or close to – the leader of the orchestra” in the manner written into Mahler pioneer Willem Mengelberg’s conducting score. Mitchell thus raises the interesting possibility that “this was a ‘tradition’ Mengelberg inherited from Mahler himself.” Adding weight to the theory that this was an instruction inherited from Mahler himself is the fact that Unger was not a protegé of Mengelberg but of another of Mahler’s own protégés, Bruno Walter. Donald Mitchell, “Mahler’s Fifth Symphony,” in The Mahler Companion, ed. Donald Mitchell and Andrew Nicholson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 236-325. The aforementioned discussion appears on page 275.

Interestingly, the most critical review of the work appeared in the Musical Times: “In listening to a great symphony one has the impression that when the composer set about writing the first notes his mind had already a complete picture of the whole. That is an impression that Mahler’s symphonies do not convey...there were times during the performance when one felt that the composer, enamoured of his own emotion, lost touch with realities and was no longer thinking in terms of practical notes...” “Mahler’s Fifth Symphony,” Musical Times, Date unknown. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52. Other reviewers were far more receptive, recounting both the enthusiasm of the audience (“one has seldom witnessed such whole-hearted enthusiasm as that to which the audience gave vent at the conclusion”) as well as the strength of the
enthusiasm that his performances of Mahler’s music generated in quarters of the audience and the critical community, we cannot fail to see that English audiences and, especially, English music critics were not yet fully attuned to Mahler’s idiom, a fact which underlines Unger’s bravery in so aggressively campaigning on behalf of Gustav Mahler’s music.  

By the end of the war, Heinz Unger had established himself as a leading conductor in England. Along with his prominent place at the head of the Northern Philharmonic, he was a regular guest with the London Philharmonic Orchestra as well as a highly respected guest with other orchestras such as the City of Birmingham Orchestra and the Liverpool Philharmonic. His campaign for the acceptance of Gustav Mahler’s music, while not entirely successful, played a part in redefining British musical tastes mid-century. At the close of the war, Heinz Unger was safely ensconced within Britain’s cultural community.

---

work itself (“Mahler’s Fifth Symphony is a magnificent work”). That same reviewer then went on to praise the conductor’s performance of this unfamiliar work – “it calls for playing of the utmost virtuosity and sensitivity, and this Dr. Unger secured.” H.S.R., “London Philharmonic Orchestra,” Musical Opinion, Date unknown, LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52. One of Britain’s most important music critics Hugh Liversidge appropriately characterised the conductor’s work as being “in the true Mahler tradition.” Hugh Liversidge, “London: Lends Ear to Mahler Fifth,” Musical Courier, LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52

Donald Mitchell notes that performances such as Unger’s British premiere of Mahler’s Fifth Symphony “bring fascinating evidence that the English Mahler ‘boom’ was struggling to get under way even during the inauspicious wartime years.” Donald Mitchell, “The Mahler Renaissance in England,” in The Mahler Companion, pp.545-564. The quote appears on p. 550.

Along with his advocacy for Mahler’s Fifth Symphony, Heinz Unger was also able to conduct another Mahler work close to his heart – Das Lied von der Erde – with the Liverpool Philharmonic on 3 March 1945. The soloists on this occasion were Mary Jarred and Parry Jones. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52.

Heinz Unger’s status as a conductor in war-time Britain had developed to such an extent that in the early post-war period he was granted a contract by the Decca Recording Company. In the spring of 1947, Heinz Unger made one of his few appearances in the sound studio, on this occasion laying down on record a program of works that lay in the mainstream of the classical repertoire – Mendelssohn’s “Ruy Blas” Overture and Beethoven’s Third Symphony (“Eroica”). The reviews for the recording confirmed the musician’s growing reputation in Britain, not only because of the confidence laid in him in granting him the opportunity but also by the reviews that demonstrated the high esteem in which he was held, one reviewer going so far as to declare that “Dr. Unger is a first-class conductor whom we can ill afford to lose.” “Ruy Blas,” Symphony, July 1947. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75. The Mendelssohn was recorded with the
IV. “Die zwei blauen Augen von meinem Schatz” (“The Two Blue Eyes of My Sweetheart”). And in the fourth and last song he begins his wanderings to the rhythm of the kind of funeral march that is soon to become a feature of Mahler’s music in general. But in the end ‘all was well again...Gone were love and grief and dream...’ when he finds a haven of peace under the branches of a lime-tree by the wayside.  

Yet somehow, even with all this critical acclaim and popular success, something was lacking in Heinz Unger’s life. After living through a harrowing decade during which the European continent had been ravaged by the Second World War and now threatened to become a new battleground for the ideological struggle between capitalism and communism, Unger realized that this something that was missing was the peace and stability that he felt that Europe could never offer him or his family. Like Mahler’s Wayfarer, Heinz Unger sought comfort after a period of dislocation and horror:

Die zwei blauen Augen von meinem Schatz,  
die haben mich in die weite Welt geschickt.  
Da musst’ ich Abschied nehmen vom allerliebsten Platz!  
O Augen blau, warum habt ihr mich angeblickt?  
Nun hab’ich ewig Leid und Gramen!  

Ich bin ausgegangen in stiller Nacht,  
woh! über die dunkle Heide.  
Hat mir niemand Ade gesagt, Ade!  
Mein Gesell’ war Lieb’ und Liede!  

Auf der Strasse stand ein Lindenbaum,  
da hab’ ich zum ersten Mal im Schlaf geruht!  
Unter dem Lindenbaum,  
Der hat seine Bluten über mich geschneit,  
da wusst’ ich nicht, wie das Leben tut,  
war alles, alles wieder gut!  
Ach, alles wieder gut!  
Alles! Alles!  
Lieb’ und Leid, und Welt und Traum!  

The two blue eyes of my love,

National Orchestra and the Beethoven with the London Philharmonic Orchestra. The exact dates of the recording sessions are not known.

they’ve sent me out into the wide world.
So I had to take my leave
of the town so dear to me!
O blue eyes, why did you look at me?
Now I am full of grief and sorrow.

I went out at the dead of night,
across the gloomy heath;
no-one said goodbye to me.
My companions were love and sorrow!

By the wayside stands a linden-tree;
and there at last I’ve found some sleep,
under the linden-tree.
It snowed its blossoms over me,
I knew no more of the evils of life,
for all things turned to good again,
O all to good again,
Everything, everything,
love and grief, the world, my dreams!

But Heinz Unger could not yet rupture the ties that bound him to the continent
that had been his home since birth. He would thus remain in Europe for a further two
years. Those years were not filled with concerts in his adopted home of England but,
rather, centred around Spain, a country that had so impressed him with its warmth and
enthusiasm for his art on earlier travels on the eve of the Spanish Civil War. In late fall
1945, Unger travelled again to Spain, this time to a country attempting to recover from a
four-year long civil war that had set Spain alight and in which thousands had died for
their political beliefs. Spain was a country in need of unification, of uplifting, and of
peace. It was also a country in desperate need of legitimacy due in no small part to its

57 Text and translation from: Deryck Cooke, Gustav Mahler: An Introduction to his Music, 32-33.
58 Heinz Unger travelled to Spain in the summer of 1935 and 1936, conducting the Valencian premiere of
Beethoven’s 9th Symphony on 2 July 1935 and repeating his performance of the Beethoven work the
following summer in Madrid. Further Valencian concerts were to have followed but were cancelled as the
Civil War began. See: LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74 and “Art, Politics and a Conductor,” The New York
Times, 31 October 1937, LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. The Spanish Civil War would commence in the
summer of 1936 and last until 1939.
war-time complicity with Nazi Germany. Shortly after the end of the war, in the fall of 1945, Heinz Unger accepted an invitation from the Spanish government to travel there as a “cultural ambassador.”

Heinz Unger’s acceptance of this role might today be seen as a compromise – a compromise that might very well be seen by some as collaboration with a dictatorial regime – that begs the question of his morality. Such a position, however, discounts a number of important factors that might have informed Unger’s decision. First, the invitation had met with the approval of the British Government, a government that, much like the rest of the western world, was coming to see Franco and his regime as a significant member of an anti-Communist block necessary to prevent the expansion of the Soviet Union’s influence into Western Europe.

Second – and perhaps most germane to our discussion – following upon a concerted campaign by Franco’s government that in the final years of the war and in the immediate post-war period attempted to highlight its Historians of modern Spain have in recent years helped us better understand the nature of the relationship between Franco’s “quasi-Fascist” Spain and Hitler’s Nazi Germany, demonstrating that while Franco flirted with the idea of more closely aligning with Nazi Germany early in the war, such a course was dashed by Hitler’s assessment that Spain had little to offer the Axis as a fighting force and his desire to not alienate his precarious relationship with Vichy France by conceding the French territories in North Africa that Franco sought as compensation for entering the war. Perhaps as early as late 1943 and certainly by the spring and summer of 1944, Franco had begun a “tilt to the allies” as it became clear that Germany would lose the war. See: Stanley Payne, *Franco and Hitler Spain, Germany and World War II* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2008)

The Department of Cultural Relation of the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs has had the courtesy of facilitating the travel of Unger to come to Spain, cordially attending as such to the petition made by our local government and other Spanish entities.

Maestro Unger has come to Spain on a cultural mission and one of the goals of this journey is to introduce in our country – by way of the artistic temperament of this illustrious director – works by English composers, some of which figure in the programs of our concerts.”

This note is taken from an insert included in an appearance by Heinz Unger with the Valencia Orchestra in late fall 1945 “El Maestro Unger,” LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52. Translation by author.

In the immediate post-war period, Franco was already beginning to be seen as an ally in the common front against Soviet expansionism. Then, “the commencement of the Cold War in the final years of the 1940s dismantled whatever enthusiasm existed for forcing out a violently anti-Communist Franco who, whatever his evils, at least ensured that Spain would not fall into the Soviet sphere of influence.” Florentino Portero, “Spain, Britain and the Cold War,” in Sebastian Balfour and Paul Preston, ed *Spain and the Great Powers in the Twentieth Century* (London. Routledge, 1999), 210-228
positive actions in respect to Jewish support and aid during the war period, significant elements in the Jewish world had come to endorse such a view. And while Spanish overtures toward the soon-to-be created State of Israel would be rebuffed in the late 1940s and early 1950s—a function of Israel's attempt to position itself "morally" in the first years of its existence—even within Israel a significant segment of the Sephardic Jewish population was also calling for closer ties with Spain. All things considered, therefore, it should come as no surprise that Heinz Unger would not have seen his work in Spain as an "immoral" act considering that the Franco regime had received support from both significant Jewish personalities—however myopic they may have been—and from the Western powers more generally. And just as importantly, whatever Unger's declared hostility to authoritarian regimes, his resistance towards non-democratic political systems was, as we have seen in his time in the Soviet Union, often trumped by a humanism whereby he understood that his primary responsibility lay in enriching people's lives by providing them solace through music.

Heinz Unger's first concerts in Spain were, perhaps surprisingly, not in the Spanish capital but in Valencia. Unger's first Valencian concerts as a "cultural ambassador" did not disappoint—the audience roared and the press greeted him

---

62 Even the president of both the political committee and the British section of the World Jewish Congress, Rabbi Maurice Perlzweig, would be convinced of Spain's positive war-time record in respect to providing assistance to Jews. In his final assessment, Bernd Rother notes: "No se le puede atribuir a la dictadura de Franco que haya apoyado la persecución judía llevada a cabo por el nacionalsocialismo. Este gobierno estaba tan ligado a los valores católicos tradicionales que no pudo compartir las terribles consecuencias que los nacionalsocialistas extrajeron de su ideología racista desde el principio de la segunda guerra mundial." "One cannot attribute to Franco's dictatorship a support for the Jewish persecution carried out by National Socialism. This government was so tied to traditional Catholic values that it could not share in the terrible consequences that the National Socialists extracted from their racist ideology from the beginning of the Second World War." Bernd Rother, *Franco y el Holocausto* (Tubingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), 405. Translation by the author.


64 The Orquesta de Valencia is an organization that had been founded as recently as 1943. At its inception it was known as the Orquesta Municipal de Valencia and only changed its name years later.
rapturously. And these concerts, true to their declared goal of introducing works by English composers, included not only the standard symphonic works by Beethoven and Brahms but also the Spanish premieres of English “novelties” such as Arthur Benjamin’s “Overture for an Italian Comedy” and Gordon Jacobs’ “Passacaglia.” By the time of his departure, the Valencian audiences had been won over by Unger’s genial and affectionate readings of music both familiar and unfamiliar and sent him off with “una encendida, carinosisima y prolongada ovacion de despedida.” In a mere three weeks, Valencia had fallen under Heinz Unger’s spell.

Following his concerts in Valencia, Heinz Unger proceeded to the capital where he appeared in a further sequence of concerts with the Madrid-based Orquesta Sinfonica de Madrid and the Orquesta Nacional de Espana. As in Valencia, the Madrilenian press and audiences were also greatly impressed by Unger’s talents. Heinz Unger’s

---

65 Unger was called “one of the greatest conductors...that we have had the occasion of hearing in our lifetime.” (“uno de los mas grandes conductores...que tuvimos ocasion de haber escuchado en nuestra vida.”) Federico, “Musica en la Sociedad Filarmonica: Unger es recibido de nuevo Clamorosamente,” Jornada, 11 December 1945. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52. Translation by the author.


67 The concert with the Orquesta Sinfonica de Madrid (founded 1903) was held on 30 December 1945, the programme consisting of Brahms’ First Symphony, Gordon Jacobs’ Passacaglia, Wagner’s Siegfried Idyll, and Dvorak’s Carnival Overture. The concerts with the Orquesta Nacional (founded 1940) were held on 11 January and 25 January 1946. The program for the first concert was: Weber’s Oberon Overture, Smetana’s “Vltava,” Milanes’ Suite Espanola, and Tchaikovsky’s Fifth Symphony. The second concert consisted of Gluck’s Iphigenie in Aulis Overture, Brahms’ Fourth Symphony, Richard Strauss’ Don Juan, and orchestral pieces from Berlioz’s Damnation of Faust.

68 After these concerts, the Madrilenian press wrote glowingly of Unger’s achievement: “El publico madrileño ha sabido prestar la acogida mas entusiasta e incondicional a Heinz Unger, el maestro admirable, cuyos conciertos quedaran durante mucho tiempo como modelo de dificil copia.” “The Madrilenian public has known to lend the most enthusiastic and unconditional reception to Heinz Unger, the admirable conductor, whose concerts will remain for a long time as a model difficult to copy.” A. Fernandez-Cid, “Triunfal concierto de despedida de Heinz Unger,” Arriba, 26 January 1946. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3 File 52. Translation by the author.
success in both the regional centre of Valencia as well as in the Spanish capital was complete.

By no means was the admiration one-sided, however. Upon his return to England, Heinz Unger would note that the *Orquesta Nacional* was a “conductor’s dream” and that the musical success of Spanish musicians lay in the fact that they “play with their hearts as well as their heads.”\(^\text{70}\) Just as significantly, Unger was also impressed by the Spanish Government’s non-interference in cultural matters:

> Dr. Unger said that in Spain music is still the free expression of the individual and not a vehicle for propaganda. He was both surprised and pleased to hear the Secretary of the “Comisaria de la Musica” in a Falangist Government suggest a performance of a work by the Soviet composer Shostakovitch [sic].\(^\text{71}\)

Admittedly, Unger was a musician first and his political commentary cannot serve as definitive in any way. That said, the fact that he would make such a statement recognizes that even the politically uninitiated – some might even say naïve – could recognize that Franco’s regime was far removed from the totalitarian regimes of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union wherein all cultural elements were conscripted in an ideological battle.\(^\text{72}\)

Franco’s post-war Spain – while being, in the words of Spanish historian Antonio Cazorla-Sanchez, a “brutal police state” – was a very different creature to the fascist and communist dictatorships further east.\(^\text{73}\)

---


\(^\text{71}\) Ibid.

\(^\text{72}\) Unger’s assessment is in part echoed by no less an authority than Stanley Payne who, in speaking of the Spanish Government’s policy toward the arts, describes the 1950s as a period best characterized as an “apolitical climate” of “relative cultural anomie.” And though the use of the term anomie is suggestive of a lack of social norms resulting from a Durkheimian moral vacuum, such an understanding runs counter to Unger’s statement of artistic freedom as well as the positive experiences he would have in Spain in the post-war period. Payne, *Franco and Hitler*, 435.

\(^\text{73}\) Antonio Cazorla-Sanchez, “Beyond ‘They Shall not Pass.’ How the Experience of Violence Reshaped Political Values in Franco’s Spain,” in *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol.40, No.3 (July 2005), 503-
A mere three months later, Heinz Unger would return to Spain. On this trip, like on the previous journey, the musician conducted in both Valencia and Madrid, the mutual admiration and trust being demonstrated by his hosts allowing Unger to adventurously program Gustav Mahler’s First Symphony on concerts with both ensembles.⁷⁴

Encouraged by his triumphs of that year and by his wonderful experiences on both trips, Spain would become an annual pilgrimage for Heinz Unger for the remainder of his life. In the first year after the Second World War, Unger spent two entire months (essentially the entirety of the 1946 Fall season) in Spain, conducting orchestral concerts in Valencia, Madrid and Barcelona.⁷⁵ Ostensibly still appearing as a “cultural ambassador,” those concerts on occasion still included works by British composers.⁷⁶ As he solidified his reputation in Spain, however, the number of British works in his concerts

---

⁷⁴ The Mahler concert with the Orquesta Nacional was held on 29 March 1946 and also included Schubert’s *Rosamunde* Overture and Schumann’s Piano Concerto (with Jose Cubiles as soloist). The performance of Mahler’s First Symphony with the Orquesta Municipal de Valencia was held on 1 May 1946 and included Gluck’s *Iphigenie in Aulis* Overture and Mozart’s Serenade No.7. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52. On the occasion of Mahler’s performance in Madrid, the press had this to say: “Si esta sinfonía de Mahler no hubiera sido servida por un director como Unger, el resultado, aun favorible a la obra, hubiera sido muy otro. Con el, el interes fue creciendo desde el primer compas hasta terminar, en el ultimo tiempo, en las ovaciones mas delirantes.” (“If this symphony of Mahler’s had not been presented by a conductor like Unger, the result, despite favourable to the work, would have been very different. With him, interest grew from the first bar to the end, at the end being greeted with the most delirious ovations.”) A. de la H., “Clamoroso triunfo de Unger y Cubiles con la Orquesta Nacional,” *Informaciones*, 30 March 1946. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 52. The reviews from Valencia were similarly positive. Translation by the author.

⁷⁵ The first concert was with the Orquesta Nacional on 4 October 1946. The last concert was with the Orquesta Municipal de Valencia on 2 December 1946. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75.

⁷⁶ On the 18th and 19th of October, Unger conducted the Orquesta Nacional (Madrid) and included Ernest John Moeran’s (1894-1950) “Overture for a Masque” in a program of otherwise standard symphonic fare by Weber, Schumann, and Mendelssohn. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75.
steadily fell as they were replaced by works that fell into Unger’s standard repertoire – the works of the Central European musical canon. Indeed, Unger was becoming sufficiently central a character in the Spanish cultural world that even more honorary types of engagements began to come his way; on November 14, 1946, he appeared at the Universidad Literaria de Valencia in the Gala held for the fourth centennial of one of Spain’s most important cultural figures, the author Miguel de Cervantes.78

After a brief return to England in the winter of 1946 during which he appeared as guest conductor with the City of Birmingham Orchestra79, Heinz Unger would return to Spain in the spring of 1947, appearing again with all of Spain’s leading orchestras.80 These concerts were interrupted only by the rare appearance in his home country England; on 21 October 1947, Unger appeared at the helm of the Philharmonia Orchestra.81

Heinz Unger’s visits to Spain in the immediate post-war years were also significant because they resulted in an increased exposure in the Spanish-speaking world, attention that would lead to the arrangement of a series of concerts in Latin America beginning in 1948. After a further winter and spring season spent in the sunny climes of

---

77 A list would be superfluous here. Suffice it to say that Unger’s concerts regularly included the standard symphonic works of the eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. For the “Jewish” significance of this repertoire, see Philip Bohlman’s The Land Where Two Streams Flow: Music in the German-Jewish Community of Israel (1989).
78 The work very appropriately chosen to be performed by Unger and the Valencian musicians on that occasion was Richard Strauss’ Don Quijote, a work composed by a German on a Spanish theme penned by Cervantes himself. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75.
79 The concert, which included Charles Stanford’s Irish Rhapsody No.1, Borodin’s “In the steppes of Central Asia,” Chopin’s Piano Concerto No.1 (Weingarten as piano soloist), and Beethoven’s Sixth Symphony (“Pastoral”), was held on the afternoon of 8 December 1946. A.F., “Heinz Unger as Guest Conductor,” Birmingham Mail, 9 December 1946. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75.
80 The first concert of this trip was on 14 March 1947 with the Orquesta Nacional, the last with the Orquesta Municipal de Valencia on 4 May 1947. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75.
81 The Philharmonia (founded 1945 by the famous EMI producer Walter Legge) concert, held at Central Hall, Westminster, consisted of Gluck’s “Iphigenia in Aulis” Overture, Mozart’s Piano Concerto in A major (K.488) and Tchaikovsky’s Fifth Symphony. The piano soloist in the Mozart concerto was the Romanian (and Jewish) Mozart specialist Clara Haskil (1895-1960). LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75.
Spain, Unger departed for Cuba. In the summer of 1948, he appeared with the Orquesta Filarmonica de la Habana on four occasions, leading the ensemble in a series of programs built around some of the standard works of the European musical canon.

On the back of his Cuban concerts, Unger continued to develop his reputation in the Spanish speaking world. In November 1948, after a summer of settling into his new Canadian home, Unger would once again travel to the Spanish-speaking world, this time conducting in Mexico.

The next few years proved a busy time in Heinz Unger’s career. On the one hand, he occupied himself with trying to build his reputation in his new Canadian homeland. At the same time, he spent many felicitous moments in Spain, a site that served as a refuge from the challenges and frustrations that were such a key feature of his first years in Canada. By 1951, Unger was so highly esteemed by his hosts and so confident in the Valencian musicians that he felt comfortable enough to begin to program Mahler’s more “challenging” symphonies with the Valencian orchestra. In February 1951, Unger performed the Spanish premiere of Mahler’s Second Symphony (“Resurrection”) at

---

82 The first concert on this particular tour was held with the Orquesta Sinfonica de Valencia on 6 February 1948, the last with the Orquesta Municipal de Barcelona on 23 May 1948. See Programmes in LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75. A concert held on 22 February 1948 even included Mahler’s Fourth Symphony, a performance that “captivated general attention and was greatly applauded.” (Author’s translation) Federico, “La Orquesta Municipal, en un Programa Totalmente Nuevo,” Jornada, 24 February 1948. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75. Unger also performed Mahler’s Fourth Symphony with the Orquesta Nacional on 23 April 1948.

83 The composers represented in these programs were Berlioz, Beethoven, Smetana, Richard Strauss, Rossini, Chopin, and Tchaikovsky. The concerts were held on June 14, June 27, June 28, and July 11 1948. The Cuban press commented upon these concerts very favourably, noting in particular how Unger’s style and force of personality made a quick impression on both musicians and non-musicians alike. “el estilo del maestro Unger acuso, enseguida, una recia personalidad para conducir inmejorablemente el conjunto orquestal” “Maestro Unger’s style at once showed a strong personality to conduct the orchestral group in an insuperable manner.” Vicente Bernardes, “Heinz Unger y la Filarmonica,” Pueblo, 22 June 1948. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75. [picture 70] Author’s translation.

84 Heinz Unger conducted the Sinfonica Mexicana on 28 November 1948. The program on that occasion included Gluck’s “Iphigenia in Aulis” Overture, Brahms’ First Piano Concerto, and Tchaikovsky’s Fifth Symphony. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75. Unger would return to Mexico in 1950 and lead the Orquesta Sinfonica de la Universidad on at least two further occasions in the fall of 1950.
Valencia’s Teatro Principal. The performance was highly praised and the work – a long and challenging one – was greeted with enthusiasm and understanding; in short, it was “a complete success.” Heinz Unger was, in another new setting, proselytizing for Mahler’s music and quickly gaining for the composer new supporters.

After a further spring and summer spent trying to consolidate his Canadian reputation and career, Heinz Unger once again returned to the Spanish speaking world. This time, his travels took him to Argentina, that most European of Latin American cities. The Buenos Aires of the early 1950s was a city in which Spanish mixed with German, and even English was heard in the streets, the Buenos Aires Herald serving as the English-speaking community’s mouthpiece. So too was the Buenos Aires of the 1950s experiencing its golden age, a time when Evita Peron wielded tremendous influence and buttressed the presidency of her general-husband, Juan Peron. This was the “classic” Argentina, the Argentina where gauchos in traditional dress rubbed shoulders with European émigrés in sharp tailored suits, where a native culture intermingled with the high culture imported by immigrants from both before the war and after.

Arriving in such a cultural mecca, Heinz Unger could not help but be fascinated by the city and its cosmopolitan culture. Imbued with the optimism of the era, he thus...

85 “Anoche, la Valencia..., sensible al tremendo esfuerzo del insigne maestro Unger, la Orquesta Municipal, Coral Polifónica y Orfeón de Godella, contralto y soprano solistas...es decir, correspondiendo a la tarea admirable de un conjunto de doscientos cincuenta ejecutantes...saludo con unánime aplauso, clara expresión de afecto y admiración sin reservas, al eminente director...” “Last night, Valencia...sensitive to the tremendous effort of the distinguished maestro Unger, the Municipal Orchestra, Coral Polifónico and the Orfeón de Godella, the contralto and soprano soloist...that is to say, corresponding to the admirable task of an ensemble of two hundred and fifty executants...greeted with unanimous applause and a clear display of affection and admiration to the eminent conductor...” (Author’s translation) Federico, “Estreno en España de la sinfonía ‘Resurrección’, de Mahler: Una Audición Memorable Y un Éxito Clamoroso,” Jornada, 22 February 1951. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75. The concert was held on 21 February 1951 and began with Mendelssohn’s A Midsummer Night’s Dream Overture. The program was repeated the following day as well as on 25 February 1951. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75.

86 E.L. Chavarri, “Estreno en España de la Segunda Sinfonía de Mahler,” Las Provincias, 22 February 1951. The critic, after a lengthy explanation of the work and performance completes his review with the short phrase “Fue un éxito completo.” The translation is the author’s own. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75.
seized his opportunity firmly with both hands, leading the Orchestra of the State Radio with a dynamism that would lead critics to herald his achievements in a series of concerts held in August and September 1951. Heinz Unger’s notable success in Argentina was even reported back in his adopted Canadian homeland, *The Globe and Mail* noting that “the queue for tickets for the final Beethoven concert extended five blocks.” In both his adopted Canadian home as well as in the Argentinean Republic, Unger was clearly becoming a musical celebrity.

Indeed, three years later, Heinz Unger was asked to return to Buenos Aires. This time, the Orchestra of the State Radio attempted to ensure that its *Portenio* audience would be provided with the opportunity of hearing him conduct. The directors of the orchestra thus booked Unger in an entire cycle of concerts, a cycle that would survey the entirety of Beethoven’s symphonic oeuvre. These concerts, held weekly between 16

---

87 The concerts were held at the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences of the Universidad de Buenos Aires on 23 and 30 August, and 6 September. The programs were an interesting mix of the familiar and the unknown, the unknown mostly being 20th century works by Argentinean composers; the 23 August program was: Berlioz’s *Roman Carnival* Overture, Brahms’ St. Anthony Variations, Turina’s “Fantastic Dances,” and Tchaikovsky’s Fifth Symphony. The 30 August program was: Mozart’s Symphony No. 41 (“Jupiter”), Ginastera’s *Canto de Estio* (Marcha Funebre), Troiani-Bandi’s *Cueca*, and Berlioz’s *Symphonie fantastique*. The September 6 program consisted of Drangosch’s “Creole Overture,” Mendelssohn’s Fourth Symphony (“Italian”), and Mahler’s First Symphony. Unger’s success in these three concerts meant that a fourth and fifth concert were added on 20 and 22 September 1951. These two concerts were devoted to Beethoven and included the composer’s *Egmont* Overture, and his famous Fifth and Sixth symphonies. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76. After his final scheduled concert which also happened to be the end of the winter season for the orchestra, one critic would summarize the conductor’s achievements by commenting on how “[Unger] impresionó de manera favorable, tanto por su autoridad y dominio de los recursos tecnico," la expresividad y animación que supo comunicar a sus interpretaciones.” “[Unger] favourably impressed, as much with his authority and mastery of technical matters as with the expressivity and animation that he communicated in his interpretations.” “El maestro Unger ofreció su última audición,” *La Nacion*, 8 September 1951. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76. Translation by author.

September and 10 October were almost unanimously praised, Argentinean critics and audiences alike praising the conductor for his clarity and direction.\textsuperscript{89}

Despite his successes there, Heinz Unger never returned to Argentina. This was not a result of any antipathy from either side but merely a consequence of the fact that Unger’s career would take a different direction in the years to come. In the decade following the end of the Second World War, Unger had taken to travelling the world, much like the young wayfarer in Mahler’s song. As time passed, health issues began to take a toll on his career and he spent his dwindling strength not on seeing the world but on advancing his career in Canada. His contact with the Spanish world did not end, however. Instead, Spain, and Valencia in particular, became an oasis from the harsh Canadian winters and from the frustrations that he faced with his most important post-war project – the York Concert Society. But that is to move too far ahead. For the moment, Unger busied himself with expanding his activities in Canada. Heinz Unger’s years of wandering had come to an end.

\textsuperscript{89} While praising Unger for his “balanced rendition…that adequately marked the contrast between the timbres and the choral mass” the critic for \textit{La Prensa} also noted that the performance of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony lacked “profundity.” “Finalizo el Ciclo de Sinfonias de Beethoven,” \textit{La Prensa}, 8 October 1954. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76. So great was Unger’s success that the directors of the State Radio invited Unger to repeat the entire cycle as well as to perform the Ninth Symphony a further two times. “Dr. Unger Repeats,” \textit{The Globe and Mail}, 2 October 1954. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76. In total, it is estimated that over 25,000 people attended Unger’s Beethoven cycle. “Un Hecho Cultural Altamente Significativo,” \textit{Musica} (Date Unknown). LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76.
CHAPTER 6

EARLY LIFE IN CANADA AND A RETURN TO GERMANY (1937-1956)

Musical Motif: Symphony No.2 (“Resurrection”)

[Gustav Mahler’s Second Symphony] is based on two contrasting ideas: the thought of rebirth as opposed to the thought of death; of man as part of nature and subject to the eternal laws of nature, and of man as a spiritual force, indelible, indestructible, ever returning through the powers of faith and love. Undoubtedly it is because the symphony is concerned with this most deeply moving of human problems that it has become one of Mahler’s most successful works.¹

I. Allegro maestoso. Mit durchaus ernstem und feierlichem Ausdruck [With deeply serious and solemn expression]. The first movement is taken up with the negative side of these opposing ideas, with thoughts of death and destruction. It suggests a gigantic mural representing those aspects of human life that are liable to human obliteration: hopes, triumphs, heroic deeds, catastrophes, consolations and memories. In the end there is nothing left but mourning and the measured tread of a great funereal procession.²

Heinz Unger and his family immigrated to Canada in 1948. The story of his experience in Canada, however, does not begin in 1948 but rather in 1937, for it was in that year that the conductor made his first North American concert appearance. In the fall of 1937, Unger travelled to New York aboard a Cunard White Star Line vessel, arriving by the end of October. Heinz Unger’s appearance in the Americas during so turbulent a time in Europe bears all the hallmarks of a “Resurrection” – a new beginning in a new land where the heartaches and the emotional turmoil of the last years could, at least for a few fleeting moments, be forgotten.

Heinz Unger’s trip may have been simply an opportunity to leave behind the maelstrom in Europe for a short while and to embark on a long sea voyage – something that he enjoyed his entire life – and unburden himself of the emotional stresses of the

---

¹ Heinz Unger, Gustav Mahler: Second Symphony (Programme notes to January 22, 1958), LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 38.
² Ibid.
time. It is also entirely possible, however, that the trip was undertaken as more than merely an isolated foreign engagement and, instead, was an exploration of sorts, a journey to discover new lands and new opportunities. Such a scenario is a distinct possibility, given that he had just lost his important but intensely frustrating position with the Leningrad Radio Orchestra, his contract and visa not renewed for 1938. Indeed, Unger may have been on a reconnaissance tour to determine whether there were any opportunities to arrange a position that might serve to fill the void resulting from his recent Soviet debacle.

His bitter disappointments in the Soviet Union fresh in his mind, Heinz Unger's early forays into the North American public eye often involved denouncing Soviet political interference in cultural matters. In an interview that would appear in the New York Post, he perhaps surprisingly attempted to downplay his anger towards the Soviet authorities, trying to cast matters in a lighthearted manner:

The Soviet officials came to me about one of the concerts. They said the slow movement of Tchaikovsky’s Sixth Symphony should be altered so as not to end slowly and morbidly. Would I just speed it up a bit? they said. I couldn’t agree internally. Or there was Mahler’s Fourth Symphony! [...] They wanted me to have the soloist sing it in a parodistic style!3

Heinz Unger and journalist Earl Lewis even made light of the reason for his exile from the Soviet Union as well as from his native Germany:

He has been refused a visa -- kicked out. Ironically, the official explanation offered the man who since has become conductor of the British Broadcasting Company Orchestra is that he is a German — “although” he said, spiritedly, “because I am a non-Aryan, I have not been welcome in Germany for years!”4

3 New York Post, Tuesday October 26, 1937. Interview with Earl Wilson. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74.
4 Ibid.
However much Lewis attempted to help record the good-natured comments that Unger made, his interviewer saw through the forced joviality, describing the conductor as a “solemn, frowning man of forty-two.”

Heinz Unger did not stay long in New York. Despite publicly praising the United States and its artistic climate ("The country you have here is so wonderful...because in it an artist can breathe"), he secretly confessed to his wife that he found the American cultural climate not to his liking. By the beginning of November, he had moved on to Canada, discussing matters both light and profound with journalists prior to his North American debut with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra. In an interview with a correspondent from the Toronto-based *Globe and Mail*, Unger tried to convey his love of the “American” lifestyle, playing up his love of both movies and jazz music as well as reiterating his stance on artistic freedom:

> You want to know what I think of this continent? Do you know my real impression? In every country [on] the other side of the ocean, except England and Scandinavia, there is no freedom for art. It has to fit with the political ideology. Here in America I love the air I breathe. Everything seems so much more human. The freedom of movement and expression enjoyed by the people of America is new to me.

In the same interview, Unger, still reeling from the shock of recent events, turned down the opportunity to discuss at length the reasons for having left Germany, instead noting that “the times speak for themselves.” The conductor’s light-hearted spirit and desire to embrace the optimism and freedom of America was but a thin veneer that barely covered

---

6 Ibid.
7 Unfortunately, the family lore that is the only source for this otherwise un-confirmable anecdote has not retained the other perhaps more important part of this comment that would have noted why he did not find the United States to his liking.
8 *The Globe and Mail*, November 3, 1937. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74
9 Ibid.
over the sadness and trauma he felt over his forced exile of his native Germany. In Heinz Unger, we have the case of a refugee so traumatized by the events of the period that he could hardly bear to discuss them.

Despite his best attempts at concealing his concerns, Heinz Unger could not help but speak at length about the dark times through which almost the entirety of Europe was already passing or heading towards. In an interview with The Evening Telegram’s C.B. Pyper, Unger developed his view that the intermingling of art and politics was a gross transgression of freedom, both on a personal level and in the larger sense of preventing people – and society more generally – from expressing themselves:

When politics meddles with art, art dies...In Germany, where the objection is to work by non-Aryans, and in Russia, where it is to work by individualists, the result is the same. Art cannot live.\(^\text{10}\)

For Heinz Unger, politics and art existed on two separate planes that should not be conflated in any sense, much less to manipulate art to help meet political goals. Unger, a product of the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century’s German conception of Bildung, saw art as a reflection of life; to limit art, therefore, was to limit life.

These interviews were conducted at the Westminster Hotel, where Heinz Unger was staying during his brief sojourn in Toronto. His main site of activity was Massey Hall, where he was preparing to lead the Toronto Symphony Orchestra in a work they had never performed and is an “especially demanding work even for a virtuoso orchestra” – Hector Berlioz’s Symphonie fantastique.\(^\text{11}\) Unger insisted upon three rehearsals to

\(^{10}\) The Globe and Mail, November 3, 1937.

familiarize the orchestra members with the complex score and acquaint them with his vision of the work.12

The concert itself took place on November 9, 1937, a Tuesday night that would be remembered in Toronto for a very long time. The concert was actually divided between Heinz Unger, who conducted the aforementioned Berlioz work as well as the performance of Mozart’s Symphony No. 35 (“Haffner”) that opened the evening, and Ernest Macmillan, the orchestra’s regular conductor, who assumed directorial duties in a performance of Tchaikovsky’s Violin Concerto with Mishel Piastro as soloist.13 The reviews of the concert that appeared in the next day’s newspapers could not have been more enthusiastic about the concert itself, nor about Unger’s conducting ability. In particular, the music critics in attendance called attention to Heinz Unger’s role in stimulating the Toronto Symphony Orchestra to new heights:

It was the guest conductor – Heinz Unger – that did it, of course. For if there was any doubt about that when the Mozart was finished, the playing of the Berlioz settled it forever. For if the Mozart was revelation of an orchestra’s latent power the Berlioz was positively revolutionary. The number might be called a test piece for orchestral virtuosity. It is full of effects – tone painting and rhythm torturing – fire and fury – charm and ugliness – the bitter and the sweet – the nightmare and the religious rhapsody. Small wonder that the audience cheered Mr. Unger and couldn’t recall him often enough at the end of the concert.... it must be said that it was a new-born orchestra, and guest conductor Heinz Unger was the miracle worker. When comes their such another?14

12 Heinz Unger, who liked to talk to the orchestra members about matters beyond the score itself, had wanted more than the three rehearsals that he was granted. Ezra Schabas, *Sir Ernest MacMillan*, 122. Throughout his career, Unger would wage similar battles in what was often a futile attempt to secure what he considered to be the required time to adequately rehearse and prepare for a performance.

13 The evening was supposed to begin with Mozart’s Overture to “The Marriage of Figaro” but this was omitted (despite being on the concert program) due to the length of the program.

14 Edward Wodson, “Visiting Artists Work Miracles with Orchestra” *The Evening Telegram*, Wednesday, November 10, 1937. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. The un-credited music reviewer for *The Globe and Mail* commended Unger in a similar manner: “The hero of the evening was undoubtedly Heinz Unger, famous European conductor, who led our players superbly in two of the three major works that made up the fine program presented. He was recalled
After what can only be called a remarkable success, Heinz Unger left for Europe, returning on the Cunard White Star Line’s RMS Queen Mary on December 15, 1937. In light of Unger’s achievements with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, it should come as no surprise that he was invited back for a second concert. On November 11, 1938, he once again set sail for the Americas, this time bypassing the United States and steaming directly to Canada for his eagerly anticipated return. And if the critical reception for Unger had been positive the previous year, the response to the 1938 concert was positively rapturous, reviewers from all corners of the Toronto critical community noting the strength of the conductor’s interpretations and his ability to inspire the TSO. In sum, the majority if not the entirety of Toronto’s musical press, along with a great

countless times, applauded and cheered to the echo, but steadily refused to accept for himself the extraordinary ovation tendered, always insisting upon making our players rise to share in acknowledgement the ardent tribute. Our players did, indeed, distinguish themselves in their sensitive and vital response to his leadership, so that many passages throughout the evening could hardly have been bettered anywhere, but the chief honours, nevertheless, were Dr Unger’s “A Splendid Concert” The Globe and Mail, Wednesday, November 10, 1937 LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74

“Ocean Travellers” The New York Times, Wednesday, December 15, 1937 LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74

Unger arrived in Montreal aboard the RMS Ausonia on November 20, 1938 LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74

Unger’s second concert with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra (held at Massey Hall) took place on November 29, 1938, the program consisting of an assortment of some of the 19th century’s greatest works: Brahms Fourth Symphony and, following the intermission, three tone poems Liszt’s Les Preludes, Wagner’s Siegfried’s Rhine Journey, and Tchaikovsky’s Romeo and Juliet MUS 56, Box 5, File 74. As noted in the text, the reviews for the concert were without exception positive. Hector Charlesworth, writing in Saturday Night, noted how Unger “more than justified the golden opinions he won a year ago” while the contributor for The Globe and Mail also praised Unger effusively, commenting on how “our distinguished European visitor made the orchestra sing divinely in his profoundly beautiful and moving reading of [Brahms’] great work, especially in the heavenly andante.” Unger’s success, however, was not limited to his Brahms, The Globe and Mail critic also noted that the “playing throughout was of a high order, taut, clean, unanimous, and sensitively responsive to the conductor’s masterly leading” Augustus Bridle was also effusive in his praise, noting how “in a complete program conducted by a master of spiritual interpretation [concertgoers] were conscious of a high intellect working to bring out subtleties of mood and meaning through a marvellously expressive sincerity of technique in conducting, and a highly responsive orchestra.” See Hector Charlesworth, “Visit of a Great Master,” Saturday Night, December 10, 1938 LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74, “A Great Conductor” The Globe and Mail LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74, Augustus Bridle, “Unger Makes Magic Aided by Symphony,” Toronto Daily Star, Wednesday, November 30, 1938 LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 74
many concert-goers and lovers of music, were swept away a second time by Unger’s mastery of the orchestra and his passionate readings.

