

Creative Expression: An Imminent Clash as Experienced by Three Artists

Author: Laura Goodhue

Persistent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/4427>

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](#),
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2005

Copyright is held by the author, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise noted.

Chapter 1: Tensions in Germany and the Entartete Kunst Exhibition

Ancient civilizations create an image for themselves in history by leaving behind remnants of their culture, specifically writings and artwork. When a leader decides to deprive his nation of such cultural markings and instead completely censor all means of creative expression, he takes away a crucial part of a successful society and invites failure. During the rule of Adolf Hitler and the Third Reich, in Nazi Germany in the 1930s and 1940s, modern German artists, musicians and writers were branded with the label “degenerate.” The Nazis arranged an exhibition of “degenerate” art (Entartete Kunst), shown in Munich in 1937 to insult and degrade artists who are recognized today as some of the most talented artists of the twentieth century. The success of the exhibition affected each artist in a different manner. Many fled Germany and ventured to the United States while others unwilling to leave their homeland suppressed their creative impulses for a life of fear and psychological torture in Germany. The horrific and irreversible effects on the German artists and culture can only be adequately discussed in the context of the time period preceding the exhibition. The movement toward abstraction and expression in art clashed with the rise of Nazi aesthetics to culminate in the exhibition of “degenerate” art.

In the early years of the 20th century, German artists revolutionized the definition of art by extending its boundaries from classical themes and realistic depictions of established subjects, to include broken lines, jagged shapes, distorted figures and everyday objects. Two main art movements, Expressionism and Dada, coupled with the many innovative art schools established throughout Germany, created an open environment in which to relay personal expression through avant-garde artwork. Simultaneously, the National Socialists gained muscle throughout Germany. They began to take aim at avant-garde art. One of their first targets was the leading experimental art school, the Bauhaus. In their campaign to eradicate modern art, the Nazis struck a final blow to freedom of creativity in the culminating clash between freethinking, progressive artists and Nazi notions of aesthetics. This clash, the Entartete Kunst exhibition, changed the lives of all talented artists, among them Max Beckmann, Oskar Schlemmer and Ernest Barlach whose experiences will be studied in subsequent chapters.

Many of the artists effected created works in the Expressionist style. Expressionism finds its origins in the virtually simultaneous creation of art movements in Munich and Dresden at the turn of the century. The liberal art scene in Dresden inspired four young architecture students, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Fritz Bleyl, Erich Heckel and Karl Schmidt-Rottluff to form a group in 1905 to encourage individuality in art¹. They called themselves Die Brücke meaning “The Bridge,” and they rejected formal instruction (Figure 1-1). They argued that art could not be taught but must instead be a manifestation of the individual’s personal emotions². Die Brücke artists visited museums in Dresden and openly admired the works of great artists from the past such as Toulouse-Lautrec and Albrecht Durer. They combined expression with tribal motifs inspired by

African and Iberian art that they discovered in Dresden's ethnographic museum, to create an art of spontaneity, honesty and emotional truth³. Dresden offered a safe, peaceful and encouraging place for the members of Die Brucke to flourish. The group expanded and extended membership to many German and foreign artists including Emil Nolde in 1906⁴. Although the group broke up some time in 1913, they set a tone for modern art. This tone of individuality and spontaneity also flourished in other German cities, all the while gaining momentum and support. It came to embody the notion of art that the Nazis fought so hard to stifle.

Around the same time in Munich, the artists Alexej von Jawlensky, Alexander Kanoldt, Adolf Erbsloh, Marianne Werefkin, Gabriele Munter and Wassily Kandinsky joined together to create Die Neue Kunstlervereinigung, (New Artist's Alliance)⁵ (Figure 1-2). This group came together in 1909 to foster a fusion of inner being and external nature in one emotionally charged expression⁶. Die Neue Kunstlervereinigung extended membership to painters and sculptors as well as dancers, actors and other performance artists. They exhibited art in the Galerie Thannhauser and included works by Georges Braque, Pablo Picasso, and Odilon Redon⁷. The artists, working in an array of mediums, coalesced with the purpose to be revolutionary and create art derived from "inner necessity"⁸. As a means of validating their goals with the general public and also honoring the great classical artists before them, Die Neue Kunstlervereinigung gave credit to Russian fresco scenes as a major source of inspiration⁹. This group of self-proclaimed artistic revolutionists still felt bound by ties to classic art. The end of the group came in 1911 when Die Neue Kunstlervereinigung's selection jury rejected some of Wassily Kandinsky's new work for an exhibition in the Galerie Thannhauser¹⁰.

Feeling betrayed and constrained, Kandinsky left the group taking Franz Marc and Gabriel Muntter with him.

Kandinsky, Muntter and Marc founded Der Blaue Reiter (The Blue Rider) with the distinct goal to push the boundaries of art, a desire suppressed by Die Neue Kunstlervereinigung. In addition to their own works, the group exhibited works by Die Brucke artists as well as Paul Cézanne and Robert Delaunay at the Galerie Thannhauser¹¹. Like Die Brucke, the artists of Der Blaue Reiter appreciated primitive art. However, the Munich group also greeted Cubism and Abstract painting as exciting sources of inspiration in their earliest stages¹².

Approximately ten years after the Expressionists began working in Germany a group of expatriates founded an art movement calling itself “Dada” in Zurich, Switzerland in 1916. Many artists ranging from painters to actors found relief from the chaos of World War I in Dada's absurd and humorous style. The intrinsic irony of turning pain and war into an art based on absurdity took root at the Cabaret Voltaire that the Germans Hugo Ball, and Emmy Hennings, and the Romanian Tristan Tzara, had founded in Zurich. The trio performed elaborate theatrical events that turned the culture and current political affairs into material for jokes. The mockery of contemporary German politics seen in this form of theater inspired artists to transform the irony and jest into artwork. Dada artists proclaimed the inherent superiority of the “new”. Like Expressionists, they aspired to create from internal, spontaneous human feeling. Taking Expressionist excitement and political criticism to a more complex level, they merged the boundaries between art forms, leaving the door open for collage and performance art to have equal significance and effect (Figure 1-4). Dada artists used found, everyday objects

to make personal and political statements in their art, drawing the fire of many art critics who saw the art as large collections of junk rather than art in the traditional sense. In effect this was the desired outcome of the Dada artists: to challenge the previous notions of what constituted artwork. With the conclusion of the war, many of the artists who had gathered at the Café Voltaire brought Dada back to Germany.

The immediate postwar period in Germany also witnessed the creation of the Bauhaus in 1919 (Figure 1-5) dedicated to innovative art education and to the merging of modern art and technology. Germany had recently surpassed England as the world leader of technology, and people sought a marriage of art and industry to reinforce the power of the German culture¹³. The young but already successful architect Walter Gropius founded the Bauhaus in Weimar, a city already associated with innovation as the site of the writing of the new democratic constitution by the National Assembly of the First German Republic¹⁴. The democratic constitution fostered a receptive and open environment for Gropius and the Bauhaus school¹⁵. The Bauhaus employed prominent teachers such as Wassily Kandinsky, Oskar Schlemmer, Paul Klee and later Joseph Albers who had been a Bauhaus student. The Bauhaus students held nighttime lectures and readings open to members of the public. Despite their desires to give back to society, the Bauhaus faced enormous dissent from members of the general public in Weimar. Many people favored art in the traditional sense because it was familiar. They opposed Expressionism's radicalism and emphasis on the individual's emotions, and they opposed the radical experimentation of the Bauhaus.

Under extreme pressure to relocate, Gropius moved the school from Weimar to Dessau in 1925 where he hoped to see his school run without interruption or criticism¹⁶.

Although the school did not close officially until 1933, harsh opposition began in 1930 when the National Socialists won power in the local state government of Thuringia, and Wilhelm Frick, Minister of Education, made a public move against modern art, modern culture and the Bauhaus program. When the National Socialists gained control of the national government in 1933, they forced the Bauhaus to close. They transformed the modernist facade of the Dessau Bauhaus school building into their own conservative Academy of Architecture and Handicrafts¹⁷. By taking over the Bauhaus and denouncing its artists, the National Socialists began their attacks on modern art that culminated in the Entartete Kunst exhibition.

Many supposedly scientific claims added to the Nazi assertions that modern art embodied the decay of society. The main tenant of Nazism stresses the “superiority” of the Aryan race, an idea carried over into the criticism of artwork. Nazi leaders believed, as Helmut Lehmann-Haupt stated, that “hereditary determinism dictated not only physical appearance, but the political, intellectual, and spiritual structure of personality, society, and nation¹⁸”. In the early 1900s Pieter Camper used facial measurements to rank the races according to intelligence and beauty¹⁹. Hans Gunther published works that “scientifically” proved the superiority of the Aryan race. Famous for his book entitled “Degeneration”, Max Nordau linked modern art with sexual promiscuity, genetic mutation, diseases and criminal acts²⁰. The dislike for modern abstract art, combined with the “pseudo-scientific populist literature²¹” that had become widespread since the end of the nineteenth century, led to the Nazis’ concept of “degenerate” art.

A discussion of the psychology surrounding Nazi rule and the motivation of the masses to follow a horrific regime in murder and cultural annihilation will help to

understand this baffling phenomenon. It will also emphasize the extent to which the “entartete” artists represented a minority in a land of evil and censorship. The Nazi program attracted people who were hostile to the Weimar Republic. Many German’s, bitter about the loss of World War I, deplored the pacifism and personal expression praised during the Weimar Republic²². Right-wing intellectuals opposed the liberal ideas inherent in the new democratic constitution²³. During the 1920s and early 1930s, Germany witnessed extreme poverty, which the Nazis blamed on the Republican government. They appealed to suffering workers by promising better working conditions²⁴. The Nazis used the new mass medium of radio to heighten the emotional response to the first form of loud, attention-grabbing mass communication²⁵.

The Nazis were obsessed with art because they used it as a tool for propaganda and as a symbol of status. To the highest members of the group who spent most of the time competing for power, art became a mark of rank. The person with the largest art collection had the most power. It is no wonder then that Hitler’s own personal collection stood as the largest among the officers with an astounding 6,755 paintings²⁶. Hitler enlisted the help of Albert Speer to redecorate the walls of his private chancellery to “impress and intimidate” by exploiting the splendor of the room²⁷ (Figure 1-6). Speer took photos of the chancellery to use as propaganda. With such large art collections in their personal possessions, the Nazi leaders considered themselves the barometers of culture, specifically art. They believed that they had the wisdom and right to decide the “aesthetic policies” of the nation²⁸.

In their private collections, the Nazi elite only wanted works by old masters that illustrated the traditional, neo-classical style²⁹. They set out to regain all artwork by

German artists that had ever left the country. Joseph Goebbels, the head of the Reichspropaganda Leitung (State Propaganda Leadership of the Nazi Party), made a list of all the works that had left Germany since the 1500s³⁰. The Nazis were drawn to the classical style because they believed that the Greek and Roman sculptures specifically embodied, in white marble, the ideal physical form of the Aryan race (Figure 1-7)³¹. Hitler wanted to communicate with the masses through an art that met his agenda. He relished art that glorified the peasantry and the military³² while promoting community and the superiority of the Aryan race. For Hitler, classical art proved the Aryans to be the superior cultural leaders and thus the most superior race on earth³³. Using classical models helped validate his new art in the minds of people who already identified the classical art with beauty³⁴.

Idealizing art as a tool for propaganda and exploiting neo-classical artists for political use began with Anton Raphael Mengs³⁵. A painter during the 18th century, Mengs originated the idea of “classical aesthetics, namely that beauty was found in the art that aesthetically appealed to the majority of people, specifically classical art”³⁶. The Nazis followed this idea in creating their own art. Joseph Goebbels hired a traditional, neo-classical artist named Adolf Ziegler to create art for the Nazi cause (Figure 1-8). His works showed idealized, strong nudes³⁷.

While praising this contrived neo-classical style, the Nazis condemned the contemporary artwork of schools and groups such as Die Brucke, Der Blaue Reiter and the Bauhaus as “degenerate.” Any art provoking critical thinking, individual expression or imperfection threatened the Nazi concepts of a unified, obedient Aryan race³⁸. Abstract, formless, energetic, strange, challenging, and fragmented work fell under the

large, insulting veil of “degeneration”³⁹. Public speeches against the artists helped rally the German people behind Hitler. In 1937, on “the Day of German Art”, Hitler exalted works of Adolf Ziegler and other neo-classical artists (Figure 1-9)⁴⁰. After clearly defining “good” art for the public, the Nazis began work on the Entartete Kunst exhibition (Figures 1-10, 1-11).

In 1937, in one great effort to rid Germany of “degenerate” art, the National Socialist Party organized an exhibition to open in Munich on July 19. To acquire the works for the exhibition, Goebbels and Hitler ordered the collection of over 16,000 pieces from museums all over Germany⁴¹. Containing works of Expressionist, Cubist, Surrealist and Dadaist artists, the Entartete Kunst exhibition aimed to show the German public that a cultural monstrosity had been created. Publicly mocked and belittled, the “entartete” artists, as Robert Wistrich describes, were “accused of having traitorously blasphemed against the German fatherland and its army, mocked religion, perfidiously raised prostitution to a moral ideal and insulted the German motherhood.”⁴²

The Nazis divided the artwork on display into nine groups by subject matter. Work in the first three groups comprised the bulk of the exhibition. The first group included works with wild, tribal shapes and colors. Condemned as primitive representations of inane subject matter, this category encompassed most of the work found in the exhibition⁴³. Religious Christian images comprised the second group. The Nazis claimed that many modern artists purposely defamed Christian symbols⁴⁴. The third and most personally threatening group to the Nazis was art that encouraged politically anarchist behavior. By jamming the artwork onto small walls covered in

graffiti, the Nazis publicly mocked modern art to unify people in disgust at works they did not understand⁴⁵.

When the exhibition ended, the Nazis, in an act of blatant hypocrisy, began a mass effort to sell the works back to the institutions they stole them from originally, under the condition that the institutions keep the works off display⁴⁶. If the museums could not afford to repurchase the works, the Nazis then tried to trade them for classical paintings and sculptures. In the spring of 1939, all the pieces remaining were declared worthless and were destroyed⁴⁷.

The years preceding World War II had fostered the birth of numerous groups of progressive, experimental artists who set the tone for artists all over Germany and beyond. In these years of individuality, spontaneity, absurdity, revolution and boundary-less art, Expressionism, Dada and the Bauhaus school collectively caused the explosion of modern figurative and abstract art in Germany. This atmosphere of creativity and cultural freedom clashed with National Socialist objectives. In one culminating event, the Entartete Kunst exhibition of “degenerate” art crushed the avant-garde with a forceful blow. Many artists fled from Germany while others stayed to face seclusion and persecution. Each artist subjected to humiliation in the exhibition has a unique, powerful story. The remainder of this paper will focus on the lives of three German artists before and after the exhibition. These artists, Max Beckmann, Oskar Schlemmer and Ernst Barlach, dealt with squandering of their creativity in three different manners, however their painful stories all reveal one common lesson: Germany’s irreversible mistake in displacing modern culture in the nineteen thirties serves as an example of the critical role that creative expression plays in a free society.

Chapter 2: Ernst Barlach

My little boat is sinking fast. The louder the Heils roar, instead of cheering and raising my arm in Roman attitudes, the more I pull my hat down over my eyes.

Ernst Barlach⁴⁸

While the exhibition represents the macroscopic effects of the National Socialists on German culture and people, each individual artist's story offers a microscopic view of the personal tragedy wrought at the hands of Hitler and the Nazis. The sculptor Ernst Barlach (Figure 2-1) felt the pressure of censorship and hatred of his artwork, but remained optimistic that justice would prevail. Barlach chose to stay in Germany despite hostility and severe artistic limitations. Through the 1930s Barlach's health paralleled the criticism and destruction of his work. Upon hearing in 1938 that the National Socialists had forbidden him under the most severe penalties to exhibit his work not only publicly but also privately, he lost the will to battle his heart disease⁴⁹. Barlach died of a heart attack approximately one year after the Entartete Kunst exhibition. Not even the obituaries in German newspapers spared him cruel words, calling him un-German, offensive and degenerate⁵⁰.

Despite this ignominious end, Barlach's career had begun positively. Working in Dresden, Paris and Berlin, Barlach experienced great success as a sculptor and playwright in the early 1900's⁵¹. He gained national recognition in the Berlin Secession exhibition of 1907 and had his first major exhibition of sculptures in the gallery of Paul Cassirer⁵². He

wrote his first play in 1912 at the age of 42. While writing plays, Barlach proved his aptitude in the visual arts by illustrating Goethe's *Faust* and Schiller's *Ode to Joy*⁵³. Around the same time Cassirer signed Barlach to a contract hiring him to work as a full-time artist⁵⁴. The National Socialists would later use the fact that Cassirer was a Jew as "proof" that Barlach himself was Jewish⁵⁵. However until the 1930s the German public praised Barlach's sculptures and plays. His expressionist style and apparent talent landed him many commissions across Germany.

Barlach's ability to tap human emotion and sculpt timeless figures was inspired by a trip to Russia in 1906 that permanently changed his style⁵⁶. In Russia he saw beggars in the streets and peasants sowing the fields. He concluded that the poverty and solidity of the people working the earth constituted the link between humanity and nature⁵⁷. In the Russian countryside Barlach discovered the power of human emotion, which he was inspired to capture through artistic expression⁵⁸. He deeply believed that all humans shared the same struggles and fears he saw in the Russian beggars⁵⁹. They were "symbols of the human condition in its nakedness between heaven and earth."⁶⁰ A drawing created after his time in Russia, *A Russian Couple* (Figure, 2-2), marks the stylistic birth of his signature figures⁶¹. Another example *Blind Beggar* (Figure, 2-3) reveals the emotionality in Barlach's early sculptures. A seated man rocks backward as he gazes up toward heaven. His cheek muscles strain to push his mouth into a tense pucker. With hunched, smooth shoulders and curving lines in the rags that serve as drapery, Barlach's beggar is ennobled, tangible and serene. In later war memorial commissions, Barlach's depiction of peasants and beggars as the ultimate display of human existence first angered people who

wanted to see war memorials that idealized death, and later angered the National Socialists who found fault in Barlach's theme more so than his style⁶².

The emotionality that his sculptures evoke defines Barlach as an Expressionist. Although many of his sculptures were cast in bronze, his choice of wood as a favorite carving material also suggested expressionism because of its links to primitive civilizations⁶³. In his 1926 *The Fettered Witch* (Figure, 2-4), Barlach turns the witch's face into an African Mask, typical of the expressionist approach⁶⁴. The mask-like features that define the witch's face are the large eyes, heavy lines, hyper-defined eyebrows, and a long nose. Other Expressionist artists incorporated shapes and colors from African masks into their work. In Emil Nolde's *Mask Still Life III* from 1911 (Figure, 2-5), five faces float against a dripping green background. The colorful, angular, body-less faces resemble African masks.

Barlach's sculptures can be divided into two categories based on size. He created small-scale sculptures for museums and shows, and large-scale commissions for churches and war memorials. His small-scale sculptures like *The Fettered Witch* (Figure, 2-4) and *The Avenger* (Figure, 2-6) are smooth and harmonious, relying on simple shapes and continuous lines. Dressed in timeless garb, his figures represent an emotion derived from the human condition, not specific individuals⁶⁵. Unlike other expressionists such as Oskar Kokoschka, Barlach's peasants, while they are social outcasts, are solid and strong not deformed, erotic, tormented or violent⁶⁶. In *The Avenger* of 1914 (Figure, 2-6), a peasant darts quickly through space carrying a farming tool above his shoulder. He wears timeless cloak, which is defined by strong horizontal lines. The smooth contours and simple shapes show the determination and steady resolution of the peasant. The title, *The*

Avenger, embodies the pre-World War I sentiment of a frustrated working class, eager to move forward even if that meant war.