II. Andante Moderato. Sehr gemachlich. Nie eilen [Very leisurely. Never hurry.] A lengthy intermission ensues [the end of the first movement]. This was prescribed by Mahler to allow the deep emotions of this grandiose prelude to fade from the audience’s mind. The second movement that follows could not be of greater contrast. It is an idyll in the style of an old-fashioned menuet [sic]. Inextinguishable joy of living succeeds the vision of death. A song of the deepest happiness takes the place of the strains of mourning. But there is an unmistakable veil of some distant sadness over this music. It is like a dream of some happiness long past.18

Heinz Unger would not return to Canada for another ten years. A major reason for this surely lies with the commencement of the Second World War, a conflict that made sea travel particularly dangerous. But there was also the matter of one Sir Ernest MacMillan, the long serving director of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra who had been responsible for Unger’s initial invitation to Toronto.19 The guest conductor’s successes in 1937 and 1938 could not have but caused MacMillan consternation, especially during a period in which his own relationship with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra was undergoing evaluation.20 Ernest Macmillan must have been relieved that circumstances had arisen that would bar Unger from returning to Canada for many years.

By 1945, the world was exhausted of war and conflict. The Second World War was the final bloody bookend of a thirty year period during which Europe had been

---

19 Sir Ernest Macmillan (1893-1973) was one the most important figures in the development of music in Canada in the first half of the 20th century. Alongside his principal role as conductor of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra between 1931 and 1956, he was also principal of the Toronto Conservatory of Music between 1926 and 1942 as well as an accomplished composer.
20 According to Schabas, MacMillan was going through a period of questioning whether he in fact wanted to remain at the helm of the TSO. Schabas states that the low point of MacMillan’s relationship with the TSO fell in the latter parts of the 1930s and lasted into the early 1940s. See Schabas, pp. 146-154.
wracked by war, conflict, and instability. 21 Tens of millions had died in two apocalyptic wars and millions more had been driven out of their homes, forced to begin their life anew. The first half of the 20th Century – with very short respites – had been an era of unremitting pain, desperation and death for too much of Europe and the rest of the world.

Heinz Unger had not been exempt from all this anguish, whatever he might have said – or not said – in interviews at the time. Indeed, his life to this point had been one of promise cut short by the misdeeds of his fellow Europeans. He had served in the First World War, experienced the years of hyper-inflation, depression and growing anti-Semitism in Germany, run afoul of Soviet authorities, and lived through the bomb raids – the Blitz – on London. Exhausted by the constant worry of further conflict and dislocation and eager to start anew, he decided that his future and that of his family lay not in the cauldron that was Europe but in the new world. Even at the end of the war, Unger saw no future in Europe, a continent that he felt would soon be overrun by Stalinist and Communist expansionism – a system he knew all too well from his time in the Soviet Union – an eventuality that would have plunged the European continent back into the grasp of another totalitarian and repressive dictator.

As we have seen, Unger had once before visited the United States and found it not to his liking. By this time, however, his former mentor and idol Bruno Walter had settled in California, fitting into a community of German Jewish exiles (many of whom Unger knew personally) that had grown in size and importance. 22 For whatever reason –

---

21 AJP Taylor considers the First and Second World Wars as a continuity, casting these conflicts as a “Thirty Years War” with an era of instability bookended by two bloody conflicts. See: AJP Taylor, The Origins of the Second World War (New York: Touchstone, 1961).

22 During the 1930s and 1940s, German Jewish artists and intellectuals had moved in great numbers, settling in California and becoming key members of a burgeoning American arts industry in Hollywood and in the greater Los Angeles area. A selective list of musicians who made this move include the conductors Bruno Walter and Otto Klemperer, and the composers Erich Korngold and Ernst Toch. For a
perhaps a fear of too much competition or perhaps the desire to leave behind the German Jewish community that had failed in Europe – Unger decided that settling in this location would not suit his purposes. Nor did he like New York anymore than he had in the past; during his emigration to the Americas, he remained there for a year before determining that his future lay not in the United States but in the Canada where he had been so warmly received ten years earlier.  

After a short stay in the United States, therefore, Heinz Unger decided to move to Toronto, the scene of his artistic triumph in the prewar period and the country to which immigration would be most simple on account of his British citizenship. In light of the very favourable response that he had received in his two pre-war concerts with the TSO, Unger must have felt that he would be immediately granted a myriad of opportunities and that he would quickly rebuild a successful career, perhaps culminating in the directorship of one of Canada’s oldest and most distinguished musical ensembles, the Toronto Symphony Orchestra. And indeed, his post-war return to Canada was initially a favourable one; in his first post-war Canadian appearance on July 15, 1948, Unger led the Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra in a Proms concert at Toronto’s Varsity Arena, the concert being a collection of mostly lighter fare in the Proms tradition.  

25 Reviews of the fuller discussion of the extensive Jewish artistic contribution to the Los Angeles of the day, see: Dorothy Lamb Crawford, A Windfall of Musicians: Hitler’s Émigrés and Exiles in Southern California (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009).  

23 Little information is extant on Unger’s activities or even on where he stayed in his year-long sojourn in New York. In fact, only one document in his Fonds relates to this period: a letter wherein Leopold Stokowski informs Unger of the “disturbed and crowded conditions” and he thinks it unlikely that he will be able to help him obtain a position. Letter from Leopold Stokowski to Heinz Unger, 20 December 1947. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 10.  

24 That the culture of Toronto seemed somehow more familiar and comfortable because of its Commonwealth sensibilities cannot also not be discounted as a “pull” factor in Unger’s selection of a new home.  

25 Despite the fact that many of the players were culled from the TSO’s ranks, the Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra was actually a separate entity, “established with the assistance of the Toronto Musical Protective Association to provide summer employment for musicians.” See: Robert W. Judge, “Promenade
concert were favourable, if not as rapturous as on the conductor’s appearances with the TSO a decade earlier.  

Despite his earlier Toronto successes and his arrangement of a concert upon his move to Canada, however, Heinz Unger failed to establish himself within the Toronto musical scene during the first years of his life in Canada. This is due to a number of reasons that encompass both the personal and have implications for the wider social understanding of Heinz Unger as a German Jew trying to integrate into his new Canadian context.

The personal reasons are the easiest to lay out though still difficult to truly understand. Unger, having been contracted to conduct four Proms concerts, fell ill and was unable to fulfill his contract; his health, never robust, took a battering in the strains of a move to a foreign land while his experience of witnessing the death of millions that most likely included members of his immediate family and of many close friends was surely a strain that took both a physical as well as a psychological toll. Moreover, the shock and trauma that he experienced in those years of cataclysm and dislocation exacerbated Unger’s tendency toward self-pity and defensive posturing.  

26 The Evening Telegram's music critic called the performance of the Beethoven overture an interesting reading, the Borodin dances "quite fascinating," the Schubert "delightful" and the "almost banal" Strauss waltz "the reincarnation of the spirit of that musical city [Vienna] that has become almost a legend." The Evening Telegram, Toronto, July 16, 1948. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75. The unsigned reviews of the concert in both The Globe and Mail and The Evening Telegram (both July 16, 1948) both note, however, that Unger was handicapped by a lack of rehearsal time. LAC, MUS 56, Box 5, File 75.

27 Unfortunately, attempts to determine whether his parents may have been among those who perished in the Nazi death camps have proved futile.

28 In the author's unofficial discussions with both the conductor's daughter, Ines Johnston, and the former director of the Music Division of Library and Archives Canada, Helmut Kallman, both expressed sadness
confusion – his inability (like so many others) to deal with the events of a decade and a half filled with persecution, displacement, loss, and death – transformed him into a “difficult” personality, a character trait that was to plague him throughout the remainder of his life and to complicate matters in many instances.

The unfathomable feeling of anger at his fellow man, of guilt for surviving while so many loved ones, colleagues, and friends were sent to their death – the ungraspable sense of being wronged – translated into a clumsy negotiation of the realities of his new adopted Canadian homeland that in turn resulted in a series of missteps that created for Unger a set of conditions that meant his peripheralization even before his permanent move to Toronto. For, in attempting to secure for himself employment in the wake of his removal from the position of music director of the Leningrad Radio Orchestra, he had approached his pre-war concerts with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra as an opportunity to impress upon the orchestra’s directors that he should be considered the successor to the long-time musical director of the TSO and doyen of the Toronto music scene Ernest MacMillan. Unger’s perceived duplicity in this respect resulted in a rivalry with MacMillan that would be a key feature of the German Jewish conductor’s Canadian frustrations in the first decade of his life after immigration.

In his authoritative biography devoted to Ernest MacMillan, Ezra Schabas often mentions the rivalry between MacMillan and Unger. He also makes much of certain episodes which served to both demonstrate as well as heighten this supposed rivalry. In particular, he draws special attention to circumstances surrounding Unger’s second trip to Toronto in 1938:

---

over Unger’s ability to arouse the ire of potential friends and supporters, and to ostracize himself in the process.
When Unger had been in Toronto in 1938, he and some avid supporters had heard some rumours that MacMillan might be leaving the TSO (it was the time of MacMillan’s despondency with the orchestra) and had made some inappropriate and tasteless proposals to the TSO that he be MacMillan’s successor. MacMillan had gotten wind of this, and from then on was wary of Unger. Unger had written to MacMillan from England during the war to try and clear himself, but MacMillan’s responses had been guardedly cool. He rarely judged people unkindly, but thought Unger a flagrant opportunist and, worse, an ingrate. He had, after all, given Unger his first chance in North America.29

In his recounting of this episode, Schabas clearly sympathizes with Ernest MacMillan. In downplaying Unger’s attempted war-time rapprochement with Macmillan, however, Schabas proves more than a touch harsh on Unger. Moreover, in failing to examine the Unger Fonds, Schabas overlooked a personal letter that sheds a new light on the matter altogether. In a letter to his friend Harry Newstone written many years later, Unger suggests that the misunderstanding may have stemmed from the agent Arthur Judson30:

Careful with Judson! After my first great success in Toronto in 1937 I saw him in New York and he told me that MacMillan was leaving Toronto (!), which was incorrect, but caused me to make a lot of wrong moves (the damage of which lasted for many years).31

According to Unger’s account, the reason for the discord with MacMillan had stemmed from flawed intelligence he had received from the outspoken and irresponsible Judson.

And while Unger may have exhibited poor judgement in not directly approaching

29 Schabas, p 196  The letter from England that Unger wrote to MacMillan is dated October 6, 1944 and is found in the MacMillan Fonds at LAC
30 Arthur Judson (1881-1975) was a manager of numerous musical societies during his long career  In the period between 1922 and 1956, he was the manager of the New York Philharmonic  He also managed individual artists, the leading figures being: Marian Anderson, John Barbirolli, Robert Casadesus, Van Cliburn, Clifford Curzon, Todd Duncan, Nelson Eddy, Benjamin Gigi, Mischa Elman, Zino Francescatti, Gary Graffman, Jascha Heifetz, Vladimir Horowitz, Jose Iturbi, Lorin Maazel, Yehudi Menuhin, Eugene Ormandy, Lily Pons, Fritz Reiner, Rudolph Serkin and Helen Traubel  Notably, Judson had a falling out with another Mahler disciple Otto Klemperer over the conductor’s decision to program Mahler’s Second Symphony at a concert with the New York Philharmonic in the 1935-1936 season.
31 Letter from Heinz Unger to Harry Newstone, dated February 12, 1962  LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 15  In this letter, Unger was trying to advise his friend Newstone who was seeking opportunities in Canada and was trying to deduce whether Walter Susskind might be leaving the post of the director of the TSO.
MacMillan to determine whether Judson’s account was accurate, it would be unfair to cast Unger as a “flagrant opportunist” or condemn him too harshly. Indeed, the misunderstanding may have very well come about because Unger and MacMillan stemmed from distinctly different cultural milieus informed by contrasting codes of conduct.

It also stands to reason, however, that Macmillan, though long established in Toronto, would remember Unger’s Canadian successes and be wary of the arrival of such a highly-esteemed European conductor. Indeed, contemporary sources seem to bear this suspicion out, an article in Mayfair Magazine pointing out the fact that some “think it remarkable that Dr. Heinz Unger, the Berlin-born conductor of high reputation in Europe who has been living in Toronto since 1948, has not graced the TSO podium since the 1938 season.” This article clearly insinuates that McMillan was rather reluctant in allowing any conductors to lead “his” orchestra, especially when they had already demonstrated their craft in such a remarkable way.

To portray this relationship as solely filled with antagonism, however, would be to misrepresent matters; after all, when Heinz Unger established the York Concert Society, Ernest MacMillan and his wife served as patrons of the society for the entirety of its existence. Over time, therefore, Unger and MacMillan developed a peaceful co-existence – never becoming friends, perhaps – but learning to deal with one another’s idiosyncrasies.

32 Ezra Schabas intimates that MacMillan was upset by Unger’s immediate success with his Toronto Symphony Orchestra in 1937 and 1938. Reading reviews of the sort that were written following the concerts, one can understand MacMillan’s apparent concern; Unger had been greeted as a “miracle-worker” and as an artist capable of making the TSO transcend its own artistic limits and its achievement under MacMillan’s leadership. The seeds of hostility, it is fair to suggest, stem from this opening salvo – Heinz Unger’s immediate and comprehensive success with the TSO.
III. In ruhig fliessender Bewegung [With a gently flowing movement]. The third movement is the turning point in the symphony. After the first two movements which picture the past, reality intrudes abruptly and the mood changes. The music is a symphonic transcription of “St. Anthony’s Sermon to the Fish”, one of Mahler’s songs from the cycle “The Youth’s Magic Horn”. In the poem on which it is based, the Saint, finding the churches empty, goes to the fish to preach to them. They all listen to him and admire his eloquence. “Never has any sermon pleased the fish so much”. But there it ends. After the sermon is over, they continue as before. In the symphony this movement has a similar sense. It is in the form of a perpetuum mobile, alternating between pessimistic humor and the most bitter sarcasm. It depicts life as moving in empty and endless circles; all endeavour is useless, and the lone prophet remains alone. The movement ends on a note of disgust and despair.  

The antagonism between Unger and MacMillan – albeit becoming muted over time – suggests at the greater reason for why Unger may have struggled to establish himself in Toronto in his early years there. Heinz Unger was a German Jew – a German and a Jew – and his arrival in Canada in the immediate post-war years may have directly contributed to an isolation from both the Canadian Jewish communities for being German and a more general Canadian context wherein being neither a Jew or a German were particularly coveted.

In regards to the Canadian Jewish community, we must remain cognizant that Unger stemmed from a Central European milieu wherein the contours of identity and the integrationist impulses that had long been established amongst German Jewry during the course of the 19th century were at odds with that familiar to the vast majority of Canadian Jews who had arrived from an Eastern Europe where understandings of Jewishness and embeddedness with the surrounding non-Jewish milieu were very different. And while post-war Canadian Jewry underwent a process wherein members of the Canadian Jewish community, in the words of Franklin Bialystock, “were bent on advancing from the fringes of the Canadian mosaic into the mainstream of Canadian society” – the contours

---

of the community would have still been informed by its antecedents.\textsuperscript{35} In other words, the pre-conditions for what Canadian historian Harold Troper has called the "whitening of Euro-ethnics" could not have entirely discarded the self understandings accrued over the course of centuries in the old country as well as in the first fifty years of life in their adopted new homeland of Canada.\textsuperscript{36} Canada, in welcoming far fewer German Jews in the post-war period than its neighbour to the south, remained a space wherein the views of a once Eastern European Jewry continued to dominate the contours of a national Jewish ethos in the process of negotiating its own space in the evolving Canadian mosaic. 

In this context, the German Jewish immigrants of the immediate post-war period were as islands in a stream, having come from a different milieu than the majority of Canada’s Jews who, while undergoing a process of liberalization in the post-war period and breaking many of the contours of a formerly parochial community, continued to view themselves – and just as importantly be viewed by other Canadians – as part of a distinct community within Canada, however much they may have “gained the acceptance of most Canadians.”\textsuperscript{37}

Moreover, we cannot discount the rather obvious fact that German Jews bore distinctly German features. For, while German Jews remained Jews, the manner in which

\textsuperscript{35} Franklin Bialystock, \textit{Delayed Impact: The Holocaust and the Canadian Jewish Community} (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2000), 69 

\textsuperscript{36} In his magisterial account of Jewish life in the Americas, Irving Howe makes this precise point with a beautiful nuance that bears repeating: "Cultures are slow to die; when they do, they bequeath large deposits of custom and value to their successors, and sometimes they survive long after their more self-conscious members suppose them to have vanished. A great many suburban Jews no longer spoke Yiddish, a growing number did not understand it, some failed to appreciate the magnitude of their loss; but their deepest inclinations of conduct, bias, manner, style, intonation, all bore heavy signs of immigrant shaping. What Jewish suburbanites took to be "a good life," the kinds of vocations to which they hoped to lead their children, their sense of appropriate conduct within a family, the ideas capable of winning their respect, the moral appeals to which they remained open, their modes of argument, their fondness for pacific conduct, their views of respectability and delinquency, - all showed the strains of immigrant Yiddish culture, usually blurred, sometimes buried, but still at work " Irving Howe, \textit{World of our Fathers} (New York: Simon and Schuster), 618

\textsuperscript{37} Bialystock, \textit{Delayed Impact}, 69.
they expressed themselves often contained elements – everything from their more formal mode of dress to their preferences in music, literature, and the arts, and their decidedly German-inflected speech – that would have served as painful reminders for Canadian Jews who had very recently seen, in their eyes, the vile manifestation of the very culture that German Jews carried within them. In short, how could Canadian Jews stomach the cultural expressions of German Jews who seemed to them eerily similar to those Germans that had slaughtered millions of Europe’s Jews?

Such a crude formulation aside, this is not to say that Unger was entirely ostracized by all parts of the Toronto Jewish community. While his difficulties in embedding himself on account of his bifurcate German Jewish identity may have caused his first years in Canada to be difficult ones, he still did advance in ways that would cause him great pride and allow him to express his Bildung sensibilities as well as begin a dialogue with segments of Toronto’s Jewish community. For, though Unger managed to make but one appearance with a professional ensemble in his first years in Canada – the aforementioned Proms concert with the Toronto Philharmonic in 1948 – he did in fact manage to make a series of new acquaintances that would propel his Canadian career in the years to come. Indeed, the main thrust of his career in these years lay with the Forest Hill Village Community Orchestra, an ensemble that he led in a series of concerts culminating in an adventurous program on 12 November 1951 at the Forest Hill Community Centre. The concert programme on that occasion consisted of three works: Ernest Bloch’s *Concerto Grosso for Strings and Piano Obbligato*, a commissioned work
The 1951 concert with the Forest Hill Village Community Orchestra, an ensemble that mixed professional and amateur musicians, was the culmination of an effort to build up an orchestra that had been, as recently as 1950, in a "very rudimentary state." It was also a consequence of Unger managing to embed himself within a Forest Hill that, in the words of Gerald Tulchinsky, was a key site for a number of Canadian Jews who were proving increasingly upwardly mobile:

Some more affluent Toronto Jews moved away from the areas of first and second settlement up to swanky Forest Hill... Many of the new arrivals shed their 'old-fashioned' ways – abandoning Orthodox religious observances, for example – and adopted upper-class norms.

The initiative, according to Unger, had initially been launched by "two ladies when they asked me to take charge of the Forest Hill Village Community Orchestra" and his earnest goal was "to gather together in the Village a group of people...and mould them into a band of first-class musicians." Heinz Unger, once a regular conductor with the Berlin Philharmonic, was now the leader and artistic director of a Community

---

38 The piano part in the Bloch work was played by Leo Barkin. Leo Smith (b. Birmingham 1881- d. Toronto 1952) was, as well as a composer, also the principal cellist of the TSO between 1932 and 1940 and a professor of music at the University of Toronto's music faculty until his official retirement in 1950. John Beckwith, "Leo Smith," in The Encyclopedia of Music in Canada.


40 Gerald Tulchinsky, Canada's Jews: A People's Journey (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 417. As we have seen, Heinz Unger and his family had long ago abandoned "old-fashioned" ways and would have surely been comfortable in a milieu wherein religious observance and Jewish cultural affiliation were unconnected. The ethnic and cultural composition of Forest Hill might also explain why Unger was to achieve his first Canadian successes there after immigration, significant members of the community all too happy to have in their midst a Jewish conductor of such high standing and achievement to serve as a community flag-bearer and reflect their civic pride.

41 Ibid.
Orchestra in Toronto. But his move also marked the beginnings of a relationship – albeit a tenuous and selective one – with Canada’s Jewish community.

Heinz Unger immersed himself fully in the challenge and embraced his new, modest role with an enthusiasm that suggests not only a sincerity to succeed in his new Canadian home but also reveals his sincere respect for a role wherein he could help cultivate the development of Canadians, Jewish or otherwise, according to his own Bildung sensibilities. As early as July 1950, he had held a public rehearsal with his then six-month old Forest Hill Orchestra, partly in an attempt to display his achievements unto this point and also, presumably, in the hopes of creating more interest in his enterprise and perhaps luring more supporters. At the rehearsal, held at Forest Hill’s Central School, Unger’s ensemble of some 70 musicians – “although the drum and percussion instruments were entirely missing and some other sections too thinly populated” – made a favourable impression on a small audience assembled to hear the new group’s first endeavour and also took the opportunity to outline the Orchestra’s main goals.42 Unger’s goals – being of a primarily pedagogical nature – were a set of aims that were entirely consistent with the elements of Bildung with which he himself – as a German Jew – had been inculcated and had not abandoned despite his move to a new home in a faraway land.

By the fall of 1950, Unger’s pedagogical goals had been further refined. His Forest Hill enterprise had grown to include a Forest Hill Training School for Ensemble

---

42 The goals were as follows: a. “To give to [the music lovers and amateur musicians] the deep enjoyment, that real understanding and appreciation of music and music performances in general, which can only be derived from meticulous studies of the works at hand and from the observance of the essential rules of true ensemble playing”; b. “To the student and the professional members of the orchestra we wish to give a valuable training ground for orchestral practice in general”; c. “to our listeners we wish to bring performances of the masterworks of the musical literature.” Gladys Allison, “Dr. Heinz Unger Directs Forest Hill Orchestra,” The Enterprise (Lansing, Ontario), July 6, 1950. MUS 56, Box 5, File 75.
Playing. By 14 November, the ensemble was prepared to make its official public debut and did so to great effect. Assembled to hear the performance were many of the critics of the Toronto musical community who went away surprised at Unger’s achievement in bringing his ensemble to so high a level of execution in so short a time. Leo Smith, The Globe and Mail’s music critic in attendance, ended his favourable review with an interesting comparison:

Forest Hill of today and Italy of the seventeenth century seem far apart in thought. But to me there was a point of similarity. The Italians, having got their pupils, saw to it that the best musicians should be their directors. I thought Forest Hill had done the same in choosing Dr. Heinz Unger as their conductor and tutor.

Unger would obviously have been very flattered by such a comparison, especially one that dove-tailed so closely with his own views, as expressed in a talk he gave at the concert’s intermission:

Tonight you are here because we wish to show you the progress made since last spring. I remarked in June that I was a firm believer in the possibilities of cultivating music on a ‘civic’ basis, the word ‘civic’ implying collaboration of instruments as members of a community and irrespective of the fact of their being either professionals or amateurs. Our ensemble here is a living example of what can be done on this basis.

Heinz Unger, in speaking of civic values, was trying to ensure that his audience understood his adherence to “civic” values not only because it might serve as a means of generating further support for his enterprise but also because it was a set of precepts in which he truly believed.

---

43 The works programmed for the concert were by no means light-weight fare – Weber’s Oberon Overture, Schubert’s Eighth Symphony (“Unfinished”), Beethoven’s Egmont Overture, and Mozart’s Serenade No. 12 for eight wind instruments.


Unger’s success with the Forest Hill Orchestra paid dividends almost immediately; shortly after the concert, the Toronto Department of Parks and Recreation swooped in and secured the conductor’s services, contracting him to improve the level of playing of the Beaches Orchestra, based out of the Malvern Collegiate Community Centre. In his first years in Canada, Heinz Unger was quickly earning a reputation as an orchestra-builder.

From our perspective, moving from the summit of European musical culture with the Berlin Philharmonic to creating a community orchestra from scratch in a sleepy Toronto suburb seems like a tremendous fall from grace. In Heinz Unger’s Bildung-bespectacled gaze, however, the opportunity to teach a new generation of musicians the values that he had learnt and to be able to conduct his rehearsals at leisure must have seemed like a wonderful and exciting new opportunity. Moreover, he was playing a savvy tactical game; surely disappointed by his inability to establish himself in the mainstream of Toronto musical life immediately upon his arrival, he was playing a clever waiting game, building his reputation and slowly moving from the periphery towards the centre of activity in his newly adopted country of Canada.

By the 1951-1952 season, Unger’s hard work and patience with respect to his advancement in Canada had begun to pay off; as he continued to devotedly serve community orchestras in the greater Toronto area, increased opportunities began to come his way, beginning with two Proms concerts in the summer of 1951.46

46 The program for the May 31 concert opened with Tchaikovsky’s Romeo and Juliet Overture, a selection of songs and arias, and ended with Dvorak’s Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”). The guest soloist for the vocal selections was baritone Igor Gorin. Heinz Unger also led a second Proms concert the following week, the programme being Mendelssohn’s “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”, a selection of lighter violin “encores” by Foster-Heifetz, Kreisler, and Sarasate (all performed with Simeon Joyce accompanying at the piano), Mozart’s Violin Concerto No. 4 in D Major, and Beethoven’s Symphony No. 5. The soloist for the violin pieces on that occasion was Donna Grescoe. On June 11, 1951, Unger also led
continued in his progress with the City Parks Department-sponsored “Community Centre Orchestra,” holding an all-Mozart concert on 29 January 1952 at the Oakwood Collegiate Auditorium that was praised for blurring the distinction between amateur and professional ensemble.\textsuperscript{47} Heinz Unger also seized his opportunity to conduct rather more substantial fare when he was contracted to conduct Arnold Schoenberg’s \textit{Transfigured Night} for the CBC Wednesday Night program of 23 January 1952.\textsuperscript{48}

The months that followed were filled with further opportunities as the conductor’s domestic reputation continued to grow. February brought Unger the opportunity to conduct at the 33\textsuperscript{rd} annual concert for the Toronto Police Association, an enormous Pops concert held at the Maple Leaf Gardens, with more than 7000 attendees.\textsuperscript{49} March, meanwhile, signalled his debut with the London Chamber Orchestra in a program that included a selection of Mozart, Handel, and Franck works.\textsuperscript{50} Unger’s March success with the London Chamber orchestra in turn led to further engagements with that ensemble;

---

\textsuperscript{47} The reviewer in attendance paid particular attention to the fact that the orchestra’s work blurred the lines between professional and amateur ensemble-playing, concluding that “no such matter needed to be taken into consideration.” Pearl McCarthy, “Community Orchestra Plays Mozart Concert,” \textit{The Globe and Mail}, January 30, 1952. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76. The all-Mozart program that consisted of \textit{Les Petit Riens} Ballet Suite, Violin Concerto No.4 in D Major, Serenade No.12 for Winds, and the great \textit{Haffner Serenade}, No.7.

\textsuperscript{48} CBC Times, January 23, 1952. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76. Unfortunately, this important performance seems not to have been preserved by the CBC.

\textsuperscript{49} The orchestral part of the February 26 program consisted of: Berlioz’s “Roman Carnival” Overture, Tchaikovsky’s “Romeo and Juliet”, Wagner’s “Rienzi” Overture, and Liszt’s “Les Preludes.” Edward Wodson, “Police Concert Stars Baritone, TSO and Ballet,” \textit{The Telegram}, February 27, 1952. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76

\textsuperscript{50} The March 20 program at Aeolian Hall consisted of: Handel’s Concerto Grosso in G Major, Op.6, #1; Franck’s \textit{Symphonic Variations}; Mozart’s Piano Concerto in A Major (K.488); and Mozart’s \textit{Marriage of Figaro} Overture. The soloist was Helen Ingram. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76.
following the concert, he was contracted to lead the opening concerts of the Bach Festival held in April of that same year.\textsuperscript{51}

Before leaving on his annual concerts to Spain, Heinz Unger made a few further appearances on Canadian soil. In October 1952, he led concerts on two consecutive weeks for CBC Radio. The first concert, broadcast on October 6, was a performance of the second movement of Mahler’s Third Symphony, followed by Richard Strauss’ \textit{Till Eulenspiegels Lustige Streiche} and Mahler’s \textit{Songs of a Wayfarer}. The second program, broadcast on 13 October, began with a Suite from Domenico Scarlatti’s “Good Humoured Ladies” and continued on to Brahms’ final symphonic utterance, his profound Fourth Symphony.\textsuperscript{52} On 20 October 1952, Unger was once again at the helm of the London Chamber Orchestra, conducting a mixed programme of works by Handel, Schubert and Beethoven while two days later the conductor returned to lead his “Community Centre Orchestra” in a bipartite program, the first half devoted to works by Schubert and the second half to works by Beethoven.\textsuperscript{53}

Following this very busy October in Canada, Heinz Unger again returned to Europe, conducting extensively in Spain and also in England. At this point in time, Unger’s international career comprised a prominent part of his professional life and the

\textsuperscript{51} The two concerts took place on Friday and Saturday evenings, April 18 and 19 respectively. The Friday night concert was: Cantata No. 51 “Jauchzet Gott in Alle Lande” (Soprano: Eunice MacDonald), Air in D from Suite No. 3, Brandenburg Concerto No. 3, and the Overture in G minor. Saturday’s evening concert consisted of Brandenburg Concerto No. 4, the Trio in C Major, the Harpsichord Concerto in F Minor (soloist: Ray McIntyre), Suite No.2 for Orchestra. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76.

\textsuperscript{52} LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76.

\textsuperscript{53} The London Chamber Orchestra works were: Bach’s Overture in G Minor, Schubert’s Symphony No. 5 and Beethoven’s Second Piano Concerto (soloist: Helen Ingram). At the concert with the Community Centre Orchestra, the Schubert works were the Overture in C Major (“In the Italian Style”), and his Eighth Symphony (“Unfinished”). The Beethoven works performed were the \textit{Egmont} Overture and Symphony No. 2. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76.
conductor was going from strength to strength. With a gently flowing movement, Heinz Unger was contentedly living his life as a conductor on both sides of the Atlantic.

IV. Urlicht. The world having thus failed us, what can be the solution? At this critical moment the human voice makes its entry, without interruption (fourth movement). In a song of deepest faith and tenderness – the setting of another poem from “The Youth’s Magic Horn” called “Urlicht” (“Primeval Light”) – it sets us a goal and provides an answer to the question posed in the third movement.

“...Man lies in greatest need! Man lies in greatest pain! Rather would I be in heaven. I came to a wide road. There a little angel tried turning me away. O no! I would not be turned away. I am from God and wish to return to God! God will grant me a little light to show me the way to the eternal, happy life!”

In Canada, Heinz Unger was steadily building a network of supporters that recognized his talent and wished him to have an orchestra upon which he could impress his artistic vision and talent. In 1953, a group of music-lovers and supporters of his work came together to help him organize what would become the York Concert Society. The York Concert Society (YCS) was to be a new type of ensemble on the Canadian landscape; culled from the ranks of the TSO and holding most of its concerts at Toronto’s Eaton Auditorium, the YCS was created by “admirers of Unger’s art” to allow him the opportunity of practicing his art in Canada on a regular basis. The ensemble’s activities were limited: four concerts held every spring to supplement the regular TSO concerts and to present to Toronto audiences music-making of the highest order by a world-class conductor.

The creation of the York Concert Society was greeted with much enthusiasm in the Toronto area, the press lauding the Society’s goal of “adding to Toronto’s musical life during the gap between the Toronto Symphony Orchestra Subscription Series and the Promenade Symphony concerts.” In declaring such an aim, the press was accurately reflecting the York Concert Society’s professed goal of “providing additional work and encouragement to Toronto musicians.” The Society’s goals were not, however, limited to serving as a stop-gap between Toronto’s winter and summer concert seasons. As an early programme proclaimed, the Society’s goal was “[t]o enrich Toronto musical life by adding to it a number of first class performances of outstanding symphonic music of all times.”

The newly-formed society also had an express goal of encouraging home-grown talent, “with preference given to Canadians and New Canadians who belong to this top class [of musician].” Indeed, in the course of its existence, the YCS did encourage Canadian talent, including notable soloists such as Lois Marshall, Maureen Forrester, Greta Kraus, and Lubka Kolessa. In sum, while the expressed goal of cultivating Canadian talent as well as “providing additional work and encouragement to Toronto musicians” must have been a goal which did nothing to hurt the Society’s formation from a purely financial standpoint, this was by no means a cynical goal aimed at furthering Heinz Unger’s career; rather, it was an extension of the German Jewish musician’s philosophy of Bildung, of cultivating learning and culture at a civic level.

---

55 “Society Concerts Fill Spring Gap” The Globe and Mail, February 17, 1953. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76.
56 Ibid.
57 “York Symphony Society.” LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76. In early years, the Society was referred to as both the York Concert Society and as the York Symphony Society. Only over the years did York Concert Society become the more common epithet for the Society.
58 Ibid.
The constitution of the York Concert Society as an orchestra that would stage its concert season each Toronto spring not only provided local musicians with much needed work; it also afforded Heinz Unger the time to continue his regular concert tours of Europe and beyond during each winter season. As such, it initially proved a supplement to Unger’s continued international activities and foreign engagements. However, as the YCS matured and gained an ever greater reputation, a notable shift occurred; while the number of concerts never actually increased, the anticipation surrounding each event and each new season grew. Moreover, the YCS, because of its affiliation with the TSO and the CBC Orchestra, allowed the conductor to remain close to the nerve centre of the Toronto – and Canadian – music scene and to make important contacts within the orchestra itself and with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, an affiliation that would pay dividends in the coming years and lead to numerous other engagements.

The organization of the YCS also allowed Heinz Unger one further liberty; despite its musicians being culled from the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, the York Concert Society was a fully autonomous entity, allowing the music director to freely choose the shape of its programs. And while early music played a major part in the programming due to logistics (the YCS was a smallish orchestra after all, and such an undersized orchestra proved particularly responsive for the performance of early music) and the preferences of his soloists, Unger was also able to expand the orchestra on select occasions to programme the music of those composers closest to his heart. Not surprisingly, therefore, Gustav Mahler’s music would figure prominently in the YCS programs, the York Concert Society becoming the vehicle for the Canadian premieres of many of Mahler’s works.
In its first season, the YCS concerts displayed a variety that was to remain a fixture in future seasons. The premiere concert of the York Concert Society, held on 23 April 1953, was a program devoted to Beethoven’s works, with Lubka Kolessa as soloist.\(^{59}\) The second concert was an all-Bach programme, the third organized thematically as a “Serenade Programme” while the final concert of the YCS’s inaugural year consisted of a selection of Mozart works, Schubert’s Sixth Symphony and, beginning a tradition of including at least one Mahler work per season, the Adagietto from Mahler’s Symphony No. 5 and two of his orchestral songs.\(^{60}\)

The York Concert Society’s debut concert was highly praised in the media. John Kraglund (1922-), the recently-appointed music critic for The Globe and Mail, praised the soloist but ultimately ruled that:

> It was, however, more of a triumph for Heinz Unger and the small orchestra’s outstanding musicians... Dr. Unger’s conducting has an individual angularity that is rare in Toronto. It is an almost violent quality, but one obviously suited to the music and there was no feeling of wasted effort. For the audience there is an impelling magnetism that translates the music into an easily understood idiom of deceiving simplicity... There was about the whole concert

---

\(^{59}\) The all Beethoven programme was held on April 23\(^{rd}\) and consisted of the Lenore No. 2 Overture, Piano Concerto No. 4, and Symphony No. 7. LAC MUS 56, Box 6, File 76. Note that the Bach and Beethoven programmes that comprised the first two concerts of the YCS were switched, presumably due to the soloists’ availability. Lubka Kolessa (1902-1997) was a pianist born in the Ukraine who emigrated to Canada in 1940 and continued to concertize until 1954 after which she devoted herself entirely to teaching.\(^{60}\) The Bach programme held on May 6 consisted of: Overture in G Minor, Harpsichord Concerto in F Minor, Air from Suite in D, Brandenburg Concerto No. 3, and the Suite in B Minor. The soloist on this occasion was Greta Kraus. The “Serenade Programme”, held on May 14, consisted of Mozart’s Serenade No. 7 (Haffner), Berlioz’s Serenade from Harold in Italy, Hugo Wolf’s (orch. Reger) Italian Serenade, and Tchaikovsky’s Serenade for Strings. The final program (held on May 26) was to have opened with Mozart’s Symphony No. 41 (“Jupiter”), continued with an Aria from Mozart’s opera “Il Re Pastore”, and ended with a performance of Mahler’s Symphony No. 4. The program was changed prior to the concert and consisted of: Mozart’s Symphony No. 35, an Aria from the Mozart opera “Il Re Pastore”, the Adagietto from Mahler’s Symphony No. 5 and two songs from his collection of The Youth’s Magic Horn and closed with Schubert’s Symphony No. 6. The soloist on this occasion was the Canadian soprano (and, in her later singing years, mezzo-soprano) Lois Marshall (1924-1997). LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76.
a vibrant vitality that fully justified the rounds of applause that kept calling the dynamic conductor back to the podium.\textsuperscript{61}

Edward Wodson mirrored Kraglund's enthusiasm, praising the thirty-seven member Chamber Orchestra and their leadership under Heinz Unger.\textsuperscript{62}

The same positive response was generated by the second all-Bach YCS concert. On this occasion, the unusually small ensemble of some 20 players performed admirably, John Kraglund echoing his enthusiasm for the first program by calling the performance one that “came close to perfection” and even questioning why the musicians did not play at this high level when not performing under Dr. Unger.\textsuperscript{63}

In short order, therefore, the York Concert Society became a significant part of the Canadian musical landscape, the success of its inaugural season leaving many looking forward to its return the following year and in the years to come. Just as \textit{Urlicht} serves as the central and most emotive movement in Mahler's “Resurrection” symphony, the establishment of the YCS would serve as the central pillar upon which Heinz Unger's post-war Canadian resurrection would rest.

\textsuperscript{61} John Kraglund, “Small Orchestra, Conductor Score in First of Series,” \textit{The Globe and Mail}, April 24, 1953. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76. John Kraglund was born in Denmark and, despite his family having moved to Canada in 1929, had become a naturalized Canadian citizen as recently as 1949. After studies in music theory and criticism with Leo Smith, he would embark on a decades-long career as a music critic, retiring from \textit{The Globe and Mail} only in 1987. In his time as a critic, Kraglund continued much to the development of Canadian music culture, expecting much from the concerts and events he attended. Indeed, his high expectations were rarely met and he was often guarded in his praise; writing in the Encyclopedia of Music in Canada, Alan H. Cowle and Kenneth Winters note that “a measured enthusiasm from Kraglund was the equivalent of panegyric from a colleague.” In light of this assessment, Kraglund's consistently positive views of the many Unger-led concerts he attended carry much weight. See: Alan H. Cowle and Kenneth Winters, “John Kraglund,” in \textit{The Encyclopedia of Music in Canada}. A further assessment of Kraglund's music criticism (along with those of his many colleagues at \textit{The Globe and Mail}) can be found in Colin Eatock, “Classical Music Criticism at the \textit{Globe and Mail}: 1936-2000,” in \textit{Canadian University Music Review} 24/2 (2004).

\textsuperscript{62} Edward Wodson, “Beethoven Music Delights Concert Audience,” \textit{The Telegram}, April 24, 1953. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76.