Much of the later opposition to these small-scale sculptures came from their titles and themes more than their actual stylistic execution. That a major source of opposition came in the works' titles is ironic because in most cases Barlach left his work to be titled by other people⁶⁷. Often times his non-violent sculptures acquired violent names. A perfect and ironic example is *The Berserker* (Figure, 2-7), a bronze cast of a smooth, triangular and completely non-violent figure contrasts with the violence in its name⁶⁸. In fact, Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's Propaganda Minister, praised *The Berserker* during a museum trip in 1924. He admired "the complex figure that its creator would have dismissed with a shrug."⁶⁹ Goebbels recognized the peasant's emotional complexity years before the National Socialists labeled Barlach as degenerate and destroyed his reputation⁷⁰.

Besides small-scale bronze sculptures, Barlach created commissions for many war memorials across Germany that also raised controversy. One major commission resulted in a sculpture that was suspended beneath the dome of the Gustrow Cathedral to commemorate the congregation members killed in World War I (Figure, 2-8). Barlach's design, a 7-foot bronze angel whose features resemble those of Barlach's close friend and fellow artist at the Prussian Academy of Arts, Kathe Kollwitz (Figure, 2-9), caused immediate controversy⁷¹. Many survivors felt betrayed that the work made no visual reference to the cause for which they fought, and did nothing to glorify the death of their comrades as patriotic duty⁷². His floating figure lies horizontally with hands crossed over her chest closes her eyes as she floats up. Her motionless drapery, simple geometric

frame and smooth contours create a solid figure hovering inside the dome. The figure makes no direct reference to the soldiers who died in the war. In fact, the only sign that this is a war memorial is the names of the 234 dead engraved in a book below the dome⁷³. Barlach's intention in this war memorial was to recall emotion and sorrow, not to ennoble or glorify death⁷⁴. His preoccupation with death and the raw reality behind it grew from his brief experience as a soldier in the German army when he concluded that war causes unnecessary and brutal death. In his memorials he aimed to recreate the grief associated with death⁷⁵.

Barlach's views resonated with many Germans in spite of its criticism. Seeing his skill in large-scale memorial commissions as evidence by the Gustrow dome figure, many other people commissioned Barlach to create large-scale memorials including *The Fighter of the Spirit* (Figure, 2-10) in Kiel and a war memorial in Magdeburg (Figure, 2-11)⁷⁶. Perhaps his most controversial large-scale sculpture, the memorial in Magdeburg meant to commemorate the fallen World War I soldiers, caused extreme tension with two conservative veterans' groups: the Stahlhelm (steel helmet) and the Stahlhelm's ladies' auxiliary⁷⁷. They protested his representation of six people on two different registers. Three soldiers stand carrying a cross engraved with significant dates in the war. Below them, a skeleton sinks into the ground while a poor veiled woman and a horrified man kneel next to the skeleton. Full of terror, the motionless scene, defined by strict vertical lines and covered faces, spares no ghastly detail to reveal the true horror of war. Barlach even included a gas mask hanging from the neck of one figure. The same man holds his own head to prevent it from rolling off his shoulders. These ghastly soldiers exist in a hellish world separate from the realm of the viewer⁷⁸.

This wooden monument, Barlach's only war memorial to include any visual reference to war, received the most protest because it did not idealize the German soldier⁷⁹. Missing the significance inherent in Barlach's harsh realism, the two Stahlhelm groups labeled Barlach a communist. They claimed that the soldiers' faces resembled people of Slavic descent and that the memorial mocked war and death⁸⁰. Barlach stood by his work asserting that nearly two million Germans had died gruesome deaths in the war, and there was no justification only grief⁸¹. Although he argued that his works were apolitical, the controversy surrounding them was inescapable and Barlach's work took on political associations⁸². The negative attention forced the cancellation of a war memorial in its early planning stages in Malchin and halted completion of the niche figures for St. Catherine's Church in Lubeck⁸³.

Barlach had been commissioned to create sculptures to fill all the niches on the facade of St. Catherine's Church. However, only three were completed. The three figures, forming *The Community of the Holy One* (Figure, 2-12), are made of glazed brick and reveal human emotion with the same simplicity and dignity as his small-scale works of peasants and beggars. The man in the central niche is *The Crippled Beggar*. He clings to his crutches as he gazes into heaven with determination and awe. *The Crippled Beggar* is now in the Busch-Reisinger Museum at Harvard University in Cambridge. A weathered woman stands in the niche to his right, strong and solid despite the sadness in her gaunt face. To the left of *The Crippled Beggar*, a choirboy holds sheet music as his lips open in joyous praise. This trio, completed in 1933, is one of Barlach's only group works. As Nazi condemnation culminated, he only carved single works that could be easily sold⁸⁴.

Significant trouble for Barlach began in June of 1932 when the National Socialists won the election in Mecklenburg-Schwerin where he lived. Galvanized by this victory, those opposed to Barlach's work threatened him and damaged his property⁸⁵. Hoodlums smashed his windows, and the police read his mail. The National Socialists censored his work and watched his house⁸⁶. He was upset that none of his attackers would openly challenge him. Barlach knew that the National Socialist party criticized him, but no individuals in his hometown of Gustrow, where his house was vandalized and his life threatened, openly admitted their actions. Barlach concluded that all of Germany was equally hypocritical in the 1930s⁸⁷.

In the months before Hitler became chancellor, Barlach spoke out on the radio in a series of talks called "Artists on their Times." He spoke of the increasing threat to artistic expression, stating that a great clash was taking over Germany; a clash between "those who possess spiritual values and those who do not"⁸⁸. He vehemently pointed to Hitler and the Nazis as blind destroyers posing a serious threat to all of Germany⁸⁹. In his radio speech, Barlach openly criticized the recent expulsion of his two friends Kathe Kollwitz and Heinrich Mann from the Prussian Academy of Arts for political reasons⁹⁰. The Law for the Reestablishment of Professional Officialdom of April 7, 1933 legally sanctioned these unwarranted expulsions⁹¹. In reaction to Barlach's bold statements, the man holding the land deed to his house in Gustrow declared that the document was a forgery, and Barlach found himself homeless⁹².

As the National Socialists gained power, they kept an unwritten list of grievances against Ernst Barlach. They labeled him degenerate for several reasons and accused him of being Jewish despite written proof of his gentile descent⁹³. They despised the Russian

(Slavic) origin of the inspiration for his work and harped on his much earlier association with the turn of the century Berlin Secession and its leader Max Liebermann who was Jewish⁹⁴. Although Barlach had papers proving his gentile decent, he acted in defiance by refusing to publicly refute the Nazi claims that he was a Jew. To argue the point would be to accept that being Jewish was a crime⁹⁵.

The Nazis also condemned his choice of subject matter. They charged that his small-scale works were expressionist representations of the deformed and inferior members of society, namely peasants, beggars and witches. The most notorious German critic of modern art was Paul Schultze-Naumburg. In his earlier career as an architect, Schultze-Naumburg had fanatically searched for a link between genetics and artistic ability⁹⁶. He attempted to “scientifically” prove an innate link between mentally and physically handicapped individuals and the deformed figures that Barlach, Nolde, and Kirchner created. By placing photographs of deformed individuals, whom the Nazis associated with impurity, next to these expressionist images (Figure, 2-13), Schultze-Naumburg set out to prove that only racially “impure” artists could create “impure” art⁹⁷. He charged that these artists violated the Nazi standard for “good” art designed to unify Germany and show strong Aryan people⁹⁸.

Throughout the period of constant scrutiny and harsh criticism, Barlach remained calm and quiet. He did not respond because he denied the severity of his situation. He truly believed that in the end justice would prevail and he would gain his artistic freedom and positive recognition⁹⁹. However, not all of Barlach’s friends were content with allowing the National Socialists to defame their friend. When Barlach would not openly refute the claims that he was Jewish, one friend published the papers proving his gentile

descent in a newspaper, hoping to restore Barlach to dignity regardless of the absurd nature of the Nazis' condemnation.

The National Socialists interpreted this move as defiant opposition¹⁰⁰. His plays and exhibitions were cancelled. Museums removed all of his sculptures from display¹⁰¹. For example *Christ and John* (Figure, 2-14) was removed from the museum in Schwerin and his drama *The Genuine Sedemunds* in Altona was closed¹⁰². His Magdeburg monument ended up in storage and his 3 niche sculptures from Saint Catherine's were removed, including *The Crippled Beggar* that ended up in Boston's Busch-Reisinger Museum. The rest of his large-scale public monuments met a more tragic fate. The National Socialists melted down his floating angel sculpture in the ceiling of the Gustrow dome and cut the Kiel monument into three pieces¹⁰³.

The National Socialists included only one small-scale Barlach sculpture in the Entartete Kunst exhibition. A small wooden sculpture *Christ and John* (Figure, 2-14) was "described...as two monkeys in nightshirts"¹⁰⁴. It served as an example of the glorification of deformities. In this vertically oriented sculpture, a tired Christ with an over-sized head and feet supports a sagging, elderly John. The exhibition dismissed the emotion and beautiful humanity of *Christ and John* and labeled the work as an example of deformed, degenerate expressionist art¹⁰⁵. In the early days of the exhibition a Swiss woman tried to buy the work, but later it was removed from display all together¹⁰⁶.

By the end of 1937, two of Barlach's sculptures remained standing in public places, while 387 works had been removed¹⁰⁷. Only his monument titled *Meter Dolorosa* in the St. Nikolaus Church (Figure 2-15) and his Bremen woodcarving *Shepherd in a Storm* remained in their intended public settings¹⁰⁸. In spite of this abuse, he did not stop

creating entirely, sculpting an artistic response to Nazi oppression in his 1937 *The Evil Year*. In this work a young girl, obviously suffering and tired, seems to be on her last breaths of life¹⁰⁹.

The National Socialists destroyed many of the removed works as well as Barlach's reputation and essentially his life. They forbade him from exhibiting work in the public or private sector and took away his livelihood¹¹⁰. Some of the National Socialist officers, who referred to Barlach as an alien amongst the German people, strongly suggested that he emigrate¹¹¹. Choosing to remain in Germany, Barlach's health deteriorated in the years following the exhibition and he died in 1938 without the knowledge that his work would ever be praised in museums again.