\textsuperscript{63} John Kraglund, “Harpischordist, Small Orchestra Near Perfection,” \textit{The Globe and Mail}, May 7, 1953. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76. George Kidd echoed Kraglund's verdict, noting that “Dr. Unger is a demanding conductor but he gets results that are at all times pleasing to listen to and interesting to watch.” “Unger, Krauss Combination Very Enjoyable,” \textit{The Telegram}, May 7, 1953. LAC, MUS 56, Box 6, File 76.
V. Im Tempo des Scherzos. Wild herausfahrend [At the same speed as the Scherzo. In a wild outburst]. The Finale leads us back on the road from stress and pain to the Creation. This fifth movement of the symphony is on a scale that dwarfs any attempt to describe it in words. The ultimate promise and fulfillment is preceded by a spiritual tempest in which everything past and present is stirred up and unsettled... What Mahler has attempted to put into music here is nothing less than a vision of Judgment Day, when all that is worldly is wiped out, and the spirit reborn...64

The middle third of the 1950s represent a fertile period in the conductor’s artistic life. After a very successful string of concerts in Argentina, he returned to Canada to conduct two concerts with the CBC Symphony Orchestra, both of which would air on the CBC network. The first program, broadcast on 6 December 1954, consisted of Wagner’s Siegfried Idyll, and Beethoven’s Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”) while the second program contained Gustav Mahler’s Fourth Symphony, broadcast on 13 December 1954 and a CBC premiere.65 Being the first time that Unger had conducted a complete Mahler symphony in Canada, the performance was an important event for the conductor. The program was also a major milestone for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as it represented the first time that a complete Mahler symphony was broadcast in its entirety on the CBC, a fact attributable in part to the timely “extension of the CBC Symphony period from 45 to 50 minutes.”66

As the leading musical authority on Mahler resident in Canada, Heinz Unger was finally beginning to receive the accolades and opportunities that such a reputation

---

64 Heinz Unger, Gustav Mahler: Second Symphony (Programme notes to January 22, 1958), LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 38.
65 CBC Times December 5-11, 1954. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77. “Mahler’s Fourth,” The Globe and Mail, November 27, 1954. MUS 56, Box 7, File 77. See also: CBC Times, December 5-11, 1954. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77. A longer discussion of Unger and his affiliation with Mahler can be found in: “Gustav Mahler” CBC Times, December 12-18, 1954. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77. The Soprano Soloist in the final movement was Elizabeth Benson-Guy.
66 “Gustav Mahler” CBC Times, December 12-18, 1954. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77. The only review of the Mahler concert that remains in the Unger Fonds at LAC is a brief note in The Musical Courier in which Ezra Schabas and Stuart Nall called “[h]is reading of the Mahler Fourth Symphony on Dec. 13 must be considered a sympathetic if not exquisite performance of this beautifully iridescent [sic], almost naïve work.” Ezra Schabas and Stuart Nall, The Musical Courier, January 1, 1955. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77.
merited. The CBC, reflecting a world-wide rise in interest in the music of Mahler, also began to devote ever more airtime to the composer’s works. On 30 March 1955, CBC Wednesday Night devoted two and a half hours to the airing of a radio-biography of the composer, with all the musical excerpts (which consisted of Songs of a Wayfarer and Kindertotenlieder, the first movement of Symphony No. 3 and the first two movements of The Song of the Earth) conducted by Heinz Unger.67

However important was Unger’s work in respect to the expansion of the understanding of Mahler’s singular voice and his devotion to the still-young York Concert Society, one of the highlights of this period in Unger’s career was his return to the TSO podium after years of yeoman’s work.68 In 1955, Unger was officially invited back to conduct the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, a full 17 years since his last appearance with the TSO and seven years since he had been resident in Toronto. Perhaps there had been a rivalry after all, a situation that MacMillan had tried to control by keeping Unger on the periphery and, instead of allowing the rivalry to escalate, showing both good will and tactical savvy by patronizing the York Concert Society. In the course of the years exiled from the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, Heinz Unger had grown

67 “A CBC Wednesday Night Devoted to Mahler” CBC Times, March 27-April 2, 1955. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77. Unfortunately, the tapes for this interesting program have either been lost, destroyed or languish in some unknown corner of the CBC. In his capacity as music critic, Ezra Schabas called the program, which consisted of the aforementioned musical works as well as a radio biography that dramatized many of the pivotal moments in the composer’s life, “one of the most interesting two and one half hours our CBC Wednesday nights have had in quite a while.” Ezra Schabas, The Musical Courier, May 1955. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77.
68 Indeed, Unger’s work with the YCS had resulted in Governor-General Vincent Massey and the Lieutenant-Governor and his wife Mr. and Mrs. Louis O. Breithaupt accepting Honorary Patronship of the Society “in recognition of the achievements of the York Concert Society in the past three years and of its support for Canadian art and artists.” “Honorary Patrons of York Society” The Globe and Mail, October 8, 1955.
increasingly frustrated by this state of affairs, as had those that considered themselves supporters of Unger’s art.\footnote{A letter from an audience member at the 35th Annual Police Department concert that Unger had conducted on February 23, 1954 neatly summarizes the situation: “I do wish you would conduct the Toronto Symphony Orchestra in Massey Hall, where the acoustics, though not perfect, would be an improvement over those in Maple Leaf Gardens. Indeed, it would be a treat if a man of your good taste were to become the permanent conductor of the TSO.” Letter from Lorne Adamson to Heinz Unger, February 24, 1954. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 10. The very fact that the conductor kept this letter is in and of itself testament to his finding resonance in the words therein. Moreover, it demonstrates that there were dissenting voices who lamented Unger’s peripheralization in the Toronto music scene.}

Knowing full well the significance of his return to the TSO at the beginning of November 1955, Heinz Unger’s attention was squarely on his two appearances with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra. On November 4, Unger led the TSO in a Pops concert that mixed lighter fare with the Adagietto from Mahler’s Fifth Symphony.\footnote{The full orchestral program, broadcast Coast to Coast, consisted of: Auber’s “Fra Diavolo” Overture, the Nocturne and Scherzo from Mendelssohn’s “Midsummer Night’s Dream,” the arias “Parto, parto, Ma tu ben mio” from Mozart’s opera La Clemenza di Tito and “In Questa Reggia” from Puccini’s Turandot, the aforementioned Adagietto from Mahler’s Symphony No. 5, and Strauss’s “Southern Roses” Waltz. The guest vocal soloist was Lois Marshall. After an intermission, Lois Marshall returned to the stage to sing a selection of songs with piano accompaniment. The evening then concluded with Tchaikovsky’s Romeo and Juliet Overture. (all of the works performed after the intermission were not broadcast). LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77.} A scant four days later, he was again at the helm of the TSO, this time leading the orchestra in more substantial fare: Berlioz’s Roman Carnival Overture, the Adagietto from Mahler’s Symphony No. 5, Beethoven’s Symphony No. 8, and Tchaikovsky’s Fifth Symphony.\footnote{The same programme was repeated the following evening as well, on November 9, 1955. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77.}

The critical reception to Unger’s performances with the TSO was just as rapturous as it had been almost two full decades earlier, John Kraglund characterizing the events in this way:

Last week’s pair of concerts marked the first time Heinz Unger has appeared with the TSO on the Subscription Series since he took up residence in Toronto. The results were little short of spectacular for all concerned. Clarity was the outstanding characteristic, not only in the softest pianissimos of the introduction to the Berlioz
“Roman Carnival” Overture, but also in the towering climaxes of Tchaikovsky’s Symphony No. 5.  

In sum, the reviews beg the question why he had failed to appear with Toronto’s and perhaps Canada’s finest ensemble in so many years, at the same time answering why perhaps MacMillan had so feared allowing Unger a chance to prove himself with the TSO.

Before departing for his usual winter tour of Europe, Heinz Unger conducted two further important performances in Canada, both with the CBC Symphony Orchestra and both broadcast on the CBC network. For these performances, the conductor chose interesting repertoire that was underappreciated in Canada but spoke to both his continuing attachment to the Central European canon of art music as well as to his embrace of new music discovered during his travels. The second concert, held on 26 December 1955, consisted of Anton Bruckner’s Symphony No. 4 (“Romantic”), a work he had not conducted in years but was a mainstay of the symphonic repertoire. The performance the week prior, however, was rather more unusual; as well as the beautiful Les Nuits d’ete of Hector Berlioz (with Elizabeth Benson-Guy as vocal soloist), Unger programmed the Argentinean composer Alberto Ginastera’s Variaciones Concertantes, a

---

72 John Kraglund, “Toronto,” The Musical Courier, December 1, 1955. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77. Hugh Thompson echoed Kraglund’s praise, noting how the performance pleased the crowd, as “[t]hree thousand concert-goers in Massey Hall last night took to clapping, cheering and stamping at the close of the Toronto Symphony subscription concert conducted by Dr. Heinz Unger.” Hugh Thomson, “Unger-led Tchaikovsky Wins Boisterous Ovation” Toronto Daily Star, November 9, 1955. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77. George Kidd, meanwhile, noted how Unger “thrilled a near-capacity audience” and how his “approach was one of sincerity and deep feeling, and the orchestra’s response was a labour of love for both composer and conductor.” George Kidd, “TSO Brass Section Correct, Precise under Dr. Unger,” The Telegram, November 9, 1955. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77.
In the new year, Heinz Unger was once again on a lengthy concert tour of Europe, beginning in Scandinavia with an important set of concerts that underlined his ongoing devotion to expanding Mahler oeuvre. Following a concert with the *Filharmonisk Selskaps Orchester* (State Radio Orchestra, Oslo) where he programmed Mahler’s Fourth Symphony as the centrepiece, he then continued his work in Norway by leading the Oslo Philharmonic Society in a performance of Mahler’s Second Symphony.

Despite this successful, Mahler-filled stop-over in Scandinavia, Heinz Unger’s 1956 winter tour of Europe was dominated by a set of concerts that proved to be one of the most significant events of his life; on this trip, the German Jewish musician returned to the city of his birth to conduct the Berlin Philharmonic for the first time since his exodus in 1933. The invitation had come from none other than the famous music director of the Berlin Philharmonic Wilhelm Furtwängler (1886-1954) who before his death the previous year had asked Unger to return to his native city to conduct the ensemble with which he had experienced his first artistic triumphs.

Heinz Unger made his return to Berlin in a set of identical concerts that were repeated on two consecutive nights, February 22 and 23, 1956. The programme chosen

---

73 The Ginastera work, commissioned by the Buenos Aires Society of Friends of Music and with which Unger had surely made its acquaintance on his recent travels to Argentina, was receiving under Unger its Toronto (and presumably also Canadian) premiere. *CBC Times*, December 18-23 LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77.

74 The other works performed on that occasion were Carl Ditters von Dittersdorf’s (1739-1799) *Actaeon* Symphony, and the obscure and now forgotten Norwegian composer Regnald Skrede’s *Den Kvitte Fuglen*. “Program Bladet” February 8, 1956. The Soloist in the Mahler symphony was the Norwegian Soprano Randi Helseth (1905-1991). LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77.

75 “Here and There,” *The Musical Courier*, March 1, 1956. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77. On the back of these successful performances, Unger obtained engagements in Copenhagen, Goteborg and Bergen for the subsequent season. Unfortunately, there are no confirmed details of these concerts.
for these concerts did not include any Mahler, a circumstance that would have surely
disappointed a musician whose career had been so fundamentally built on his reputation
as a Mahler devotee and specialist since his professional debut at the beginning of the
1920s. Nevertheless, the programme was still an important and fitting one; it began
with the Overture to Smetana's *Bartered Bride*, continued with an aria from Smetana's
opera as well as a further one from Dvorak's *Rusalka*, then moved on to the tone-poem
"Die Moldau" from Smetana's *Ma Vlast* ("My Homeland") and, after an intermission,
ended with Antonin Dvorak's Symphony No. 9 ("From the New World"). The program
thus ended with two works that, whether planned or not, spoke of Heinz Unger's return to
his own fatherland from the new world – perhaps he had not had the opportunity to
conduct Mahler again in his native city but he did have a program that was just about as
fitting, and fulfilled "his secret yearning to do a native's return and conduct, after an
absence of 22 years from his home city, the Berlin orchestra again." Heinz Unger's
return to his childhood city was bittersweet – as he put it, "it was a little saddening" to
find it "reduced to rubble." That sadness, however, could not detract from his joy at
discovering he had not been forgotten, and "was delighted and touched to discover
standing audiences for both Berlin Philharmonic concerts he conducted, and

---

76 Klaus Pringsheim (b. Munich 1883- d. Tokyo 1972), another German conductor who had been vital in
the Mahler Renaissance of the 1920s and also returned to conduct in Berlin in the same concert season, was
granted the honour of conducting Mahler's music with the BPO, a token of appreciation that surely would
have touched him greatly and puzzled Unger all the more. It must be said, however, that Unger never made
a fuss over the programme that he conducted.
77 The February 22 and 23, 1956 concerts were held in the Konzertsaal Der Hochschule Fur Musik and
featured Anny Schlemm as the vocal soloist in the arias. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77.
LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77.
79 Ibid.
'overwhelming ovations'.”

Heinz Unger's return to Berlin after a time in the Canadian wilderness was indeed a “Resurrection.”

---

CHAPTER 7

Musical Motif: Symphony No. 4

"Mahler’s 4th Symphony occupies a unique place among the composer’s works. It is what the sailor knows as the ‘eye’ of a cyclone, the calm area in the centre of mountainous seas.

It is the only Mahler-symphony which is beyond all worldly or spiritual struggle. An unreal fairy-tale mood permeates the whole work which breathes peaceful serenity and an almost unearthly happiness."

The late 1950s represent an important time in Heinz Unger’s life. Professionally, the conductor’s career was looking ever more promising, both domestically and abroad. Within Canada, his orchestra – the York Concert Society – was gaining an ever greater reputation as a quality ensemble and concerts were coming ever faster, the repertoire featured in these concerts ever closer to the conductor’s heart. On the international stage, too, Unger’s concert tours were filled with significant achievements that received positive press wherever he travelled.

However much these developments must have brought him happiness, further important developments loomed on the personal horizon. Heinz Unger’s return to Berlin had opened up a part of his heart and a core element of his identity he had kept locked away and hidden for decades. Returning to Germany, Unger reconnected with his German Jewish identity, an element that had played but a peripheral role in his life for a number of years, all at once. His German Jewish rebirth was heightened by the rapidly approaching 1960 centenary of Gustav Mahler’s birth, the composer that, as we have seen, represented a nexus of German Jewish identity for Heinz Unger and who the

---

1 Heinz Unger, Dr. Heinz Unger on Symphony No. 4 in G major by Gustav Mahler. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 38.
conductor viewed as a kindred emotional spirit, his music serving as his own personal gospel. Moreover, significant events in the Jewish world – including a belated understanding of the Holocaust – were to affect the German Jewish Unger’s understanding of himself and his place in the Jewish world. Over the course of the next two chapters, we will witness the many manifestations of this German Jewish renaissance as they appear and reappear during a period of intense professional and personal activity. In sum, we will see how Heinz Unger’s final decade of life was marked by a return to an interest in Jewish issues, at least as they impacted on his thoughts and feelings, if not religiously.

I. Bedächtig. Nicht eilen—Recht gemächlich (Deliberately. Unhurriedly—Very leisurely). The movement is a child’s dream as to what earthly life should be like: blue skies, sunshine on the fields, sunshine in the woods, fairies, miraculous birds, with everything being possible and any miracle likely to happen at any moment (as it eventually does in the 3rd movement).

Heinz Unger’s concertizing in 1956 and in the years that follow reveals how important Mahler’s music – and the other core works of the Central European art music canon – was to the German Jewish conductor. Indeed, as his reputation – and the corresponding opportunities – grew, he would begin to so regularly program a music that meant so much to him that it is tempting to consider this a “performative rite” – a ritualized practice of German Jewish identity assertion. Reflective of this is the fact that, beginning in 1956, a major Mahler work was performed by Unger in virtually every year until his death a decade on. Other works that shared a Mahleresque sensibility – in some way imbued with a love of nature, with a striving for capturing in some small way that

---

2 Heinz Unger, *Dr. Heinz Unger on Symphony No. 4 in G major by Gustav Mahler*. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 38.
which lies beyond – also made up an important element of Heinz Unger’s performative expression of his Romantically-tinged German Jewish identity.

The fourth and final concert of the 1956 York Concert Society season, held on 15 May 1956, is a case in point. On this occasion, Unger selected a program that was adventurous and also close to his heart; the evening began with Weber’s *Oberon* Overture and ended with a traversal of Schubert’s Symphony No. 9 (“The Great”). In between, the YCS presented the Canadian Premiere of a Catalani-Zandonai work, *Sogno.*\(^3\) The heart of the concert, however, lay in Mahler’s *Songs of a Wayfarer* and the Entr’acte music from Weber’s *The Three Pintos* (completed by Mahler).\(^4\) Kraglund, aware of the importance that Mahler held for Unger, devoted the majority of his concert review to the Mahler works on the program, praising in particular the Wayfarer Songs as understood and executed by both the conductor and his guest soloist Maureen Forrester:\(^5\)

\begin{quote}
Gustav Mahler’s music is high on Dr. Unger’s list of favourites. His enthusiasm seems to have been passed on to Miss Forrester and the orchestra, for one of the evening’s highlights was the interpretation of Mahler’s *Songs of a Wayfarer*. Both words and music of this youthful cycle of unhappy love songs were written by the composer, resulting in a well-balanced whole.

The balance was retained in performance. Miss Forrester skilfully evoked contrasts, even in the almost unalloyed despair of the opening song, resorting frequently to the depths of heavy, contralto coloration. Then with the same ease the soloist’s voice
\end{quote}

---

\(^3\) Alfredo Catalani (1854-1893) and Riccardo Zandonai (1883-1944) were both Italian opera composers who have failed to establish themselves in the mainstream repertoire except for the odd Aria. Catalani is best known for his opera *La Wally* while Zandonai is more obscure. The particular work was a Zandonai arrangement of a Catalani aria.

\(^4\) Carl Maria von Weber (1786-1826) had begun the composition of his comic opera *Die Drei Pintos* in the summer and fall of 1821, after completing the Romantic opera *Der Freischutz*. After being refused permission to stage the work, Weber abandoned the work. After Giacomo Meyerbeer proved unable to complete the work, it returned to the Weber family who in turn passed it on to a young Gustav Mahler who conducted his completion of the opera at Leipzig on 20 January 1888. Michael Kennedy, “Mahler’s Only Opera?,” Liner notes to Carl Maria von Weber (compl. Mahler) *Die Drei Pintos* (Naxos: 8.660142-43, 2004).

\(^5\) The highly acclaimed contralto Maureen Forrester (1930-) was born in Montreal. Her career beginning in 1953, she is recognized as Canada’s supreme female voice of the last half of the 20th century.
soared lightly and grace-fully to soprano heights in the gayer, swinging rhythm of the second piece.

Dr. Unger displayed his ability to get out of singer and orchestra in the third song. The instrumental music served by turns as contrast, support and exaggeration for the singer, now voicing dramatic protest, then depressed acceptance. And as a fitting climax there was the more harmonious mood of a resigned peace, verging on joy, in the expression [sic] finale.6

Dr. Unger’s ability to express the varied moods of a work so unfamiliar to Canadian audiences speaks of his exceptional skill, along with that of Maureen Forrester, in conveying the meaning and painting the moods in a music so dear and so important to him.7 Heinz Unger’s performance of Mahler’s music was a revel of the most profound kind.

In the summer of 1957, Heinz Unger continued his crusade on behalf of composers and musical expressions that expressed his musical-cultural creed. Amongst those was even Richard Strauss (1864-1949), a composer who had been closely linked to the Nazi regime.8 Even so vile a connection could not, however, erase the musical importance of the composer as a representative of the German culture that was a significant element of the German Jewish conductor’s identity, whatever the politics at stake. On 31 July 1957, Unger led the CBC Orchestra in a concert at the Stratford Festival of Music that was composed of a challenging program of works, opening with

7 George Kidd’s review of the concert also highlighted the beauty in the performance of the Wayfarer Songs, if stressing not Unger’s contribution but noting with emphasis the excellent contribution made by Forrester: “Miss Forrester was heard in Mahler’s Songs of a Wayfarer, and once again the beauty of this remarkable voice shone brilliantly throughout the four parts. She has apparently made a complete study of the work and it emerged with sincerity, beautiful control and an exciting imagination.” George Kidd, “Final Concert in Series Proves Musical Treat,” The Telegram, May 16, 1956. LAC, MUS 56, Box 7, File 77.
8 In 1933, Strauss was appointed president of the Reichsmusikkammer, the very organization that had barred Unger from work in Germany. And while Strauss’ sympathy for the Nazi regime is less than clear, he would remain active in Germany during the entirety of the Nazi regime’s life, even going so far as to compose the anthem for the 1936 Olympics. See, among others: Michael Kater, The Twisted Muse Musicians and their Music in the Third Reich (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).
the Canadian composer Violet Archer’s *Fanfare and Passacaglia*, continuing on to Richard Strauss’ *Four Last Songs* (with Lois Marshall as soloist) and *Death and Transfiguration*, and closing with Carl Nielsen’s unfamiliar Symphony No. 4 (“The Inextinguishable”). The final work, seldom heard in Canada, had according to John Kraglund already been heard once before in Canada, in a broadcast performance by Unger and his forces. Nevertheless, Nielsen’s work was sufficiently obscure for Kraglund to feel that an article was needed to help the audience understand its significance. In this piece, Kraglund discussed how the symphony expressed the composer’s belief that:

> music was a fundamental part of life and that it was to be found even in the inanimate objects that have a place in life and living. Music was rhythm and tone, to him, and life’s basic need were expressed through movement and sound. In Living Music, his volume of essays, he summed up his feelings in the statement that “Music is life, and, like it, inextinguishable.”

This program of Nielsen’s, so distinctly similar to Mahler’s own creed, helps explain Unger’s interest in this particular work and to Nielsen’s oeuvre. Heinz Unger, like Gustav Mahler and Carl Nielsen, believed that nature and the world were connected and suffused with a meaning that transcended the baseness of humanity.

---

9 The concert was held on 31 July 1957. Violet Archer (b. Montreal 1913 d. Ottawa 2000) was an important Canadian composer and teacher of the last century. She studied with a number of composers of the first rank (including the Hungarian Bela Bartok and Paul Hindemith) and later became chairman of the theory and composition department at the University of Alberta between 1962 and 1978. Barclay McMillan (revised Elaine Keillor), “Violet Archer,” in *The Encyclopedia of Music in Canada.*

10 Unfortunately, Kraglund fails to give the occasion of this broadcast and no information is to be found in the remainder of the Unger Fonds. John Kraglund, “Nielsen Symphony at Festival Interprets a Composer’s Credo,” *The Globe and Mail,* July 20, 1957 LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78. Regardless, Heinz Unger was undoubtedly responsible for introducing Nielsen’s 4th Symphony to Canada.

II. In gemächlicher Bewegung, Ohne Hast (At a leisurely pace, unhurriedly). The 2nd movement maintains the atmosphere of unreality. It is a fantastic dance, in which light and dark are changing several times or are melting into each other, 'light' being a worldly rustic peasant dance of Austrian color, and 'dark' being represented by the bone-man death with his fiddle, appearing, like on paintings of old, to lead his flock gently into the other world, life and death not intended to be contrasts, but more like the two sides of the same coin. It is technically of interest that the fiddler death is represented in this movement by a solo-violin tuned one tone higher than normal, giving a curious sharp and dismal sound.¹²

For decades, Heinz Unger had been hoping for an opportunity to conduct the Israel Philharmonic. A brief piece appearing in The Jerusalem Post in the summer of 1959 may have led him to believe that the arrival of his dream was imminent as it reported that he had become “the first Canadian conductor to be awarded the Mahler Medal by the Bruckner Society.”¹³ Equally promising was the fact that the brief article noted Bruno Walter’s verdict that “Dr. Heinz Unger… [is] the outstanding exponent of Mahler of our age.”¹⁴ Given the fact that Unger was being recognized in the Israeli press may have led him to believe that the time was right for him to begin a relationship with the Israel Philharmonic. After all, the music that had launched his career and the honour that had been bestowed upon him had come as a consequence of his relationship with a composer that held special meaning for Jews around the world, not least of all in the young state of Israel that was seeking to construct a proud artistic tradition.¹⁵

Further lending support to the possibility of an engagement with the Israel Philharmonic was the fact that Unger was becoming a recognized point on the Israeli cultural compass. In the winter of 1958, Heinz Unger had been invited by Arthur Lourie,

¹² Heinz Unger, Dr. Heinz Unger on Symphony No. 4 in G major by Gustav Mahler. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 38.
¹³ A.J.L., “Mahler Award,” The Jerusalem Post, July 8, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78.
¹⁴ Ibid.
¹⁵ For more on the Jewish significance of Mahler’s music, see chapter 3.
the Israeli Ambassador to Canada, to serve as a patron for the Toronto premiere of the Inbal Dance Theatre Group’s performance.\textsuperscript{16} This gala event, a part of Israel’s Tenth Anniversary Celebrations, was held on March 3 at Toronto’s Royal Alexandra Theatre. Whether Unger in fact attended or patronized the event is not known. Still, its significance lies in the fact that even at the highest levels, segments of the Israeli community recognized Heinz Unger as a constituent part of their cultural milieu.

None of this, however, seemed to matter to the directorship of the Israel Philharmonic. By 1959, as Unger expectantly looked forward to the possibility of working with his colleagues in Israel’s national orchestra, the fruitless and often turbulent relationship between the conductor and the Israel Philharmonic (IPO) was nearly at an end. For decades, Unger had been attempting to arrange to conduct in “the country to which I have more personal ties than any of you can possibly know.”\textsuperscript{17} According to his own account, Unger had been pursuing such a course since the 1930s, in the period just after his emigration from Germany to England.\textsuperscript{18} During the next two and a half decades, Unger had been in touch with the IPO from England, from Spain and also from Canada, writing to the old Palestine Orchestra as well as the national orchestra in its current incarnation.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{16} Letter from Arthur Lourie to Heinz Unger, dated February 10, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
\textsuperscript{17} Letter to the Executive Council of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, September 29, 1960. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 13.
\textsuperscript{18} Letter to Mrs. Mark Levy, June 5, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid. In this letter, Unger explicitly outlines the nature of his attempts to contact the IPO: “For order’s sake I should like to put on record that since 25 years I have expressed my great interest to conduct in Israel on countless occasions. As a Jewish conductor I need hardly give special reasons for this interest. I have written them several times from England (after our immigration from Germany), I have written to them later from Spain. I have written to them from Canada. I have written to the administration of the old “Palestine Orchestra” (Mr. Levertoff), I have written to the administration of the new “Israel Orchestra” (Mr. Haftel, Mr. C. Salomon, and others whose names I do not remember). I have always written directly (conductors mostly do not act through agents). As replies I have received nothing but excuses, pretexts for indefinite postponement etc. etc.” Documents provided by the Israel Philharmonic Archive confirm that Unger had in fact been in contact with the IPO on a number of occasions since at least 1947 and that,
During that span of time, Heinz Unger had witnessed what had initially been called the Palestine Orchestra – organized by the Polish Jewish violinist Bronislaw Huberman (1882-1947) – evolve into a world-class ensemble called the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra. He had, moreover, witnessed many of his colleagues – Jewish and otherwise – receive invitations to conduct and even record with the director-less orchestra. And while some of the conductors invited were certainly world-class – Arturo Toscanini (1867-1957) would lead the orchestra in its inaugural concert on 26 December 1936 while the years that followed saw musical celebrities such as Sergiu Celibidache (1912-1996), Dimitri Mitropoulos (1896-1960), Eugene Ormandy (1899-1985), and Leonard Bernstein (1918-1990) lead the orchestra – many of the conductors who led the orchestra following its debut – conductors such as Paul Paray (1886-1979), Jean Martinon (1910-1976), Bernardino Molinari (1880-1952), Erich Leinsdorf (1912-1993), Paul Kletzki (1900-1973), to name but a few – possessed reputations and profiles not dissimilar to – and sometimes lesser than – Unger’s.

indeed, “excuses, pretexts, indefinite postponement” had been the order of the day for at least a decade. In light of the fact that Unger had ultimately never been invited to conduct an IPO concert despite the many promises made, his frustration by the end of the 1950s is certainly understandable. It is also interesting to note that Unger’s first documented approaches to the IPO closely coincide with the birth of Israel, thereby granting a better understanding of Unger’s close attention to if not intimate involvement with the Jewish State. Documents courtesy of the Israel Philharmonic Archive.

20 The Israel Philharmonic Orchestra would appoint Zubin Mehta as its first Music Director in 1977 after decades of relying on “music advisors” and guest conductors to lead the orchestra.

21 It should be noted that this is but a partial list of conductors who worked with the IPO during the period, suggested to the author by Avivit Hochstadter at the IPO archives. And while we would certainly not like to denigrate in any way the achievement of the conductors who were granted opportunities with the IPO, it must be noted that our understanding of these musicians’ achievements are not informed by their contemporary reputations but by their posthumous import built largely upon the back of a recorded legacy that Unger has failed to accrue. Thus, “hierarchizations” of the musicians’ import are, at best, subjective. It is also important to recognize that certain of these musicians worked in the midst of fascist dictatorships, a fact that did not seemingly trouble the directors of the IPO in appointing them; Maestro Molinari, for instance, retained his position with the Orchestra dell’Accademia Nazionale di Santa Cecilia (Rome) for the entirety of the Second World War, surely a greater “sin” than Unger choosing to conduct in Spain during the post-war years.
Under any normal circumstances, Heinz Unger, never the most patient or accommodating of men, would have taken these rejections – and the fact that he was being overlooked and that other conductors of similar stature were being granted opportunities with the IPO – at face value and looked elsewhere for opportunities. A chance to conduct the Israel Philharmonic, however, was no normal circumstance. The reason for Unger’s persistence in trying to obtain an engagement with the Israel Philharmonic lay in his self-identification as a “Jewish conductor,” a position which he never abandoned and an element of his identity that was central to his very existence. Indeed, despite the fact that throughout his life he most often only alluded to the reason for his exodus from Germany, the affair with the Israel Philharmonic suggests that the Jewish elements of his persona constituted a core value which he was at pains to not deny or, indeed, have denied him: “On one occasion a New York management told me that the administration of the [Israel Philharmonic] orchestra believes me to be baptised, a libellous error, which I have rectified straight-away.”

Heinz Unger then continued, confessing his heart-felt feeling about his lack of success in securing an invitation from the IPO:

> With countless non-jewish [sic] conductors having been and being invited to Israel, I consider it almost an insult to Jewish musiclovers [sic] in general that a Jewish conductor of my standing should be deliberately and successfully kept out of Israel by some irresponsible and petty intrigue on the part of one or two people whom or whose real motives I do not even know.\(^{23}\)

---

\(^{22}\) Letter to Mrs. Mark Levy, June 5, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.

\(^{23}\) Ibid. In this same letter to Mrs. Levy, Heinz Unger mentions that some people involved with the IPO questioned not his personal commitment to being Jewish but, rather, his professional credentials. The passage bears noting here: “Seeing no other way out, I accepted in the end the offer of a very musical Berlin friend of mine (a citizen of Israel, who looks after my legal claims in Germany) to find out what was wrong. The reply he received was a letter from Mr. C. Salomon, written in Hebrew on the Orchestra’s letter-head, to the effect that they would never invite me because I was “not good enough a conductor to be in charge of their orchestra”. It was after this really grotesque statement that I turned to you.” In light of Heinz Unger’s career trajectory and success with orchestras of a high professional standing in both Europe
Unger clearly valued his Jewish identity and being excluded from a Jewish milieu hurt him profoundly.

In the same letter to his friend and supporter Mrs. Levy, Unger also elucidated his views on the significance of the Mahler centenary and, indeed, of the importance of Mahler as a Jewish composer:

The year 1960 will bring the 100th Birthday of Gustav Mahler, one of the most important composers of Jewish origin, to whose music as you know I have devoted my whole life. No doubt that the Israel Philharmonic will do something on a grand scale about this Centenary. It would have made me proud to make this the occasion of my belated first appearance in Israel, but if not a miracle happens, I fear this will remain a dream.24

In the context in which these words were written, one cannot fail but see the deep significance that Mahler bore for the conductor; Mahler represented for Unger a summation and nexus of Jewish identity, an identity that they shared and that, so he felt, should be shared with Jewish music lovers as an expression of their shared culture and history.

Mystified by the “excuses, pretexts for indefinite postponement” that he had received from the Israel Philharmonic, the conductor tried desperately to unravel the mystery of this “entirely unnatural attitude towards a well-known Jewish conductor.”25 Unger and his acquaintances and friends thus began an intense campaign to ascertain whether he could in fact make an appearance in Israel. Foremost among those seeking to assist him in this campaign was Unger’s own Toronto-based lawyer, Mark Levy. As well

---

24 Letter to Mrs. Mark Levy, June 5, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
25 Ibid.
as friend and legal counsel to Unger, Levy was also closely tied to Canada’s Jewish community.\footnote{While there is no evidence to prove any connection between the two events, it seems more than a little coincidental that Mark Levy and Mrs. Levy’s trips to Israel should come about only a short year or two before the “First National Canadian Leadership Mission” to Israel in 1960 that included Samuel Bronfman. Perhaps the Levys were involved in these trips as well, suggesting that their role in the Canadian Jewish Community was indeed pivotal. See: Michael R. Marrus, 	extit{Mr. Sam: The Life and Times of Samuel Bronfman} (Toronto: Viking Press, 1991), 439. This hypothesis is granted further weight by a brief article in the February 8, 1963 edition of 	extit{The Canadian Jewish Review} that notes that Mr. and Mrs. Levy were seated at the head table for the 1963 Annual Ambassador’s Ball held at Toronto’s Conservative Beth Tzedec Synagogue and patronized by the Israeli ambassador to Canada, Yaacov Herzog. See: “Israel Bonds,” 	extit{Canadian Jewish Review}, 8 February 1963, 9.} Heinz Unger, then, was by no means isolated and had key allies in his quest to visit Israel in a professional capacity. As early as the winter of 1957-1958, Unger’s representatives had been in touch with the America-Israel Cultural Foundation, and with Arthur Lelyveld in particular, to see whether something could be arranged.\footnote{Rabbi Arthur Lelyveld (1913-1996) was a Reform Rabbi who would later become president of the American Jewish Congress, holding the position from 1966 to 1972. The America-Israel Cultural Foundation had been founded in 1939 with the express purpose of helping develop Israel’s cultural institutions. Despite coming to nothing in the end, Heinz Unger’s approach to the Foundation was a very clever tactic that could have in fact yielded a very different and positive result.} In his polite reply, Mr. Lelyveld lamented that nothing could be done in the short term because “the 1957-58 season had been planned long before our conversation, and the 1958-59 season will be a short one for the Orchestra inasmuch as they will be on tour in the United States and Canada beginning in January 1959.”\footnote{Letter from Arthur Lelyveld to Mark Levy, dated December 10, 1957. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 10.} Seemingly, the impasse had nothing to do with animosity and had more to do with logistics, a fact borne out by Lelyveld’s assurances that he had “written once again to our friends in the Orchestra and I hope that this letter will elicit some expression of interest in bringing Dr. Unger to Israel at some future date.”\footnote{Ibid.} Despite this promised aid, Lelyveld sounded a more guarded tone in regards to the results that he felt might be achieved: “The Israel Philharmonic, as you know, controls independently its own programming and its own invitations to guest
However helpful Lelyveld could be, the final decision would be made not by him but in Israel.

In the months that followed, Mark Levy made a trip to Israel. On that occasion, he took the opportunity to meet with Joseph Jacobson, one of the board members of the Israel Philharmonic. In a letter following their visit, Mark Levy thanked Mr. Jacobson for receiving him in his "charming home" and laid stress upon how he felt Unger’s appearance in Israel would be a great success: "I can assure you that Dr. Unger’s experience with first-rate orchestras all over the world, and now with the reputation he has made in Toronto, that he would appeal very much to the cultivated tastes of the Israeli music-lovers." Mark Levy, acting as both friend and lobbyist, was doing all in his power to help the Jewish conductor achieve his dream of conducting the Israel Philharmonic.

The steps that the Levys had taken on behalf of their friend during their trip to Israel, however, were little comfort to Heinz Unger after the many years of frustration that he had faced in respect to the IPO. As a consequence, a mere three days after Mark Levy had written his letter to Joseph Jacobson, Unger himself was writing a letter to Mrs. Levy, noting how "the short report which you gave me with regard to your contact with the Israel Philharmonic on my behalf is disturbing me considerably." As a result of Unger’s insistence in the affair, Mark Levy wrote Joseph Jacobson a second letter in the space of a week, including with it a package of promotional literature and a further note from the conductor about his unhappiness at not having yet conducted in Israel.

---

31 Letter from Mark Levy to Joseph Jacobson, dated June 2, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
32 Letter to Mrs. Mark Levy, June 5, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
33 Letter from Mark Levy to Joseph Jacobson, June 9, 1958. MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
answer to that letter came later in the summer, the IPO declaring once again that no decision could be made at the time because “our program for 1959/60 will be discussed only in January.”

His hopes again raised by the contact with Joseph Jacobson, Unger sent a personal letter to Jacobson at the beginning of September 1958 in which he expressed his “sincere hope that the mentioned correspondence [with Mark Levy] and your kind personal interest in this matter will lead to an entirely new page being turned over in my – so far negative – relations to the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra.”

Unfortunately, no such page was turned and nothing changed in the Unger – Israel Philharmonic relationship as yet another approach from the conductor was cast aside. The affair continued in much the same vein in 1959 when Heinz Unger wrote to Abe Cohen, another representative of the IPO, and was informed that he had pursued his interest in conducting with the Israel Philharmonic through the incorrect channels, a fact that he tried to explain away by declaring that “not knowing of the existence of your representatives in Europe and in the United States...I have approached the Israel Philharmonic in the past always directly.”

Despite written with the intention of securing an engagement with the Israel Philharmonic, the tone of this letter clearly suggests that Unger was at his wit’s end, first commenting on how he “had long ago given up any expectation to visit Israel in my lifetime” and closing the letter with the cry of a jilted lover as he declared, “it is obvious that the next step, if any at all, would have

---

34 Letter from Mark Levy to Heinz Unger, dated August 5, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
35 Letter from Heinz Unger to Joseph Jacobson, dated September 1, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
36 Letter from Heinz Unger to Abe Cohen, dated March 17, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12.

Unfortunately, the majority of this exchange of letters is missing and only the (presumably) final letter in this correspondence remains in the Heinz Unger Fonds at LAC.
to come from your side, as I do not wish to give the impression, that I am trying to intrude where I am apparently not wanted.\textsuperscript{37}

However much he would have liked for the executive of the Israel Philharmonic to have realized the error of their ways and to embrace him, such a rapprochement never came. Thus, thoroughly disheartened by the matter, Heinz Unger tried one final approach which he hoped might lead to the fulfillment of his long-held dream of conducting in Israel. In late summer 1960, he wrote one last letter to the executive of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, lamenting how he would be absent from the orchestra’s visit to Canada:

I regret my absence, not only because it deprives me again of an opportunity to listen to your orchestra in person, but also because after all these years of artificially created misunderstandings I would have very much welcomed an opportunity for personal contact with you. Meeting personally would probably have gone a long way to confirm a natural understanding as to our mutual outlook, which has been missing so far from our relations in consequence of false informations spread by parties unknown to me.\textsuperscript{38}

In other words, Unger believed that a rapprochement was still possible and that, indeed, the true reason behind the impasse lay in a sinister campaign in which his “outlook” or, to put it more frankly, his Jewish identity had been besmirched and that a face-to-face meeting would dispel any such misconceptions. Unger’s earnest hope, even until to the last, was “to establish at last artistic contact between us” that would lead to an invitation to conduct in “the country to which I have closer personal ties than any of you can possibly know.”\textsuperscript{39} That opportunity, however, never came and Heinz Unger, a musician

\textsuperscript{37} Letter from Heinz Unger to Abe Cohen, dated March 17, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12.

\textsuperscript{38} Letter from Heinz Unger to the Executive Council of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, dated September 29, 1960. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 13.

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid.
who had suffered immeasurably as a result of being Jewish, would never walk in the promised land.

III. Ruhevoll (Calm) (Poco Adagio). The 3rd movement, one of Mahler’s most beautiful and longest Adagios, is like a fervent thanksgiving prayer of a soul at peace. Richard Specht again recalls a Boecklin painting in this connection, showing a hermit playing a fiddle before a picture of the Holy Virgin.40

His frustrations with the Israel Philharmonic notwithstanding, the end of the 1950s represent an important and fruitful period in Heinz Unger’s career. In January 1958, Unger was finally afforded the opportunity to lead one of Mahler’s more ambitious symphonic utterances, his Symphony No. 2 (“Resurrection”) with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra. This performance, a Canadian premiere, signalled the arrival of Unger on a higher plane, coming to symbolize his increasing reputation on the Canadian musical scene and also serving to punctuate the growing interest in the work of Gustav Mahler as the centenary of the composer’s birth approached.

Indeed, so great was the interest stimulated that, long before the concert, the media was expectantly writing about the event.41 So too, were important Canadian musicians; Leslie Bell (1906-1962), the famed Canadian choral conductor, took the opportunity to compare the work of Heinz Unger on behalf of Gustav Mahler to that of

40 Heinz Unger, *Dr. Heinz Unger on Symphony No. 4 in G major by Gustav Mahler*. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 38. As noted in the heading to the previous section, the events described in this section of our biography precede those described above.

41 Near the beginning of January, *The Globe and Mail* helped lay the groundwork for the concert’s success by granting space to discussion of the Mahlerian sound-world and the particular beauty of the Second Symphony that Unger would himself call in print a “deeply moving experience.” “Mahler’s Second Symphony Deeply Moving Experience,” *The Globe and Mail*, January 4, 1958. This article is uncredited but was, in all likelihood, written by John Kraglund. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78. Later in the month, John Kraglund continued the discussion devoted to Mahler, noting how even before the performance, the much anticipated concert of Mahler’s Second Symphony “had renewed our interest in the music of Mahler.” John Kraglund, “Concerts Renew Interests,” *The Globe and Mail*, January 18, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78.
Hans Von Bulow for Richard Wagner or to that of Thomas Beecham on behalf of Frederick Delius. Bell’s words about Unger and the challenges that he faced in his devotion to Mahler’s cause bear citing:

The greatest missionary conductor in Canada is Heinz Unger who has devoted years in championing the music of Gustav Mahler. It has not been an easy task. The length of Mahler’s symphonies and the huge orchestral personnel they require have made it difficult to get them heard. Some have said that Mahler’s music is not worth the trouble involved in its performance. But Unger affirms that Mahler is one of the truly greats and has suffered shameful neglect.

The CBC, perhaps swayed by such words of support or more likely by Unger’s own missionary zeal, seemed to agree that the performance of Mahler’s music, whatever the complications, was a worthwhile enterprise. On 22 January 1958, after the first half of a program composed of Beethoven’s *Prometheus* Overture and three of Mahler’s orchestral *Ruckert* Songs (sung by Mary Simmons), concert-goers were joined by listeners across the entire CBC network in an impressive night of music-making by Unger and a TSO augmented to meet the requirements of Mahler’s soundscape (the performance of the symphony required 102 players, far beyond the orchestra’s usual complement of 80 players) that endeavoured to present the Canadian premiere of Mahler’s Second Symphony.

Critical understanding of the vast work and its structure varied; George Kidd colourfully yet misguidedly cast the deeply spiritual work as a showy piece, calling it a

---

42 Hans von Bulow (1830-94) was one of the most famous German conductors of the 19th century and is credited in helping bring Richard Wagner’s work to public attention.

43 Leslie Bell, “Leslie Bell’s Music: Unger and Mahler,” *Toronto Daily Star*, January 18, 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78. Heinz Unger’s daughter, Ines Johnston, was a member of the Bell Singers after her move to Canada a few short years after her parents. Bell therefore knew Unger and his family well, lending his comments concerning Unger’s role in the dissemination of Mahler’s music particularly authoritative.

44 The three songs were: “Ich atmet’ einen linden Duft,” “Ich bin der Welt abhanden gekommen” and “Um Mitternacht.” From the concert program, LAC. MUS 56, Box 8, File 78.
“technicolour-three dimensional stereophonic symphony that Hollywood would call colossal” while John Kraglund questioned, for instance, “the musical worth of [the symphony’s] long last movement.” Nevertheless, the performance was described as an incredible achievement, unfamiliarity with the score and a questioning of some of the elements of the symphony as written by Mahler failing to prevent Kraglund from noting the correctness of execution of the symphony under the conductor’s baton:

A measure of Dr. Unger’s deep insight into the score was demonstrated in his ability to shape the numerous climaxes with a tightness that made each seem inevitable and yet without a loss of musical detail...it was Dr. Unger’s interpretation of the Resurrection Symphony that made the evening something to be remembered.

If some critics were somewhat disoriented by the length and complexity of Mahler’s score, few in the audience seemed to echo those concerns. When the last strains of Mahler’s music had died away, the smaller-than-expected audience in Massey Hall — John Kraglund noted that “doubtless many were kept away by reports of the length of the symphony” — were rapturous in their response: “the applause and shouts that greeted Dr. Unger [becoming] a thunder of stamping feet by the time he appeared for his third curtain call.” At the last curtain call, careful to share his glory with the composer, the conductor “picked up the Mahler score and brandished it mindfully at the audience” — this was not only Unger’s success but also Mahler’s.

Heinz Unger was visibly and quite understandably buoyed by both the opportunity to conduct this work and also by the reception his leadership received. He

---

48 Joyce Goodman, “Standing Ovation Given Heinz Unger and TSO,” (newspaper and date unknown) LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78.
was also convinced, as he had been since his youth, of the importance of Mahler’s works—both musically and extra-musically—and that further performances could only aid comprehension and win over those who were not yet wholehearted supporters of Mahler’s art. William Krehm, music critic and commentator for the CBC, was also convinced of the merit of Mahler’s work and, at the annual luncheon of the YCS Women’s Committee held on 13 February 1958, lamented that far too many “Torontonians chose to sleep through the sounding of the last trumpet” and missed Unger’s “memorable” performance of Mahler’s Second Symphony.  

At that same meeting, the president of the Women’s Committee, Lady Robinson, amusingly compared the conductor’s work to contemporary events: “Ranking with Sputniks and moon travel in importance[...]was the fact that last season Toronto audiences seemed suddenly to awake to the fact that we have a great conductor in Dr. Unger.”

However hyperbolic Ms. Robinson’s claims for the conductor’s importance, the Toronto Symphony’s directorship quite suddenly seemed to realize that in Heinz Unger they had a unique talent living and working in their midst. And while he was overlooked when the TSO went looking for a new music director to replace the retiring Ernest Macmillan—the rather younger and more personable and charismatic Walter Susskind was selected instead—the directorship still recognized that after a decade of life in Canada, Heinz Unger merited the opportunity to conduct works that meant a great deal to him and also intrigued many concert-goers. Thus, even when contracted to conduct

50 Ibid.
51 The Czech conductor Walter Susskind (1913-1980) had lived his life in Czechoslovakia until fleeing the country in 1938 following its annexation by Nazi Germany. Thereafter, he moved on to Britain where, among other engagements, he conducted the Carl Rosa Opera Company (1942-45) and the Scottish National Orchestra (1946-52). After a spell in Australia, he moved to Canada where he was appointed as
Pops concerts, Heinz Unger was able to program Mahler’s works, as he did on 9 February 1958 when the second movement from Mahler’s Second Symphony was included in a concert of lighter fare.\[^{52}\] Later that same week, he was again at the podium for a TSO concert, this time conducting not Mahler but another set of works that were an integral part of his repertoire: Weber’s *Der Freischütz* Overture, Beethoven’s Symphony No. 7 and, in between, the Canadian premiere of Walter Braunfels’ *Phantastic Apparitions of a theme by Hector Berlioz*.\[^{53}\]

Heinz Unger’s Canadian career continued to blossom throughout the course of the next year. In 1958, Unger’s adventurous repertoire extended into the first subscription concert of the season with “his” orchestra, the York Concert Society. On April 22, 1958, the YCS concert consisted of three works: Schumann’s Piano Concerto (with Patricia Parr as soloist), Hector Berlioz’s *Symphonie fantastique* and, most interestingly, three preludes from Hans Pfitzner’s opera *Palestrina*.\[^{54}\] The second concert of the season, meanwhile, explored another side of the musician’s artistic personality, including on the concert both Ralph Vaughan William’s Violin Concerto (a debt to his long tenure in England) and, in what was perhaps a nod to his Jewish roots, Arnold Schoenberg’s *Transfigured Night*. The third concert of the season held on May 6th, also included a

---


\[^{53}\] The rest of the program consisted of a selection of arias, the solely instrumental pieces being Weber’s *Der Freischütz* Overture, Bach’s Air from Suite No. 3 in D, Liszt’s *Les Preludes*, and Strauss’ “Southern Roses” Waltz. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78.

\[^{54}\] Walter Braunfels (1882-1954) was a German composer and pedagogue who achieved early success until the rise of the Nazi regime in 1933. Considered “forbidden” on account of his half-Jewish ancestry, his music was classified as *Entartete* and he retired from the public sphere. After the war, he returned to public life and resumed his role as director of the Cologne Academy of Music.

\[^{54}\] *Palestrina* (premier Munich, 1917) is the most famous opera by the German composer Hans Pfitzner (1869-1949). The work is set in the European Renaissance and concerns itself with the role of music in the Reformation. The work, much like Paul Hindemith’s opera *Mathis der Maler* has been the source of much musicological inquiry due to its portrayal of and commentary on musical trends of the period. See for instance: Leon Botstein, "Pfitzner and Musical Politics." *The Musical Quarterly*, 85, 63-75 (2001).
novelty mixed in amongst more familiar fare: performances of Tchaikovsky's Piano Concerto No. 1 and Dvorak's Eighth Symphony were preceded by the Canadian composer Harry Somers' *Passacaglia and Fugue*. The final concert of the YCS season, held on 13 May, was a return to more familiar territory – an all Beethoven program that included two of the composer's overtures (*Fidelio* and *Leonore* No. 3) bracketing his First and Fourth Symphonies.

The conductor's excitement at being able to present these concerts filled with important reportorial expansions, however, could not compare with one of the greatest honours that Unger would receive in his lifetime. On June 3, 1958, *The Globe and Mail* noted that Heinz Unger “has accepted an invitation to join the honorary board of directors of the newly founded Gustav Mahler Society of America,” an invitation extended by Mahler's widow, Ms. Alma Mahler-Werfel. This acknowledgement of his activities and achievements on behalf of his most revered composer must have surely brought him a great joy, one which would compel him to further enthusiastic activity on his behalf of Gustav Mahler's art.

Even this recognition and achievement could not rival the next award bestowed upon the German Jewish conductor. In 1959, after a life of toiling on behalf of Mahler's music, Unger was honoured with the Mahler medal, an award bestowed upon a select few

---

55 Toronto-born Harry Somers (1925-99) was one of Canada's leading composers during the second half of the twentieth century. The work performed, his *Passacaglia and Fugue*, was written in 1954.

56 In light of the familiarity of the works on this program, it is shocking to find that all the reviewers for this final concert complained of raggedness of ensemble, poor string tone and the occasional tendency of Unger's to "over-conduct." Perhaps Unger, in re-acquainting himself with this music that forms the core of the symphonic canon, tried too hard to provide probing and unique readings. See: Hugh Thomson, "All - Beethoven Concert Dr. Unger's York Finale," *Toronto Daily Star*, May 14, 1958; John Kraglund, "Music in Toronto," *The Globe and Mail*, May 14, 1958; George Kidd, "Dr. Unger Interprets Beethoven," *The Telegram*, May 14, 1958. All LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78.

57 "Mahler Society," *The Globe and Mail*, June 3, 1958, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78. The official letter of invitation from Alma Mahler-Werfel, signed in her odd, large script lies in LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 4. The official letter is accompanied both by a personal note to Heinz Unger as well as a letter to Hella Unger, indicating that all three knew one another and shared, at the very least, a cordial friendship.
who had done vital work in the dissemination of Mahler’s music and creed. The medal, having been granted only to those at the summit of the musical world (Bruno Walter, Eugene Ormandy, Dmitri Mitropoulos, Otto Klemperer, William Steinberg, Leonard Bernstein and George Szell) was a beautiful piece of bronze-work created by the artist Julio Kilenyi (1885-1959) that bore a profile of Mahler’s head on one side and, on the other, the prophetic quote “Meine Zeit Wird Noch Kommen” (“My time will come”) that so neatly encapsulates Mahler’s posthumous fate as well as the aims of the society founded to help achieve Mahler’s popularization. Heinz Unger, for his work in performing Mahler’s works and speaking on his behalf the world over, was now to become a member of this elite company of Mahlerians.

The Canadian premiere performance of Mahler’s Second Symphony the year before must have also brought to light Heinz Unger’s continuing role in the advocacy of Mahler, something that the newly formed Mahler society, under the auspices of the Bruckner society of America, could not have failed to note. Unger’s devotion to Mahler, especially in so barren a cultural landscape, and his mentor Bruno Walter’s prominent role in the Bruckner society, meant that, after forty years of devotion to Mahler’s art, he was awarded the Mahler medal, the first such distinction to go to a musician resident in Canada. The award, and the international prestige that accompanied it, also helped bring to prominence Unger’s art within Canada itself. To celebrate the award of this prestigious medal, the CBC scheduled the Canadian premiere of Mahler’s Fifth Symphony. Indeed, the hype surrounding the granting of the Mahler Medal to an artist resident in Canada was fully exploited by a CBC keen to draw attention to the artist. In the days leading up to the concert, the CBC Times ran a full page article that told of the
conductor's life and also provided space for Unger's own interpretation of the symphony that highlighted his opinion that "the fifth symphony is in its final outcome an apotheosis of joy, not of a shallow and meaningless frolic, but of that deep contentment and joy of life obtainable only after severe struggles and the experience of deepest despair."

On this occasion, it truly seemed as though Unger was not vaguely speculating but was truly recounting his own life experience, reflecting on his joy at being able to present this symphony to Canada after so many years of toil and struggle and after the years of rootless existence as a result of the anguish and displacements that he had had to undergo because of the travesties of the century.

On 25 February 1959, the CBC devoted extended time to the event so that the nation-wide broadcast could include the official presentation of the Mahler Medal, Unger's comments on receiving the award, as well as the Canadian premiere of Mahler's Symphony No. 5. The conductor's comments upon receiving the Mahler medal from CBC Music Director Geoffrey Waddington tell us much of the central role that Mahler and his music had played for Unger for the entirety of his adult life:

it was on a November evening as far back as nineteen hundred fifteen when I, as a very young person, heard for the first time the message of the music of Gustav Mahler. The place was Munich. The occasion was a performance of the "Song of the Earth" under Bruno Walter. That evening became decisive for my life because it was this impression which made me a conductor. Since then, I have had the opportunity and the privilege to contribute spreading Mahler’s work in many countries, in recent years in an increasing degree here in Canada, my new home country. And it makes me happy that a growing number of music lovers here too seem to be opening their hearts to the message of this music. The Mahler

58 "Conductor to be Honoured Wednesday," CBC Times, February 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78.
59 The entire Massey Hall concert began with Mozart's "Marriage of Figaro" Overture, continued with Beethoven's Piano Concerto No. 4 (with Moura Lympany as soloist) and only continued on to Mahler's Fifth Symphony after an intermission. Needless to say, the brunt of the interest in the concert lay with the Mahler premiere.
Medal which the directors of the Bruckner Society of America are awarding to me comes to me as a heart-warming token of appreciation of my efforts. It makes me proud to accept the medal out of the hands of the director of music of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. And it gives me very special satisfaction that this to my knowledge is the first medal of its kind which has found its way into Canada and which has been won in cooperation with and through the efforts of Canadian orchestras.  

As had been the case with the premiere of Mahler's second symphony the previous year, an enraptured but less-than-full Massey Hall was swept away by the beautiful and otherworldly strains of the Mahler work heard in Canada for the first time. And, as in the previous year, critical reception was again mixed, some critics being more receptive to Mahler's idiom than others. Whatever may have been the critics' opinions of the work itself, all unanimously agreed that the conductor's presentation of the work left nothing to be desired, Kraglund noting that "It was Dr. Unger's ability...that made last night's interpretation a resounding success." In his review of the concert, George Kidd also took the opportunity to highlight how the evening represented a "moment of deep emotion" for Dr. Unger, an astute and touching observation that highlighted the profound

---

60 Transcription of Heinz Unger's broadcast speech on receiving the Mahler Medal, CBC Wednesday Night, 25 February 1959. LAC, MUS 56. In the face of the CBC's current obstinacy regarding access to and release of Heinz Unger's recordings (both those still under as well as those out of copyright), Heinz Unger's comments regarding the high regard in which he holds the CBC and its role in disseminating Mahler's music strikes one as particularly grating.

61 John Kraglund, for instance, while conceding that "there are moments that fail to hold our interest" also stressed that "the power, color and clarity of Mahler's orchestration quickly brings us back to the matters at hand." John Kraglund, "Music in Toronto," *The Globe and Mail*, February 26, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78. George Kidd meanwhile opined that it is "a glowing work, strongly melodic, dramatically exciting and often emotionally moving." George Kidd, "A Lavish Attention to Detail," *The Telegram*, February 26, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78. Hugh Thomson however, was less than impressed by the work, calling it "excessively long" and filled with "strenuous, excessively busy orchestration." Hugh Thomson, "York Series Opens Honor Heinz Unger," *Toronto Daily Star*, February 26, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78.

meaning – musical and extra-musical – of the event for the German Jewish musician.63 Heinz Unger, in the final years of the 1950s, was ever closer to achieving a state of ecstasy, laying forth by way of his performative observance a “fervent thanksgiving prayer” for the composer through whom he expressed his German Jewish identity.

IV. Sehr behaglich (Very contentedly).  It is an old legendary text from the ‘Youth Magic Horn’ which Mahler uses for the Soprano Solo of the last movement. If the 1st movement was a child’s dream of earthly life the last one is its dream of life in heaven. With ‘serene expression, but without any trace of parody’ (Mahler’s own prescription for the singer) the child tells us how they enjoy life in heaven, avoiding earthly ado and living in complete peace, but that the angelic life nevertheless does not prevent them from being quite gay, from dancing and skipping and singing... The last verse of course is reserved for a description of the heavenly music led by St. Cecilia and her musicians, a music, which ‘is so beautiful that nothing on earth can stand comparison with it’ and which goes on, on and on in softest pp into eternity, ending and yet not ending Mahler’s most moving dream.64

Lamentably, nothing ever came of the contact with the Israel Philharmonic. Despite many years of letter-writing, fretting, anguish and concern, Heinz Unger was never invited to conduct in Israel and never given the opportunity of expressing his Jewish identity in the Jewish homeland. However great this disappointment, he could not afford to spend too time much mourning the sad conclusion to the long-running affair with the Israel Philharmonic. During the 1960 centenary of Gustav Mahler’s birth, he would, after all, have the rest of the world with which to share the composer’s gospel.

63 However much his performance of Mahler’s Fifth Symphony was recognized as an important milestone for both Unger and for culture in Canada, other observers who were more acclimatized to Mahler’s idiom were even more adulatory and recognized Unger’s wonderful achievement in conducting a work that they fully understood. Robert Gray, the Executive Secretary and Treasurer of the Bruckner Society of America, was just one such voice and his comments bear noting: “It was thrilling to listen to the tape recording of your truly inspired and inspiring reading of Mahler’s Fifth. One does not wonder that it caused the audience to give you and the excellent orchestra so prolonged an ovation. The applause and cheers were rightly deserved. You brought out the dramatic as well as the lyric quality of the great symphony; the build ups to climaxes and the climaxes themselves were stirring; the broad outline of each movement was clear and yet no detail was overlooked.” Letter from Robert G. Gray (Executive Secretary and Treasurer, The Bruckner Society of America) to Heinz Unger, dated June 15, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78.

64 Heinz Unger, Dr. Heinz Unger on Symphony No. 4 in G major by Gustav Mahler. LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 39.
Unger, deeply convinced of Mahler’s genius and deeply influenced by the composer as an expression of his German Jewish identity, was almost desperate – even frantic – to mark the significant milestone by filling his year with as many concerts of Mahler’s music as possible.

The fact that the Mahler centenary was vital to Heinz Unger was not only a function of the conductor’s deep devotion to the composer’s music. It was also, as has been repeatedly stressed in this work, a consequence of Unger’s understanding of Mahler – both the man and his music – as an expression and reflection of his German Jewish identity. It was, moreover, a means by which the German Jewish conductor could negotiate his sense of displacement in a period during which, in Bialystock’s words, “the Holocaust was not a defining element in Canadian Jewish identity.”65 The Mahler centenary was thus Heinz Unger’s way of expressing his identity in a period during which Canada’s Jews had yet to understand the Holocaust and before they had recognized the trauma that survivors – both those that had survived the camps as well as those who had managed to escape such a fate – had undergone.66

In point of fact, Unger’s preparations for the Mahler centenary had been begun at the very time that he was embroiled in the imbroglio with the Israel Philharmonic, devoting much of the summer of 1958 to feverishly writing to orchestras around the

---

65 Bialystock, *Delayed Impact*, 72.

66 Only during the course of the 1960s would Jews around the world – and the world at large – begin to recognize the true magnitude and significance of the Holocaust. Such new understandings began only with the kidnapping, trial, and execution of Adolf Eichmann (Eichmann was captured in Argentina by Mossad agents in May 1960, faced trial beginning in April 1961, and was hanged on 31 May 1962) during which the Holocaust received extensive public attention and continued on through the 1960s as Israelis and Jews around the world internalized the 1967 Six Day War as a desperate battle for survival against Arab states seeking the destruction of the Jewish State. Neither of these contexts were discussed by Heinz Unger (and the Six Day War occurred, in fact, after his death) and so can only be understood as general contexts upon which Unger never commented or even lived through. We can therefore only speculate whether the events of the period impacted at all upon Unger in his negotiation of his Jewish identity.
world in the hopes of securing concerts with which he could celebrate the Mahler Centenary in 1960 in grand fashion. In that summer, Unger wrote letters to many of the world’s leading orchestras in the hopes of sharing Mahler’s music with as many as possible. Sadly, far too many of those letters – to such Mahlerian musical Meccas as Vienna and Amsterdam – failed to lead to concert engagements in this, one of the most important years in the entirety of Unger’s artistic life.

Still, the year was filled with many wondrous moments sharing Mahler’s music with fellow musicians and audiences. The first of these concerts had been a taping of Das Lied von der Erde, with the BBC, recorded in January 1959 and aired the following year as part of the BBC’s celebration of Mahler’s centenary. In late 1959, Unger was supposed to have returned to England to record a performance of Das Klagende Lied, Mahler’s first official composition and still a relative rarity in the concert hall, as well as a selection of Mahler songs. In being selected as one of the conductors to lead centenary performances of Mahler’s music, Heinz Unger was in elite company; the only other conductors chosen to lead concerts connected to the Mahler Centenary with the

67 In the summer of 1958, Heinz Unger wrote letters to the highly regarded and significant organizations of the BBC, the Concertgebouw (Amsterdam), the Radio-Symfonie Orchester of Berlin, and the Vienna Philharmonic. Having received a favourable reply only from the BBC, the following year Unger wrote to other ensembles in the hopes of securing concerts. The organizations that he contacted in 1959 to arrange Mahler centenary concerts were: the CBC as well as to the Chairman of the Vancouver International Festival to see if he could arrange a concert in Vancouver, and the Oslo Philharmonic (Norway).

68 The songs that were selected were the five songs of the song group Lieder nach Gedichten von Friedrich Ruckert ("Ich atmet' einen linden Duft," "Liebst du um Schönheit," "Um Mitternacht," "Blicke mir nicht in die Lieder," "Ich bin der Welt abhanden gekommen") and two further songs from Des Knaben Wunderhorn ("Revelge" and "Der Tamboursg’sell"). The songs were sung by Kristin Mayer and Richard Lewis (the Ruckert cycle was sung by Ms. Mayer, with the exception of "Blicke mir nicht in die Lieder" which was given to Mr. Lewis while the other two “martial” songs from Des Knaben Wunderhorn were given to Mr. Lewis). See: letter from Heinz Unger to Bernard Keefe of the BBC, dated 25 April 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12. The songs were indeed recorded and aired during the following year but it is uncertain whether the recording of Das Klagende Lied was ever made or broadcast. The seven songs recorded were grafted on to the program that featured Heinz Unger’s recording of Das Lied von der Erde. Whatever the circumstances surrounding Mahler’s Op. 1, Unger must have surely still been pleased to have had the opportunity and honour of recording important works by his beloved Gustav Mahler.
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BBC were the much admired and respected Jascha Horenstein (1898-1973), Sir John Barbirolli (1899-1970), William Steinberg (1899-1978), and Antal Dorati (1906-1988).

On 24 February 1960, the Canadian leg of Heinz Unger’s year-long celebration of Mahler well and truly began. On that date, the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, working on that occasion under the auspices of the York Concert Society assembled to give the YCS’ Mahler Centenary Concert at Massey Hall, with a performance of Mahler’s Das Lied von der Erde. It seems almost superfluous to discuss the details of a concert on such an important occasion but it must be noted that the reviews of the concert were unanimous in their praise of the conductor’s directorship of the orchestra and of his advocacy of Mahler’s idiom. This evening was more than just a concert, however – it was an event, a fact underlined by a post-concert reception held in honour of Heinz Unger and the performers at the Royal York Hotel and hosted by the Consul of the Federal Republic of Germany, Gottfried von Waldheim.

In the spring of 1960, listeners to the CBC were once again treated to a further helping of Mahler, this time selections from the Mahler completion and orchestration of Carl Maria von Weber’s uncompleted opera Die Drei Pintos. The performance of this rare music was accompanied by a performance of Mahler’s more familiar First Symphony. As the year drew to a close and once again in his familiar place at the conductor’s podium with the Municipal Orchestra of Valencia, Unger repeated his

---

69 The concert began with a performance of Schubert’s Symphony No. 8 (“Unfinished”). The guest soloists for the occasion were Elena Nikoloidi and, replacing the indisposed Richard Lewis, David Lloyd.
70 Blaik Kirby called Unger’s conducting “eloquent” and “graceful” while George Kidd was even more effusive in his praise, noting that “Dr. Unger seized the work with his usual authority for Mahler and produced it with care and affection.” Blaik Kirby, “Tenor .22 Calibre in Big Gun Role,” Toronto Daily Star, February 25, 1960; George Kidd, Fine Mahler Work Opens New Season,” The Telegram, February 25, 1960. LAC, MUS 56, Box 8, File 78.
71 For further information regarding Die Drei Pintos, see footnote 4.
72 The concert was aired on a Friday in April, possibly the 15th on CBC FM at 9pm. See: CBC Times, week of April 15, 1960. LAC, MUS 56, Box 9, File 79.
performance of Mahler’s First Symphony, this time as a part of the Valencian commemoration of the centenary of the composer’s birth.\textsuperscript{73}

And with these last concerts during the calendar year of 1960, Heinz Unger’s contribution to the Mahler centenary would come to a close. For Unger, the Mahler centenary was supposed to have been a tremendous celebration of the composer’s art. It was to be the moment in the life of the conductor during which, after the honours bestowed upon him by the Bruckner Society of America, his status as a Mahler conductor was recognized the world over. In the end, however, his involvement in the Mahler centenary was less than what he would have hoped for; Unger’s contributions to the commemoration of his beloved composer were limited to areas (Toronto, Valencia, London) where he had already helped bring about the Mahlerian revival. And with the passage of time, Heinz Unger’s contributions to the Mahler centenary – much like his other achievements – have been forgotten. Unger had once written that the conclusion of Mahler’s Fourth Symphony “is reserved for a description of the heavenly music led by St. Cecilia and her musicians, a music, which ‘is so beautiful that nothing on earth can stand comparison with it’ and which goes on, on and on in softest pp [pianissimo] into eternity, ending and yet not ending Mahler’s most moving dream.”\textsuperscript{74} Similarly, Unger’s work during the 1960 celebrations for the composer was to have been a depiction of heaven, both for himself and for others. As in that eloquent passage, however, nothing on earth could in fact compare to the vision of a Mahlerian heaven that Heinz Unger had dreamed of. Fortunately for us, the work that he did do helped us appreciate, many years hence, the beauty of Mahler’s music – “Mahler’s most moving dream” has never ended.

\textsuperscript{73} Mahler’s First Symphony was, in fact, performed twice by Unger and the Orchestra on consecutive days, Sunday and Monday, November 20 and 21, 1960. LAC, MUS 56, Box 9, File 79.

\textsuperscript{74} Unger programme notes, LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 39.
CHAPTER 8

THE FINAL YEARS AND A FAREWELL TO THE WORLD (1959 - 1965)

Musical Motif: Das Lied von der Erde (The Song of the Earth)

Das Lied von der Erde.

... 'The Song of Earth' is based on a selection of lyrics by a number of Chinese poets as it has become known to Mahler in its German version by the poet Hans Bethge. Mahler has chosen from this selection the seven poems underlying the six parts of his work in such a way as to give a bitter-sweet picture of life as a whole, with its ever contrasting moods changing as rapidly as life itself. There is drama, there is idyllic restfulness, youthful frolic, despairing loneliness, gaiety, admiration of prowess, frustration, longing for beauty and love, and permeating everything, the spirit of the wise who embraces and accepts all of it with deepest understanding. "\(^1\)

I. Das Trinklied vom Jammer der Erde (Drinking Song of Earth’s Sorrows)

Part 1. ‘Drinking Song to the Misery of this World.’ ‘Here sparkles wine in golden vessels’, the singer tells his assembled friends, ‘but do not drink ere you have heard my song!’ And he reminds them of the transforming powers of joy and grief alike. He tells them how earth and firmament outlast the life-span of man, and only after having made them intensely conscious of the fragility of human life, he challenges them to empty their cups, and drink to the eternal mystery of life and death. ‘Dunkel ist das Leben, ist der Tod. ’\(^2\)

In the previous chapter, we detailed Heinz Unger’s affair with the Israel Philharmonic. In doing so, we highlighted how his long courtship for a guest appearance with that ensemble – ideally leading a work by Gustav Mahler, the composer who Unger felt best represented his own distinct stream of German Jewish identity – was an expression of his deeply-held Jewish identity. We thus learnt that Heinz Unger bore a distinctly Jewish identity – an identity he carried with pride and with a determination that had not wavered whatever the circumstances in his life. What is more, we discovered that Unger’s sense of Jewishness – his Jewish identity – was an integral part of his being that cannot be ignored despite the fact that he did not often articulate it in orthodox

---

\(^1\) Heinz Unger, “Gustav Mahler Centenary Concert: The Song of the Earth” (February 24, 1960 Program notes), LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 39.

\(^2\) Ibid.
speech acts. Rather, his Jewish identity was tied to a performative and reportorial musical practice wherein he expressed his Jewishness by way of an allegiance to specific musical texts that were endowed with Jewish meaning.³

Such theoretical formulations aside, another way of achieving insight into Unger’s affiliation with Jewish culture is to draw attention to the informal Jewish networks of which he was a participant. Heinz Unger’s Jewish network lay neither in Israel nor in any other location but, rather, reflects the complicated Diasporic existence of German Jews, especially that imposed upon them by their exodus from their own Zion, the Central-European lands in which they had long established themselves and where they had come to constitute an integral part of the social, cultural and economic fabric. The friends that formed his Jewish network were, like Unger himself, like so many grains of sand, picked up by the winds of time and circumstance and dropped around the world.

In Toronto, despite the large number of East European Jews that formed the nucleus of a Jewish community in which he never felt truly comfortable, Heinz Unger managed to create for himself a network of Jewish affiliation. In the dealings with the Israel Philharmonic, we have already been introduced to Mark Levy and wife. Mark Levy was Unger’s legal counsel but was also, along with his wife, one of Unger’s closest friends and greatest supporters. Heinz Unger could also count among his friends the German Jewish archivist and musicologist Helmut Kallmann who, after many years at the CBC music library in Toronto, would eventually move on to become head of the National

³ Unger’s allegiance to Gustav Mahler’s music in particular is a most fitting example of this. Of course, not all the music that Unger performed during his long career so neatly fits into this rubric. Nevertheless, as Philip Bohlman has pointed out, we cannot discount the fact that the Central European art music canon had evolved during the course of the 20th century into, for lack of a better term, an “ethnic music” for German-speaking Jewry. For a fuller discussion, see Chapter 2.
Archives’ Music Division. By far the most intriguing relationship was with Joseph Plaut, the Rabbi of Toronto’s oldest and largest Reform Synagogue, Holy Blossom Temple. And we would be remiss if we were to fail to mention that Unger had chosen to settle in Willowdale, a Toronto suburb that had traditionally been home to a large number of the greater Toronto area’s Jewish population. His role in the Forest Hill Orchestra, moreover, might have also been as a consequence of a shared culture with a long-resident Jewish community that was excited by the prospect of establishing in their midst a significant cultural institution that would be headed by a Jewish conductor of Unger’s stature and achievement. Even as a recent immigrant to Toronto, Heinz Unger would cultivate a network of Jewish affiliation.

In other corners of the world, Heinz Unger’s Jewish connections were many. Despite the passage of so many years, Unger remained close with the German Jewish

---

4 Helmut Kallmann (1922-) was born in Berlin and, like Unger, had escaped Nazi Germany, albeit as late as 1939. After a brief time in England where he was interned as a German citizen, Kallmann moved to Canada where he was again interned between 1940 and 1943. Thereafter, he studied music in Toronto and eventually moved on to work in the Toronto-based CBC music library between the years 1950 and 1970. In 1970, he was appointed director of the newly-created Music Division at the National Library of Canada, working in that capacity until his retirement in 1987. “Helmut Kallman,” in *The Encyclopedia of Music in Canada*. Helmut Kallman is still resident in Ottawa and it was the author’s good fortune to meet with him in the course of the writing of this work.

5 Rabbi Gunther Plaut (1912-) was born in Munster, Germany, fleeing from Nazi Germany in 1935 and emigrating to the United States. After serving in the Second World War as a chaplain, he assumed religious directorship of the Mount Zion Temple in St. Paul, Minnesota (1948-1961), thereafter moving to Toronto and becoming the Rabbi at Holy Blossom between the years 1961 and 1977 as well as serving as President of the Canadian Jewish Congress. According to Sharon Drache, his non-traditional religious views placed him “firmly within the secular Jewish camp.” Sharon Drache, “Gunther W Plaut,” in *The Canadian Encyclopedia* (Toronto Hurtig Publishers, 1988). Amongst the conductor’s papers, there is not one shred of evidence to connect the two men bar a letter of condolence from Rabbi Plaut to Hella Unger after her husband’s passing. Dr Unger’s daughter, however, recalls having seen Rabbi Plaut visit the family home and speaks of Rabbi Plaut as a family friend. How this was so is not necessarily clear, though the key to the mystery may lay in one of two connections tracing back to Germany: a the actor Joseph Plaut (1879-1966) had once been a guest at a gala held by Heinz Unger on 27 January 1926, b both Heinz Unger and Gunther Plaut spent their youths in the Berlin suburb of Charottenburg, where many of Berlin’s Jewish families resided. Indeed, Plaut was a writer as well as a Rabbi and wrote a fictionalized account of a Jewish-German youth in his collection of short stories entitled *Hanging Threads* (Toronto Lester and Orpen Limited, 1978). Perhaps Heinz Unger and Gunther Plaut were family friends, perhaps not. Whatever the case, it must surely be of some importance that Heinz Unger’s daughter, a woman who had long before converted to the Anglican Church, knew of Rabbi Plaut and has personal recollections of him at the family home in Toronto.
community that had remained in Germany following the Holocaust. In Israel, despite his professional marginalization, Unger maintained regular contact with the family members who had emigrated there from Germany.\textsuperscript{6} And despite an alleged anti-Zionist stance consistent with that held by many of his fellow German Jewish émigrés, Unger understood the significance of Israel for the Jewish people.\textsuperscript{7} Indeed, Unger's understanding of the symbolic significance of Israel in modern Jewish life is made plain as one looks to his attempts to conduct there (and, especially, to conduct the work of Mahler in the composer's centenary year) as well as the close relationship that he cultivated with the members of his family that had settled there in the post-war period.

Despite the Jewish friends and family that he had in Canada and Israel, the locus of his Jewish network lay not in these settings but in the United States and, in particular, in the greater Los Angeles area. During the 1930s, Los Angeles had become a virtual Jewish émigré outpost as more and more Jewish artists, exiled from central Europe on account of an increasingly intolerant and anti-Semitic climate, moved to the United States in search of safety and a new life free from persecution.\textsuperscript{8} By the beginning of the 1940s,

\textsuperscript{6} In particular, Unger maintained a very close relationship with Grete Turnowsky and Alice Jacob-Loewenson, two members of his family who had settled in Tel-Aviv and with whom he kept up a regular correspondence.

\textsuperscript{7} Nowhere in his Fonds is there any mention of Unger's stance on Israel, the only evidence to suggest that Unger was not in favour of the creation of Israel is an assertion that the conductor's daughter, Ines Johnston made in conversation. Indeed, her assertion that her father was "anti-Zionist" stems only from her recollection that he allowed her to convert to the Anglican Church of England after a British diplomat was assassinated by early Zionists. The incident to which she might have been referring could be the assassination of the Swedish diplomat Folke Bernadotte (1895-1948) by the Lehi Group (known by the British as the Stern Gang) who had been sent by the UN Security Council to help resolve issues pertaining to the Israel conflict of 1947-48. Heinz Unger's daughter's assertion that her father was thoroughly opposed to the existence of a Jewish state is further undermined by the significance that Israel held for Unger in the highly charged affair with the Israel Philharmonic as well as the fact that an essay on early Zionism was kept by Unger and made its way into his Fonds.

Jewish artists had become leading members of the Los Angeles artistic scene, being intimately involved in the worlds of music and cinema. Indeed, during the “Golden Age” of cinema, Jewish artists of all types became leading luminaries in their respective fields. In the area of movie music especially, Europe’s once-famous Jewish composers such as Max Steiner (b. Vienna 1888 –d. 1971 Los Angeles) and Erich Korngold (b. Brno 1897-d. 1957 Los Angeles) became the finest and most overworked film composers of the period, contributing the soundtracks to such famous movies as the blockbuster *King Kong* (1933), the Bette Davis vehicle *Deception* (1946), and the Errol Flynn swashbucklers *Captain Blood* (1935) and *The Sea Hawk* (1940).

Conductors who had once graced Europe’s most important podiums also settled in the Los Angeles area, building their careers anew. Heinz Unger did not in the end participate in this world on a regular basis. However, he maintained close relationships with some of this community’s key figures. Bruno Walter’s performance of Gustav Mahler’s *Das Lied von der Erde* in Munich in 1915 had been the original impetus for Unger’s embrace of music. In the years that followed, Bruno Walter became a supporter of Unger and his art while Unger retained his affection for Walter both personally and professionally. Over the years, they also became friends, a relationship in which their mutual affection remained undiminished despite the distance that separated them.9 Long since settled in Los Angeles, Bruno Walter continued to be a significant part of Unger’s life until Walter’s passing in 1962. Another very close Jewish friend of his from Berlin, Hugo Strelitzer (1896-1981), had arrived in Los Angeles in 1936 and had the honour of serving as chorus master at the 1945 Los Angeles premiere of the *Genesis Suite*, a

---

9 Not only did Heinz Unger and Bruno Walter settle in different cities and countries; Walter also converted to Christianity while Unger remained Jewish throughout all his years. Their regular exchange of letters over the course of many years, however, suggests at the importance of the relationship for both men.
collaboratively-composed work that musically depicted the major events of the Biblical book of Genesis.\footnote{10}

One of Heinz Unger’s most interesting relationships in Los Angeles was with Rabbi Maxwell Dubin of the Reform Wilshire Boulevard Temple.\footnote{11} By the late 1950s, their correspondence bore a warm familiarity, indicating that they had known each other for a number of years and had made mutual efforts to keep abreast of each other’s activities and whereabouts. Indeed, by the late 1950s Rabbi Dubin had become one of Unger’s most fervent supporters in the United States and lent his weight to helping the conductor obtain wider exposure in the United States. In a letter sent in the spring of 1959, Rabbi Dubin, after congratulating his friend on the honours bestowed upon him by the Bruckner Society of America, turns his attention to answering Unger’s queries pertaining to the post of director of the Los Angeles Philharmonic.\footnote{12}

\footnote{10} The composers who came together to each compose one portion of the seven-part work were the Austrian Arnold Schoenberg (1874-1951), New York born Nathaniel Shilkret (1889-1982), the Polish born Alexandre Tansman (1897-1986), Frenchman Darius Milhaud (1892-1974), Italian Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco (1895-1968), Vienna-born Ernst Toch (1887-1964), and the Russian Igor Stravinsky (1882-1971). The project was the brainchild of Nathaniel Shilkret. All but Stravinsky were Jewish and all were resident in the greater Los Angeles area at the time. The concert was held on November 18, 1945 at the Wilshire-Ebell Theater and a recording with the original performers was made on December 11, 1945. All the information bar Strelitzer’s participation as chorus master is extracted from James Westby’s informative notes to the Milken Archive’s recording of the Genesis Suite. Naxos 8.559442 (2004).

\footnote{11} Little information is to be found relating to Rabbi Maxwell Dubin. In their survey of American synagogues, Kerry Olitzky and Marc Lee Raphael note that “In 1926, Maxwell Dubin was appointed to the position of Director of Religious Education and Social Activities” at the Wilshire Boulevard Temple. According to Olitzky and Raphael’s account, Dubin never rose to become Senior Rabbi of the Wilshire Boulevard Temple. Kerry Olitzky and Marc Lee Raphael, \textit{The American Synagogue: A Historical Dictionary and Sourcebook} (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1996), 51. Aside from this one fact, we know that Rabbi Dubin survived past Unger passing in 1965, though the year of his death is not known. As to the circumstances that originally brought them together, nothing is known; one can only guess that these two men met while Unger was on a trip to Los Angeles to visit friends yet no definitive evidence exists to describe their first encounters.

\footnote{12} The post had just recently become vacant after its director, the Dutch conductor Eduard van Beinum (1900-1959), had suddenly died of a heart attack the previous month while rehearsing with the Concertgebouw Orchestra in the Netherlands. Letter from Rabbi Dubin to Heinz Unger, dated May 12, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12. Acting on the conductor’s inquiries, Rabbi Dubin informed Unger that he had “taken the liberty of sending your clippings to Mrs. Norman Chandler” whom the Rabbi charmingly described as being “very active in the Los Angeles Philharmonic Society.” Letter from Rabbi Dubin to Heinz Unger, dated May 12, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12. In his letter to Mrs. Chandler,
In the end, Rabbi Dubin’s advocacy on behalf of Heinz Unger came to nought and he was never formally considered for the post. Nonetheless, Dubin’s repeated attempts for Unger’s nomination to the post speak of a faithful friendship and an affection on both the personal and professional plains. Indeed, in late summer of 1959, Unger went to Los Angeles to meet with his friend Bruno Walter to honour a “standing invitation from him since 2 years” and took time to visit with his rabbi friend, a fact acknowledged in a letter from Dubin to Unger in September where the rabbi notes that “we enjoyed having you here, but regret that you did not give us more time.”