Ernst Barlach's life chronicles the impact of Nazi rule on the creative backbone of Germany. The artist who was inspired by the beauty, grace and humanity of the hardworking peasants and beggars in the Russian countryside, who created small-scale sculptures with smooth, soft curving lines, and who won commission after commission for his large-scale war memorials, left a body of work powerful in its execution as well as its oppression. Refusing to leave the country that had betrayed him, Barlach remained in Germany through physical, emotional and professional abuse of the most evil kind. Barlach's enemies ruined his house, turned family members against him and destroyed his masterpieces, melting many down for scrap metal or simply cutting them into pieces¹¹². When the Germans destroyed Barlach's art, they essentially killed him. A year after the exhibition Barlach died, leaving behind a tragic but important story of the triumph of creative genius, a victory Barlach would not witness in his lifetime, over the most evil and destructive regime in history.

Chapter 3: Max Beckmann

You don't have to respond to the painting so intensely that you get the whole meaning. When you look at a picture, first you should feel the quality of the painting; then later you can think it out. Every masterpiece has a quality of painting- but it must have an idea, a meaning too.

Max Beckmann¹¹³

In search of freedom and justice, two fundamental rights of man squandered under Hitler and the Third Reich, Max Beckmann fled Germany. As did Ernst Barlach, Max Beckmann enjoyed success and praise in Germany until the Nazis took power, and he and his work suffered discrimination and slander culminating in the Entartete Kunst exhibition. Unlike Barlach however, Beckmann fled from Germany and hid in the Netherlands during the war. He immigrated to the United States, a country eager to appreciate and aid modern German artists affected by the Third Reich's policy of intolerance. While his story continues well past the 1937 exhibition to his success in the United States, Beckmann never forgot Germany and his connection to a homeland he was never to see again.

Born in Leipzig Germany in 1884, Beckmann stayed in school until the age of fifteen when he dropped out and passed an exam necessary to avoid automatic placement in the German military¹¹⁴. Despite his lack of formal education, he enjoyed reading the works of many philosophers and poets such as Goethe, Nietzsche and the Brothers

Grimm. Because of his interest in philosophy, Beckmann constantly looked to the world around him for artistic inspiration especially in the diverse people he met on a daily basis¹¹⁵. His self-tutoring also led him deep into the field of art history where he studied works by the old masters¹¹⁶.

Beckmann was an athletic man with a large head that later became a signature of his many self-portrait images (Figure, 3-1). His friendly, humorous and egotistical personality stemmed from his inner desire to assume the role of the artist, a constant presence in everything he did¹¹⁷. Beckmann lived in Paris between 1903 and 1904 where he admired first-hand, the works of Cézanne, Manet and Monet. While his time in Paris proved influential and educational, he was relieved to return to Germany a year later¹¹⁸.

Shortly after his return, Beckmann won an award from the Art Association in Berlin when he showed his work titled *Young Men at the Sea* (Figure, 3-2)¹¹⁹. The scholarship, which allowed him to travel and study not only in Florence but also in Rome and India, exemplified the attitude among contemporary German artists that the world was open to them and their ideas. In the early 1900s, the modern German art scene saw no limits, only open doors¹²⁰. Success came quickly to Beckmann starting in 1910 when the members of the Berlin Secession elected him a director¹²¹. His first solo exhibition opened three years later in the Galerie Cassirer, the same gallery that housed Barlach's first major solo exhibition¹²². The same year Hans Kaiser wrote the first monograph on Beckmann, including illustrations of Beckmann's works and a very significant marker in the life of an artist. In the monograph Kaiser vehemently praised Beckmann as a genius capable of expressing the deepest feelings of human beings through the figures in his paintings¹²³. Beckmann's artistic career seemed assured.

In this same time period, Beckmann naively supported a war to unite what he viewed as a broken Germany. His notion of war as helpful was shattered almost immediately¹²⁴. His initial response to the war came in the form of drawings for the art history newspaper *Kunst und Künstler*, which commissioned him to document people's reactions to the war¹²⁵. In 1914 he joined the army as a medical orderly and later as a soldier, and he served in Prussia and Belgium¹²⁶.

His work from these years reflects his experience as a medical orderly. In his free time Beckmann sketched drawings of the wounded soldiers and corpses around him. In his *Self-Portrait as a Nurse* from 1915 (Figure, 3-3), Beckmann stares out with hardened eyes and a solemn face. He wears the red cross of a medical orderly but holds something outside the picture. The viewer must decide if he holds a medical instrument or a paintbrush. By hiding his implement, he captures his struggle between the grotesque world of a medical orderly and his desire to paint. Barlach visually records the images of war. This self-portrait, his least graphic illustration from his time in the army, focuses on his eyes, implying that Beckmann's eyes have seen horrors that even an artist cannot render onto canvas¹²⁷. As a member of the German Army, Beckmann witnessed so much death and destruction that in April of the same year he left the army a changed man. Beckmann stated later that the violence and inhumanity he experienced during his short stint in the army was the most decisive inspiration for his artwork¹²⁸.

By the end of the war his style had changed from bright color and painterly strokes that resembled the technique of the Impressionists, to sharp angles and flat dull colors¹²⁹. He developed the critical, ironic tone that marks so many of Beckmann's paintings including his *The Night* of 1918-19 (Figure, 3-4). In this horrific scene of

torture, rape and murder figures twist and bend in disturbing positions. Unlike images of Judgement Day such as Michelangelo's in the Sistine Chapel that offer hope among the gore (Figure, 3-5), *The Night* is a scene of hopelessness¹³⁰. The pain and crime is unwarranted and unrelenting for everyone involved. Seeing people kill one another in war influenced Beckmann to paint scenes of the senseless horror that men bring upon one another. Sharp angles of contorted limbs that fill the space create a visually harsh experience. The sharpened realism and dark drab colors reveal an innate irony and even bitterness¹³¹. Disturbing images such as *The Night* would later be used by the Nazis to prove his visual "deformation". His bitter critique of postwar Germany extended beyond painting to the stage. He wrote many plays including "The Ladies' Man" and "The Hotel," which used sarcasm as the main method of expression¹³². His interest in drama manifests visually in the spatial settings of his later paintings.

When his style changed as a result of his wartime experience, the critics praised his work even more so than before. In 1919 the Frankfurt Museum purchased his *Deposition* (Figure, 3-6), and the Mannheim Museum his *Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery* (Figure, 3-7)¹³³. Both works show the same sharp angles and drab colors as *The Night*. Beckmann created many religious works inspired by the scenes of death he had witnessed in the war. His depictions of traditional subjects are untraditional in their depiction. In the *Deposition* of 1917 (Figure, 3-6), bitter realism prevails. The people lowering a green-hued Christ from the cross must fight his rigor mortis to manage his long, Mannerist body. A darkened sun represents the underlying tone of desperation and hopelessness¹³⁴. One close friend recalls that "his brush was at its best when dipped in gall and vinegar,"¹³⁵ a statement proven by the high praise that his work generated. A

confident Beckmann, not afraid to share his views on the war, supporting many radical newspapers that popped up in Berlin around 1919¹³⁶.

An article in the newspaper *Le Figaro* referred to Beckman as a “German Picasso”.¹³⁷ Indeed there are many similarities between Beckmann and Picasso, but there are also important differences. Both men often referenced classically Western iconography. Another similarity comes through in the tone of their works. They rely on negative images as a power source. Both men depict the less pleasant side of society, often portraying brutal images and using role-playing as a means to express these feelings¹³⁸. Like Beckmann, war effected Picasso’s work, an example being his famous *Guernica* of 1937, a protest to the bombing of a Basque village during the Spanish Civil War (Figure, 3-8). A main difference comes in the way that the two men handle line and space. Picasso relies on fragmentation and uses sharp lines to bring recognizable figures close to abstraction. Beckmann adheres more to traditional figural representation but plays with space and the relationship it creates between humans and objects in the world¹³⁹. In the central panel of his 1936 triptych *Temptation* (Figure, 3-9), Beckmann places the figures into an unrealistic spatial arrangement. Beckmann hints at perspective by placing his model higher than the artist in the foreground, however because the figures are the same size and do not cast overlapping shadows, the woman appears to float above the painter.

The issue of space was one of the greatest problems that Beckmann grappled with in his lifetime. He criticized other artists such as Matisse and Picasso for their lack of depth¹⁴⁰. For Beckmann, spatial depth created the relationship between the elements in his works¹⁴¹. He always included many central focus points and allowed for different

interpretations of space around the figures, creating a world in which space defied the laws of gravity¹⁴². In many of his self-portrait works, he positions himself up close to the viewer in the foreground about to invade our space. A representative example is his *Self Portrait in a Tuxedo* in the Busch-Reisinger Museum (Figure, 3-10). These portraits reveal an artist trying to find his way through the broken, incongruous space¹⁴³. As a favorite type of image, Beckmann's self-portraits are straightforward and invasive. He avoids veiling his presence in myth or metamorphosis and instead leaves his image vulnerable, mocking himself in the work¹⁴⁴. Often times the smoke trails from a lit cigarette in his hand or a jazz instrument plays melodious tunes. Beckmann includes these transitional objects to link layers of space¹⁴⁵.

Between 1924 and 1930 Beckmann enjoyed the greatest financial prosperity and artistic respect of all the years he lived in Germany¹⁴⁶. I.B. Neumann, critic and gallery director, wrote Beckmann's second monograph and then signed him to a three-year contract for a handsome salary of 10,000 reichsmarks per year¹⁴⁷. During these years of prosperity Beckmann introduced lighter and brighter colors into his palette, a reflection of his overall happiness¹⁴⁸. His first American solo exhibit opened in New York in April of 1926 at I.B Neumann's New York Gallery and the National Gallery in Berlin bought his *Self-Portrait in a Tuxedo* in 1928¹⁴⁹. Despite all the success and patronage, a first sign of dissention came in 1933 when Beckmann's works ended up on display in an exhibition in Stuttgart titled "Spirit of November: Art in the Service of Subversion" in which it was mocked¹⁵⁰.

From that time on his admirers dwindled and public opinion began to sway under the increasingly shrill propoganda of the Third Reich. Beginning in 1932 many of his

exhibitions were cancelled. In March 1933, the Frankfurt School of Applied Arts, where he had taught since his earlier years of success, terminated his employment. Shortly after, the Nazis closed a gallery where Beckmann's work was displayed and removed his paintings from the Kronprinzenpalais, the museum of modern art in Berlin¹⁵¹. Until 1937 Beckmann lived with the knowledge that the Third Reich found his work offensive, but he did not grasp the extreme nature of the threat¹⁵². He mocked Hitler to his friends and even included him in *The Temptation of Saint Anthony* as a bellhop. The bowlegged bellhop's evil face reinforces the swastika formed by the victim's arms and the bellhop's legs¹⁵³. However, his fear quickly arose, in 1937 when Hitler spoke at the opening of the Haus der Deutschen Kunst in Munich and opened the Entartete Kunst exhibition shortly thereafter¹⁵⁴.

In the first room of the exhibition, which was devoted to religious images, hung two impressive Beckmann paintings, *Deposition* (Figure, 3-6) and *Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery* (Figure, 3-7). The Nazis deplored Beckmann's two works because they showed deformed, weighty and gaunt figures instead of an idealized savior. The Nazis accused Beckmann of attacking the value of family in his *Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery*, stating that depicting a Christ who forgives an adulteress was glorifying the ruin of family cohesion, an essential "value" to the Nazi idea of unity and Aryan supremacy¹⁵⁵.

Other works by Beckmann included in the exhibition were his *Parisian Carnival*, which the Nazis charged celebrated sexuality and promiscuity, and his *Self portrait with a Red Scarf* (Figure, 3-11)¹⁵⁶. The Nazis asserted that Beckmann's figures were grotesque, bulbous deformed, and "proved" the insanity and mental derangement of the

artist. To Hitler, that Beckmann would even paint himself in this deformed, abstract manner confirmed his position as a “degenerate” artist¹⁵⁷. Beckmann’s *Still Life with Saxophones* (Figure, 3-12) hung in the exhibition because of its tribute to Africa as the birthplace of jazz, Beckmann’s favorite type of music¹⁵⁸. A landscape with contorted spatial arrangements and eleven lithographs of beggars and prostitutes completed the assortment of Beckmann’s work displayed as “degenerate”¹⁵⁹.

In total, the Nazis confiscated over 500 works by Max Beckmann from museums and collections across Germany during their years of totalitarian rule¹⁶⁰. Of all the work confiscated, only his 1939 canvas *Queens* was burned in a fire after the Entartete Kunst exhibition. Compared to many German artists who lost their entire life’s work, Beckmann’s one loss is extremely low and undeniably fortunate¹⁶¹. The rest of his works were sold by the Nazis and found homes across Germany and abroad. In their act of extreme hypocrisy, the Nazis sold his *Masked Ball* for about 200 dollars to make money after the exhibition¹⁶². Many works escaped Germany via patrons in the United States including eight of his nine triptychs and his *Carnival* (Figure, 3-13)¹⁶³.

The German public’s positive reaction to the Entartete Kunst exhibition marked the end of Beckmann’s time in Germany. The Nazis were so obsessed with promoting “good” art and purification that they threatened to castrate the “degenerate” artists to keep them from procreating and passing their “distorted” vision on to future generations¹⁶⁴. Betrayed by the same public that had applauded the power of his talent years before, Beckmann felt hopeless and horrified. Unwilling to change his views or his artwork, he saw only one alternative. On the opening day of the Entartete Kunst

exhibition, Beckmann and his wife Quappi fled to Amsterdam, never to set foot in Germany again¹⁶⁵.

In Amsterdam the couple stayed with his wife's sister until settling into their own small but comfortable house where Beckmann kept his paintings stacked together facing the walls¹⁶⁶. He longed to return to Germany, knowing that his desires were impossible and keeping himself busy painting landscapes¹⁶⁷. Months after moving to Amsterdam poverty plagued the Beckmanns, but a saving grace came in the form of his longtime friend Steven Lackner who agreed to pay Beckmann a monthly stipend in return for two paintings each month¹⁶⁸. In 1938 the New Burlington Galleries in London exhibited Beckmann's work as part of a response to the Nazi suppression of modern art. At the opening of this exhibition Beckmann read a speech titled "On My Painting" to discuss the relationship between his artwork and politics, but the English public showed little interest in it¹⁶⁹.

While the German audience was hostile towards Beckmann and his art, the American audience loved the work of exiled German artists. Beckmann received enthusiastic reviews from the *New York Times* in response to an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York titled "Free German Art" in which his triptych *Departure* (Figure, 3-14) gained him positive media attention¹⁷⁰. Americans saw Beckmann and many other artists branded as "entartete" as the definition of freedom prevailing. Their art symbolized the culture that the Nazis had failed to permanently annihilate¹⁷¹. The lasting effects from war in Holland coupled with a tempting job offer to teach at Washington University in St. Louis gave Beckmann reason to move again in 1947, this time to the United States¹⁷².

A year after his move to America, Beckmann received an invitation to teach at the Frankfurt School in Germany. After World War II the Germans tried to entice many artists, whom they forced into exile years before, to return to Germany as a Band-Aid for their cultural wounds. Beckmann longed to return but could not leave the country that had just welcomed him so joyously for the one filled with memories of persecution and degradation¹⁷³. Beckmann chose to continue teaching and painting in the United States.

His style went through one last change in the late 1940's. He kept his signature irony but added Romanticism in his subject matter, painting an increasing number of sword wielding figures, classical columns, and knights in armor¹⁷⁴. The left panel of his 1949-50 triptych *The Argonauts* illustrates this development in style (Figure, 3-15). A woman model wearing classical Greek garb sits on an idol-like head as she turns to face the painter. Her breasts spill over her shirt and she wields a sword. This Greek goddess lacks the classical idealization seen in Greek and Roman sculptures but embodies many Romantic ideas. Unlike the gruesome, tormented figures in his early works such as *The Night* (Figure, 3-4), these people are strong and serene. Their muscular bodies are in natural, calm poses instead of twisted and angular. This change in style came at the end of his life after he had overcome the omnipresence of death in World War I and persecution in Nazi Germany. Beckmann had come to terms with his demons¹⁷⁵. In 1950, a few days after the completion of *Argonauts*, Beckmann died of heart failure on a street corner in New York City¹⁷⁶.

Beckmann had lived through the hellish days of the Third Reich propaganda and degradation to make a successful life for himself in the United States. He even revealed to a close friend that one good outcome arose from the horrors that led to him to

emigration from Germany, namely his strong relationship with his son from his first marriage¹⁷⁷. He had been married to Minna Tube with whom he had a son Peter who lived in the Netherlands. His ten years living in Amsterdam strengthened Beckmann's almost non-existent relationship with Peter, a fact for which he was forever grateful.¹⁷⁸

While Max Beckmann was able to find some positive results in an otherwise horrible situation, his life story illustrates the sorrow and heartache enveloped in his work. From his years as a medical orderly to the threats and confiscation of his work at the hands of the totalitarian Nazis, Beckmann developed a bitter negativity manifest in his work from the 1920s to 1940s. The eerie self-portraits and ironic religious scenes reveal a truth about the evil of humanity seen first hand in Hitler and the Third Reich. While Beckmann escaped physical harm by fleeing his homeland, the memories stayed fresh the rest of his life and live on in his canvases.

Chapter 4: Oskar Schlemmer

When the creative spirit comes over one...one becomes nothing but a medium, a tool...a transitional agent.

Oskar Schlemmer¹⁷⁹

Unlike Ernst Barlach who died a year after the Entartete Kunst exhibition, and Max Beckmann who fled on the day it opened, Oskar Schlemmer (Figure 4-1) remained in Germany for six years, coping with the repercussions of the exhibition while still living under Nazi rule. Despite suffering extreme poverty and working many degrading

jobs, Schlemmer refused to leave his country, ignoring help from friends in the United States who begged him to flee¹⁸⁰. Schlemmer died in 1943 in Baden-Baden, Germany of complications from his diabetes. A year before his death Schlemmer revealed in his diary that he felt guilty about betraying his artwork in the face of persecution and stated “my depression persists unabated. I should have disappeared in 1933, gone somewhere abroad where no one knows me, instead of going through the undignified performance of selling my soul before the throne of artistic conscience for a few pieces of silver¹⁸¹.” His troubled final years are a case study of the effects of censorship not only on artistic style but also on the psyche.

Born in 1888 in Stuttgart, Schlemmer excelled in many aspects of artistic creation including the visual arts and theater design¹⁸². In the early 1900s he attended the Advanced High School of Science and Arts in the city of Goppingen and then the Academy of Fine Arts in Stuttgart¹⁸³. The years he spent in these schools paralleled a rapid growth of industrialization in Germany. In response to industrialization, a group of artists called the Werkbund, combined the aesthetic qualities of the fine arts with the idea of mass-production to create every-day household objects for ordinary people¹⁸⁴. Amidst the excitement of a newly industrialized Germany, Schlemmer studied arts and crafts more than fine arts in his early years at school. He also spent a year as an apprentice for a man who owned a wood-inlay shop¹⁸⁵. His training in applied, industrial art laid the foundation blocks for his later style, which relies upon geometric forms and rejects individuality of figures.

Other main factors in the development of Schlemmer’s style came in 1914. After a year of independent study, Schlemmer returned to the Academy in Stuttgart but enlisted

in the German Army only months later when World War I began. Injured twice in the war, Schlemmer left the army for good in 1915 and focused his attention on his artistic career¹⁸⁶. While on leave from the army after his first injury, Schlemmer had helped paint a mural for the 1914 Werkbund exhibition in Cologne, an event that marked the start of his successful career as a mural artist¹⁸⁷. Simultaneously, Schlemmer discovered expressionist theater in the work of Oskar Kokoschka, the first successful expressionist playwright¹⁸⁸. Schlemmer was so impressed by Kokochka's play *Murderer, Hope of Women*, an emotional journey into the struggles between men and women, that he later produced the stage set for a performance in 1922¹⁸⁹.