To only mention Unger’s Jewish networks of affiliation would, however, represent a serious distortion of the German Jewish musician’s life and self-understanding. For, as a German Jew living in the Double Diaspora imposed by the process of emancipation and the turbulent events of the twentieth century, he had moved beyond an exclusively Jewish self-understanding and was bound up in a modernity wherein Germanness and Jewishness coexisted and could not be divorced from one another. Thus, we would be failing to accurately convey the nature of Unger’s networks if we were to overlook the fact that, alongside the aforementioned Jewish networks of

---

Dubin made clear his admiration for Dr. Unger, calling him a “conductor of outstanding ability [that] would bring to our Orchestra the stature and leadership it requires.” Letter from Rabbi Dubin, to Mrs. Chandler, dated May 12, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12. Mrs. Norman Chandler was in fact Dorothy Buffum Chandler (1901-1997), the wife of the publisher of the Los Angeles Times from 1945-1960. Dorothy Chandler spent a large part of her life attempting (and in fact succeeding in) revitalizing the Los Angeles Arts scene. In honour of her tireless work in its creation, the Los Angeles Music Center’s main orchestral hall (completed 1967) was named the Dorothy Chandler pavilion and served as the home of the Los Angeles Philharmonic between 1964 and 2003, when it was replaced by the newly-built Walt Disney Concert Hall. Eduard van Beinum (b. 1901 Arnhem, Netherlands, d. 1959, Amsterdam) was a Dutch conductor who rose to prominence after being appointed co-conductor (with Willem Mengelberg) of the Concertgebouw, Amsterdam in 1938 and remained its chief Music Director following the war (despite controversy surrounding his cooperation with the Nazi regime). He was appointed Music Director of the Los Angeles Philharmonic in 1956, serving in that role until his death from heart problems in 1959.

Mention of Unger’s trip to visit Walter is made in a letter from Unger to Dubin, dated May 15, 1959, on the eve of his departure to Peru for a set of concerts with the Peruvian National Orchestra. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12. The Dubin quote is from a letter Dubin sent to Unger, dated September 9, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12.
affiliation, Unger also maintained networks of affiliation that transcended the Jewish sphere alone. Indeed, some of Unger’s closest friends in Canada – like the managing director of Volkswagen Canada Karl Barths – were themselves a part of a German Canadian community that had been ostracized in a post-war Canada where an understanding of all Germans being Nazis was a common phenomenon.¹⁴ Moreover, the very fact that one of the most recent mentions of Heinz Unger falls within Gerhard Bassler’s 1991 survey of German Canadians – wherein he notes that Unger was “among the country’s most distinguished musical directors” – is surely evidence of the imprint that the German Jewish conductor had made in the German Canadian community before his death.¹⁵ Furthermore, Unger developed a network that transcended either the German or the Jewish realms and spoke to his third identification – that of being a musician.¹⁶

In cursorily surveying the conductor’s network of affiliation, it becomes clear that Heinz Unger, despite not limiting himself to the Jewish sphere, had a well-developed Jewish network of relationships that ranged across the Diaspora. In drawing attention to this element of his personal and professional networks, we must remind ourselves that he also maintained himself in the mainstream, maintaining friendships that transcended his Jewish network and reflect the fact that Unger did not live, metaphorically speaking, a

¹⁴ Numerous examples could be drawn to support the fact that Unger frequently fraternized and was close friends with non-Jewish Germans. Shortly after receiving the Grosskreuz des Verdienstordens der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, the managing director of Volkswagen Canada Karl Barths sent Unger a warm letter congratulating him on his honour. See: letter from Karl Barths to Heinz Unger, dated 2 February 1965. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16. For perceptions of Germans in Canada in the post-war period, see: Alexander Freund, “Troubling Memories in Nation-Building: World War II- Memories and Germans’ Interethnic Encounters in Canada after 1945,” in Histoire Sociale/Social History 39/77 (2006): 129-156.


¹⁶ Many of his closest friends from England, including the conductor Harry Newstone, were not Jewish. The same could also be said of Heinz Unger’s many musician friends in Spain and, of course, in Canada.
life cloistered life behind ghetto walls. As an assimilated German Jew, Heinz Unger was at once both of and not of the Jewish community.

II. Der Einsame im Herbst (The Lonely Man in Autumn)

Part 2. ‘Lonely in Autumn.’ Singer and orchestra describe in telling colors all the beauty and all the melancholy of autumn; blue mists on the lake, the golden leaves which will soon be floating away on the water. After the most subtle and loving description of autumn in nature, the singer remembers her own loneliness and the autumn in her own soul. In despair she cries out for the ‘sunshine of love to dry her bitter tears’.  

Rabbi Dubin’s advocacy of Heinz Unger for the post of conductor of the Los Angeles Philharmonic was not the only time that the Rabbi pledged his support for the conductor. In late summer 1959, Rabbi Dubin interceded on Unger’s behalf to see whether he might help the conductor attain the representation of famous impresario Sol Hurok (1888-1974), the Jewish concert agent responsible for the talents of many of the world’s musical stars. In a letter sent by Dubin to Hurok, the Rabbi spoke of how Heinz Unger was “anxious to place himself under your management, provided, you feel, and it must be solely on the basis of his professional ability, justified in handling his affairs.” Despite stressing that any future Unger-Hurok relationship should be built on a foundation of professionalism, Dubin could not help but add a word that spoke volumes for the main reason the Rabbi bore such an affection for Heinz Unger:

Not only is Dr. Unger a distinguished conductor; he is, in addition, one of the few Jewish maestros who refused to compromise with

---

17 Heinz Unger, "Gustav Mahler Centenary Concert: The Song of the Earth" (February 24, 1960 Program notes), LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 39.
18 The Jewish impresario Sol Hurok (born Solomon Isiaevich Hurok) had stemmed from modern-day Ukraine and had moved to the United States in 1906. Over his many decades as a concert manager, Hurok would come to represent some of the greatest artistic talents of his time, including: Marian Anderson, Vladimir Ashkenazy, Van Cliburn, Emil Gilels, David Oistrakh, Jan Peerce, Mstislav Rostropovich, Arthur Rubinstein, Isaac Stern, and Efrem Zimbalist.
19 Letter from Maxwell Dubin to Sol Hurok, dated September 9, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12.
his faith and accept baptism in order to further his career. As a rabbi, this has made him doubly close to me.  

These words, true as they were, were meant to help Sol Hurok understand the common religious outlook of the parties in the hopes of bringing Unger and Hurok closer together and to form the basis of a professional relationship.

Any possibility of a relationship between Heinz Unger and Sol Hurok, however, seems to have already been poisoned by Unger’s defence of his old friend Wilhelm Furtwängler in what has come to be known as “the Chicago Affair.” In the winter of 1949, the board of the Chicago Orchestral Association announced that they had contracted the renowned German conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler as principal conductor for a series of concerts in the coming season. Doubtless the appointment of a famous conductor such as Furtwängler was a coup for the Chicago Orchestral Association but they had little time to revel in their success. The appointment of Furtwängler to the post immediately set off a violent series of protests by musicians and members of the public suspicious of his conduct during the Second World War, when he had chosen to stay in Nazi Germany instead of emigrating in protest; despite having been cleared by American authorities in 1947, rumours swirled about Furtwängler’s allegiance and support of the Nazi regime. Even Furtwängler’s conviction that he had done no wrong, remaining in Germany because of his allegiance to the nation rather than the regime and that he had resigned his official posts and avoided as much as possible involvement with the regime, did little to dispel the suspicions many held; Furtwängler was a Nazi and deserved to be punished for supporting the criminal government.  

---

20 Letter from Maxwell Dubin to Sol Hurok, dated September 9, 1959. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 12.

21 There is a vast literature on Wilhelm Furtwängler and even today a heated debate on whether partaking in an “internal migration” to set oneself apart from the regime under which one lives and works is a morally
In January 1949, *The New York Times* covered the Chicago Affair in great detail, running articles that discussed the salient features of the narrative while also printing letters from notable musicians and members of the Jewish community who felt inclined to voice their opinions on the matter. On 6 January 1949, Harold Taubman wrote an article declaring that “a group of world-famous soloists and conductors, including Vladimir Horowitz, Artur Rubinstein and Alexander Brailowsky, pianists; Lily Pons, Metropolitan Opera Soprano, and Andre Kostelanetz, conductor, have warned the Chicago Symphony Orchestra that they would not appear as soloists or guest leaders with that ensemble if Wilhelm Furtwaengler [sic] became principal conductor.”22 Not all musicians, whether Jewish or otherwise, were against Furtwängler’s appointment or saw the matter in such a stark light. Taubman, in the name of fairness, also wrote that “Mr. Furtwaengler’s record has not been without its defenders,” correctly noting that the violinist Yehudi Menuhin was the most eminent Furtwängler defender and ally.23

Another Furtwängler ally, albeit perhaps one less squarely in the public eye, was Heinz Unger. On 13 January 1949, *The New York Times* ran a lengthy letter that Unger had written in defence of Furtwängler. In this letter, Unger articulated his understanding of Furtwängler’s decision to remain in Nazi Germany:

---


22 Howard Taubman, “Musicians’ Ban on Furtwaengler Ends His Chicago Contract for ‘49,” *The New York Times*, 6 January 1949, p.1. The article title was premature, as the cancellation of Furtwängler’s contract did not come until later in the month. In the same article, Taubman quotes the full telegram sent by Artur Rubinstein from his home in Beverly Hills; it reads: “I will not collaborate, musically or otherwise, with any one who collaborated with Hitler, Goering and Goebbels.”

23 Taubman, “Musicians’ Ban on Furtwaengler Ends His Chicago Contract for ‘49,” *The New York Times*, 6 January 1949, p.1. It should also be noted that Menuhin had appeared as guest soloist with Furtwängler as early as 1946, surely a sign that he felt that the conductor had done no wrong.
True, he could have left Germany as did many of his colleagues, and the world would have been open to him. But...he felt so strongly connected with German music and musical life that the idea of possibly shutting the door behind them forever was more intolerable for him than to put up with circumstances as they were. Weakness? Perhaps; certainly not more.24

Unger, a German Jew who had not easily reached his own decision to abandon Germany, seemed to well understand the paradox in which Furtwängler had found himself, at once resistant to Nazi policies but also torn by a love of his German homeland. Thereafter, Unger continued his nuanced defence of Furtwängler, drawing parallels to his own life experience and the realities of a period wherein musicians – like so many others – were compelled to work in trying circumstances:

To blame Furtwaengler [sic] because, on having remained in Germany, he conducted occasionally in the presence of Hitler is something which really cannot be discussed seriously. I hope that Mr. Horowitz and Mr. Rubinstein will not suspect me of Communist sympathies because during my musical activities in Russia I sometimes could not avoid conducting in the presence of high Soviet officials.25

Unger’s letter of support for Furtwängler appeared in The New York Times alongside a letter by a Menuhin who held Furtwängler in the highest esteem as both conductor and person, and was prepared to declare so in no uncertain terms:

Of all German musicians, Furtwaengler [sic] put up the most resistance to the Nazis. He kept as many Jews as possible in the Berlin Philharmonic. He never went on Nazi propaganda trips. He was never a member of the party. Altogether, he behaved well – as well as could be expected of a man who is entirely German, who is a good German in the best sense of the word. There is no reason for him to suffer. The man has been cleared (by a German

24 Heinz Unger, “Furtwaengler Ban Discussed: Chicago Action Criticized By Former Conductor of Berlin Philharmonic,” The New York Times, 13 January 1949, 22. Incidentally, Unger’s defence of Furtwängler and his understanding of his colleague’s reluctance to leave Germany speaks volumes for Unger’s own connection and love of German musical and cultural life.
denazification court). If he is cleared by those most interested, then it is not our business to judge further.  

In that same edition, *The New York Times* also picked up a piece from the Associated Press in which Furtwängler was finally allowed to speak for himself, his heartfelt views echoing those expressed by his supporters:

Everyone must bear the fate to which he is bound by ties of an age, a race or a nation. I am a German, born on German soil. As a musician, I have to fulfill the tasks of that country. My artistic ancestors were German musicians and I am building on a soil, which through two centuries has proved to be undyingly fertile.

The resistance to Furtwängler could not be surmounted, however. In the tension-laden atmosphere following the Holocaust and concurrent with the young state of Israel's struggle for survival, the presence in America of a German conductor who had chosen to remain in Germany during the dark years of Nazi rule was bound to be divisive. Indeed, so divisive that prominent members of the Jewish community also weighed in on the affair. On 14 January 1949, *The New York Times* ran an article that spoke of how “Rabbi Morton M. Berman, president of the Chicago division, American Jewish Congress, today joined the forces opposing the proposed engagement of Wilhelm Furtwaengler [sic], German conductor, as conductor of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra.” In that same article, Rabbi Berman acknowledged the arguments made by notable musicians such as Heinz Unger and Yehudi Menuhin but ultimately dismissed them, saying:

With reference to Furtwaengler’s [sic] claim that he helped individual Jews...every Nazi seeks to make the same claim. The token saving of a few Jewish lives does not excuse Mr.

---

Furtwaengler [sic] from official, active participation in a regime which murdered 6,000,000 Jews and millions of non-Jews.  

With the rising tide of resistance to Furtwängler’s appointment, the voices of a few musicians who knew Furtwängler well could not save him from the angry mob of voices condemning his active participation in American cultural life. By the third week of January 1949, the affair had come to an end. Wilhelm Furtwängler, grown tired of the personal attacks, issued one last public statement in which he lamented the turn of events and signalled the end to his candidacy:

It is inconceivable that artists should perpetuate hatred indefinitely, while all the world is longing for peace. In order to spare the Chicago Orchestra further difficulties, I withdraw herewith from the already concluded contract.

While the Chicago Affair ended abruptly for Furtwängler, the aftershocks were felt by those who had supported him. Yehudi Menuhin, concertizing in Italy, must have been distressed to hear that “leaders of the Jewish community in Rome” had encouraged the members of the community to boycott his final two concerts in Rome. Heinz Unger’s support of Furtwängler in 1949 had, meanwhile, caused a deep and permanent rift between himself and many committed Jews in the United States. Thus, while Rabbi Dubin had approached Sol Hurok in good faith in 1959, the events of ten years earlier may have already compromised the possibility of Sol Hurok showing any affection or sympathy – personal or professional – for Unger. Not surprisingly, therefore, nothing

30 In an article printed in the New York Times on 18 January 1949, James C. Petrillo, head of the American Federation of Musicians, indicated that the union membership also opposed Furtwängler’s appointment “Petrillo For Ban on Furtwaengler Indicates The Musicians Union Will Oppose Chicago Dates For German Conductor,” The New York Times, 18 January 1949, p 17
came of Dubin’s initiative and the matter of Hurok’s representation of Unger, a representation that could have borne great fruit for the conductor in the twilight of his career, died a quiet death. This negative result notwithstanding, Unger must have surely been touched by Rabbi Dubin’s reference to his being a “Jewish maestro.” In light of Unger’s dealings with the Israel Philharmonic and his own fury at being called anything other than Jewish, the Rabbi’s words must have been balm to his lonely Jewish soul.

III. Von der Jugend (Of Youth)

Part 3. ‘Of Youth’. A little lake, a little pavilion in its midst, a little bridge, arched like a tiger’s back, leading to it, and in the pavilion a host of young friends enjoying life, chatting, playing, writing verses, everything as fragile as china. Suddenly the narrating singer looks into the clear lake, and there, mystified, he sees everything standing on its head, the little bridge no longer like a tiger’s back, but rather like a half moon, the pavilion, the friends, everything upside down. He wonders. So does the music.33

Despite lying on the periphery of the Jewish world and, as evidenced in the Chicago affair, coming into direct conflict with positions advanced by Jewish artists and community members, Heinz Unger’s Jewish soul reawakened at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s as he reconnected with his German Jewish roots. One can of course speculate endlessly on the reasons for this Jewish renaissance. One cannot, for instance, discount the role played by advancing age and ailing health; the awareness of his impending mortality may have led Unger to clear away the layers of grime that encrusted his Jewish soul and admit to himself that he bore a distinctly German Jewish identity that he could not deny. Nor can one discount the possibility that, after years of an almost violent suppression of the Holocaust by both the Jews who had lived through it and also by a wider Jewish community that had felt shame over the seemingly passive

33 Heinz Unger, “Gustav Mahler Centenary Concert: The Song of the Earth” (February 24, 1960 Program notes), LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 39.
way in which Europe’s Jews were led to their death, the fact that the beginning of the
1960s represent a time during which the events of the Holocaust began to be discussed, if
at first tentatively, may have contributed to Heinz Unger's reconnection with his
Jewishness. 34

My feeling, however, is that the Mahler centenary played a crucial role in Unger's
awareness of his German Jewish identity. Whatever the importance of the above-noted
possibilities for Unger's German Jewish renaissance and not dismissing the fact that both
of these circumstances added a level of meaning to the Mahler centenary, the arrival of
the Mahler centenary allowed Unger to reflect upon and fervently realize that Mahler and
his soundscape represented for him a universe of German and Jewish meaning, a
meaning made explicit in his declaration that “the year 1960 will bring the 100th birthday
of Gustav Mahler, one of the most important composers of Jewish origin, to whose music
I as you know have devoted my whole life.” 35 Heinz Unger, after years of wandering,
had, by way of Mahler's music, reconnected with his roots, with his youth, and with the
world he thought he had lost on the Nazi rise to power. The power of Mahler's music –
the one cause to which Unger had remained devoted his entire life – had led him back
across the little bridge to the pavilion where he could once again join “a host of young
friends enjoying life, chatting, playing, writing verses.”

Heinz Unger's Jewish reawakening in turn led him to engage in philanthropic
activity on behalf of the Jewish people. Informed by his German Jewish identity and

34 For the fullest account of the evolution of Holocaust awareness in a Canadian context, see: Bialystock,
Delayed Impact. In his work on German Canadians, Alexander Freund declares that “public awareness and
interest in the Holocaust emerged in North America only in the 1970s.” Freund, “Troubling Memories in
Nation-Building,” Histoire sociale/Social History 39/77 (2006), 140. This seems rather a conservative
timeline that discounts earlier – albeit perhaps less “public” – negotiations of the Holocaust. The matter is
also discussed, albeit briefly, on pages 626-627 of Irving Howe’s World of Our Fathers.
35 Letter from Heinz Unger to Mrs. Mark Levy, dated 5 June 1958. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 11.
impelled to reconnect with the German Jewish community from which he had stemmed, however, his activities in this sphere centered not on the Canadian or American Jewish communities wherein he never comfortably situated himself but were directed towards the difficulties faced by the post Holocaust German Jewish community. In late summer 1960, Unger was pleased to be able to grant in full to the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland an honorarium that he had received from the Westdeutschen Rundfunks in Köln (Cologne) for a concert conducted the previous year. The money from the honorarium, according to a letter sent to Unger from the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland, was used for the education of a Jewish teacher.\(^{36}\) Despite not being an integral part of Canada’s Jewish community, Unger displayed concern for the fate of the Jewish people, albeit one that privileged German Jews.

The exchange with the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland highlights the fact that Heinz Unger, despite his aforementioned marginality in Canadian Jewish society, had not severed his ties with the Jewish communities elsewhere. Indeed, mention of Unger was made in a publication published by the German Jewish agency, a fact noted in both a letter sent to Unger from the Zentralrat as well as by musicologist Daniel Gillis who was delighted to see the German Jewish conductor continue to be recognized by his community.\(^{37}\) Although not formally a part of the Jewish community in his adopted

\(^{36}\) The letter, sent by the Council’s Secretary Dr van Dam, explicitly mentions that the money will be used for the training and education of a Jewish teacher. ("fur die Ausbildung eines judischen Lehrers verwandt"). Letter from the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland to Heinz Unger, dated December 15, 1960 LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 13 The total amount of the honorarium was 720 DM

\(^{37}\) In his letter to Unger, Daniel Gillis noted that he “was delighted to see your name on page 197 of Die Juden im deutschen Kulturbereich, edited by Siegmund Konzelson (Judischer Verlag, Berlin, sec edition) in the section “Dingenten”. Letter from Daniel Gillis to Heinz Unger, dated December 20, 1960 The letter from the Zentralrat to Heinz Unger is dated December 15, 1960 Both LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 13
Canadian homeland, Heinz Unger continued to be viewed – and to view himself – as a significant member of German Jewish cultural life even decades after leaving Germany.

The year 1960, therefore, represents the apex of Heinz Unger’s life after immigrating to Canada. By that time, he had become an acknowledged expert in the Mahlerian world and his work in other repertoire was also receiving high praise. On a more personal level, he had also come to a fuller understanding of his identity, recognizing that it consisted not only of his German self but also that he bore within him a strong connection to Jewish culture that he had suppressed for a number of decades. His new self-understanding provided him with a new strength and vitality. In sum, the new decade promised much for Heinz Unger both personally and professionally.

On 4 January 1961, John Kraglund wrote a long laudatory piece that shared with The Globe and Mail readers Unger’s success on his most recent tour. On that tour, Unger conducted in Geneva, Stuttgart, Madrid and Valencia, capping off his European tour with a visit to London where he marked his 65th birthday by conducting Mozart with Harry Newstone’s chamber ensemble-sized Haydn Orchestra, a recording that was broadcast on the BBC.38 In the same article, Kraglund also voiced his enthusiasm for the upcoming York Concert Society’s season, declaring that “the York’s ninth season promises to be one of the most impressive in programming and soloists.”39

As so often in Unger’s life, however, promise was curtailed by circumstance. Just a week after Kraglund’s anticipation-filled comments concerning the coming YCS

---

38 John Kraglund, “Music in 1961: Unger has Birthday With Mozart on BBC,” The Globe and Mail, January 4, 1961. LAC, MUS 56, Box 9, File 79. Harry Newstone (b. Winnipeg, Manitoba 1921 d. Victoria, BC 2006) was a Canadian-born conductor who lived much of his life in England, founding the highly-rated Haydn Orchestra in 1949. There is no mention of how the two met but it is clear from their correspondence that they were good friends right up to Unger’s death in 1965.

season, expectations for the upcoming YCS season, and indeed for the Society’s future beyond 1961, had been dashed, the chairman of the Society’s executive council Malcolm A. Moysey reporting that “a review of the organization’s financial situation and the outlook for a major concert series had prompted the decision to cancel [the season].”

In exposing the sad fate of the York Concert Society, Kraglund then noted that the Canada Council – the Crown Corporation created as recently as 1957 to oversee the development of the arts in Canada – “had decided to withdraw its support ($3000 last season).” Just as in Das Lied von der Erde where the singer “looks into the clear lake, and there, mystified, he sees everything standing on its head, the little bridge no longer like a tiger’s back, but rather like a half moon, the pavilion, the friends, everything upside down,” Heinz Unger must have wondered what had transpired to turn his world upside down.

Come the spring of 1961, however, strong support for the York Concert Society and for Unger’s achievements in Canada led to a reconsideration of the Society’s future, Kraglund reporting that “the most recent [musical phoenix] to rise from what seemed a fairly conclusive funeral pyre is the York Concert Society, which has just announced plans for a 1962 season under the direction of Heinz Unger.” This new course was undertaken in the wake of a barrage of letters of support that “expressed the dismay of part of Toronto’s concert public” and made public the sentiments of “many of those that had supported the organization through nine troubled years [who] were not prepared to

---

41 Ibid. Other early reports were just as clear if not even more condemnatory in the particular reason for the season’s cancellation, laying the blame squarely on the recently created Canada Council itself: “With no Canada Council Grant, the situation was hopeless,” said Mr. Moysey. “Financial difficulties for York Concert Society: Cancel Concert Series,” The Telegram, January 13, 1961.
accept complete failure."\(^{43}\) As a consequence, a new executive board was formed and plans for the 1962 season quickly got underway. The York Concert Society, like the proverbial phoenix, was indeed rising from the ashes.

In the coming weeks and months, the particular circumstances that had compelled the YCS to cancel its 1961 concert season would come to light. The Canada Council’s motivation for withholding YCS funding was not an isolated phenomenon but had instead come about as a consequence of a report tabled to the Canada Council by the Australian musician Bernard Heinze that was meant to report "on the present state of development of Canadian symphony orchestras."\(^{44}\) For the purposes of the report, the Canada Council requested Bernard Heinze travel across Canada and survey the artistic level of almost two dozen orchestras spread out across the land. In making Heinze responsible for such a daunting task, the Council forced upon the Australian a set of circumstances where any conclusion that he reached was bound to upset those orchestras that found themselves excluded from the Canada Council’s dispensation. For, in asking Heinze to examine the situation from a national perspective, the Canada Council in essence forced the Australian to recommend the continued funding of one orchestra per established region (Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver) along with the funding of "young" orchestras that served the needs of smaller Canadian cities and regions (Victoria, Halifax and

---


\(^{44}\) Sir Bernard Heinze (1894-1982) was a teacher of music and the most influential conductor and music administrator in Australia from the mid 1920s until the mid 1960s. During this time, he served as music advisor for the Australian Broadcasting Corporation and was conductor of the Melbourne Symphony Orchestra from 1933 to 1956. Heinze was knighted for his services for the advancement of music in Australia in 1949. The Canada Council, in fact, commissioned two reports at this time: Heinze was responsible for "the artistic part of the survey, the economic part being the responsibility of Mr. Kenneth Carter." In his report, Heinze states that, as of 1959, the Canada Council was "helping 10 of some 25 Orchestras and the amount available, $200,000, was falling short of the needs of this small number." He continues: "The Council wished to reconsider if it was directing its help to the orchestras most meriting its assistance." Sir Bernard Heinze, "Survey of Canadian Symphony Orchestras," The Canada Council, June 1960. Unpublished report from the Canada Council Library.
Calgary/Edmonton, for example). In essence, the conditions that generated the report (that is, the limited funds available) forced upon Heinze a set of conclusions that would allow for funds to be better managed and facilitate the growth of culture nationwide. In so doing, however, the conclusions also brought with them the possible consolidation of but one large orchestra – a “super orchestra” – that supposedly best suited the needs of each Canadian urban centre.

Once the details of the Canada Council’s initiative came to light, the ever-opinionated and often-outspoken Heinz Unger could not keep his disappointment and anger at the Council’s new direction to himself. In the summer of 1961, Unger wrote a lengthy article for the *Globe Magazine* in which he discussed his views on the matter in detail. In this article, Unger ranged far and wide before arriving at his most important point; namely, that the Canada Council’s all too frequent changes of policy were, instead of creating the conditions for the growth of the arts in Canada, causing so much discord as to prove completely destructive of its very mandate and goal:

Uneasiness prevails in many quarters and, paradoxically, no small part of this uneasiness must be traced to the institution which came into being a few years ago for the very purpose of advancing culture in Canada. It is the Canada Council, whose everchanging policies are considered by many to be a grave and undue security risk to which the performing arts in Canada are at present exposed.

In Unger’s view, the policy of the Canada Council was serving the very opposite end from that which it meant to achieve; namely, the development of the arts in Canada was being impeded by a set of policies that laid conditions that created not cultivation but insecurity. The primary concern that Unger had with the Canada Council was that “by

---

46 Ibid.
way of abrupt changes of its policy...the responsible organization increases insecurity
and instability instead of doing the opposite."47

And what were the particular areas that Unger identified as counter-productive?
Firstly, he railed against the confusion that resulted over whether the Canada Council
"considers its task to give ‘support’ or only to ‘encourage’ or – the latest version – to
create ‘conditions’” for the growth of arts organizations.48 Similarly, he noted the abrupt
lurches of the Canada Council’s policy of cultural growth, having first supported
organizations of “nationwide” import, then having pursued a policy of “expansion,” and
finally setting its sights on “traveling” organizations that would “bring culture to remote
districts of the country.”49

In sum, therefore, Unger was not railing against any one particular policy but
noting how the constant changes that the Canada Council was instituting bore the risk of
destabilizing the very artistic organizations – already living a precarious existence – that
it purported to want to help. And while acknowledging that it would be understandable
that an organization as young as the Canada Council would have to experiment before
coming to a set of definite policies, he still lamented the effect that these oscillations had.

After such general discussion, Unger turned his attention to the particular policy
that had resulted in the cancellation of the York Concert Society’s 1961 season and
almost in its untimely demise: “the Canada Council policy concerning orchestral
organizations – a policy inaugurated only recently on the strength of a report from an

48 Ibid.
49 Ibid.
Australian adviser – to support only one such organization in each city.” In his scathing reply to this policy, Unger questioned the validity of adopting an initiative that, in supporting only one orchestra in a city as large and as culturally-sophisticated as Toronto, meant that even Canada’s largest city might have only one orchestra – the same number of orchestral organizations that smaller urban centres would share. In sum, Unger thought that such a policy could only lead to “monopolies” and “stagnation.”

Heinz Unger was, to put it mildly, frustrated by the Canada Council’s policies in both the general and specific senses. He was careful to acknowledge, though, that he did not question the Council’s sincerity and that “it is the Canada Council’s wish to build and not to destroy.” He did, however, feel that the manner in which it was implementing change was “inconsiderate recklessness” and that such a disregard for the sustainability of Canada’s artistic organizations would lead to a spirit of pessimism in which “no important and culturally worthwhile musical program can be formulated.” In sum, though, Unger left the affair with these optimistic words:

We need the Canada Council badly in the realm of the performing arts, in order not to be entirely dependent on private support and its inevitable fluctuations. May these experimental years lead to greater wisdom, greater responsibility and greater consistency in all quarters for the benefit of culture in Canada, so that we can confidently attack greater heights from the high plateau reached without fear that we must descend.

Though immensely frustrated by the unfolding developments, Heinz Unger still called for a spirit of optimism and reflection to help a culturally naïve nation overcome its growing

---
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52 Ibid., 24.
53 Ibid.
54 Ibid.
pains and arrive at its own pavilion – a structure that would hopefully not be as fragile as the image conjured in Mahler’s “Song of the Earth.”

IV. Von der Schonheit (Of Beauty)

Part 4. ‘Of Beauty’. A fine summer day. Young girls picking flowers and chatting at the water’s edge, a gentle wind playing with their garments, and sunshine reflecting their picture. A sudden storm seems to break. A cavalcade of young horsemen passes by. Look, one of the horses is shying and carries its rider far ahead of the others! The eyes of the most beautiful girl follows him. What she feels, music portrays in most delicate tones. 55

The difficulties that Heinz Unger had faced in respect to the cancellation of the York Concert Society’s 1961 season were not to be repeated in the months and years to follow. Rather, the first third of the 1960s was a period during which Unger was able to live in beauty – to continue to attract new listeners to Mahler’s music by way of his concerts. In late summer 1961, he was also notified by the Gustav Mahler Society of Vienna (Bruno Walter, president) that he had been made an honorary member of the society. 56 Shortly thereafter, he was once again in Europe, conducting his regular series of concerts in Valencia as well as in Barcelona and also in Geneva, Zurich, Stuttgart and London; Unger must have been happy to have such a full European concert schedule for the Fall of 1961 to make him forget his Canadian tribulations of earlier in the year. 57

Heinz Unger’s 1962-1963 season began, as had so many seasons before, with a trip to Europe wherein he passed a lengthy spell in Valencia before proceeding on to Germany, Norway and England. 58 Without doubt, however, the highlight of that season

55 Heinz Unger, “Gustav Mahler Centenary Concert: The Song of the Earth” (February 24, 1960 Program notes), LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 39.
56 “Dr. Unger is Honored,” The Globe and Mail, September 2, 1961. LAC, MUS 56, Box 9, File 79.
57 Ibid.
58 Unger conducted four concerts in Valencia between 28 October and 11 November 1962. The details on the remainder of his European concert dates for that season are unfortunately lost. See: “Mahler’s Ninth,” CBC Times, Volume 15, No. 30 (January 26 – February 1, 1963). LAC, MUS 56, Box 9, File 79.
lay in the Canadian premiere of Gustav Mahler’s last completed symphonic utterance, his Ninth Symphony. Certain of its import and eager to convince Canadians of its worth, Unger threw himself fully into the Mahler Ninth, exploiting every opportunity to rehearse the work with the musicians of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra so that they would be utterly familiar with every nuance of the complex and important work; as a complement to the usual rehearsal time, the conductor exploited a TSO student concert to perform the Scherzo and Burlesque third and fourth movements of the Ninth Symphony as a “trial run” for the premier proper, scheduled for the following evening.  

Indeed, while acknowledging that “dress rehearsal concerts are not a proper subject for music criticism,” John Kraglund noted that “there are occasions when they merit at least a mention.” The Canadian premiere of the Mahler Ninth was apparently just such an occasion.

Hindsight is a curious human faculty, a gift as well as a curse that bears the capacity of filling us with joy and sorrow at once. With hindsight to inform us that Heinz Unger had but two years left of a life that had been filled by starts and stops, of aborted moments of ecstasy, one is lead towards feeling the particular poignancy of his words relating to the Ninth Symphony:

Mahler’s last completed work, his Ninth, can be considered a symphonic continuation of his ‘Song of the Earth’. ‘The Farewell’, as the last part of the ‘Song of the Earth’ is called, would be an appropriate inscription for the Ninth Symphony as a whole, a farewell, however, raised far above any individual human fate, and therefore not requiring human song or words as a medium of expression, but using orchestral language in its most absolute

---

59 The 22 January 1963 concert was actually a dress rehearsal of sorts and consisted of the above mentioned Mahler excerpts as well as Lois Marshall singing the Wagner arias that would form the first half of the program the following evening.

form. This music represents contemplation of life from a tremendous distance, almost from a point beyond.\textsuperscript{61}

For Heinz Unger, Mahler’s Ninth Symphony was a work filled with great meaning and to present it for the first time in Canada was a tremendous honour. But what of the reception to the performance? Unfortunately, the reactions of the 2,000 audience members assembled at Massey Hall and of the countless thousands who listened to the performance on the CBC have been lost to posterity. Our assessment of the evening is thus limited to press reactions to the event by the leading luminaries of Toronto’s critical community who for the most part recognized the conductor’s achievement and the importance of the work.\textsuperscript{62}

Not all portions of the critical press portrayed the event as a success, however. Just as Mahler’s idyll to beauty is interrupted by a sudden storm, so too was Unger’s transcendent joy interrupted by an isolated critical review that cut the conductor to the quick. Writing in the \textit{Toronto Daily Star}, the Estonian-born Canadian composer Udo


\textsuperscript{62} \textit{The Telegram}’s regular contributor, George Kidd, wrote a rather ordinary piece that only suggested at the success of the performance. Kidd, noting how the conductor led from a seated position, had this to say of Unger’s leadership “His conducting was detailed and clear, and his discipline over the orchestra was masterly. He became fully involved in the music and from his baton brought necessary influence to kindle touches of inspiration.” George Kidd, “York Musical Society An Evening Of Musical Excitement,” \textit{The Telegram}, January 24, 1963 LAC, MUS 56, Box 9, File 79 John Kraglund, however, was effusive in his praise of both conductor and symphony, devoting much attention to both the significance of the event and the structure and performance of the work itself. In regards to the ‘evening’s significance, Kraglund correctly noted how “[f]or conductor Heinz Unger last night’s opening concert in the York Concert Society series was a towering climax to more than four decades of devoted service to the music of Gustav Mahler.” He then continued with a discussion of the work itself, noting that “it is unlikely that all of the audience came to terms with it at this first hearing, for it is a complex and frequently contradictory score.” Kraglund, however, made certain to not lay any of the blame for any misunderstandings of the symphony at the conductor’s feet, carefully noting that Unger crafted an “exceedingly engaging performance” that, in tandem with an orchestra seated according to Mahler’s directions, conveyed “to us his view of the symphony” that could only be characterised as “outstanding.” In regards to “Mahler’s directions,” Kraglund is noting how Unger sat his first and second violins antiphonally, a practice that created clarity of texture but had been abandoned in the course of the 20th century. John Kraglund, “Music in 1963 Mahler Symphony No 9 Excellent,” \textit{The Globe and Mail}, January 24, 1963 LAC MUS 56, Box 9, File 79 We should also note here that the performance itself is still preserved at LAC and is wholly deserving of exhumation.
Kasemets wrote a scathing review of the concert that questioned the validity of Gustav Mahler’s music. In this review, Kasemets damned Mahler’s music as lacking both universal appeal (“Agonies and frustrations of a particular generation, living in a confined locality, are expressed through Mahler’s music, rather than matters meaning something to all humanity”) and compositional skill (“The music loses even more interest since the composer’s treatment of ideas and forms is heavy-handed and unskilled”).

So critical was Kasemets’ review that Unger felt compelled to write a response not in defence of the concert itself but to defend the composer’s work:

I have to state with utter frankness that never in my life has any concert of mine in any country been exposed to the amount of malicious falsehood and ignorance evident in Mr. Udo Kasemets’ attack on Gustav Mahler and his 9th Symphony in your edition of January 24th. His way of thinking would perhaps have done honour to some of those critics of the early Century – poor souls – who were faced with Mahler’s music when it was new and not yet readily understood or understandable. However, I am far from stooping to try to defend the truly all-embracing message of Mahler’s music against Mr. Kasemets, or to explain it to his apparently stone-deaf soul... Let Mr. Kasemets say about my conductorial work what he pleases, but if he attempts with derogatory insolence to attack the work of Gustav Mahler, and to soil it with his outpourings, he will find me on my place and ready to retaliate in any way, not only by conducting.

The conductor’s deeply personal and angry reply – complete with threat of force – surely indicates the depth of feeling that Unger reserved for Mahler’s music and – even more

---

63 Udo Kasemets (b. 1919 Talinn, Estonia) was an Estonian-born Canadian composer who became a naturalized Canadian citizen in 1957. In 1957, he founded the Toronto Bach Society. Despite an interest in early music, his compositional style placed him squarely in the avant-garde, writing music heavily influenced by the American John Cage and using such elements as “chance operations” in his compositions. His lack of sympathy for the music of Gustav Mahler is testament to his inflexibility to musics gone-by. For further detail on Udo Kasemets, see: Alan M. Gillmor and Evan Ware, “Udo Kasemets,” in The Encyclopedia of Music in Canada.


importantly – the fact that he viewed the composer as a spiritual guide, each performance of his work being a ritualized manifestation of his own identity. To attack Mahler, therefore, was to attack Unger’s own German Jewish soul.

Heinz Unger’s belligerent response to Kasemets, however, belies the weakness that the conductor was beginning to display. As reviews of the concert point out, Unger had been obliged to conduct the premiere of the Mahler Ninth seated, a practice that surely indicates that the conductor’s health was less than ideal and also shows the lengths to which he would go to lead the Canadian performance of a work that meant so much to him.66

The fears over his health that Unger had faced in connection with being available to conduct the premiere of the Mahler Ninth, however, were not but a passing problem. Rather, they were the early warnings that a heart problem would soon cut short both Unger’s career and life. In fact, the conductor had for years been warned by doctors that he would need to work a less-rigorous schedule to avoid the requisite strains of his conducting, that it would only be possible for Unger, in the words of his wife, “to continue his work on a reduced scale.”67

As he was careful to point out, however, Heinz Unger did not intend to retire completely but merely to “allow a little more space for rest between his demanding

---

66 Indeed, Unger, despite desperately desiring to have the great honour of presenting the Canadian premiere of Mahler’s Ninth Symphony had been uncertain whether he would be able to do so in the summer of 1962 Unger’s pessimistic state in regards to his health had compelled him to write to his younger colleague and fellow Mahler specialist, Leonard Bernstein, in the hopes that he might fill in to conduct the premiere had his own health been found wanting Letter from Heinz Unger to Leonard Bernstein, dated August 4, 1962 LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 15 After receiving a negative reply from Bernstein and on Bernstein’s advice, Heinz Unger immediately wrote a letter to John Barbirolli, asking him if he might be available if his health did not improve See Letter from Heinz Unger to John Barbirolli, dated October 9, 1962 LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 15

67 Letter from Hella Unger to her friends George and Gladys (last names unknown), dated October 9, 1962 LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 15
professional activities.” If anything, Unger, perhaps aware of the little time that remained to him, doubled his efforts to present as many of Mahler’s unheard symphonies to the Canadian public. The first in this string of anticipated premieres was the first Toronto performance of Mahler’s Third Symphony, a concert that took place in Massey Hall on February 4, 1964 and was then broadcast on CBC Sunday Night on February 9, 1964. Performance of the massive 90-minute long symphony required not only an enhanced TSO but also three choirs and a Soprano soloist in the shape of Mary Simmons, a logistical complexity that underlined the composer’s ambition in creating a work that was meant to describe “the world, nature as a whole, which – so to speak – is bursting into song and music out of an unfathomable silence” and also spoke to Unger’s ambition in presenting so complex a musical-philosophical work to audiences still relatively unfamiliar with the Mahlerian sound-world.

Heinz Unger was not entirely satisfied with the results of the performance or, especially, in the lack of interest that it generated. However engrossed he may have been in the work, he could not fail to notice “the rows of empty seats” in Massey Hall that
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68 Letter from Hella Unger to her friends George and Gladys (last names unknown), dated October 9, 1962. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 15.
69 “CBC Sunday Night,” CBC Times, February 8-14, 1964. LAC, MUS 56, Box 12, File 89. The work had in fact received its Canadian premiere on April 9, 1963, the Austrian conductor Hans Swarowsky (1899-1975) leading the Montreal Symphony Orchestra. Note from GP to Helmut Kallmann, dated 28 November 1980. LAC, MUS 305 (Kallmann Fonds), Box 21, File 204.
70 The participating choirs were: The Toronto Mendelssohn Choir (Soprano and Alto section) as well as the Boys’ Choirs of St. Clement’s and St. George’s (under the direction of Choir Masters John Sidgwick and Lloyd Bradshaw). The concert opened with Schubert’s Rosamunde Overture. The quotation pertaining to Mahler’s intent is from “CBC Sunday Night,” CBC Times, February 8-14, 1964. MUS 56, Box 12, File 89. Another matter is of great importance; in a letter to an audience member after the show, Heinz Unger mentions the fact that, due to logistical limitations, he did not use the original score but “an edition for ‘reduced orchestra’ published by Universal Edition for business reasons (4 horns instead of 8 etc etc.).” And while he concedes that this edition “would never have found the approval of the composer for whom the color of the orchestra was all-important” Unger decided that “confronted as I was with the problem of whether to perform the work here at all, I decided in favour of the compromise.” Letter from Heinz Unger to Robert Syrett, dated February 7, 1964. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
evening or the performance’s shortcomings. In a rueful mood, Heinz Unger could not even feel pleased by the plaudits directed his way when the work itself remained so misunderstood. For Unger, the success of Mahler’s work – and not his own achievement – was paramount.

Heinz Unger was not satisfied with having presented the Canadian premieres of Mahler’s Second, Fifth and Ninth Symphonies as well as the Toronto premiere of the Third Symphony. Two further works lay, he hoped, within his scope and purview and he desperately desired to present these works in the immediate future. Unger’s initiative to present the most ambitious of all of Mahler’s works, the Eighth Symphony, colloquially known as the “Symphony of a Thousand” due to the number of performers required in its presentation, had been an ongoing affair since June 1963 when he had originally presented his plans to the Canada Council to premiere the work in conjunction with the Canadian Centenary that would fall in 1967. Indeed, so enthusiastic was Unger to have the work performed as a showcase for Canadian talent in that year – “[I] believe that in the Centenary Year Canada should show in the first place what Canada has to offer” – that he was willing to have his efforts to have the symphony performed in 1965

72 George Kidd, although praising “the superlative work of Dr. Unger and his orchestra” who “conducted with depth, sincerity and belief,” was not convinced by a symphony he described as filled with “too many moments of complete boredom...and cluttered with the use of solo voice and chorus.” George Kidd, “Enthusiastic Reception For Unger With TSO,” The Telegram, February 5, 1964. LAC, MUS 56, Box 12, File 89. Ralph Thomas’ review in the Toronto Daily Star, must have pleased Unger rather more as it dwelt upon not only the critic’s view that the conductor’s “interpretation of the Mahler was a profound and moving experience” but also that “[t]hose who did come [Massey Hall was only half-filled for the concert] were highly enthusiastic about what they heard.” Ralph Thomas, “Unger’s Mahler Electric,” Toronto Daily Star, February 5, 1964. LAC, MUS 56, Box 12, File 89. Even John Kraglund, the Toronto critic with perhaps the greatest interest in Mahler’s work, praised the conductor’s achievement but alluded to his frustrations with the work: “Unger’s ability to draw delicately shaded musical contrasts from an orchestra was superbly demonstrated in the final Adagio — what love is telling me. This is the sort of movement that can seem endless and formless. Last night it was neither. Rather, it was completely engrossing, from the string section’s most breathless pianissimos to the transparent, resonant climaxes.” John Kraglund, “TSO Rendition of Mahler’s 3rd Symphony Engrossing,” The Globe and Mail, February 5, 1964. LAC, MUS 56, Box 12, File 89.
“discontinued immediately should the Centennial Administration decide to go ahead with regard to a first Canadian performance of the work under my direction in 1967.” For Unger, the premiere performance of Mahler’s Eighth Symphony was not an opportunity to advance his own career but to share in the development of Canadian culture.

Heinz Unger and those in Canada that hoped to see the conductor lead this, the vastest of Mahler’s symphonies, were ultimately disappointed by the verdict of the Centenary Council. In the fall of 1964, Unger was the unhappy recipient of a letter stating that “the Centennial Commission will not be able to extend financial assistance to this project [because] it is a matter of Canadian Commission policy to consider only projects that are national in scope,” a precondition that could never be met by a project in which “a performance could only take place in one city and could not possibly be toured to make it a project of wider significance.” Unger’s project, like the turbulent affairs of the YCS, once again ran afoul of the policy guidelines of Canada’s cultural institutions and therefore failed to meet the ever-changing mandates imposed in a climate of attempted – and perhaps misguided – growth.

V. Der Trunkene in Fruhling (The Drunkard in Spring)
Part 5. ‘The Drunkard in Spring’. A philosophizing drunkard ponders on the thesis that life is nothing but a dream, a thesis which would make the mere thought of work and toil absurd; and drinking and singing the most justifiable of pastimes. Little bird wakes him and tells him that spring has come overnight, and as he converses with the bird he

---

73 Letter from Heinz Unger to Norbert Prefontaine (Executive Director of the Canadian Centenary Council), dated June 14, 1963. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
74 Letter from Robbins Elliott to Heinz Unger, dated October 9, 1964. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
75 That said, it must also be noted that it would have been difficult for the Canadian Centennial Commission to fully understand the resonance that Mahler’s work had for Unger and his admittedly limited band of supporters. Truth be told, the attempt to link a performance of Gustav Mahler’s “Symphony of a Thousand” to the Centennial seems to have been myopic and misguided.
ponders about spring. In the end, however, he decides that spring is no concern of his and that it is preferable to get drunk again.\textsuperscript{76}

The general tenor of Heinz Unger’s last few years is one of disappointment and misplaced trust. Unfortunately, this was not such a novel or unusual development; in his many years of concertizing, the conductor had had repeated difficulties with his representation and management. For many years, the English management agency of Ibbs and Tillett had been his representatives in the non Spanish-speaking world. On many occasions, Unger felt that the agency had been far from assertive enough in promoting him, a state of affairs that had prompted him, as we have seen, to unsuccessfully court the management of Sol Hurok. In the Spanish-speaking world, meanwhile, he had been represented by Daniel Attractions, a Spanish-based agency that had effectively represented him in Spain and also arranged for his many successful trips to Latin America. It is not surprising, therefore, that when Daniel Attractions opened a branch office in Canada, Unger would feel that signing a contract with their new Canadian representative was the most promising alternative that lay before him. In the last spring of his life, Heinz Unger signed a contract with Daniel Attractions that made Aladar Ecsedy his agent the world over.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{76} Heinz Unger, “Gustav Mahler Centenary Concert The Song of the Earth” (February 24, 1960 Program notes), LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 39
\textsuperscript{77} In a letter to his old BBC friend Bob Simpson, Unger explained the situation in this manner “[A] week ago I followed an insistent invitation by the North American Head Office of Daniel Attractions (Conciertos Daniel) and signed a contract with them for exclusive representation in the whole world This may mean an entirely new page At least, with Ibbs and Tillet having done practically nothing for me, I thought I should give them a chance to show what they can do.” Letter from Heinz Unger to Robert Simpson, dated April 25, 1964 LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16 The North American Head Office to which Unger refers was conveniently located in Hamilton, Ontario The contract between Heinz Unger and Daniel Attractions was signed on April 20, 1964 and came into force that very same day The contract was signed for a period of three years, to lapse on April 19, 1967, with an option to extend the arrangement for a further three years until April 19, 1970 LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16 [picture 135] Little is known concerning Aladar Ecsedy bar the fact that he had been born in Hungary and had, between 1950 and 1952, served as a piano teacher for the Oshawa-born Canadian composer Norma Beecroft (1934--) Kenneth Winters and Betty Nygaard King, “Norma Beecroft,” in The Encyclopedia of Music in Canada
In the first few months of the Unger-Ecsedy relationship, the musician’s decision seemed to bear fruit. In contrast to his rather infrequent correspondence with Ibbs and Tillet, communication between Unger and Ecsedy as well as between Ecsedy and parties interested in securing Unger’s services, came frequently. In a letter from Ecsedy to Unger sent in September of 1964, the agent informed Unger of his work in the previous months and of his prospects for the coming seasons, noting that he had received “a number of good responses.” Heinz Unger had seemingly made a wise decision in choosing Ecsedy and Daniel Attractions as his representatives.

The sense of trust being cultivated in the Unger-Ecsedy relationship was reinforced not only by Ecsedy’s ambition in obtaining concert engagements for Unger but also in his dealings with local matters. Unger, in light of prior problems with funding and grants for the York Concert Society, had been concerned that the YCS would not get the requisite money from the Grants Committee of Metropolitan Toronto for its upcoming season, a state of affairs that was “not so much a question of whether or not the York Concert Society will be able to scrape through without a Metro grant” but spoke more to his injured sense of pride – “But how can I continue working wholeheartedly in a community whose authorities refuse me at my age the most elementary recognition of my work.” In this battle, a battle that Unger certainly did not need at this point in his life,

---

78 Letter from Aladar Ecsedy to Heinz Unger, dated September 18, 1964. LAC, MUS 56 Box 1, File 16. Whether these “good responses” would have concretized into concert engagements is a moot point, in light of Unger’s death in early 1965. However, compared to the Ibbs and Tillet era in which the conductor himself made much of the concert arrangements himself, Unger must have been pleased that he had found an agent who was at least doing some of this tiresome work for him.

79 Letter from Heinz Unger to Leon Weinstein, dated August 16, 1964. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16. Leon Weinstein was a grocery store entrepreneur in the greater Toronto area who long served the well-known Loblaw’s food chain, serving as its president for many years. In 1980, Weinstein donated a violin (the 1717 Windsor-Weinstein Stradivari) to the Ontario Heritage Foundation who in turn transferred it to the Canada Council in 1988. “History of the Musical Instrument Bank,” The Canada Council
Ecsedy and his allies were keen to help allay his fears and to fight for the grant on his behalf. By September, matters had markedly improved and Ecsedy was only too happy to be able to inform Unger, away on his usual fall European tour, that the grant had in fact been approved and that “[e]verything is perfectly under control.”

As the leaves changed colour and fell from their trees, however, Unger’s felicity would come to an end. On the last day of fall, The Globe and Mail printed an article that signalled the end of the conductor’s short-lived fruitful period under Ecsedy’s management. The article exposed how Aladar Ecsedy had “been charged under Section 50 of the Immigration Act... in connection with the admission to Canada of three immigrants.” The circumstances of the charge could have come straight out of a feature-length film:

Three Hungarian immigrants told RCMP officers they were told by a man in Buenos Aires that he could get them into Canada for $300 each. They paid the money, they said, but they never heard from the man.

Ecsedy appeared in the city magistrate’s court on December 29, 1964 and, facing his own set of problems, silently disappeared from Unger’s life. Heinz Unger, struck by one last twist of fate at once both sad and fantastic, was again left alone to navigate the last months of his life without the representation and professional support he so deserved.

(http://www.canadacouncil.ca/prizes/musical_instrument_bank/pk127245482885000000.htm (accessed July 31, 2009)).

Interestingly, in early exchanges between Unger and Weinstein, the conductor addressed and signed his letters formally. In the last letter Unger sent to Weinstein in February 1965 a mere two weeks before his death, Unger addressed Weinstein by his first name alone, surely demonstrative of a blossoming friendship between the two men that was cut short by Unger’s death.

80 Letter from Aladar Ecsedy to Heinz Unger, dated September 30, 1964. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
81 “Charge Pianist in Admission of Hungarians,” The Globe and Mail, December 21, 1964. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
82 Ibid.
VI. Der Abschied (The Farewell)

Part 6. ‘The Farewell’.

Words and music describe an evening of superb beauty. Sunset behind mountains, evening descending into the valleys, a gentle wind rustling in the pine trees, the moon floating up like a gondola of silver, the last birds going to rest, a brook whispering through the dusk, and the singer going to and fro on soft grass, lute in hand, expecting the friend... The friend does not come... [But there is] no reproach here. The evening and the whole world are so beautiful that the coming or not coming of an expected friend has become unimportant. Mahler’s singer and his orchestra break out into a paean to the ‘beauty of this world, drunk with eternal life and love’ (Mahler’s own words).

After an orchestral interlude depicting tragedy and disappointment, the real ‘Farewell’ part begins. The singer... meets his closest friend to bid him the last farewell. He tells him that it has to be, and that he is going away into the mountains (a Buddhist expression for going to another incarnation). Fate has not been kind to him in this world, he says, and he is longing for home and rest. And then follow, replacing completely the resigned and tired words of the original poem, those incomparable words of Mahler’s own: ‘Quiet is my heart and waiting for its hour. This beloved earth always will blossom up in spring and green anew. Always and everywhere will shine a blue light in the distance. Ever... ever...’

And with this vision of that which knows no limits ‘The Song of Earth’ fades away. A ‘farewell’ symphony indeed, but a farewell in which the curtain goes up, not down, at the end, written in a spirit, which in saying good-bye, blesses the whole universe. Is this resignation? Is this pessimism? Is it not rather a most fervent declaration of love for this world and all it stands for, with all the joys great and small, it has to offer, and in spite of all the sorrow and despair it causes time and time again?83

It would be unfair to cast the entirety of Heinz Unger’s last years as unmitigated sadness and struggle. In his final years, despite health problems, setbacks and disappointments, he had been fortunate enough to continue to lead an active concert life and to present the Canadian premieres of many of Mahler’s symphonies. He also retained the affections of his Spanish colleagues (especially in Valencia) until the very last. So too did Unger receive a final distinction in the winter of 1965. On January 28, 1965 Unger was honoured with the West German award of the Verdienstkreuz on the occasion of his Golden Jubilee as a conductor and, according to Unger, “in recognition for what I have done in the course of my career for the music of the country of my

83 Heinz Unger, “Gustav Mahler Centenary Concert: The Song of the Earth” (February 24, 1960 Program notes), LAC, MUS 56, Box 3, File 39.
The award would not only be a tremendous professional honour for the conductor – it would also serve a curative purpose on a more personal level, granted as it was, in Unger’s words, “in an effort to mend what the years of darkness [the Nazi period] have done to me and so many others.”

Heinz Unger was awarded the West German Government’s “Order of Merit for Cultural Achievements” at a ceremony hosted by the West German ambassador to Canada, a function held in Toronto on 28 January 1965. On this occasion, Unger made a speech that, coming so close to the end of his life and being one of his last public utterances, can be seen as the summation of his life and views and helps us understand the values and views that he had borne throughout his life and, now honoured, felt he could finally express. Here, at last, lay Unger’s opportunity to publicly expound and reflect upon his fate.

Heinz Unger’s speech was eloquent, but the conductor did not mince his words. Having so long carried the burden of being a refugee, Unger shared his views concerning what the years of Nazi domination represented and what he had undergone in those “years of darkness”:

> Our generation has experienced things unfathomable. None of us will or must ever forget the years of darkness we have witnessed or of which we have been victims. It was a sinister day indeed when those who held power temporarily in the country in which I, like generations of my ancestors, had considered home, deprived me on account of my race of the right to continue in my profession, and when I, to escape worse, left the country with my family. Every tie broke in those evil years.

---

84 Letter from Heinz Unger to Peter Johnston (First Secretary to the Canadian High Commissioner in London), dated December 9, 1964. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
85 Ibid.
86 Letter from Heinz Unger to Peter Johnston, dated January 22, 1965. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
87 Heinz Unger’s speech to the Consul General of the West German Republic, January 28, 1965. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
However final had seemed the breaking of the ties in that period, Unger made clear that a permanent rift with German culture, whatever his experience, could never have occurred:

Would I not have had to sacrifice my very own and truest nature, if I had not continued also on foreign soil and also during the years of darkness, to remain faithful to that art which meant everything to me, and which was, so to say, my self-expression?\(^{88}\)

While the formal ties with Germany had indeed been severed, Unger could not but maintain his allegiance to the values that underpinned German culture and had existed prior to the Nazi seizure of power. In his formulation, Nazi values were not German values but, instead, were an artificial imposition that had subsumed the true Germany, if only for a short, desperate time.

But what was this true Germany? And just as importantly, how did Heinz Unger view the role of Germans Jews in this Germany? In addressing the matter, Unger made a definitive statement that clearly demonstrated his conviction that German Jews had played an integral role in the development of German culture:

Germany always was for me not only the country of Beethoven, of Brahms, the country of Goethe, Lessing, Hans Sachs and Walter von der Vogelweide. It was and will always remain also the country of Felix von Mendelssohn, of Heinrich Heine, of Albert Einstein, the country of the “Magic Horn” romanticism and of Faustian poetry, which inspired Gustav Mahler to his greatest creations.\(^{89}\)

While acknowledging the German cultural essence borne by the greatest lights in the German cultural firmament, Unger was careful to point out that Germany’s Jews (and the German-speaking Jews of Central Europe) had played a central role in the development and evolution of German culture. Heinz Unger, in a life devoted to music making and to

---

\(^{88}\) Heinz Unger’s speech to the Consul General of the West German Republic, January 28, 1965. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.

\(^{89}\) Ibid.
Gustav Mahler’s symphonic utterances, clearly saw himself as an integral part of a rich German tradition that had accepted its Jewish countrymen and a cultural trajectory that had benefitted greatly from the accomplishments that were at once both German and Jewish.

Unger then ended his speech with a final note concerning the Germany that had re-emerged from the mid-century cataclysms:

[A]re we really capable of changing in things essential to us? I do not quite believe it. Only the times are changing, and I do not hesitate to say that I was very happy indeed to be able to return to Germany, a different Germany, for very enjoyable musical activities on various occasions after the nightmare years had passed.  

Germany had not changed substantively after the period of Nazi rule. Instead, it had awoken as if from a bad dream, and the values that it had borne within itself before the nightmare, had once again risen to the surface. Unger, on the occasion that marked his being awarded the highest civilian honour that the West German government could bestow, was exalted that the Germany he had known, the Germany where Germans both Jewish and Christian were recognized as equal, had once more arisen.

Heinz Unger had for many years struggled with health problems. In the final years of his life, however, he bore one particular ailment that pursued him relentlessly and that he could not evade indefinitely. This ailment, a heart condition which required him to avoid undue stress, only worsened with time. By the winter of 1965, Unger had to

---

90 Heinz Unger’s speech to the Consul General of the West German Republic, January 28, 1965. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
face the sad reality that he could no longer continue as director of the York Concert Society in any major capacity. As he himself put it, "[m]y medical advisors are trying to convince me in ever more urgent terms that it is not advisable for me to continue beyond my seventieth year with any kind of permanent activity such as organizing a whole concert series, however short, with its inevitable excitements, [as it is] damaging to my health."\(^91\) Unger, however, could not imagine retiring from the conductor's podium and so reconciled himself "to a very limited number of guest engagements here and abroad, where the enjoyable experience of making music and fulfilling tasks of special interest to me, is the only excitement."\(^92\)

Heinz Unger did not have the opportunity to put his plans for retirement into practice. In the final month of his life, the conductor continued to work as he had always done, concentrating on evangelizing on behalf of Gustav Mahler. On 2 February 1965, in celebration of Unger's fiftieth year as a conductor, he led a final performance of Mahler's *Das Lied von der Erde* with the CBC SO. This concert was then broadcast on CBC radio on February 7, the first of what was intended to be a trio of 1965 performances of Mahler's music that were a fitting honour bestowed upon a conductor who had done so much to familiarize Canadians with Mahler's oeuvre.\(^93\)

Shortly thereafter, Unger proceeded to prepare and begin the recording of what would be the last of his Canadian Mahler premieres, the Symphony No. 6. Indeed, the conductor's last act on this earth was to record the first three movements of the Canadian Mahler Symphony No. 6 on February 28\(^{th}\) and Mahler Symphony No. 7 scheduled for April 25\(^{th}\). See: "Song of the Earth", CBC Times, February 6-12, 1965, p.3. MUS 56, Box 12, File 89.

\(^{91}\) Letter from Heinz Unger to Leon Weinstein, dated February 12, 1965. The letter is marked: "Absolutely confidential, until we jointly decide that it should be otherwise." LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
\(^{92}\) Letter from Heinz Unger to Leon Weinstein, dated February 12, 1965. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 16.
\(^{93}\) The other to works that were to have been broadcast were both to have been Canadian premieres, Mahler's Symphony No.6 on February 28\(^{th}\) and Mahler Symphony No.7 scheduled for April 25\(^{th}\). See: "Song of the Earth", CBC Times, February 6-12, 1965, p.3. MUS 56, Box 12, File 89.
premiere of Mahler’s Symphony No. 6 ("Tragic"), a symphony that bore in its final movement three hammer blows that according to the composer’s wife signified the three tragedies in Mahler’s life: the death of his daughter Maria Anna, his forced departure from the directorship of the Vienna Opera and his beloved Viennese home, and the diagnosis of a heart condition that would prove fatal and “fell him like a tree.” Heinz Unger, however, did not survive long enough to perform this tragic and moving conclusion to the symphony, suffering a major heart attack at his home upon returning from the CBC studios after that day’s recording session, on the eve of February 25, 1965.

Sadness always overwhelms us as we reflect on the end of a life. The sense of tragedy is magnified as we reflect upon the passing of Heinz Unger, especially as it came while he was involved with Mahler’s own “tragic” symphony. Under these circumstances, one cannot help but wonder whether it was the general stress of work that caused his demise or whether it had anything to do with the particular tragic work that he was conducting. Was Unger awed, stressed, perhaps even overwhelmed in conducting the work that had foretold of Mahler’s own demise?

We shall, of course, never know. What we do know is that Heinz Unger’s passing brought with it the regret, sadness and shock that always confronts us when someone close to us dies. John Kraglund reflected on Unger’s life and on their relationship in this way, noting:

After years of close affiliation with Heinz Unger, as a friend – albeit on the armed basis that must exist between performer and critic – as a sounding-board for hopes, frustrations, and program plans and, consequently, sometimes in an advisory capacity, it is difficult to view objectively his final contribution to our musical life.\(^{94}\)

Then, acknowledging the anachronism inherent in his logic, Kraglund looked to Unger’s final activities and their meaning:

> But it can safely be said that Dr. Unger would have been happy, although not entirely satisfied with the results. Perhaps I am giving way too much to romanticism when I suggest that the CBC’s broadcast of the work...gave the impression that everyone from conductor to recording technician had done everything within his power to make this a fitting memorial to Dr. Unger.  

Finally, Kraglund weighed in on the matter of whether the final movement of what was to be the Canadian premiere of Mahler’s Sixth Symphony, left unrecorded at Unger’s death, should have been completed by the conductor’s own forgotten protégé Hans Bauer:

> It was suggested by a friend that the tribute might have been more fitting if only the three movements recorded by Dr. Unger had been broadcast. Such is not, I believe the case. The fact that he died virtually in the middle of a performance, after repeated warnings from doctors, seems ample evidence that he deemed music, especially the music of Mahler, more important than his own life. He would doubtless have felt neither Mahler nor the public had been properly served if the work had not been completed.

Kraglund rightly concluded that Mahler’s music represented for Unger a spiritual essence that transcended life itself.

> Yet, as in Der Abschied - the final movement of Das Lied von der Erde - that Unger felt bore neither resignation nor pessimism but a “most fervent declaration of love for this world and all it stands for,” the conductor’s passing was not all sadness. As Kraglund had correctly highlighted, Heinz Unger died doing what he loved, not only making music, but actively engaged with Mahler’s music. His passing therefore, while filling us with sadness as we look back, meant that he could continue being a part of

---


96 Ibid.
Mahler's sonic universe even after saying his own farewell to the corporeal plane upon which we live.
CONCLUSION

Heinz Unger departed this world on February 25, 1965. By the time of his passing, he had managed to construct a rich life three times over, first in his native Germany, again during his residence in war-time England, and once more following the Second World War as he succeeded in becoming an important cultural celebrity in his adopted Canadian home and a frequent traveller who had many admirers, not least in Spain. And while Heinz Unger's name continues to circulate in one very meaningful yet limited context – in 1967, a Heinz Unger scholarship was created that to this day continues to help cultivate young Canadian conductors to help build a promising career – today very few know of Heinz Unger’s achievements, regardless of whether we are speaking in a Canadian or European context. Even among Mahlerites, Heinz Unger is a shadowy figure, perhaps a name alone, an obscure footnote in musical history. In short order, Heinz Unger disappeared from the cultural scene, forgotten by most despite his lengthy list of accomplishments both domestically and abroad.

The neglect from which Heinz Unger’s legacy has suffered is difficult to comprehend. At the time of his death, the great loss that the musical world had suffered was widely recognized; the Heinz Unger Fonds is filled with expressions of sadness at the conductor’s passing and also the recognition that a major musical talent had departed, the sources for these sentiments ranging from musicians and friends to diplomatic missions from around the world. Of course, close friends and family also wrote to his

---

1 The Heinz Unger Award is today administered by the Ontario Arts Council and, according to their dictates and in keeping with the philosophy of the scholarship at its inception, “is given to an individual to encourage and highlight the career of a young to mid-career Canadian professional conductor who has professional experience at a professional, semi-professional and/or community orchestra.”

http://www.arts.on.ca/Page142.aspx (accessed November 1, 2009)
bereaved widow Hella Unger to soften the grief of her beloved husband’s passing. As news of his death made its rounds through the Canadian cultural community, his widow was inundated with a barrage of condolence letters from such distinguished Canadian musicians as Greta Kraus, Oskar Morawetz, and Harry Somers. In sum, musicians and music-lovers the world over decried the fate of the talented conductor who throughout his life had laboured to introduce audiences to fine music and who had worked tirelessly to help develop Canadian culture in the two decades he resided in the country.

Most of the expressions of grief at the time commented on Heinz Unger’s love of Gustav Mahler and correctly noted that the composer had lost one of his most important followers – a disciple who had helped introduce his symphonies to England, Spain and of course Canada – who had for decades expressed almost a missionary zeal in attempting to convince the concert public and the world at large of the composer’s significance and the beauty of his music. Yet today, Heinz Unger’s name is lost, few people knowing his name at all and even fewer knowing the extent of his contribution to the acceptance of Mahler’s music.

In a letter to Heinz Unger’s recently widowed wife, the Czechoslovakian and Canadian composer Oskar Morawetz would note:

I couldn’t help but think, during these last few days, of Mahler’s “Abschied” from the “Lied von der Erde.” I feel that Dr. Unger’s life had many things in common with Mahler’s life as a composer, including the fact that, although he had many great admirers, his real greatness was never appreciated to the full extent. But I am glad that he at least lived in an age when great conductors can always be remembered through their tapes.2

Yet Oskar Morawetz’s words have failed to bear fruit. In a Canada dominated by the towering genius of Glenn Gould, all others seem lost at the fringes of history. Instead of

---

2 Letter from Oskar Morawetz to Hella Unger, dated March 2, 1965. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 19.
serving as a means for Canadians to better understand their cultural history, Gould’s legacy has eclipsed all others, preventing the light from ever reaching those artistic talents that we in Canada have had who perhaps never shone as brightly as the mercurial Glenn Gould. Vast numbers of people interested in Canadian culture, instead of looking beyond the cult of the eccentric Canadian pianist, seem content to begin and end their explorations there, within reach of a vast universe of stars such as Heinz Unger who shone just as brightly in their time yet have not received the posthumous attention they so merit. The CBC too, all too aware of the bottom-line in the present day’s precarious economic climate, has spawned a Glenn Gould industry, satisfied that high culture can earn a line next to that other Canadian cultural obsession – hockey.

Heinz Unger, then, has been relegated to the aforementioned fringes of Canadian cultural history. Why this is also the case in other contexts is a question that in part must go begging. That said, a few guesses can still be made as to why this might be the case. Cognizant of the obviousness of the fact, we must remind ourselves that the 20th century was one of the most turbulent centuries that humankind ever passed through, a century fraught with displacement and destruction on an unprecedented scale. Due to the seismic historical events of the 20th century, Heinz Unger died in Canada where, as we have seen, he has been all but forgotten. Moreover, any chance of other researchers from around the world happening to come across material relating to Heinz Unger has been largely compromised by the aforementioned devastation of the 20th century. As a result, the entirety of Heinz Unger’s known archive (amounting to two metres of textual records and

---

3 Documents pertaining to Unger’s early career, for example were lost when the old Berlin Filharmonie was destroyed in the Second World War. Whether records pertaining to Heinz Unger’s time in the Soviet Union exist is an intriguing question that might be answered if someday a researcher with the requisite knowledge of the Russian language and Byzantine archival system takes on the daunting task of seeking out the existence of such material.
consisting of an extensive collection of letters, documents, along with a vast number of recordings) is here in Canada; all the material Heinz Unger had kept was deposited by his wife and daughter at Library and Archives Canada after his passing. And because no-one until now has undertaken to explore this rich collection, Unger’s achievements have, with the passage of time, been forgotten both in Canada and elsewhere.

But there are other possible reasons for the neglect that Heinz Unger has suffered. As has been made abundantly clear in the course of this work, the conductor looked upon Gustav Mahler’s oeuvre with an almost holy reverence and devoted the majority of his life to trying to see that the composer’s work was better understood and appreciated. I would here like to suggest that Unger’s single-minded devotion to Mahler may have in fact come at the wrong time. As we noted in our discussion of Gustav Mahler, the composer was for many decades forgotten, his fortunes rising again only in the 1960s when charismatic young conductors such as the American Leonard Bernstein helped re-popularize Mahler’s admittedly difficult works. In the rush to rediscover Mahler’s importance, the musical world embraced a new breed of conductors such as Bernstein as the embodiment of the perfect specimen to inject new life into a flagging art music culture being assaulted by the more visceral (and better selling) genre of rock and roll. Older conductors such as Heinz Unger – with their Kapellmeister-like ways – simply would not “sell.” And so as new recordings of Mahler’s works were made – most in stereo and better able to convey the complexity of Mahler’s scores – there seemed little reason to rely on older recordings made in such “backwaters” as Canada to introduce a new generation of listeners to the work of masters like Gustav Mahler.\footnote{Of course, recordings by better-established names such as Bruno Walter did continue to circulate but these recordings bore both the authority of Walter having been a “first-generation” disciple of Mahler’s as} Heinz Unger, so
vital in sustaining Gustav Mahler at the edges of the repertoire for decades, was cast aside and forgotten just as the composer was rediscovered and transformed into a cultural icon.

In overlooking Heinz Unger’s role as a Mahler disciple, the musical world has been deprived of knowledge of a musician whose recordings of Mahler’s music represent an important example of mid-century understandings of Mahler performance. Yet as we have already noted, Heinz Unger’s widow was at the time of her husband’s death bombarded with a barrage of letters of condolence, letters written by people who had been friends, colleagues, associates and fans who had followed the conductor’s career from his earliest days and fondly remembered his intensity and devotion to Mahler’s music. However quickly he may have disappeared from the public consciousness, Heinz Unger did not die alone and defeated – he died doing what he loved most: conducting Gustav Mahler’s music and secure in the knowledge that he had made the composer many new supporters.

But even in death, Unger’s crusade for Gustav Mahler did not cease. At his funeral, the music that accompanied the mourners was the famous Adagietto from Mahler’s Fifth Symphony, surely a sign of a devotion that transcended this world and was more than just a singular devotion to a composer and his oeuvre. As we have seen in the course of this work, Gustav Mahler represented for Unger an affiliation with his Jewish identity, an identity that could not be lost whatever the circumstances or events of his life. For Unger, the Mahlerian cause was an act of devotion that transcended the purely artistic plane and signified a delicate string to his Jewish world, a delicate string that transformed his performance of Mahler’s music into a Jewish performative ritual.

well as having settled in the United States and forging close ties with major American recording companies such as Columbia.
Historians of Jewry, deprived of an important example of the importance that Gustav Mahler bore for a generation of German Jews who carried within them a two-fold identity that privileged neither “Germanness” nor “Jewishness,” have only recently—and belatedly—begun to dismantle the long-privileged narrative of the failure of German Jewish integration.

Alongside the composer’s affection and enthusiasm for Gustav Mahler’s music, therefore, another significant theme appears repeatedly at the time of Heinz Unger’s death and bears noting. For one who was often excluded from or failed to make a deep impression on the Jewish world (and especially within the confines of the Canadian Jewish community), the many outpourings of grief surprisingly reveal a marked Jewish component and were expressed within a fabric of Jewish communal sentiment. Mr. and Mrs. Mark Levy, amongst his closest friends in Canada, for instance, immediately made a donation to the Toronto-based organization Canadian Friends of the Hebrew University. Others, too, would make gifts in Heinz Unger’s name to notable Jewish institutions. Rabbi Gunther Plaut, Rabbi at Toronto’s Holy Blossom Temple, would write to his widow that “all of us were the richer for his presence and all of us the poorer for his absence” while Heinz Unger’s long-time friend and supporter Rabbi Maxwell Dubin of Los Angeles’ Wilshire Boulevard Temple would note “I was shocked beyond words this morning when I looked through a copy of the London Jewish Chronicle and noted an

---

5 In a letter sent by Chapter president Judge Harry Waisberg to Hella Unger, he notes that the donation was specifically earmarked “for Student Aid to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.” Letter from Judge Harry Waisberg to Hella Unger, dated February 26, 1965. LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 19.
6 Mr. and Mrs. Orliffe, for example, would make a contribution in Heinz Unger’s name to the National Council of Jewish Women of Canada (Toronto Section), the donation contributing to the Council’s Scholarship Fund. Clare and Joseph Sera meanwhile would make a donation to Toronto’s Mount Sinai Temple Student’s Library Fund in Heinz Unger’s name while Leo Weil would make his donation to Clanton Park Synagogue’s Doreen (Dolly) Edell Memorial Library. See: LAC, MUS 56, Box 1, File 19.
obituary that my good friend Heinz Unger had passed away." And while none of these sentiments in isolation would reveal anything significant, taking them as a whole (and in tandem with the tremendous importance with which Unger endowed his admittedly sporadic activities at the Jewish community level) presents us with a far fuller understanding of Heinz Unger's affiliation with segments of the Jewish community within both Canada and beyond. Having come to better understand the manner in which the Canadian Jewish community was a closed one into which Heinz Unger never gained (or truly sought) entry, his marginalization on the Canadian Jewish scene is not difficult to understand. Our research, however, demonstrates that the study of only large segments of the Canadian Jewish community fails to show its plurality; members of the Jewish Diaspora that did not find a place within the Canadian Jewish community have failed to be recognized and understood as an important (albeit numerically small) part of the story of Canadian Jewry. Along with other scholars, I feel that the time has come to redress this selective record and to demonstrate and even celebrate the achievements of Canadian Jewry – and of all the Jews in the Diaspora – in a more truthful, fuller, and, ultimately, more enriching manner.

In the final sequence of Paul Wagener's 1921 film "Der Golem," Rabbi Loew's Golem strays outside the gates of the Jewish ghetto. Happening upon a fair-haired child, he lifts her up and takes her in his arms. The child, drawn to the Star of David affixed to the Golem's neck, grabs at it and pulls it from the well-formed clay body in which it is embedded. The creature immediately falls to the ground lifeless, only to be discovered soon after by the Jews coming to find the creature's whereabouts. Relieved that no harm

---

has been done, the Jews carry off the Golem’s motionless form, returning it to the ghetto from whence it had sprung while praising God and closing the gates behind them. The Jews, at least in this particular interpretation of Jewish history, are seemingly only secure in their separate sphere behind the safety of the ghetto’s walls.