In addition to studying theater, Schlemmer focused much of his attention on the visual arts specifically painting and sculpture. His style, which developed parallel to many important career and political events in his life, began with early influences from the works of other famous artists such as Cézanne and Picasso. In his *Hunting Lodge in Grunewald* (Figure 4-2) of 1911, Schlemmer quotes many aspects of Cézanne's signature style. As in Cézanne's images of the Chateau Noir (Figure 4-3), Schlemmer sets the architectural focus point behind a strong tree that establishes the foreground. The strong painterly strokes and broken lines of the geometrical architecture blend the building into the sky above. In other works of 1912 Schlemmer directly quotes Picasso¹⁹⁰.

Schlemmer's *House (Cloister Garden)* (Figure 4-4) from that year breaks the image of a house into geometric shapes as if seen from many angles simultaneously. He admired the works of these two men specifically for the importance they placed on system and law. Schlemmer favored the geometry of cubism to the lawless emotion apparent in the works

of other modern artists¹⁹¹. His early lessons in cubism played an essential role in forming the base of his signature style and were the elements that most offended the Nazis.

At the Academy in Stuttgart Schlemmer's teacher Adolf Holzel, a well-known modern artist, inspired Schlemmer to develop his own style¹⁹². Besides preferring order to chaos, Schlemmer wanted his artwork to be free of human emotion and psychology, especially his own. He only painted four self-portraits in his lifetime, the last one completed in 1912¹⁹³. He felt so strongly about eliminating emotion and individuality in his figures, that he often painted idol-like faces comprised of outlined geometric shapes and smooth surfaces defined by strong contrast between dark and light¹⁹⁴. A perfect example is his *Female Head in Gray* from 1912 (Figure 4-5). The face resembles the head of a Cycladic idol in its simplicity and shape¹⁹⁵. Schlemmer paints a large oval head with a strong outline that breaks in some areas to reveal bare canvas or blur the boundary between figure and background. The figure, known only to be female by the label in the work's title, has simple, stylized features. Schlemmer goes so far as to leave out the figure's eyes, which are often interpreted as the windows to the soul and the indicator of emotion. While many of Schlemmer's contemporaries criticized him for his style, saying that his lack of emotion and his reliance on order and form moved away from the goals of freedom and emotion in modern art, Walter Gropius recognized Schlemmer's talent and hired him as a teacher at the Bauhaus¹⁹⁶.

Schlemmer taught at the Bauhaus in Weimar from 1920 to 1925 and then in Dessau from 1925 to 1929¹⁹⁷. His years as a teacher at the Bauhaus proved to be among the most productive years of his life. He initially taught sculpture and mural painting but was promoted to director of theatre in 1923, the same year that he painted murals in the

stairwell and hallways of the Weimar building¹⁹⁸. As the director of theatre Schlemmer wrote his *Triadic Ballet* and designed the set for Igor Stravinsky's *The Nightingale* and *The Fox*, among many other projects¹⁹⁹. Schlemmer can also be credited with saving the theatre department of the Bauhaus from closing early under financial difficulties, when he convinced Gropius of the department's importance by creating the "Bauhaus Dances"²⁰⁰. In these dances Schlemmer sought to attain the perfect theatrical character, capable of changing emotions and grace at any moment. He also investigated color, line and space on stage²⁰¹.

In a scene from his 1927 performance of *Form Dance* (Figure 4-6), three figures stand in different vertical poses. The central figure leans back holding a long pole. His body assumes the shape of the pole's hard, thick line. The left-hand figure wears a fencing mask and lunges forward in attack. His counterpart on the right holds a sphere into the air with one hand and perpendicularly connects a rod to the central pole with his other hand. Schlemmer relied on shape, color and line to define his figures and explore the most essential elements of theater.

After spending his first few years at the Bauhaus in theater, Schlemmer returned to painting and added tangible spatial settings to his repertoire of identifiable stylistic characteristics²⁰². Schlemmer kept his stylized figures and his reliance on shape, but began to place his figures in actual tangible space. This further angered fellow avant-garde artists who defined modern expressionist art as the rejection of traditional artistic formulas. They claimed that Schlemmer relied too heavily on classical components and that he used architecture to frame his figures²⁰³. He used his newfound space to maneuver amongst groups of people in the images, another new element to his style inspired by the

group living atmosphere of the Bauhaus²⁰⁴. Combining groups of people with architectural boundaries, Schlemmer developed the “banister scene” to deal adequately with planes and perspective while resisting impulses to defy structure²⁰⁵.

One of Schlemmer’s most famous banister paintings associated with the Bauhaus is in the collection of the Museum of Modern Art. His *Bauhaus Stairway* exemplifies the use of architecture to frame a spatial setting for several figures (Figures 4-7, 4-8). The stairs lead the viewer and the figures into the work and carry the focus right as they ascend. Simple shapes create a scene of patterned geometry in the oval heads, cylindrical limbs, and angular elbows. Schlemmer’s decision to paint the Bauhaus stairway as an active area reveals his positive feelings associated with the building.

Nine years after he first accepted the position as a teacher at the Bauhaus, Schlemmer resigned from his beloved institution because he wanted to keep his artwork apolitical. He predicted that the combination of the two would be disastrous²⁰⁶. In 1929 his colleague Hans Meyers and many students in the theatre department wanted to incorporate political opinion that criticized the government into the Bauhaus performances. Schlemmer probably refused to stay and teach a curriculum of art draped in politics, and so he resigned²⁰⁷. Because of his favorable reputation, Schlemmer immediately received a teaching position at the Academy of Fine Arts in Breslau²⁰⁸.

Schlemmer experienced another success in 1929 when he won a competition to design the murals for the interior walls of the Minne fountain room in the Museum Folkwang in Essen²⁰⁹. He spent three years developing his designs for the walls. In his initial attempt, his four figures dominated the room with the effect that the fountain was reduced to a mere second thought (Figure 4-9)²¹⁰. Realizing the need to enhance the

fountain designed by Minne instead of dominate it, Schlemmer finally decided on scenes of single figures on some walls and groups on the others (Figure 4-10). His signature, stylized geometric figures float in rectangular planes of dark color, fading into the depth. The mural designs offer another example of Schlemmer's desire to avoid emotion and drama²¹¹. When explaining the lack of emotion in his figures Schlemmer asserted "I resist the temptation to portray an allegory of life; even though that would have seemed the obvious and conventional approach in such a case. I wanted to respond to the simple gestures of the figures in Minne's fountain by portraying the simple existence of figures, without pathos, without dramatic movement, without telling stories!"²¹²,

In 1929, the same year as his resignation from the Bauhaus and the Essen mural competition, hostility rose between the National Socialists and the dying Weimar Republic, brought on by many factors including worldwide depression²¹³. Because of the depression and increased unemployment, the Prussian State Government began to close many of the art schools including in 1933 the one in Breslau where Schlemmer had been teaching for the past three years²¹⁴. He immediately moved to Berlin and accepted a position at the United States School for Art. Simultaneously his beloved Bauhaus moved to Berlin²¹⁵.

Negativity and hostility toward his art skyrocketed in the early 1930s. An art exhibition of his work was mocked and banned in the Stuttgart *Kunstlerbund*²¹⁶. Another devastating blow came when the Thuringian Minister of the Interior and Education Dr. Wilhelm Frick hired Paul Schultze-Naumburg to close all of the remaining modern art schools in Germany²¹⁷. Although the Bauhaus had already dispersed, its teachers fleeing to Berlin or leaving Germany completely, Frick ordered the destruction of Schlemmer's

murals that covered the walls of the Weimar Bauhaus building²¹⁸. Schlemmer learned of the removal of his murals after the fact and had no chance for a final look or photograph²¹⁹. Upon reading that Frick and Schultze-Naumburg had demolished his work, his pessimism increased and he became afraid for the future freedom of his art²²⁰. Instead of releasing a public statement of outcry, Schlemmer documented his emotions privately in his diary, revealing a new trepidation. He wrote “the horrible thing about this cultural backlash is that it is not directed against works of a political nature, but against purely artistic, aesthetic works²²¹.” He reasoned that if the Nazis destroyed his apolitical work, they would stop at nothing to annihilate the work of all modern artists, not just that of political dissenters²²².

Over the next few years Schlemmer stood by helplessly as the National Socialists banned his work from public display and ruined his career. Schlemmer’s confrontation with National Socialism became personal when some of his Nazi students in Breslau accused him of being Jewish in an attempt to discredit and mock his art. When Schlemmer turned to the school administrators for support, they forced him to “take a vacation” from which he would never return to teaching²²³. He could no longer find work in any art related fields and turned to sheep herding and farming as a last resort to support his family²²⁴. A last hope for his art came in 1933 when a retrospective of his work opened in Stuttgart. However, the National Socialists closed the exhibition the day after it opened, and art critics who supported the Nazis denounced Schlemmer as a “degenerate” artist²²⁵.

Despite the hostility toward his artwork, Schlemmer saw modernism and progressiveness as an essential part of German culture and could not understand how the

National Socialists could think otherwise²²⁶. On August 7, 1933 Schlemmer wrote *Hope or Resignation*, a speech meant to solidify his idea that modern art deserved a high position in the culture of a sophisticated state²²⁷. While aware that his art offended the Nazis, he did not comprehend the extent to which the strict censorship would affect his life. He naively believed that he could change how the Nazis viewed his art²²⁸.

In the years leading up to the Entartete Kunst exhibition Schlemmer wrote many letters to high ranking Nazi officials attempting to explain his art. An exhibition of “Bolshevik” art included his *Stairway Scene* (Figure 4-11) as a prime example of “rampant bolshevism”. Shocked and offended at the “Bolshevik” label, Schlemmer wrote an appeal to Goebbels and expected a supportive response²²⁹. He was devastated to learn that the National Socialists condemned his work as unpatriotic. Extremely offended and expecting an apology, Schlemmer wrote to Goebbels again. He cited his service in World War I along with the lack of political emphasis in his art as solid proof of his patriotism²³⁰.

When Goebbels ignored his pleas and the National Socialists removed his murals from the fountain room in the Museum Folkwang, Schlemmer began to sink into irreversible depression²³¹. The few works he managed create reveal the psychological darkness and atmosphere of secrecy. He painted darker, less descriptive figures pressed against the picture plane and cropped so as to appear suffocating in a cage-like space²³². In his *Arabesque (with Circle and Rectangle)* of 1936 he even reverted to pure abstraction, an approach he had criticized as “lawless” in his earlier career (Figure 4-12)²³³. Even when a one-man show of his work opened in London, a signal from the world that he might find support and artistic freedom in other countries, it got lost in

Schlemmer's depression and his horror at his inclusion in the Entartete Kunst exhibition of the same year²³⁴.

The Nazis displayed seven of Schlemmer's paintings and his entire portfolio of work from the Bauhaus in their exhibition of "degenerate" art²³⁵. In total, 51 works of Schlemmer's disappeared from public collections in Germany during the collecting crusades of the National Socialists. Schlemmer never recovered enough from the harsh slander of his work to create with the same conviction and passion as he revealed in his prosperous years²³⁶. After the exhibition he remained in Germany but tried to keep a low profile by creating art in secret and complying with the Nazis by not showing his work anywhere. His hopes of easing tension by disappearing in Germany dissolved when the Burlington Galleries in London included three of his works in a 1938 exhibition without his knowledge or consent. The Nazis saw this as an act of rebellion and ruthlessly harassed Schlemmer despite his attempts to explain his lack of involvement²³⁷. His naïve optimism was his tragic flaw. It kept him in Germany too long to escape psychological damage and save his artistic impulses. This blind optimism led to the depression and regret which would later be an indirect cause of his death²³⁸.

In 1939, Schlemmer's family was poor and starving. Unable to find work because the Nazis had destroyed his reputation, Schlemmer took two last resort jobs painting camouflage on military tanks and testing paint lacquer at the Institute for Information on Painting Materials²³⁹. The work proved physically challenging and mentally demeaning for Schlemmer who felt that by squandering his artistic impulses and giving in to Nazi wishes he had betrayed his life's purpose²⁴⁰. While at the Institute Schlemmer encountered other distraught, persecuted modern artists in similar positions including Willi Baumeister and Georg Muche whom he had known at the Bauhaus. The desperate bond that these men immediately formed helped to ease some of the pain and guilt of the post exhibition years²⁴¹. Temporarily inspired by his friends, Schlemmer created some small works in a Surrealist style, which he knew would be considered "Bolshevik" if ever seen by the Nazis. For the duration of his employment at the lacquer paint factory, Schlemmer continued to create miniature canvases that could be hidden easily²⁴². His

Window Picture XII: Room with Seated Woman in Violet Shadow measures a mere 12 x 8.5 inches (Figure 4-13).

An analysis of the work Schlemmer created in the last few years of his life offers visual insight into the intense mental struggle wrought by his feelings of guilt and sadness. After exploring Surrealist miniatures, he aimed to remove evidence of the artist's presence from his work. For example, he removed evidence of the paintbrush by blotting paint onto the canvas to create a splotchy effect. He called his monotype blot prints "splotchographics"²⁴³. In the monotype *Tilted Head I* (Figure 4-14) from 1941, there are no visible brushstrokes, only splotchy areas where the ink has puckered during application. Lines and letters appear in the ink, evidence that Schlemmer blotted the ink over items to create texture. Perhaps Schlemmer wanted to erase the artist's presence because he felt he no longer deserved to be an artist. His suffocating guilt at having complied with Nazi restrictions and abandoned his art constantly consumed his thoughts²⁴⁴.

In the months before his death Schlemmer's style changed one final time. He reintroduced the presence of the paintbrush and reverted to figure scenes. The element that sets these miniatures apart from his famous figure groups in the Bauhaus banister works and the Museum Folkwang murals is a window. His paintings from his final year of life use windows to convey isolation. Strong horizontal and vertical windows frame the foreground and set the viewer apart from the main focus of the scene²⁴⁵. For example, Schlemmer's figures suffocate behind the windows, set apart from the outside world in his *Window Picture XII: Room with Seated Woman in Violet Shadow* of 1942 (Figure 4-13). The sketch-like figure slumps over her desk, caged away from the viewer in

complete isolation behind the window frame. Through the canvases in his window series, Schlemmer visually articulated his inner grief. He felt abandoned and betrayed by his country and himself. The Nazis had ruined his life in Germany by taking away the most important element in his life - his art. In addition, Schlemmer felt guilt for not having left Germany to preserve his artistic freedom²⁴⁶. In January 1943 Schlemmer fell into a coma but regained consciousness long enough to scribble final thoughts into his diary. In these final entries Schlemmer described his life over the past ten years as a series of mistakes²⁴⁷. He could no longer live with the weighty guilt that had plagued him since the mid-1930s. After living like a prisoner in Germany for over a decade, Schlemmer died in 1943 of medical complications from Diabetes²⁴⁸.

His work remained relatively unknown to the mainstream world population until around 1986 when the Baltimore Museum of Art opened an exhibition of his work²⁴⁹. Most people today associate Schlemmer with the Bauhaus and his famous stairway group scenes from that time period²⁵⁰. By not studying Schlemmer's complete work, one misses the power behind his later works and the important lessons of freedom inherent in the chronology of his styles. He began by emulating masters such as Cezanne and Picasso in an atmosphere of education and artistic progressiveness under the Weimar government. While teaching at the Bauhaus Schlemmer incorporated figure groups inspired by the group living at the school. During the horror and persecution under the Nazis, Schlemmer created miniature works of surrealist rebellion followed by images of people alienated in architectural prisons. His work tells his story and illustrates the psychologically damaging effects of the Nazi regime. Schlemmer's depression and hopelessness represent the degradation of German culture. Schlemmer's internal struggle between individuality

and loyalty to his country proved fatal. The Nazis left no room for individuality or modern art, irreversibly damaging Germany's culture for decades to come.

Chapter 5: The German Artists Revitalize Boston

The 1900's began as a promising century for the avant-garde art scene in Germany. The exciting new possibilities of experimental, expressive art brought talented students from across the country to the many art schools including the Bauhaus in Weimar and Dessau. Artists groups such as Die Neue Kunstlervereinigung and Die Blaue Reiter in Munich, Die Neue Sezession in Berlin and Die Brucke in Dresden encouraged innovation. Many young German artists emphasized emotion in their work. They felt that regardless of the means of expression, personal emotions and not formulaic training or classical style, inspired true art²⁵¹. As the art schools and organizations encouraged people to explore their emotions, the Cabaret Voltaire in Zurich typified artists' efforts to deal humorously with the pain of the World War I period. The Cabaret Voltaire inspired artists to create artwork of satire and absurdity that acquired the label Dada. Building on the individualism and experimentation that Expressionism championed, Dada emphasized spontaneity and blurred the boundaries of art to include new forms such as

performance and “found” art. The vital, flourishing German avant-garde art of the early decades of the twentieth century vaporized in the onslaught of Nazi condemnation.

In a culminating event of the clash between modern art and the National Socialists’ ideas on July 19, 1937, the Nazis opened an exhibition of modern artwork under the label “degenerate art”. They presented the exhibition as visible proof of the ills that threatened society, and they defamed the artists, mocking their work as the quintessential betrayal of the German motherland. For many artists who had previously managed to escape physical harm or had lived in denial of the extent to which the Nazis would threaten modern culture, the exhibition forced realization. They were no longer welcome or safe in their beloved country.

As the Nazis ridiculed, destroyed or sold the stolen artworks back to their original owners, a development of heinous hypocrisy, modern German artists faced a difficult decision²⁵². They could stay in hiding in Germany, forbidden to create artwork and facing the threat of persecution, or they could flee to other countries including the United States. Artists made their own decisions and their stories are all different. Max Beckmann fled Germany moving first to the Netherlands and eventually traveling to America where he found an encouraging environment for his work and several teaching positions. His story is one of the more successful ones.

Other artists never had the fortune or the will to leave Germany. Ernst Barlach, whose poor health had plagued him for years, lost his will to live, dying one year after the Nazis stripped away his freedom to create and humiliated his work in the Entartete Kunst exhibition²⁵³. Oskar Schlemmer also refused to leave Germany, living in hiding and under suppression for six years while he worked at menial jobs to support his family. As

he died in 1943, Schlemmer revealed the unbearable, mental anguish and guilt that had plagued him during those six years. He felt that he had abandoned his true calling and he deeply regretted not fleeing to the United States when the opportunity existed²⁵⁴. The stories of these three men who were betrayed by their native country illustrate the mental and physical anguish the modern artists suffered in Germany during the National Socialist rule. While the losses to German culture were enormous, this tragedy also had positive effects. The artists who chose to flee to the United States played an essential role in developing the modern American art scene.

Germany's loss was a gain for the art scene in the United States, which welcomed many of the fleeing artists as teachers and living symbols of triumph over totalitarianism. While the German influence on American culture gained momentum as more artists fled Germany, the ties to German culture stemmed back more than a century, particularly in Boston.

The Boston cultural scene first flourished in the middle of the 1800's when wealthier citizens who became known as Brahmins began donating their money to cultural efforts such as music societies²⁵⁵. As Germanic music increased in popularity, people looked to Germany to provide other aspects of culture such as visual art. With this came the creation of the Germanic (later Busch-Reisinger) Museum at Harvard University in the 1920s²⁵⁶ (Figure 5-1). The Germanic Museum opened as a place where students as well as the public could see German artwork. Kuno Francke, the director, wanted German culture to be tangible to everyone through copies of masterpieces of German art²⁵⁷.

As the National Socialists gained power in Germany, many German artists came to the United States in search of artistic freedom. Among them, one crucial artist was drawn to Boston, and his arrival would lead to a flourishing of Expressionist art in his adopted city. As a youth in Germany during World War I, Karl Zerbe witnessed the devastating effects of the war. His father was killed in battle, a loss that left his family destitute²⁵⁸. After studying chemistry, Zerbe studied art and spent time painting in Italy. After three years there, Zerbe returned home to Germany with a refreshed style of open, bright, painterly landscapes as opposed to his darker, melancholy works from his pre-Italy years²⁵⁹. A perfect example of his new expressionist style is manifest in his gouache on paper work from 1927-8 depicting women in a field (Figure 5-2). Here, the figures play a secondary role to the glorious mountain in the background. Zerbe's quick, broken lines add life to the scene of bright yellows and greens. Strokes of white and yellow form the field of flowers that engulf the farmers. The National Gallery in Berlin purchased another of Zerbe's works from this period titled *Herbstgarten*, which was later confiscated by the Nazis in the raids and eventually destroyed²⁶⁰. When Zerbe decided to leave Germany for the United States, he brought with him an important contribution to the development of expressionism.