In some respects, the life of the Jewish musician Heinz Unger shadows this very scenario, albeit perhaps in less stark black-and-white imagery. Heinz Unger was, like the Golem, a child of the Jewish peoples. He was also created as a consequence of the circumstances that swept along the Jewish people into and through modernity. Like the Golem, he too broke through the bounds of the Jewish community, emancipated and set loose upon a world that did not understand him or his intentions. The great difference is that Heinz Unger was not taken back by the Jewish people (neither in Canada nor beyond). He was cast adrift, his legacy left to grow ever dimmer and his achievements all but forgotten. My hope is that with this work I have helped illuminate his legacy, a legacy that deserves to be rehabilitated and teaches us not just about the perseverance of a great artist and his single-mindedness but also helps us better understand modern Jewish history across the Diaspora.
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APPENDIX
KNOWN CONCERTS AND PERFORMANCES BY HEINZ UNGER

1915
Berlin, Germany
Unknown Amateur Orchestra
Beethoven: Symphony No. 5 (Excerpts)

13 September 1919
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Wagner: Overture “Faust”; Mahler: Symphony No. 1

19 September 1919
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Mahler: Das Lied von der Erde
Soloists: Waldemar Henke (Tenor), Ida Harth zur Nieden (Alto)

7 January 1920
Berlin, Germany
Blüthner Orchester
Beethoven: Overture “Coriolan”; Bach: Violin Concerto (E-Dur); Mendelssohn: Violin
Concerto (E-minor, Op. 64); Paganini: Violin Concerto (D-Dur)
Soloist: Carola Zellenka (Violin)

20 March 1920
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mozart: Symphony No. 36; Mozart: Arias from “Il Re Pastore” and “Entführung aus dem
Serail”
Soloist: Maria Ivögün (Soprano)

29 April 1920
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mahler: Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen; Mahler: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Josef Mann (Tenor)

9 September 1920
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mahler: Kindertotenlieder; Mahler: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Olga Schaeffer

27 October 1920
Berlin, Germany
Blüthner Orchester
Mozart: Overture “The Marriage of Figaro”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 1; Liszt: Hungarian Rhapsody No. 1; Wagner: Vorspiel III Akt & Brantchor (?) from “Lohengrin”; Beethoven: Overture “Leonore No. 3”

27 November 1920
Berlin, Germany
Blüthner Orchester
Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 5; Brahms: Violin Concerto; Liszt: Piano Concerto No. 2
Soloists: Elisabeth Lesser-Cohn (Violin), Irene Freimann (Piano)

17 December 1920
Oranienburg, Germany
Blüthner Orchester
Beethoven: Overture “Coriolan”, 2nd & 3rd Movements from Violin Concerto, Overture “The Creatures of Prometheus”, Symphony No. 2
Concertmaster and Soloist: Lambinon (Violin)

18 December 1920
Oranienburg, Germany
Blüthner Orchester
Beethoven: Overture “Coriolan”, 2nd & 3rd Movements from Violin Concerto, Overture “The Creatures of Prometheus”, Symphony No. 2
Concertmaster and Soloist: Lambinon (Violin)

28 December 1920
Berlin, Germany
Blüthner Orchester
Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”, Symphony No. 6 (“Pastorale”), Symphony No. 5

10 January 1921
Berlin, Germany (Glaubenskirche)
Blüthner Orchester
Haydn: Die Schopfung
Soloists: Rose Walter (Soprano), Paul Bauer, Lederer-Prima

16 January 1921
Berlin, Germany
Blüthner Orchester
Liszt: Les Preludes, Piano Concerto A-Dur; Wagner: Overture “Rienzi”, Siegfried Idyll, Meistersinger Vorspiel

26 January 1921
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mozart: Eine Kleine Nachtmusik; Handel: Aria sequence from "L'Allegro, il Penseroso ed il moderato"; Gluck: Larissa's Aria from "Il trionfo di Clelia"; D. Scarlatti: Andante from Ballet-Suite "Les femmes de bonne humeur"; Mozart: Aria from "Il Re Pastore" and Sandrina's Aria from "Die Gartnerin aus Liebe"; Mozart: Serenade No. 7 (Haffner Serenade) (selections)
Soloist: Rose Walter (Soprano)

11 February 1921
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mahler: Symphony No. 7

17 March 1921
Berlin, Germany
Orchester aus 46 ersten Berliner Kunstlern
Handel: Concerto Grosso No. 17; Mozart: Piano Concerto No. 24 (K. 491); Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 1, Symphony No. 8
Soloist: Felix Dyck (Piano)

1 November 1922
Berlin, Germany
Blüthner Orchester
Internationale Componisten Gilde, Berlin, Erstes Konzert (founded by Varese and Salzedo, 1921)
Note: Unger appears only on select (Orchestral?) parts of programme

26 March 1925
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Beethoven: Grosse-Fugue (for String Orchestra) Op. 133; Brahms: Piano Concerto No. 2; Beethoven: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Artur Schnabel (Piano)

15 October 1925
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mahler: Drei Lieder mit Orchester; Mahler: Symphony No. 9
Soloist: Maria von Basilides (Vocalist)

12 November 1925
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Handel: Samson
Soloists: Lotte Leonard, Maria von Basilides, Gunner Graarud, Otto Helgers; Choir: Berliner Caecilienchor

10 December 1925
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Ravel: La Valse; Prokofiev: Piano Concerto No. 3 (BPO Premiere); Beethoven: Symphony No. 7
Soloist: Heinz Jolles (Piano)

21 January 1926
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mendelssohn: Overture “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”; Chopin: Piano Concerto No. 1; Brahms: Symphony No. 1
Soloist: Artur Schnabel (Piano)

18 February 1926
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mozart: Serenade No. 7 (‘Haffner’); Hindemith: Kammermusik No. 4 (Violinkonzert) (Erstaufführung); R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel

18 March 1926
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Bruckner: Symphony No. 3; Verdi: Quattro pezzi sacri
Soloists: Rose Walter, Lilli Dreyfus, Meta Glass-Villaret, Alfred Wilde, Martin Abendroth, & Berliner Caecilienchor

14 October 1926
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mahler: Symphony No. 3
Soloists: Maria Olszewska (Alto), Berliner Caecilienchor, Knabenchor der XII Realschule

11 November 1926
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Respighi: Piano Concerto in the Mixolydian mode, La Primavera (symphonic tone-poem for Solo, Choir and Orchestra)
Soloists: Ottorino Respighi (Piano); La Primavera: Mitwirkung: Elma von Haynal, Marianne Hoeglauer, Marga Burlin, Gerrit Visser, Hans Herm. Nissen, Kurt Weiler; Berliner Caecilienchor (with Antonie Sternschen Frauenchor)
9 December 1926
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Beethoven: Choral Fantasia, Symphony No. 9
Soloists: Choral Fantasia: Artur Schnabel (Piano), Soloists: Kate Ravoth, Hede Turk, Lilli Dreyfus, Gerrit Visser, Georg Muller, Albert Fischer; Symphony No. 9: Solists: Kate Ravoth, Lilli Dreyfus, Gerrit Visser, Albert Fischer & Berliner Caecilienchor (with Antonie Sternschen Frauenchors)

20 January 1927
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Weber: Overture “Euryanthe”; Weber: Zwischenaktsmusik a.d. Oper "Die 3 Pintos" (orchestrated Mahler); Brahms: Violin Concerto; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 3 "Scottish"
Soloist: Bronislaw Huberman (Violin)

24 February 1927
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mozart: Serenade No. 12; Mozart: Violin Concerto No. 5; Mahler: Symphony No. 4
Soloists: Mozart: Adila Fachiri (Violin); Mahler: Lotte Schone (Soprano)

10 November 1927
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Prokofiev: Ala und Lolly (Scythian Suite); Mussorgsky: Gesang der Parassja aus "Der Jahrmarkt von Soroschintzi"; Rimsky-Korsakov: Szene und Aria der Martha aus "Die Zarenbraut"; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 ("Pathetique")
Soloists: Meta Seinmeyer (Singer); Fritz Fischer (Piano); Hugo Strelitzer (Celesta)

16 February 1928
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Wagner: Sigfired-Idyll (Chamber version); Weill: Violin Concerto (Premiere); Schreker: Kammersymphonie
Soloist: Stefan Frenkel (Violin)

3 March 1928
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mahler: Symphony No. 8
Soloists: Lotte Leonard (Soprano), Anna-Marie Lenzburg (Soprano), Elma von Heymal (Alto), Julia-Lotte Stern (Alto), Paul Stieber-Walter (Tenor), Hermann Schey (Baritone), Albert Fischer (Bass); Choirs: Berliner Caecilienchor, Clara Krause'scher Frauenchor, Neuer Berliner Frauenchor, Das verstarkte Philharmonischen Orchester, Antonie
Stern'scher Frauenchor, Berliner Lehrer-Gesangverein, Knabenchor der XII Realschule; Others: Walter Fischer (Organ), Fritz Gahlenback (Piano), Hugo Strelitzer (Celesta), Otto Ackermann (Harmonium)

13 November 1928
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Schubert: Overture “In the Italian Style”; Schumann: Piano Concerto; Mahler: Symphony No. 1
Soloist: Moritz Rosenthal (Piano)

6 December 1928
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Krenek: Potpourri (erstaufführung); Mozart: Symphonie concertante für Violine und Bratsche; H. Wolf: Italian Serenade (Arr. Max Reger); R. Strauss: Don Juan
Soloist: Zlatko Balokovic, Josef Wolfsthal

14 February 1929
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Haydn: Der Jahreszeiten
Soloists: Hanne: Anna Maria Lenzberg; Lukas: Hans Hoefflin; Simon: Hermann Schey; Landvolk, Jager: Berliner Cacilienchor; Am Flugel: Hugo Strelitzer

10 October 1929
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Graener: Comedietta (Erstaufführung); Dvorak: Violin Concerto; Bruckner: Symphony No. 3
Soloist: Carl Flesch (Violin)

21 November 1929
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Haydn: Cello Concerto; Mahler: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Judith Bokor (Cello)

19 December 1929
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Beethoven: Symphony No. 1; Brahms: Piano Concerto No. 1; Atterberg: Symphony No. 5 (Sinfonia Funebre) (Erstaufführung)
Soloist: Wilhelm Backhaus (Piano)

20 February 1930
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Bach: Orchestersuite (Arr. Gustav Mahler); Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 4; Brahms: Symphony No. 1
Walter Gieseking (Piano)

20 March 1930
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
R. Strauss: Tod und Verklärung; Bach: Violin Concerto E-dur; Verdi: Quattro pezzi sacri
Soloist: Bach: Vecsey (Violin); Verdi: Hede Turk, Albert Peters, Lilly Dreyfus, Fritz Lechner, Berliner Cacilienchor, Klara Krauseschen Frauenchors

23 April 1931
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Beethoven: Overture “Leonore No. 3”, Violin Concerto, Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)
Soloist: Adolf Busch (Violin)

15 October 1931
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
JC Bach: Sinfonia in B; Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 1; Bruckner: Symphony No. 8
Soloist: Georg Bertram (Piano)

10 December 1931
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Prokofiev: Les Ridicules und Marsch from "The Love of Three Oranges"; Franck: Les Djinns (Symphonic Poem for Piano and Orchestra) (Erstaufführung); Saint-Saens: Piano Concerto No. 2; Bruch: Aria of Andromache from "Achilleus"; Verdi: Aria of Ebolius from "Don Carlos"; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 (“Pathetique”)
Soloists: Sigrid Onegin (Contralto); Paul Loyonnet (Piano)

3 March 1932
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mozart: Maurerische Trauermusik; Brahms: Violin Concerto; Toch: Bunte Suite fur Orchester (am Flugel: Irina Westermann); Beethoven: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Carl Flesch (Violin)

13 October 1932
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Mahler: Drei Orchesterlieder, Symphony No. 9
Soloist: Alexander Kipnis (Bass)
17 November 1932
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Wunsch: Kleine Lustspielsuite; Dvorak: Cello Concerto; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Joseph Schuster (Cello)

12 January 1933
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Beethoven: Grosse Fugue; Vivaldi: Concerto for 4 Violins (transcribed by JS Bach as Concerto for four Pianos); Bruckner: Symphony No. 9
Soloist: Goldberg, Hanke, Rostal, Totenberg, Bertram, Eisner, Kreutzer, Osborn

16 April 1934
London, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mahler: Symphony No. 1; Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 4; R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel
Soloist: Franz Osborn (Piano)

23 June 1935
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Sinfónica de Valencia
Unknown Program

2 July 1935
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Sinfónica de Valencia
Beethoven: Overtures “Egmont” and “Leonore No. 3”, Symphony No. 9 (Valencia premiere)
Soloists: Carmen Andujar (Soprano), Vicente Palop (Tenor), Vicenta Bordes (Contralto), Emilio Cortés (Baritone)

21 November 1936
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Mozart: Symphony in D (K. 385); Lalo: Symphonie Espagnole for Violin and Orchestra; Weinberger: Polka and Fugue from “Schwanda the Bagpiper”; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Samuel Dushkin (Violin)

9 November 1937
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Mozart: Overture “The Marriage of Figaro”, Symphony No. 35 (“Haffner”); Tchaikovsky: Violin Concerto (conducted by Ernest MacMillan); Berlioz: Symphonie fantastique; Soloist: Mishel Piastro (Violin)

22 January 1938
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Schubert: Overture “In the Italian Style”; Liszt: Piano Concerto No. 1; Beethoven: Symphony No. 7; Weber-Mahler: Entracte from “The Three Pintos”; Piano Solos (Dohnanyi: Rhapsody in C; Albeniz: Triana; Holst: Toccata); Bizet: l’Arlesienne Suite No. 2; Soloist: Cyril Smith (Piano)

29 November 1938
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Brahms: Symphony No. 4; Liszt: Les Preludes; Wagner: Siegfried’s Rhine Journey; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”

7 January 1939
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Athalie”; Brahms: Haydn Variations; Beethoven: Violin Concerto; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 (“Pathetique”); Soloist: Albert Sammons (Violin)

18 March 1939
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra

28 January 1940
London, England
West London Amateur Orchestra
Schubert: Overture “In the Italian Style”; Mozart: Serenade No. 7 (“Haffner”), Unknown Serenade; Brahms: Zigeuner Lieder; Beethoven: Symphony No. 1; Soloists: Erika Storm (Soprano)

4 February 1940
London, England
West London Amateur Orchestra
Schubert: Overture “In the Italian Style”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 1; Brahms: Zigeuner Lieder; Mozart: Serenade No. 7 (“Haffner”); Sibelius: Finlandia Soloists: Erika Storm (Soprano), Mosco Carner (Piano)

10 February 1940
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Schubert: Symphony No. 6; Mozart: Piano Concerto No. 20 (K.466); Smetana: “Blanik”; Chopin: Scherzo in B flat; J. Straus: Waltz “Roses from the South” Soloist: Irene Kohler (Piano)

24 February 1940
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Sibelius: Finlandia; Franck: Symphonic Variations for Piano and Orchestra; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Piano Solos (Bizet-Rachmaninov: Minuet from “L’Arlesienne”; Dohnanyi: Rhapsody No. 3); Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”) Soloist: Lance Dossor

27 July 1940
London, England
West London Amateur Orchestra
Schubert: Overture “In the Italian Style”; Mozart: Serenade No. 7 (“Haffner”), “Eine Kleine Nachtmusik; Dittersdorf: Dittersdorf: Sinfonia No. 3 (“Actaeon”)

9 November 1940
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Weber: “Euryanthe” Overture; Brahms: Symphony No. 1; Mendelssohn: Violin Concerto in E minor, Op. 64; Borodin: Polovsian Dances from “Prince Igor” Soloist: Eda Kersey (Violin)

7 December 1940
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra

25 October 1941
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Glinka: Overture “Ruslan and Ludmilla”; Tchaikovsky: Piano Concerto No. 1; Verdi: Introduction to Act III from “La Traviata”; Piano Solo (Brahms: Variations on a Theme of Paganini); Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Moiseiwitch (Piano)

9 November 1941
Wakefield, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Glinka: Overture “Ruslan and Ludmilla”; Tchaikovsky: Piano Concerto No. 1;
Beethoven: Symphony No. 5; Piano Solos (Chopin: Waltz in A flat, Scherzo in C sharp minor); Wagner: Overture “Tannhauser”
Soloist: Phyllis Sellick (Piano)

23 November 1941
Harrogate, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Glinka: Overture “Ruslan and Ludmilla”; Tchaikovsky: Piano Concerto No. 1;
Beethoven: Symphony No. 7; Wagner: Overture “Tannhauser”
Soloist: Phyllis Sellick (Piano)

6 December 1941
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Beethoven: Symphony No. 8; Mussorgsky: Night on Bald Mountain; Piano Solos
(Debussy: “Reflet dans l’eau”; Holst: Toccata); Chabrier: Joyeuse
Soloist: Phyllis Sellick (Piano)

Approx. 19 January 1941
Harrogate, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Wagner: Overture “The Mastersingers”; Liszt-Busoni: Rhapsodie Espagnol for Piano and Orchestra; Beethoven: Symphony No. 5; Massenet: “Scenes Pittoresques” Suite; Piano Solos (Brahms: Ballade in D minor, Op. 10; Chopin: Polonaise in A flat, Op. 53);
Rossini: Overture “William Tell”
Soloist: Daphne Coburn (Piano)

29 January 1942
Doncaster, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Wagner: Overture “Die Meistersinger”; Mendelssohn: Violin Concerto, Op. 64; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8
Soloist: Daniel Melsa (Violin)

21 February 1942
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Weber: Overture “Oberon”; Schumann: Piano Concerto; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8
Soloist: Myra Hess (Piano)

28 February 1942
Wakefield, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Daniel Melsa (Violin)

21 March 1942
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Mozart: Overture “Il Seraglio”; Liszt: Piano Concerto No. 1; Schubert: Symphony No. 9
Soloist: Cyril Smith (Piano)

6 September 1942
London, England
London Symphony Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Athalie”; Mahler: Songs of a Wayfarer; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy
Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Brahms: Symphony No. 3; Glinka: Overture “Ruslan and
Ludmilla”
Soloist: Sabine Kalter (Vocalist)

26 September 1942
Wakefield, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Beethoven: Overture “Fidelio”; Grieg: Piano Concerto; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4
(“Italian”); Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”
Soloist: Phyllis Sellick (Piano)

10 October 1942
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Beethoven: Overture “Fidelio”; Brahms: Piano Concerto No. 2; Mendelssohn: Symphony
No. 4 (“Italian”)
Soloist: Louis Kentner (Piano)

11 October 1942
Birmingham, England
City of Birmingham Orchestra
Smetana: Overture “The Bartered Bride”; Bruch: Violin Concerto No. 1; Brahms:
Symphony No. 1
Soloist: Norris Stanley (Violin)
28 November 1942
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Mozart: Overture “The Marriage of Figaro”; Mendelssohn: Violin Concerto in E minor;
Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Brahms: Symphony No. 3
Soloist: Ida Haendel (Violin)

27 December 1942
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”; Mozart: Piano Concerto No. 27
(K. 595); Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Clifford Curzon (Piano)

10 January 1943
Birmingham, England
City of Birmingham Orchestra
A. Benjamin: Overture to an Italian Comedy; Beethoven: Symphony No. 2;
Rachmaninov: Piano Concerto No. 3
Soloist: Cyril Smith (Piano)

2 October 1943
Wakefield, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Berlioz: Overture “Le Carneval Romain”; Franck: Symphonic Variations for Piano and
Orchestra; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8; Brahms: Hungarian Dances (in G minor and D
Major only)
Soloist: Kendall Taylor (Piano)

3 October 1943
Barnsley, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Berlioz: Overture “Le Carneval Romain”; Sibelius: Valse Triste; Massenet: Suite “Scenes
Pittoresques”; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8; Brahms: Hungarian Dances (in G minor and D
Major only)

9 October 1943
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Berlioz: Overture “Le Carneval Romain”; Chopin: Piano Concerto No. 1 in E minor;
Cesar Franck: Symphony in D minor
Soloist: Louis Kentner (Piano)

25 October 1943
Watford, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Schumann: Piano Concerto; Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)

31 October 1943
London, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; J.S. Bach: Brandenburg Concerto No. 3; Brahms: Symphony No. 4; Beethoven: Symphony No. 2

7 November 1943
Birmingham, England
City of Birmingham Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Athalie”; Elgar: Violin Concerto; Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”)
Soloist: Henry Holst (Violin)

27 November 1943
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Mozart: Symphony No. 41 (“Jupiter”); Dvorak: Cello Concerto; Wagner: Arias (“Spring Song” from “Valkyrie” and “Lohengrin’s Narration”); Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”
Soloists: Thelma Reiss (Cello), Walter Widdop (Vocalist)

18 December 1943
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; J.S. Bach: Keyboard Concerto No. 1 in D Minor; Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”); Mussorgsky: Pictures from an Exhibition
Soloist: Harriet Cohen (Piano)

11 January 1944
Coventry, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 2; Brahms: Symphony No. 4

12 January 1944
Nottingham, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Schumann: Piano Concerto; Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)

13 January 1944
Leicester, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Grieg: Piano Concerto;
Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)

16 January 1944
London, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mozart: Symphony No. 41 ("Jupiter"); H. Wolf: Italian Serenade; Bruckner: Symphony
No. 4 ("Romantic")

20 January 1944
Swindon, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; H. Wolf: Italian Serenade; Dohnanyi: Variations on a Nursery Theme for Piano and Orchestra; Brahms: Symphony
No. 4
Soloist: Joan Baker (Piano)

24 January 1944
Hanley, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Elgar: Violin Concerto; H.
Wolf: Italian Serenade; Beethoven: Symphony No. 2
Soloist: Jean Pougnet (Violin)

25 January 1944
Walsall, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Program Unknown

26 January 1944 (Lunch-Hour Concert)
Bristol, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Schubert: Overture and Ballet Music from “Rosamunde”; Mozart: Ballet Music to the
from the South”

26 January 1944 (Evening)
Bristol, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Grieg: Piano Concerto;
Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)
5 February 1944
Chatham, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Schumann: Piano Concerto;
Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)

12 February 1944
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Arthur Benjamin; Overture to an Italian Comedy; Beethoven: Violin Concerto;
Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 3 (“Scottish”)
Soloist: Eda Kersey (Violin)

13 February 1944
Harrogate, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Arthur Benjamin; Overture to an Italian Comedy; Brahms: Piano Concerto No. 2;
Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 3 (“Scottish”)
Soloist: Kendall Taylor (Piano)

26 February 1944
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Bach-Mahler: Suite; Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 1; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6
(“Pathetique”)
Soloist: Kendall Taylor (Piano)

5 March 1944
London, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Wagner: Overture “The Flying Dutchman”; Elgar: Violin Concerto; Brahms: Variations
on a Theme of Haydn (St. Antony Chorale); Berlioz: Three Pieces from “The Damnation
of Faust”
Soloist: Jean Pougnet (Violin)

14 March 1944
Newcastle, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Schubert: Overture “Rosamunde”; Berlioz: Two Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust”
(Menuet des Follets, Ballet des Sylphes); Schumann: Piano Concerto; Brahms:
Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)

15 March 1944
Darlington, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Wagner: Overture “The Flying Dutchman”; Two Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust” (Menuet des Follets, Ballet des Sylphes); Beethoven: Symphony No. 2; Brahms: Symphony No. 4

19 March 1944
Dewsbury, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Haydn: The Creation

22 March 1944
Dewsbury, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Soloist: Irene Kohler (Piano)

1 April 1944
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Mozart: Piano Concerto No. 27 (K. 595); Brahms: Symphony No. 1
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)

4 April 1944
Birmingham, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Tchaikovsky: Serenade for Strings; Beethoven: Symphony No. 2; Brahms: Symphony No. 4

14 April 1944
Bristol, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Wagner: Overture “The Flying Dutchman”; Brahms: Variations on a Theme of Haydn; Berlioz: Three Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)

27 April 1944
Manchester, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Wagner: Overture “The Flying Dutchman”; Berlioz: Two Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust”; Grieg: Piano Concerto; Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)
Soloist: Cyril Smith (Piano)

18 May 1944
Newcastle, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Wagner: Overture “The Flying Dutchman”; Berlioz: Two Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust”; Grieg: Piano Concerto; Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)

26 July 1944
Peterborough, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Fingal’s Cave”; H. Wolf: Italian Serenade; Schumann: Symphony No. 4; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8

27 July 1944
Leicester, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Program Unknown

28 July 1944
Nottingham, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Fingal’s Cave”; H. Wolf: Italian Serenade; Schumann: Symphony No. 4; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8

9 September 1944
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Haydn: The Creation
Soloists: Isobel Baillie (Soprano), Parry Jones (Tenor), Norman Walker (Bass), Arthur Haywood (Piano), Edward Allam (Organ)

30 September 1944
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Haydn-Brahms: St. Anthony Variations, Op. 65a; Chopin: Piano Concerto No. 2; Schubert: Symphony No. 6 in C; J. Strauss: “The Blue Danube” Waltz
Soloist: Louis Kentner (Piano)

14 October 1944
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Rossini: Overture “La Gazza Ladra”; Dvorak: Violin Concerto; Beethoven: Symphony No. 7
Soloist: Max Rostal (Violin)

8 October 1944
Doncaster, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Rossini: Overture “La Gazza Ladra”; Tchaikovsky: Piano Concerto No. 1; Wagner: Siegfried Idyll; Schubert: Symphony No. 6
Soloist: Julius Isserlis (Piano)

11 October 1944
Dewsbury, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Rossini: Overture “La Gazza Ladra”; Rachmaninov: Piano Concerto No. 3; Wagner: Siegfried Idyll; Schubert: Symphony No. 6
Soloist: Irene Kohler (Piano)

22 October 1944
Leeds, England
The Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Dvorak: Overture “Carnival”; Tchaikovsky: Piano Concerto No. 1; Wagner: Siegfried Idyll; Borodin: Symphony No. 2
Soloist: Julius Isserlis (Piano)

28 October 1944
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Mozart: Symphony No. 39 (K. 543); Edward German: “Valse Gracieuse” from Symphonic Suite in D Minor; Rachmaninov: Piano Concerto No. 3; Berlioz: Three Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust”
Soloist: Irene Kohler (Piano)

11 November 1944
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Bloch: Concerto Grosso for Strings and Piano; Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 4; Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Franz Osborn (Piano)

19 November 1944
Leeds, England
The Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Rimsky-Korsakov: Introduction and Cortege (“Le Coq d’or”); Grieg: Piano Concerto in A Minor; Delius: “La Calinda”; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Phyllis Sellick (Piano)

23 November 1944
Doncaster, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Wagner: Overture “Rienzi”; Grieg: Piano Concerto; Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”); Bizet: L’Arlesienne Suite
Soloist: Phyllis Sellick (Piano)

25 November 1944
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”)
Soloist: Maurice Raskin (Violin)

9 December 1944
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Nicolai: Overture “The Merry Wives of Windsor”; Mozart: Concerto in E flat for Two
Pianos (K. 365); Elgar: “Severn Suite”; Schumann: Symphony No. 4
Soloists: Cyril Smith and Phyllis Sellick (Pianos)

30 December 1944
Bristol, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Schumann: Symphony No. 4; Mahler: Adagietto
from Symphony No. 5; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8

4 January 1945
Guildford, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Schumann: Symphony No. 4; Mendelssohn: Violin Concerto in E Minor; Dvorak:
Symphony No. 8
Soloist: Jean Pougnet (Violin)

5 January 1945
Wembley, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Schumann: Symphony No. 4; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8

9 January 1945
Birmingham, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Schumann: Symphony No. 4; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4

10 January 1945
Leicester, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4; Schumann: Symphony No. 4

13 January 1945
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Cherubini: Overture “Ali Baba”; Mahler: Symphony No. 2 (Third Movement); Lalo: Cello Concerto in D Minor; Mozart: “The Catalogue Song” from “Don Giovanni”; Verdi: “O tu palermo” from “Sicilian Vespers”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 8
Soloists: Anthony Pini (Cello), Ronald Stear (Vocalist)
14 January 1945
Harrogate, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Nicolai: Overture “The Merry Wives of Windsor”; Liszt: Piano Concerto No. 1; Bizet: Movements from L’Arlesienne (Adagietto, Farandole); Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Julius Isserlis (Piano)
21 January 1945
Leeds, England
The Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Mendelssohn: Violin Concerto in E Minor; Bizet: Movements from L’Arlesienne (Adagietto, Farandole); Delius: “On Hearing the First Cuckoo in Spring” Elgar: Enigma Variations
Soloist: Frederick Grinke (Violin)
27 January 1945
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Ruy Blas”; Wagner: Siegfried Idyll; Schumann: Piano Concerto in A Minor; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8
Soloist: Eric Hope (Piano)
28 January 1945
London, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 3; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Iso Elinson (Piano)
1 February 1945
Oxford, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8; Brahms: Symphony No. 4
10 February 1945
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Mozart: Overture “The Magic Flute”; Delius: Piano Concerto; Sibelius: “Karelia” Suite; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Moura Lympany (Piano)

14 February 1945
Huddersfield, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Nicolai: Overture “The Merry Wives of Windsor”; Liszt: Piano Concerto No. 1; Bizet: Movements from “L’Arlesienne”; Dvorák: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”)
Soloist: Julius Isserlis (Piano)

18 February 1945
Leeds, England
The Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Wagner: Overture “Rienzi”; Prokofiev: Piano Concerto No. 3; Dvorák: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”; Eric Coates: “London Suite” (Two Movements only)

21 February 1945
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Beethoven: Symphony No. 9; Beethoven: Choral Fantasia
Soloists: Elena Danieli (Soprano), Parry Jones (Tenor), Freda Townson (Contralto), Ronald Stear (Baritone), Edward Allam (Pianist)

24 February 1945
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Shostakovich: Symphony No. 1; Mozart: Piano Concerto No. 22 (K. 482); Rimsky-Korsakov: Prelude and Cortege from “Le Coq d’or”; Borodin: Dances from “Prince Igor”
Soloist: Kendall Taylor (Piano)

3 March 1945
Liverpool, England
Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra
Schubert: Overture “Rosamunde”; Schubert: Symphony No. 5; Mahler: Das Lied von der Erde
Soloists: Mary Jarred, Paul Jones (Vocalists)

10 March 1945
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Tchaikovsky: Serenade for Strings, Op. 48); Elgar: Violin Concerto; Bizet: Symphony No. 1
Soloist: Albert Sammons (Violin)

11 March 1945
Doncaster, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Dvorak: Overture "Carnival"; Liszt: Piano Concerto No. 1; Wagner: Prelude and Isolde’s Death from “Tristan und Isolde”; Elgar: Enigma Variations; Glinka: Overture “Ruslan and Ludmilla”
Soloist: Kendall Taylor (Piano)

18 March 1945
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Rossini: Overture “William Tell”; Saint-Saens: Piano Concerto No. 2; Haydn: Symphony No. 100 “Military”; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”;
Soloist: Leslie England (Piano)

21 March 1945
York, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Dvorak: Overture “Carnival”; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)

24 March 1945
Leeds, England
Northern Philharmonic Orchestra
Beethoven: Overture “Coriolan”; Liszt: Piano Concerto No. 2; Elgar: Enigma Variations; Wagner: Prelude and Isolde’s Death from “Tristan und Isolde,” Overture “The Mastersingers” [sic]
Soloist: Clifford Curzon (Piano)

4 April 1945
Bristol, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Dvorak: Overture “Carnival”; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)

12 April 1945
London, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Dvorak: Overture “Carnival”; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)

16 May 1945
Manchester, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Weber: Overture “Oberon”; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Dvorak: Overture “Carnival”; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8

1 June 1945
Nottingham, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Athalie”; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Grieg: Piano Concerto in A Minor; Weber: Overture “Oberon”; Schubert: Symphony No. 5; J. Strauss: “Roses from the South” Waltz
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)

2 June 1945
Boston, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Weber: Overture “Oberon”; Schubert: Symphony No. 5; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8

4 June 1945
Watford, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Weber: Overture “Oberon”; Schubert: Symphony No. 5; Grieg: Piano Concerto in A Minor; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Dvorak: Overture “Carnival”; J. Strauss: “Roses from the South” Waltz
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)

13 October 1945
Chatham, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
R. Strauss: Don Juan; Tchaikovsky: Serenade for Strings; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8

21 October 1945
London, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Mahler: Symphony No. 5 (English Premiere)
Soloist: Eileen Joyce (Piano)

10 December 1945
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Dvorak: Overture “Carnival”; Smetana: “Vltava”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”); A. Benjamin: Overture to an Italian Comedy (Valencia Premiere); Liszt: Les Preludes

16 December 1945
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel; Berlioz: Three Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust”; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5
17 December 1945
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5; Gordon Jacob: Passacaglia;
Berlioz: Three Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust

30 December 1945
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Sinfonica de Madrid
Brahms: Symphony No. 1; Gordon Jacob: Passacaglia; Wagner: Siegfried Idyll; Dvorak:
Overture “Carnival”

11 January 1946
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Espagnole, Op. 3; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5

25 January 1946
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Brahms: Symphony No. 4; R. Strauss: Don Juan;
Berlioz: Three Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust”

9 February 1946
Sheffield, England
Halle Orchestra
Rossini: Overture “Semiramide”; Debussy: Prelude L’Apres-midi d’un Faune;
Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 4; Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”)
Soloist: Noel Mewton-Wood (Piano)

10 February 1946
Manchester, England
Hallé Orchestra
Dvorak: Overture “Carnival”; Tchaikovsky: Piano Concerto No. 1; Bruckner: Symphony
No. 4 (“Romantic”) (First Movement); Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 3 (“Scottish”)
Soloist: Benno Moiseiwitch (Piano)

29 March 1946
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Schubert: Overture “Rosamunde”; Schumann: Piano Concerto; Mahler: Symphony No. 1
Soloist: Jose Cubilés (Piano)

5 April 1946
Madrid, Spain
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Orquesta Nacional
Mozart: Serenade No. 7; Holst: Ballet Suite “The Perfect Fool”; Berlioz: Symphonie fantastique

1 May 1946
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Mozart: Serenade No. 7; Mahler: Symphony No. 1

5 May 1946
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Weber: Overture “Oberon”; Schubert: Symphony No. 8 (“Unfinished”); Mahler: Symphony No. 1

September 1946
BBC Symphony Orchestra (Broadcast only)
Wagner: Siegfried Idyll; Beethoven (unknown); Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4

4 October 1946
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Bloch: Concerto Grosso; De Falla: Nights in the Gardens of Spain; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: José Cubiles (Piano)

5 October 1946
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Bloch: Concerto Grosso; De Falla: Nights in the Gardens of Spain; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: José Cubiles (Piano)

11 October 1946
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Bruckner: Symphony No. 4 (“Romantic”); Wagner: Siegfried’s Rhine Journey, Good Friday Spell from “Parsifal”, Overture “Die Meistersinger”

12 October 1946
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Bruckner: Symphony No. 4 (“Romantic”); Wagner: Siegfried’s Rhine Journey, Good Friday Spell from “Parsifal”, Overture “Die Meistersinger”

18 October 1946
Madrid, Spain  
Orquesta Nacional  
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; Schumann: Symphony No. 4; E.J. Moeran: Overture for a Masque; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”)  

19 October 1946  
Madrid, Spain  
Orquesta Nacional  
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; Schumann: Symphony No. 4; E.J. Moeran: Overture for a Masque; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”)  

25 October 1946  
Madrid, Spain  
Orquesta Nacional  
Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”); Brahms: Variations on a Theme by Haydn; Britten: Passacaglia from the Opera “Peter Grimes”; Liszt: Les Preludes  

26 October 1946  
Madrid, Spain  
Orquesta Nacional  
Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”); Brahms: Variations on a Theme by Haydn; Britten: Passacaglia from the Opera “Peter Grimes”; Liszt: Les Preludes  

1 November 1946  
Barcelona, Spain  
Orquesta Municipal de Barcelona  
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; Britten: Passacaglia from the Opera “Peter Grimes” (Barcelona Premiere); Liszt: Les Preludes; Brahms: Symphony No. 1; Wagner: Siegfried’s Rhine Journey, Overture “Die Meistersinger”  

3 November 1946  
Barcelona, Spain  
Orquesta Municipal de Barcelona  
Brahms: Symphony No. 1; Liszt: Les Preludes; Wagner: Siegfried’s Rhine Journey, Overture “Die Meistersinger”  

15 November 1946  
Concert for the Fourth Centenary of Miguel Cervantes  
Valencia, Spain  
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia  
R. Strauss: Don Quixote  
Soloist: Juan Ruiz Casaux (Cello)  

17 November 1946  
Valencia, Spain  
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Dvorak: Symphony No. 8; R. Strauss: Don Quixote; Liszt: Les Preludes
Soloist: Juan Ruiz Casaux (Cello)

24 October 1946
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Schubert: Overture “Rosamunde”; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4; Britten: Passacaglia from the Opera “Peter Grimes” (Valencia Premiere); Wagner: Good Friday Spell from “Parsifal”, Overture “Rienzi”

29 November 1946
Valencia, Spain
With the Collaboration of 100 Valencia musicians
Concert for the Spanish Red Cross
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4

1 December 1946
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”); Brahms: Symphony No. 1

2 December 1946
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Schubert: Overture “Rosamunde”; Britten: Passacaglia from the Opera “Peter Grimes”; Brahms: Symphony No. 1; Wagner: Good Friday Spell from “Parsifal”, Overture “Rienzi”

8 December 1946
Birmingham, England
City of Birmingham Orchestra
Stanford: Irish Rhapsody; Borodin: “In the Steppes of Central Asia”; Chopin: Piano Concerto No. 1; Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”)
Soloist: Weingarten (Piano)

14 March 1947
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional

21 March 1947
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”; Liszt: Tasso; Wagner: Wesendonck Lieder; Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”)
Soloist: Carlota Dahmen (Soprano)

28 March 1947
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Schubert: Symphony No. 5; Beethoven: Symphony No. 9
Soloists: Angelita Calvo (Soprano), Maria Teresa Estremera (Contralto), Enrique de la Vara (Tenor), Chano Gonzalo (Baritone)

11 April 1947
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
J.S. Bach: Brandenburg Concerto No. 4; Mozart: Symphony No. 41 (“Jupiter”); Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Turina: Fantastic Dances

20 April 1947
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Schubert: Symphony No. 5; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 7

27 April 1947
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 (“Pathetique”); Turina: Fantastic Dances; Liszt: Hungarian Rhapsody No. 2; J. Strauss: Waltz “Roses from the South”

1 May 1947
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Schubert: Symphony No. 5; Mozart: Symphony No. 41 (“Jupiter”); Beethoven: Symphony No. 5

2 May 1947
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 (“Pathetique”); Turina: Fantastic Dances; Liszt: Hungarian Rhapsody No. 2; J. Strauss: Waltz “Roses from the South”

4 May 1947
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mendelssohn: “A Midsummer Night’s Dream” (Overture and Scherzo); Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”); Beethoven: Symphony No. 5

9 February 1947 or 1948 (Broadcast Date)
BBC Symphony Orchestra
Mozart: Serenade No. 7 (“Haffner”); Wagner: Siegfried Idyll; Mendelssohn: Piano Concerto No. 1; Schubert: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Leslie England (Piano)

21 October 1947 or 1948
London, England
Philharmonia Orchestra
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Mozart: Piano Concerto No. 23 (K. 488); Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Clara Haskil (Piano)

6 February 1948
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mozart: Overture “The Marriage of Figaro”; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”); Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5; Borodin: “In the Steppes of Central Asia”; Berlioz: Three Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust”

13 February 1948
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

20 February 1948
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

22 February 1948
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Haydn: Symphony No. 100 (“Military”); Mahler: Symphony No. 4 (Orquesta Municipal de Valencia Premiere)
Soloist: Emilia Muñoz (Soprano)

27 February 1948
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Haydn: Symphony No. 100 (“Military”); Beethoven: Symphony No. 9
Soloists: Emilia Muñoz (Soprano), Esperanza Pérez de Durán (Contralto), Enrique de la Vara (Tenor), Enrique Domínguez (Baritone)

5 March 1948
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 8; Grieg: Piano Concerto; R. Strauss: Death and Transfiguration
Soloist: Martin Imaz (Piano)

12 March 1948
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Smetana: Overture “The Bartered Bride”; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 3 (“Scottish”); Brahms: Symphony No. 3; Sibelius: Finlandia

23 March 1948
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Schubert: Symphony No. 5; Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”); Wagner: Good Friday Spell from “Parsifal”, Funeral March from “Götterdämmerung”

16 April 1948
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Muñoz Moleda: Introduction and Fugue; Mozart: Serenade No. 13 for Strings (“Eine Kleine Nachtmusik”); Berlioz: Symphonie fantastique

23 April 1948
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Mozart: Overture “The Marriage of Figaro”; Haydn: Symphony No. 100 (“Military”); Mahler: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Emilia Muñoz (Soprano)

30 April 1948
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional

7 May 1948
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Nacional
Rossini: Overture “La Gazza Ladra”; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8; Beethoven: Symphony No. 5

21 May 1948
Barcelona, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Barcelona

23 May 1948
Barcelona, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Barcelona
Berlioz: Overture “Le Carnaval Romain”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 5; Smetana: “Vltava”; R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel

27 June 1948
Havana, Cuba
Orquesta Filharmonica de la Habana
Rossini: Overture “La Gazza Ladra”; Chopin: Piano Concerto No. 1; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Ivette Hernandez (Piano)

28 June 1948
Havana, Cuba
Orquesta Filharmonica de la Habana
Rossini: Overture “La Gazza Ladra”; Chopin: Piano Concerto No. 1; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Ivette Hernandez (Piano)

11 July 1948
Havana, Cuba
Orquesta Filharmonica de la Habana
Beethoven: Overture “Leonore” No. 3, Piano Concerto No. 3; Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)
Soloist: Ivette Hernandez (Piano)

15 July 1948
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra
Soloists: Carol Brice (Contralto), Jonathon Brice (Piano)
26 November 1948  
Mexico City, Mexico  
Sinfónica Mexicana  
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Brahms: Piano Concerto No. 2; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5  
Soloist: Rosita Renard (Piano)

28 November 1948  
Mexico City, Mexico  
Sinfónica Mexicana  
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Brahms: Piano Concerto No. 2; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5  
Soloist: Rosita Renard (Piano)

13 August 1950  
Mexico City, Mexico  
Orquesta Sinfónica de la Universidad  
Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”, Symphony No. 8, Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)

20 August 1950  
Mexico City, Mexico  
Orquesta Sinfónica de la Universidad  
Rachmaninov: Piano Concerto No. 2; Berlioz: Symphonie fantastique  
Soloist: Stella Contreras (Piano)

14 November 1950  
Toronto, Canada  
Forest Hill Community Ensemble  

14 January 1951  
Madrid, Spain  
Orquesta Sinfónica de Madrid  
Berlioz: Overture “Le Carnaval Romain”; Turina: Fantastic Dances; Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)

21 January 1951  
Madrid, Spain  
Orquesta Sinfónica de Madrid  
Brahms: Symphony No. 1; J. Guridi: Ten Basque Melodies; R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel

28 January 1951  
Madrid, Spain  
Orquesta Sinfónica de Madrid

4 February 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”); Turina: Fantastic Dances; Berlioz: Overture “Le Carnaval Romain”

9 February 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

11 February 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

18 February 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”); Guridi: Ten Basque Melodies; Liszt: Les Preludes

21 February 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia/ Coral Polifónico Valentina and Orfeón de Godella (dir. Agustín Alámán)
Mendelssohn: Overture “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”; Mahler: Symphony No. 2 (“Resurrection”) (Spanish Premiere)
Soloists: Fuensata Sola (Contralto), Emilia Muñoz (Soprano)

22 February 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia/ Coral Polifónico Valentina and Orfeón de Godella (dir. Agustín Alámán)
Mendelssohn: Overture “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”; Mahler: Symphony No. 2 (“Resurrection”)
Soloists: Fuensata Sola (Contralto), Emilia Muñoz (Soprano)

25 February 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia/ Coral Polifónico Valentina and Orfeón de Godella (dir. Agustín Alamán)
Mendelssohn: Overture “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”; Mahler: Symphony No. 2 (“Resurrection”)
Soloists: Fuensata Sola (Contralto), Emilia Muñoz (Soprano)

1 March 1951
Barcelona, Spain
Orquesta Sinfónica del Gran Teatro del Liceo
Mendelssohn: Overture “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”; Brahms: Variations on a Theme by Haydn; Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”); Wagner: Funeral March from “Götterdämmerung”, Prelude from “Die Meistersinger”

3 March 1951
Castellón, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

4 March 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

18 March 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”); Brahms: Variations on a Theme by Haydn; Smetana: “Vltava”

21 March 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Symphony No. 5; Wagner: Funeral March from “Götterdämmerung”, Good Friday Spell from “Parsifal”, Overture “Die Meistersinger”

1 April 1951
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Schubert: Symphony No. 8 (“Unfinished”); Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”); Ruperto Chapi: Prelude “La Revełsa”

8 April 1951
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Sinfónica de Madrid
Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”, Symphony No. 5; Wagner: Prelude and Death of Isolde
from “Tristan and Isolde”, Overture “Die Meistersinger”

15 April 1951
Leeds, England
Yorkshire Symphony Orchestra
Wagner: Overture “Die Meistersinger”; Brahms: Variations on a Theme by Haydn; R. Strauss: Don Juan; Schubert: Symphony No. 9

31 May 1951
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra
Soloists: Igor Gorin (Baritone), Simeon Joyce (Piano)

7 June 1951
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Violin-Piano Works (Foster-Heifetz: “Jeanie with the Light Brown Hair”; Kreisler: “Leibeslied”; Sarasate: Introduction et Tarantelle); Mozart: Violin Concerto No. 4; Beethoven: Symphony No. 5
Soloists: Donna Grescoe (Violin), Simeon Joyce (Piano)

11 June 1951
Toronto, Canada
Beaches Orchestra
Rossini: Overture “The Barber of Seville”; Haydn: Symphony No. 100 (“Military”); Mozart: Symphony No. 35 (“Haffner”)

23 August 1951
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de la Radio del Estado
Berlioz: Overture “Le Carnaval Romain”; Brahms: Variations on a Theme by Haydn; Turina: Fantastic Dances; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5

30 August 1951
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de la Radio del Estado
6 September 1951
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de la Radio del Estado
E. Drangosch: Obertura Criolla, Op. 29; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”);
Mahler: Symphony No. 1

20 September 1951
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de la Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”, Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”), Symphony No. 5

22 September 1951
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de la Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”, Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”), Symphony No. 5

12 November 1951
Toronto, Canada
Forest Hill String Chamber Orchestra
Bloch: Concerto Grosso; Leo Smith: Occasion for Strings (Premiere); Tchaikovsky:
Serenade for Strings, Op. 48

23 January 1952 (Broadcast)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Broadcast
Schönberg: Transfigured Night

29 January 1952
Toronto, Canada
Department of Parks and recreation Community Centre Orchestra
Mozart: Ballet-Suite “Les Petits Riens”, Concerto for Violin No. 4, Serenade No. 12 for
Wind Instruments, Serenade No. 7 (“Haffner”)
Soloist: David Wulkan (Violin)

26 February 1952
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Berlioz: Overture “Le Carnaval Romain”; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy-Overture “Romeo and
Juliet”; Wagner: Overture “Rienzi”; Liszt: Les Preludes

20 March 1952
London, Canada
London Chamber Orchestra
Handel: Concerto Grosso, Op. 6, No. 1; Franck: Symphonic Variations; Mozart: Piano
Concerto No. 23 (K. 488), Overture “The Marriage of Figaro”
Soloist: Helen Ingram (Piano)
18 April 1952  
London, Canada  
London Chamber Orchestra  
J.S. Bach: Cantata No. 51 “Jauchzeit Gott in alle Lande”, Air in D from Suite No. 3, Brandenburg Concerto No. 3, Overture in G Minor  
Soloists: Eunice MacDonald (Soprano), Gerald Knipfel (Trumpet)

19 April 1952  
London, Canada  
London Chamber Orchestra  
J.S. Bach: Brandenburg Concerto No. 4, Trio in C Major, Concerto for Harpsichord (BWV 1056), Suite No. 2

6 October 1952 (CBC Broadcast)  
Toronto, Canada  
CBC Symphony Orchestra  
Mahler: Symphony No. 3 (Second Movement); R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel; Mahler: Songs of a Wayfarer  
Soloist: James Milligan (Baritone)

13 October 1952 (Broadcast)  
Toronto, Canada  
CBC Symphony Orchestra  
Scarlatti: Ballet-Suite from “The Good Humoured Ladies”; Brahms: Symphony No. 4

20 October 1952  
London, Canada  
London Chamber Orchestra  
J.S. Bach: Overture in G Minor; Schubert: Symphony No. 5; Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 2  
Soloist: Helen Ingram (Piano)

22 October 1952  
Toronto, Canada  
Department of Parks and recreation Community Centre Orchestra  
Schubert: Overture “In the Italian Style”, Symphony No. 8 (“Unfinished”); Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”, Symphony No. 2

2 November 1952  
Valencia, Spain  
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia  
J.S. Bach: Overture No. 6 (?); Dittersdorf: Sinfonia No. 3 (“Actaeon”); Brahms: Symphony No. 4

9 November 1952
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Symphony No. 7; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Alexander Brott: Quebec, British Columbia (Two Movements from the Canadian Suite); Chabrier: España

16 November 1952
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Weber: Overture “Oberon”; Tchaikovsky: Serenade, Op. 48; A. Brott: Fancy and Folly (Valencia Premiere); Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”)

21 November 1952
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Symphony No. 7; Weber: Overture “Oberon”; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Tárrega: Two Brief Pieces; Chabrier: España

23 November 1952
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Schubert: Symphony No. 8 (“Unfinished”); Mahler: Das Lied von der Erde (Spain Premiere)
Soloists: Fuensanta Sola (Contralto), Jesus Aguirre (Tenor)

24 November 1952
Valencia Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Dittersdorf: Sinfonia No. 3 (“Actaeon”); Mahler: Das Lied von der Erde
Soloists: Fuensanta Sola (Contralto), Jesus Aguirre (Tenor)

30 November 1952
Valencia Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mendelssohn: Overture “Fingal’s Cave”; Ravel: Ma Mere L’Oye; Smetana: “Vltava”; Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”)

7 December 1952
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Schubert: Overture “Rosamunde”; E. Lopez Chavarri: Acuarelas Valencianas; Paul Creston: Chant of 1942 (Spain Premiere); Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5

14 December 1952
Valencia Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Symphony No. 5; Wagner: Prelude from “Lohengrin”, Prelude and Death from “Tristan and Isolde”, Overture “Rienzi”

7 January 1953
Hull, England
Yorkshire Symphony Orchestra

9 January 1953
Huddersfield, England
Yorkshire Symphony Orchestra

10 January 1953
Leeds, England
Yorkshire Symphony Orchestra

11 January 1953
Wakefield, England
Yorkshire Symphony Orchestra

21 January 1953
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”, Symphony No. 2, Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)

25 January 1953
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
J.S. Bach: Brandenburg Concerto No. 4 (Valencia Premiere); Paul Creston: Chant of 1942; Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)

1 February 1953
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 (“Pathetique”); Turina: Fantastic Dances; Berlioz: Three Pieces from “The Damnation of Faust”; J. Strauss: Waltz “Roses from the South”

8 February 1953
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Sinfónica de Madrid
Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5; de Falla: “The Three-Cornered Hat”; R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel

15 February 1953
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

22 February 1953
Madrid, Spain
Orquesta Sinfónica de Madrid
Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”); Wagner: Prelude from “Lohengrin”, Prelude and Death from “Tristan and Isolde”, Overture “Rienzi”

1 March 1953
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Symphony No. 2; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8; R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel

2 March 1953
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
J.S. Bach: Brandenburg Concerto No. 4; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8; de Falla: “The Three-Cornered Hat”; R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel

23 April 1953
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Beethoven: Overture “Coriolan”, Piano Concerto No. 3, Symphony No. 7
Soloist: Lubka Kolessa (Piano)

6 May 1953
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
J.S. Bach: Overture in G Minor, Harpsichord Concerto in F Minor, Brandenburg Concerto No. 3, Air from Suite No. 3 in D, Suite No. 2 in B Minor
Soloist: Greta Kraus (Harpsichord)

14 May 1953
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Soloist: Robert Warburton (Viola)
26 May 1953
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Mozart: Symphony No. 35 ("Haffner"), Aria "Il re pastore"; Mahler: Adagietto from symphony No. 5, Two Songs from the Des Knaben Wunderhorn ("Wo die schönen Trompeten Blasen", "Wer hat dies Liedlein erdacht?"); Schubert: Symphony No. 6
Soloist: Lois Marshall (Soprano)

17 September 1953
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra
Creston: Chant of 1942 (Canada Premiere); Songs (Handel: "Lascia Chio Pianga", "Un Cenno Leggiadretto"; Canteloube: Three Songs of the Auvergne); Rossini: Overture "La Scala de Seta"; Bizet: Three Arias from "Carmen" ("Habanera", "Sequidilla", "Gypsy Song"); Dvorak: Symphony No. 8
Soloist: Gladys Swarthout (Mezzo-Soprano)

19 October 1953 (CBC Broadcast Date)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Handel-Elgar: Overture in D Minor; Nielsen: Symphony No. 4 "The Inextinguishable" (Canada Premiere)

6 November 1953
Guildford, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Borodin: Overture "Prince Igor"; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 ("Pathetique"); Smetana: "Vltava"; Berlioz: Three Pieces from "The Damnation of Faust"

16 November 1953
Acton, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Borodin: Overture "Prince Igor"; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 ("Pathetique"); Smetana: "Vltava"; Berlioz: Three Pieces from "The Damnation of Faust"

23 November 1953
High Wycombe, England
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Borodin: Overture "Prince Igor"; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 ("Pathetique"); Smetana: "Vltava"; Berlioz: Three Pieces from "The Damnation of Faust"

6 December 1953 (Broadcast?)
England
BBC Symphony Orchestra
Mozart: Symphony No. 38 ("Prague"); Schumann: Concert Piece for Four Horns and Orchestra, Symphony No. 3 ("Rhenish") (Edited by Mahler)
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23 February 1954  
Toronto, Canada  
Toronto Symphony Orchestra (Police Concert)  
Auber: Overture “Fra Diavolo”; Massenet: Aria “Il est doux, il est bon” from “Herodiade”; Verdi: Aria “Pace, pace, mio Dio” from “La Forza del Destino”; Beethoven: Symphony No. 5; Liszt: Piano Concerto No. 2; Songs (Speaks: “Morning”; Rachmaninov: “Floods of Spring”; Charles: “Let My Song Fill Your Heart”); A. Brott: “British Columbia”  
Soloists: Eileen Farrell (Soprano), Freda Terpel (Piano)

2 March 1954  
Toronto, Canada  
Community Centres Orchestra  
Soloist: Catherine Howard (Contralto)

20 April 1954  
Toronto, Canada  
York Concert Society  
Beethoven: Overture “The Creatures of Prometheus”, Violin Concerto, Symphony No. 8  
Soloist: Betty-Jean Hagen (Violin)

4 May 1954  
Toronto, Canada  
York Concert Society  
Rossini: Overture “La Scala di Seta”; Schumann: Piano Concerto; Harry Freedman: Tableau; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”)  
Soloist: Emil Debusman (Piano)

18 May 1954  
Toronto, Canada  
York Concert Society  
J.S. Bach: Brandenburg Concerto No. 4, Harpsichord Concerto in D Minor; Handel: Concerto Grosso No. 16; Scarlatti: Andante; Vivaldi: Concerto alla Rustica  
Soloist: Greta Kraus (Harpsichord)

27 May 1954  
Toronto, Canada  
York Concert Society  
Brahms: Variations on a Theme by Haydn; Mahler: Kindertotenlieder; Frederick Karam: Poem for String Orchestra; Schumann: Symphony No. 3 (“Rhenish”)  
Soloist: James Milligan (Baritone)
17 June 1954
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra
Auber: Overture “Fra Diavolo”; Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”; Grieg: Piano Concerto (First Movement only); J. Strauss: Waltz “Roses from the South”; Piano Solos (Chopin: Impromptu No. 2; Schumann: Intermezzo; Paganini-Liszt: Etude in A Minor); Liszt: Les Preludes
Soloist: Patricia Parr (Piano)

29 July 1954
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra
Soloist: Mary Syme (Piano)

6 August 1954 (CBC Broadcast)
Vancouver, Canada
CBC Vancouver String Orchestra
Harry Freedman: Tableau; J.S. Bach: Suite

8 August 1954
Vancouver, Canada
BC Electric Orchestra
Soloist: Bruce Holman (Tenor)

13 August 1954
Vancouver, Canada
CBC Vancouver String Orchestra
Bloch: Concerto Grosso; D. Scarlatti (Arr. Tommasini): Five Sonatas

15-21 August 1954 (Precise Date Unknown)
Winnipeg, Canada
CBC Winnipeg Concert Orchestra
Mozart: Suite “Les Petits Riens”; Dittersdorf: Sinfonia No. 3 (“Actaeon”); Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”)

16 September 1954
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Symphony No. 2, No. 3 (“Eroica”)

19 September 1954
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Symphony No. 2, No. 3 (“Eroica”)

23 September 1954
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Symphony No. 1, No. 4, No. 5

26 September 1954
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Symphony No. 1, No. 4, No. 5

30 September 1954
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”), No. 7

3 October 1954
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”), No. 7

7 October 1954
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Symphony No. 8, No. 9
Soloists: Angel Mattielo (Baritone), Maria Kallay (Soprano), Sante Borolen (Tenor), Franca Golob (Contralto)

9 October 1954
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Symphony No. 8, No. 9
Soloists: Angel Mattielo (Baritone), Maria Kallay (Soprano), Sante Rosolen (Tenor), Franca Golob (Contralto)

10 October 1954
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Orquesta Sinfónica de Radio del Estado
Beethoven: Symphony No. 8, No. 9
Soloists: Angel Mattiello (Baritone), Maria Kallay (Soprano), Sante Rosolen (Tenor), Franca Golob (Contralto)

6 December 1954 (CBC Broadcast)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Wagner: Siegfried Idyll; Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”)

13 December 1954 (CBC Broadcast)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Mahler: Symphony No. 4 (CBC Premiere)
Soloist: Elizabeth Benson-Guy (Soprano)

5 January 1955 (CBC Broadcast)
Toronto, Canada
Unknown Orchestra
J.S. Bach: Keyboard Concerto in D Minor
Soloist: Beatrice Bennett (Piano)

21 February 1955 (CBC Broadcast)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Schumann: Overture “Genoveva”; Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 3; Brahms: Variations on a Theme by Haydn
Soloist: Glenn Gould (Piano)

3 March 1955
Toronto, Canada
Community Centres Orchestra
Gluck: Overture “Iphigenia in Aulis”; Haydn: Symphony No. 103; Schubert: Symphony No. 6; J. Strauss: Waltz “Roses from the South”

24 March 1955
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Vivaldi: Concerto Grosso in G Minor, Op. 3, No. 2, Concerto Grosso Op. 3, No. 10; Corelli: Concerto Grosso Op. 6, No. 8; J.S. Bach: Adagio from Cantata No. 156; Bloch: Concerto Grosso No. 2; Bizet: Adagietto from “L’Arlesienne”; Rossini: Sonata
Soloists: Hyman Goodman, Isidore Dresser, Beauna Somerville, Steven Staryk

30 March 1955 (Broadcast – Radio Documentary)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Mahler: Songs of a Wayfarer, Kindertotenlieder, First Movement from Symphony No. 3, First Two Movements from Das Lied von der Erde
Soloists: Trudi Carlyle (Mezzo-Soprano), Andre Turp (Tenor), James Milligan (Baritone)

26 April 1955
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Schumann: Overture “Genoveva”; Brahms: Violin Concerto; Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Betty-Jean Hagen (Violin)

5 May 1955
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Soloist: Jan Rubes (Bass)

19 May 1955
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”), Piano Concerto No. 2, Overture “Leonore” No. 3
Soloist: Patricia Parr (Piano)

16 June 1955
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra
Smetana: Overture “The Bartered Bride”; Tartini: Violin Concerto No. 1; Scarlatti-Tommasini: Andante from Suite “The Good Humoured Ladies”; R. Strauss: Don Juan; Violin Solos (Rachmaninov: Romance; Vieuxtemps: Rondino); Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 3 (“Scottish”)
Soloist: Pearl Palmason (Violin)

23 June 1955
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra
Soloists: James Lamond (Tenor)

9 July 1955 (CBC TV Broadcast)
Canada
Soloists: Camilla Williams (Soprano), Jon Crain (Tenor), Colette Merola (Mezzo-Soprano), Napoleon Bisson (Baritone), Joseph Rouleau (Bass)

10 July 1955 (CBC Broadcast Date)
Winnipeg, Canada
Mozart: Serenade No. 7; Schubert: Symphony No. 5

15 July 1955 (CBC Broadcast Date)
Vancouver, Canada
Vancouver Chamber Orchestra
Mozart: Symphony No. 38 (“Prague”); Wolf: Italian Serenade

17 July 1955
Vancouver, Canada
BC Electric Orchestra
Auber: Overture “Fra Diavolo; Bizet: Suite “L’Arlesienne No. 2”; Grieg: “In the Hall of the Mountain King”; Smetana: “Vltava”; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8

29 July 1956
Vancouver, Canada
BC Electric Orchestra
Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”); Unknown

28 August 1955
Mexico City, Mexico
Orquesta Sinfónica de la Universidad
Beethoven: Overture “Leonore No. 3”; Chopin: Piano Concerto No. 2; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Walter Hautzig (Piano)

4 November 1955
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Soloist: Lois Marshall (Soprano)

9 November 1955
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Berlioz: Overture “Le Carnaval Romain”; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; 
Beethoven: Symphony No. 8; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5

19 December 1955
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Ginastera: Variaciones Concertantes; Berlioz: Les Nuits d’Ete
Soloist: Elizabeth Benson-Guy (Soprano)

26 December 1955
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Bruckner: Symphony No. 4 (“Romantic”)

8 February 1956
Oslo, Norway
Filharmonisk Selskaps Orchester
Dittersdorf: Sinfonia No. 3 (“Actaeon”); R. Skrede: “Den kvite fuglen”; Mahler:
Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Randi Helseth (Soprano)

February 1956 (Precise Date Unknown)
Oslo, Norway
Oslo Philharmonic Society
Mahler: Symphony No. 2

22 February 1956
Berlin, Germany
Berlin Philharmonic
Smetana: Overture “The Bartered Bride”, Maria’s Aria from “The Bartered Bride”; 
Dvorak: “Song to the Moon” from “Rusalka”; Smetana: “Vltava”; Dvorak: Symphony
No. 9 (“From the New World”)
Soloist: Anny Schlemm (Soprano)

23 February 1956
Smetana: Overture “The Bartered Bride”, Maria’s Aria from “The Bartered Bride”; 
Dvorak: “Song to the Moon” from “Rusalka”; Smetana: “Vltava”; Dvorak: Symphony
No. 9 (“From the New World”)
Soloist: Anny Schlemm (Soprano)

12 March 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
No. 6 (“Pastoral”); Ginastera: Variaciones Concertantes (Valencia Premiere)
22 March 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

25 March 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mendelssohn: Overture “Ruy Blas”; Ginastera: Variaciones Concertantes; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5

27 March 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

17 April 1956
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
J.S. Bach: Brandenburg Concerto No. 3; Handel: Aria “As when the dove” from “Acis and Galatea”; Dittersdorf: Symphony “The Four Ages”; Haydn: Aria “Oh how pleasing to the senses” from “The Seasons”; Mozart: Serenade No. 12 for Winds, Symphony No. 38 (“Prague”) Soloist: Elizabeth Benson-Guy (Soprano)

24 April 1956
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Mendelssohn: Overture “Ruy Blas”; Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 1; Brahms: Symphony No. 1 Soloist: Beatrice Bennett (Piano)

8 May 1956
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Beethoven: Grosse Fugue, Op. 133, Triple Concerto for Piano, Violin and Cello, Symphony No. 2 Soloists: Pierre Souverain (Piano), Hyman Goodman (Violin), Rowland Pack (Cello)

15 May 1956
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Weber: Overture “Oberon”; Catalani-Zandonai: “In Sogno” (Canada Premiere); Mahler: Songs of a Wayfarer; Weber (arr. Mahler): Entr’acte Music from “the Three Pintos”; Schubert: Symphony No. 9
Soloist: Maureen Forrester (Contralto)

31 May 1956
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra
Soloist: Vaclovas Verikaitis (Baritone)

14 June 1956
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra
Soloist: Selma Jetmundson (Soprano)

14 July 1956
Stratford, Canada
Festival Orchestra
Beethoven: Overture “The Creatures of Prometheus”, Piano Concerto No. 1, Symphony No. 7, Piano Concerto No. 5 (“Emperor”)
Soloist: Claudio Arrau (Piano)

29 July 1956
Vancouver, Canada
BC Electric Orchestra
Mendelssohn: Overture “Ruy Blas”; P. Mercure: Pantomime (Premiere); Meyerbeer: “O Paradiso”; Dittersdorf: Symphony “The Four Ages”; Songs (Strauss: With all my Heart”; Geehl: “For You Alone”); Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”)
Soloist: Karl Norman (Tenor)

12 August 1956
Vancouver, Canada
BC Electric Orchestra
O. Morawetz: Overture “Carneval”; Vocal Works (Saint-Saens: “My Heart at Thy Sweet Voice” from “Samson and Delilah”; “Drink to Me Only with Thine Eyes”); Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”); Tchaikovsky: Nutcracker Suite; Vocal Works
(Rachmaninov: “In the Silence of the Night”; Tchaikovsky: “None but the Lonely Heart”); Liszt: Hungarian Rhapsody No. 1
Soloist: Irene Byatt (Vocalist)

8 October 1956 (CBC Broadcast)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Smartini-Martucci: Pastorale; Mahler: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Elizabeth Benson-Guy (Soprano)

15 October 1956 (CBC Broadcast)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
F. Valen: The Silent Island; Schumann: Symphony No. 3 (“Rhenish”); Turina: Fantastic Dances

4 November 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mendelssohn: Overture “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”, Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”);
Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”)

November 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Symphony No. 6 (“Pastoral”); Turina: Fantastic Dances; Liszt: Les Preludes

November 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel; Tchaikovsky: Serenade for Strings, Op. 48; Schumann: Symphony No. 3 (“Rhenish”)

25 November 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mendelssohn: Overture “A Midsummer Night’s Dream; Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”);
Rimsky-Korsakov: Scheherazade

2 December 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mozart: Serenade for Strings; Rossini: Sonata for Strings (Valencia Premiere); Mahler: Symphony No. 1

3 December 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Schumann: Symphony No. 3 (“Rhenish”); Mahler: Symphony No. 1

9 December 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”, Symphony No. 7; Pino Donatti: Tre Acquarelli Paesani (Valencia Premiere); Catalani-Zandonai: In Sogno (Valencia Premiere); J. Strauss: Waltz “Roses from the South”

16 December 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; Mario Zafred: Sinfonietta (Valencia Premiere); Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 (“Pathetique”)

20 December 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

21 December 1956
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 (“Pathetique”); Pino Donatti: Tre Acquarelli Paesani; Catalani-Zandonai: In Sogno; Rossini: Sonata for Strings; J. Strauss: Waltz “Roses from the South”

17 January 1957
Oslo, Norway
Filharmonisk Selskaps Orchester
Dittersdorf: Sinfonia No. 3 (“Actaeon”); Schubert: Symphony No. 5; Mahler: Das Lied von der Erde
Soloists: Kerstin Meyer (Alto), Arne Hendriksen (Tenor)

18 January 1957
Oslo, Norway
Filharmonisk Selskaps Orchester
Schubert: Symphony No. 5; Mahler: Das Lied von der Erde
Soloists: Kerstin Meyer (Alto), Arne Hendriksen (Tenor)

23 January 1957
Willowdale, Canada
Metro Orchestra
Cimarosa: Overture “Il Matrimonio Segreto”; Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 2; Schubert: Symphony No. 4 (“Tragic”)
Soloist: Dorene Uren (Piano)

30 April 1957
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Mozart: Eine Kleine Nachtmusik, Recitativo and Aria of Susanna (“Deh vieni, non tardar”) from “The Marriage of Figaro”; Aria of Constaza (“Martern aller Arten”) from “Il Seraglio”; Mahler: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Lois Marshall (Soprano)

7 May 1957
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Reznicek: Overture “Donna Diana”; F. Valen: The Silent Island; Prokofiev: Piano Concerto No. 3; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Moura Lympany (Piano)

14 May 1957
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Mendelssohn: Overture “Athalia”, Violin Concerto in E Minor; Pino Donatti: Tre Acquarelli Paesani; Brahms: Symphony No. 3; Weinberger: Polka and Fugue from “Schwanda the Bagpiper”
Soloist: Michael Rabin (Violin)

21 May 1957
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Beethoven: Overture “Coriolan”, Piano Concerto No. 5 (“Emperor”), Symphony No. 3
Soloist: Boris Roubakine (Piano)

24 June 1957
Canada
CBC Strings
Handel: Concerto Grosso No. 5; J.S. Bach: Brandenburg Concerto No. 3; Bloch: Concerto Grosso No. 2; Rossini: Sonata for Strings

31 June 1957 (CBC Broadcast)
Stratford, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Violet Archer: Fanfare and Passacaglia; R. Strauss: Four Last Songs, Death and Transfiguration; Nielsen: Symphony No. 4 (“The Inextinguishable”)
Soloist: Lois Marshall (Soprano)
22 January 1958
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Beethoven: Overture “Prometheus”; Mahler: Three Songs (“Ich atmet’ einen linden Duft”, “Ich bin der Welt abhanden gekommen”, “Um Mitternacht”), Symphony No. 2 (“‘Resurrection’) (Canada Premiere)
Soloists: Elizabeth Benson-Guy (Soprano), Mary Simmons (Soprano)

9 February 1958
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Soloist: Elizabeth Benson Guy (Soprano)

12 February 1958
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; W. Braunfels: Phantastic Apparitions of a Theme by Hector Berlioz (Canada Premiere); Beethoven: Symphony No. 7

22 April 1958
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Pfitzner: Three Palestrina Preludes; Schumann: Piano Concerto; Berlioz: Symphonie fantastique
Soloist: Patricia Parr (Piano)

29 April 1958
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Handel: Concerto Grosso, Op. 6, No. 5; Vaughan Williams: Violin Concerto in D Minor (Concerto Academico); Vivaldi: Violin Concerto in E Major (“La Primavera”); Schoenberg: Transfigured Night
Soloist: Betty-Jean Hagen (Violin)

6 May 1958
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
H. Somers: Passacaglia and Fugue; Tchaikovsky: Piano Concerto No. 1; Dvorak: Symphony No. 8
Soloist: Alexander Uninsky (Piano)
13 May 1958
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Beethoven: Overture “Fidelio”, Symphony No. 1, Symphony No. 4, Overture “Leonore No. 3”

21 October 1958
Etobicoke, Canada
York Concert Society
Handel: Concerto Grosso Op. 6, No. 5; J.S. Bach: Suite in B Minor; Corelli: Concerto Grosso Op. 6, No. 8; Harry Freedman: Tableau; Tchaikovsky: Serenade for Strings, Op. 48; Rossini: Sonata in C Major

30 November 1958
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mozart: Symphony No. 33; R. Strauss: Metamorphosen (Valencia Premiere); Beethoven: Symphony No. 7

7 December 1958
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; O. Morawetz: Divertimento (Spain Premiere); Turina: Fantastic Dances; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5

14 December 1958
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
R. Strauss: Death and Transfiguration; Berlioz: Symphonie fantastique

15 December 1958
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mozart: Symphony No. 33; R. Strauss: Metamorphosen; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5

4 January 1959 (Recording Date)
London, England
London Symphony Orchestra
Mahler: Das Lied von der Erde
Soloists: Unknown

25 February 1959
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Mozart: Overture “The Marriage of Figaro”; Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 4; Mahler: Symphony No. 5 (Canada Premiere)
Soloist: Moura Lympany (Piano)

15 March 1959
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Handel: Cantata “Apollo e Dafne”; Brahms: Variations on a Theme by Haydn; R. Strauss: Closing scene from “Capriccio”
Soloists: Elizabeth Benson-Guy (Soprano), Norman Farrow (Bass-Baritone)

21 April 1959
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Mendelssohn: Overture “Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage”; Mahler: Songs of a Wayfarer; Bruckner: Symphony No. 4 (“Romantic”)
Soloist: Elena Nikolaidi (Mezzo-Soprano)

5 May 1959
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
J.S. Bach: Suite in G Minor, Keyboard Concerto in F Minor; R. Strauss: Metamorposen; Haydn: Keyboard Concerto in D Major; Mozart: Symphony No. 33
Soloist: Greta Kraus (Harpsichord)

12 May 1959
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Schubert: Overture “Rosamunde”; Mozart: Adagio for Solo Violin (K. 261); Menotti: Violin Concerto (Canada Premiere); Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 (“Pathetique”)
Soloist: Tossy Spivakovsky (Violin)

20 May 1959
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Beethoven: Symphony No. 8, No. 9
Soloists: Elizabeth Benson-Guy (Soprano), Irene Byatt (?), Alan Crofoot (Tenor), Jan Simons (Baritone)

29 May 1959
Lima, Peru
Orquesta Sinfónica Nacional
Handel: Concerto Grosso, Op. 6, No. 5 (Lima Premiere); Mozart: Piano Concerto No. 24 (K. 491); Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”)
Soloist: André Tschaikovsky

5 June 1959
Lima, Peru
Orquesta Sinfónica Nacional
Auber: Overture “Fra Diavolo” (Lima Premiere); Mozart: Symphony No. 33; R. Strauss: Death and Transfiguration; Schumann: Symphony No. 3 (“Rhenish”) (Lima Premiere); Wagner: Overture “Rienzi”

15 July 1959
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Summer Symphony Orchestra
Auber: Overture “Fra Diavolo”; Mozart: Symphony No. 23; Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 (“From the New World”); J. Strauss: Waltz “Roses from the South”

October 1959 (Precise Date uncertain)
Cologne, Germany
Westdeutschen Rundfunks
Repertoire Unknown

25 November 1959
Stuttgart, Germany
Stuttgart Philharmonic
Mendelssohn: Overture “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”; Schumann: Piano Concerto; Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Dorothea Braus (Piano)

November/December 1959
London, England
London Symphony Orchestra/BBC Choir
Mahler: Songs (“Ich atmet einen linden Duft”, “Revelge”, Liebst du Schonheit”, Blicke mir nicht in die Lieder”, Ich bin der Welt abhanden gekommen”, “Der Tambourg’sell”, Um Mitternacht”), Das Klagende Lied (Uncertain)
Soloists: Richard Lewis (Tenor), Kerstin Meyer (Soprano)

13 January 1960
Geneva, Switzerland
L’Orchestre de la Suisse Romande
Beethoven: Overture “Egmont”; Mozart: Violin Concerto No. 7 (apocryphal); Berlioz: Symphonie fantastique
Soloist: Charles Cyroulnik (Violin)

12 February 1960 (CBC Broadcast)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Busoni: Sarabande and Cortege from “Doktor Faust”; Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 3 (“Scottish”)

24 February 1960
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Schubert: Symphony No. 8 ("Unfinished"); Mahler: Das Lied von der Erde
Soloists: Elena Nikolaidi (Mezzo-Soprano), David Lloyd (Tenor)

15 April 1960 (CBC Broadcast Date)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Weber (Arr. Mahler): Excerpts from "The Three Pintos"; Mahler: Symphony No. 1

26 April 1960
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Mozart: Serenade No. 7 ("Haffner"), Piano Concerto No. 26 ("Coronation"), Symphony No. 41 ("Jupiter")
Soloist: Walter Susskind (Piano)

3 May 1960
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Vivaldi: Concerto No. 1 for Flute and Strings "La Tempesta di Mare"; R. Strauss: Sextet for Strings (Introduction to "Capriccio") (Canada Premiere); J.S. Bach: Brandenburg Concerto No. 4; Healey Willan: Poem for Strings; J.S. Bach: Brandenburg Concerto No. 5; Vivaldi: Concerto alla Rustica
Soloists: Gordon Day (Flute), Nicholas Fiore (Flute), Greta Kraus (Harpischord), Albert Pratz (Violin)

10 May 1960
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Pergolesi-Stravinsky: Suite "Pulcinella"; Chopin: Piano Concerto No. 1; Franck: Symphony in D Minor
Soloist: Mieczyslaw Horszowski (Piano)

17 May 1960
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Beethoven: Overture "Leonore No. 3", Violin Concerto, Symphony No. 5
Soloist: Betty-Jean Hagen (Violin)

13 November 1960
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mozart: Symphony No. 39; Boris Blacher: Concertante Music for Orchestra, Op. 10 (Valencia Premiere); Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 ("Eroica")

20 November 1960
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Schubert: Symphony No. 8 ("Unfinished"); Mahler: Symphony No. 1

21 November 1960
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Boris Blacher: Concertante Music for Orchestra, Op. 10; Mozart: Symphony No. 39; Mahler: Symphony No. 1

1 March 1961 (CBC Broadcast Date 8 March 1960)
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Brahms: Variations on a Theme by Haydn; Mahler: Symphony No. 1

10 May 1961 (CBC Broadcast Date)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Strings
A. Hamerik: Symphonie Spirituelle

17 May 1961 (CBC Broadcast Date)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Strings
R. Strauss: Metamorphosen; Handel: Minuet from Concerto Grosso, Op. 6, No. 5

5 November 1961
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Weber: Overture "Oberon"; Dvorak: Symphony No. 9 ("From the New World"); Wagner: Prelude to Act I from "Lohengrin", Prelude and Death from "Tristan and Isolde", Overture "Die Meistersinger"

12 November 1961
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Overture "The Creatures of Prometheus"; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 ("Pathetique"); Turina: Fantastic Dances; R. Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel

13 November 1961
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Weber: Overture "Oberon"; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 ("Pathetique"); Wagner: Prelude to Act I from "Lohengrin", Prelude and Death from "Tristan and Isolde", Overture "Die Meistersinger"

8 April 1962 (CBC Broadcast Date)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Concert Orchestra

12 April 1962
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Mozart: Symphony No. 40, Aria of Ilia (“Zeffiretti lusinghieri”) from “Idomineo”, Aria of the Queen of the Night (“O zitt’re nicht, mein lieber Sohn”) from “The Magic Flute”; Mahler: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Elizabeth Benson-Guy (Soprano)

25 April 1962
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
A. Hamerik: Symphonie Spirituelle; J.S. Bach: Violin Concerto in E Major (BWV 1042); Haydn: Violin Concerto No. 1 in C Major; Schoenberg: Transfigured Night
Soloist: Oscar Shumsky (Violin)

2 May 1962
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Gluck: Chaconne from “Orpheus and Eurydice”; Danzi: Sinfonia Concertante for Clarinet and Bassoon (Canada Premiere); Schumann: Introduction and Allegro for Piano and Orchestra, Op. 134 (Canada Premiere); Mendelssohn: Serenade and Allegro Giocoso for Piano and Orchestra, Op. 43 (Canada Premiere); Schubert: Symphony No. 6
Soloists: Abe Galper (Clarinet), Nicholas Kilburn (Bassoon), Anton Kuerti (Piano)

16 May 1962
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Beethoven: Music to Egmont (Complete), Overture “Leonore No. 2”, Aria of Leonore (“Abscheulicher, wo eilst du hin”) from “Fidelio”, Symphony No. 7
Soloist: Mary Simmons (Soprano)

15 July 1962
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Summer Symphony Orchestra

28 October 1962
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Mozart: Symphony No. 40; Berlioz: Symphonie fantastique
4 November 1962  
Valencia, Spain  
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia  
Mendelssohn: Overture and Scherzo “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Schubert: Symphony No. 6; J. Strauss: Waltz “The Blue Danube”

5 November 1962  
Valencia, Spain  
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia  
Mozart: Symphony No. 40; Mahler: Adagietto from Symphony No. 5; Schubert: Symphony No. 6

11 November 1962  
Valencia, Spain  
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia  
Wagner: Prelude to “Lohengrin”; R. Strauss: Death and Transfiguration; Beethoven: Symphony No. 5

22 January 1963  
Toronto, Canada  
Toronto Symphony Orchestra  
Wagner: Prelude to “Lohengrin”, Aria of Elisabeth from “Tannhauser”, Ballade of Santa from “The Flying Dutchman”; Mahler: Scherzo and Burlesque from Symphony No. 9  
Soloist: Lois Marshall (Soprano)

23 January 1963  
Toronto, Canada  
Toronto Symphony Orchestra  
Wagner: Prelude and Elsa’s Dream from “Lohengrin”, Aria and Prayer of Elisabeth from “Tannhauser”, Ballade of Santa from “The Flying Dutchman”; Mahler: Symphony No. 9 (Canada Premiere)  
Soloist: Lois Marshall (Soprano)

4 April 1963  
Toronto, Canada  
York Concert Society  
Haydn: Symphony No. 100 (“Military”); Mozart: Piano Concerto No. 20 (K. 466); Stravinsky: Eight Instrumental Miniatures; Beethoven: Symphony No. 2  
Soloist: Paul Helmer (Piano)

(Unconfirmed)

18 April 1963  
Toronto, Canada  
York Concert Society  
Bettinelli: Sinfonia da Camera (Canada Premiere); Boccherini: Cello Concerto; Saint-Saens: Cello Concerto No. 1; Bizet: Symphony No. 1
Soloist: Leonard Rose (Cello)

2 May 1963
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Mendelssohn: Overture “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”; Harry Somers: Fantasia for Orchestra (Toronto Premiere); Prokofiev: Violin Concerto No. 2; Brahms: Symphony No. 4
Soloist: Hyman Bress (Violin)

18 October 1963
Stuttgart, Germany
Stuttgart Philharmonic
Soloist: Shmuel Ashkenasi (Violin)

3 November 1963
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Beethoven: Overture “Coriolan”, Symphony No. 2, Symphony No. 7

11 November 1963
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia

17 November 1963
Valencia, Spain
Orquesta Municipal de Valencia
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”; R. Strauss: Don Juan; Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 5

5 January 1964 (CBC Broadcast Date)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
Bruckner: Symphony No. 4 (“Romantic”)

4 February 1964
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra/ Toronto Mendelssohn Choir
Schubert: Overture “Rosamunde”; Mahler: Symphony No. 3 (Toronto Premiere)
Soloists: Mary Simmons (Soprano)

12 March 1964
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Weber: Overture “Der Freischütz”, Aria of Agatha from “‘Der Freischütz’;
Mendelssohn: Symphony No. 4 (“Italian”); R. Strauss: Four Last Songs, Death and
Transfiguration
Soloist: Lois Marshall (Soprano)

2 April 1964
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
J.S. Bach: Suite in G Minor; Stamitz: Symphony in F Major; Mozart: Violin Concerto
No. 4 (K. 218); Morawetz: Divertimento; Bloch: Concerto Grosso No. 2; Rossini: Sonata
for Strings
Soloist: Betty-Jean Hagen (Violin)

30 April 1964
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Beethoven: Symphony No. 1, Piano Concerto No. 5 (“Emperor”), Symphony No. 8
Soloist: Anton Kuerti (Piano)

10 May 1964
Toronto, Canada
York Concert Society
Beethoven: Overture “The Creatures of Prometheus”, Symphony No. 1, Symphony No. 8

23 June 1964
Toronto, Canada
Members of the CBC and Toronto Symphony Orchestras
Villa Lobos: Bachianas Brasileiras No. 5 (Mary Morrison (Soprano)); Schubert: Serenade
(Maureen Forrester (Contralto)); S. Barber: Reincarnations (The Festival Singers of
Toronto, Elmer Iseler, Cond.); R. Strauss: “Beim Schlafengehen im Abendrot” from
“Four Last Songs” (Lois Marshall, Soprano); Beethoven: Symphony No. 9
Soloists: Lois Marshall (Soprano), Maureen Forester (Contralto), Garnet Brooks (Tenor),
Jan Simons (Baritone)

24 June 1964 (CBC TV Broadcast Date)
Toronto, Canada
CBC Symphony Orchestra
R. Strauss: Songs, Till Eulenspiegel, Four Last Songs
Soloists: Lois Marshall (Soprano), Hermann Prey (Baritone)

2 February 1965 (CBC Broadcast 7 February 1965)
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Schubert: Symphony No. 8 (“Unfinished”); Mahler: Das Lied von der Erde
Soloists: Lili Chookasian (Contralto), Garnet Brooks (Tenor)
February 1965 (CBC Broadcast 28 February 1965)
Toronto, Canada
Toronto Symphony Orchestra
Mahler: Symphony No. 6 ("Tragic") (First Three Movements) (Canada Premiere)

OTHER SIGNIFICANT CONCERTS (UNKNOWN DATES)
Circa 1920s
Vienna, Austria
Vienna Symphony Orchestra
Mahler: Symphony No. 1

KNOWN CONCERTS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Winter 1924
Ukraine, Soviet Union
7 Concerts (2 Concerts in Kiev, 2 Concerts in Kharkov, 3 Concerts in Odessa)
Repertoire Unknown

Spring 1926
Leningrad and Moscow, Russia
7 Concerts (6 Concerts in Leningrad (including a performance of Bruckner: Symphony No. 9), 1 Concert in Moscow)
Further Repertoire Unknown

Summer 1928
Ukraine
Unknown Number of Concerts in Kharkov and Kiev
Tchaikovsky: Symphony No. 6 ("Pathetique"); Further Repertoire Unknown

August 1929
Baku, Azerbaijan
Unknown Orchestra (Possibly Leningrad Philharmonic Orchestra on Tour)
Approx. 12 Concerts
Repertoire Unknown

Summer 1930
Kislovodsk, Russia
Leningrad Philharmonic Orchestra
5 Concerts (of 10 Scheduled)
Repertoire Unknown

Summer 1933
Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and Baku (Azerbaijan)
Unknown Repertoire
30 January 1935
Leningrad, Russia
Leningrad Symphony Orchestra
Mozart: Requiem

31 January 1935
Leningrad, Russia
Leningrad Symphony Orchestra
Mozart: Requiem

27 February 1935
Leningrad, Russia
J.S. Bach: St. Matthew Passion
Leningrad State Academic Philharmonic

1 March 1935
Leningrad, Russia
J.S. Bach: St. Matthew Passion
Leningrad State Academic Philharmonic

22 November 1935
Leningrad, Russia
State Philharmonic Academic Choir
Haydn: The Seasons

26 November 1935
Leningrad, Russia
State Philharmonic Academic Choir
Haydn: The Seasons

1935 or 1936 (Day and Month Unknown)
Tbilisi, Georgia
State Symphonic Orchestra
Berlioz: Symphonie fantastique; Chopin: Piano Concerto (No. 1 or 2); Tchaikovsky: Fantasy Overture “Romeo and Juliet”
Soloist: Bublikov (Piano)

1935 or 1936 (Day and Month Unknown)
Tbilisi, Georgia
State Symphonic Orchestra
Berlioz: Symphonie fantastique; Wagner: Isolde’s Death from “Tristan and Isolde”; Liszt: Les Preludes
Soloist: Beatrice Valatstsi (?) (Soprano)

5 March 1937
Leningrad, Russia
Leningrad Philharmonic Orchestra (?)
Smetana: “Vltava”; Kabalevsky: Piano Concerto No. 2; Dvorak: Symphony No. 9
(“From the New World”)
Soloist: Kabalevsky (Piano)

1-12 April 1937 (Precise Date Unknown)
Leningrad, Russia
Leningrad Radio Orchestra or Leningrad Symphony Orchestra
B. Savelyev: Red Army Suite; V. Sheherbachev: The Storm

Date Unknown
Leningrad, Russia
Leningrad Conservatory and Opera Studio
Weber: Der Freischütz