Karl Zerbe arrived in Boston in January of 1934. Because he was so young, his attachments to his native country were limited. Unlike artists such as Schlemmer who found the idea of fleeing Germany too painful, Zerbe felt he had no unbreakable bonds with Germany and was open to the adventure of life in America²⁶¹. He made the journey to the United States for two main reasons, the first being the increasing power of the

Nazis and the second being an invitation from Charles Kuhn, the second director of the Germanic Museum, to exhibit his work²⁶².

Charles Kuhn played an essential role in publicizing the work of avant-garde German artists in the United States. When Kuno Francke, the founder of the Germanic Museum, died in 1930, Kuhn became the curator of the museum as it came under the supervision of the Harvard Fine Arts Department and the Fogg Art Museum²⁶³. Kuhn exhibited the works of numerous German avant-garde artists and gave the new immigrants an audience for their work²⁶⁴. By aggressively collecting modern German art, Kuhn brought Expressionism to the forefront of the Boston art scene²⁶⁵.

As one of Kuhn's favorite artists, Zerbe became an important link between the modern art scene in Boston and the avant-garde traditions of modern art in Germany²⁶⁶. With the rise of Nazism in Germany, people in the United States responded to Expressionist works because the freedom in the execution paralleled the spiritual struggle going on in Germany. Zerbe exerted his greatest influence as a teacher and director of the Paintings Department of the School of the Museum of Fine Arts from 1937 to 1955. Although Zerbe himself moved toward a more structured style after immigrating to the United States, the curriculum he instituted at the museum school favored individual experimentation over more rigid techniques²⁶⁷. He did, however, incorporate artistic structure as a value in his curriculum, and his students developed their own expressiveness while paying attention to technical elements as well²⁶⁸. The work of Zerbe and the other "entartete" artists inspired modern artists in the United States, specifically Boston, to create modern, avant-garde and expressionist work²⁶⁹.

As Charles Kuhn urgently worked to establish a permanent collection of avant-garde German work for the Germanic Museum, his first major sculptural purchase was Barlach's *Crippled Beggar*, which once stood in a niche of the Church of Saint Catherine in Lubeck (Figure 2-12). Kuhn favored the work because it expressed the suffering of the German people in its rejection of idealization²⁷⁰. Kuhn also purchased Beckmann's 1927 *Self Portrait in a Tuxedo* (Figure 3-10). Beckmann stands with his hand on his hip, staring at the viewer while a lit cigarette creates haze. The strong verticality of architecture frames Beckmann's figure in the front of the picture plane. Beckmann's aggressive closeness complements his solemn facial features. Combined with the work's dark color palette, these features create a scene of impenetrable psyche.

Beckmann's work gained the most favor in New York initially. At the opening of the Museum of Modern Art in New York City in 1929 Paul J. Sachs donated the first four prints in the collection to the museum including one of Beckmann's titled *Toilette of 1923*²⁷¹ (Figure 5-3). Today, Beckmann's work hangs in museums across the world including his *Beginning*, (1949) in New York City's Metropolitan Museum of Art (Figure 5-4). On October 9, 1996 the Guggenheim Museum in New York opened a major exhibition of Beckmann's paintings. The exhibition, *Beckmann in Exile*, explored the depth of emotions in his art, focusing on pieces created during the height of the Nazi suppression and his years in exile²⁷². *Beckmann in Exile* showed some of his best known later works such as *Departure* (Figure 3-14) and *Carnival* (Figure 5-6).

From October 2003 through February 2004 the Busch-Reisinger Museum at Harvard University displayed designs for Schlemmer's *Triadic Ballet I*, sketched in 1926²⁷³ (Figure 5-5). The designs explore geometrical costumes ranging from circular

sleeves to accordion-like skirts. Each of the 20 figures can be broken into simple geometrical components. This shows Schlemmer's obsession with technicality and pattern, stylistic preference evident in the majority of his paintings.

The three artists detailed in the body of this thesis represent a small sample of the artists affected by the Entartete Kunst exhibition. The stories of these artists speak volumes about the importance of the freedom to create. Today, citizens of many countries including the United States take their rights for granted and can not imagine the scope of the effects from an all out war on culture. Ironically the Nazis' culture purge had the unforeseen consequence of transforming the art scene in the United States, specifically major metropolitan areas such as Boston and New York. Schools opened and talented artists accepted teaching positions. A large part of the Expressionist movement in the United States resulted directly from the exodus of German talent.

The Nazi purge of modern art is a story of despair and triumph. The artists who managed to escape changed the United States in a positive way. Those who stayed withered creatively and physically. From this exploration of the events surrounding the Nazis' Entartete Kunst exhibition in 1937, important lessons emerge. Culture and artistic freedom create a prosperous and healthy society. Not even the hatred and force behind the Nazi efforts could stop these artists from leaving a lasting, heroic image in history and spreading their art to foreign countries.

¹ Dube, Wolff Dieter. *The Expressionists*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 1985.. 23-25

² Dube, 24-5

³ Dube, 24-5

⁴ Dube, 28-32

-
- ⁵ Dube, 95
- ⁶ Dube, 95
- ⁷ Dube, 95-6
- ⁸ Dube, 96-7
- ⁹ Dube, 96-7
- ¹⁰ Dube, 98-100
- ¹¹ Dube, 100-4
- ¹² Dube, 103-4
- ¹³ Droste, Magdalena. *Bauhaus, 1919-1933*. Koln: B. Taschen, 1990. 6-17
- ¹⁴ Droste, 6
- ¹⁵ Droste, 6
- ¹⁶ Droste, 37-46
- ¹⁷ Droste, 227
- ¹⁸ Lehmann-Haupt, Helmut. *Art Under a Dictatorship*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954. 39
- ¹⁹ Burleigh, Michael, and Wolfgang Wippermann. *The Racial State: Germany 1933-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. 24
- ²⁰ Wistrich, 56
- ²¹ Paret, Peter. *An Artist Against the Third Reich: Ernst Barlach, 1933-1938*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 109
- ²² Wistrich, 56
- ²³ Wistrich, 17
- ²⁴ Wistrich, 16
- ²⁵ Wistrich, 15-8
- ²⁶ Petropolous, Jonathan. *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996. 14-5
- ²⁷ Petropolous, 7
- ²⁸ Petropolous, 5-8
- ²⁹ Petropolous, 10
- ³⁰ Petropolous, 11-21
- ³¹ Wistrich, 19
- ³² Bookbinder, Judith A., "Figurative Expressionism in Boston and its Germanic Cultural Affinities: An Alternative Modernist Discourse in Art and Identity." (Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1998.) 46
- ³³ Petropolous, 7
- ³⁴ Lehmann-Haupt, xix
- ³⁵ Lehmann-Haupt, 3
- ³⁶ Lehmann-Haupt, 3
- ³⁷ Bookbinder, 48
- ³⁸ Lehmann-Haupt, xviii-xix
- ³⁹ Wistrich, 18
- ⁴⁰ Petropolous, 10
- ⁴¹ Petropolous, 51
- ⁴² Wistrich, 57
- ⁴³ Bunce, William C., trans. "Guide Through the Exhibition: Degenerate Art." *Entartete "Kunst."* Redding: Silver Press Fox, 1972. 2
- ⁴⁴ Bunce, 8
- ⁴⁵ Bookbinder, 49
- ⁴⁶ Bookbinder, 50
- ⁴⁷ Bookbinder, 50
- ⁴⁸ Barlach, Ernst. "Letter to Reinhard Piper." *Die Briefe*. 2. April 11 (1933), 345
- ⁴⁹ Barron, Stephanie. *Degenerate Art: The Fate of the avant-garde in Nazi Germany*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991. 198
- ⁵⁰ Grosshans, Henry. *Hitler and the Artists*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983. 5
- ⁵¹ Barron, 197
- ⁵² Paret, Peter. *An Artist Against the Third Reich: Ernst Barlach, 1933-1938*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 32

-
- ⁵³ Paret, 33
⁵⁴ Barron, 196-7
⁵⁵ Barron, 196-7
⁵⁶ Paret, 32
⁵⁷ Paret, 32
⁵⁸ Barron, 196
⁵⁹ Grosshans, 41
⁶⁰ Barlach, Ernst. *Ein selbsterzahltes Leben*. Berlin, 1928. 63
⁶¹ Grosshans, 41
⁶² Paret, 30
⁶³ Paret, 25
⁶⁴ Paret, 25-6
⁶⁵ Paret, 28-9
⁶⁶ Paret, 26
⁶⁷ Paret, 28
⁶⁸ Paret, 28
⁶⁹ Paret, 17
⁷⁰ Paret, 17,28
⁷¹ Paret, 39-40
⁷² Paret, 41
⁷³ Paret, 39-40
⁷⁴ Paret, 48-9
⁷⁵ Paret, 47-8
⁷⁶ Paret, 42
⁷⁷ Paret, 43
⁷⁸ Grosshans, 49
⁷⁹ Paret, 45-6
⁸⁰ Paret, 46
⁸¹ Paret, 48-9
⁸² Paret, 48-9
⁸³ Paret, 41-3, 86-87
⁸⁴ Paret, 87
⁸⁵ Paret, 24
⁸⁶ Barron, 197
⁸⁷ Paret, 24-5
⁸⁸ Paret, 23
⁸⁹ Grosshans, 72
⁹⁰ Barron, 197
⁹¹ Grosshans, 72
⁹² Barron, 197
⁹³ Paret, 79
⁹⁴ Paret, 32-3
⁹⁵ Paret, 78-9
⁹⁶ Grosshans, 9
⁹⁷ Grosshans, 9
⁹⁸ Paret, 30
⁹⁹ Paret, 78-85
¹⁰⁰ Paret, 78-9
¹⁰¹ Barron, 197
¹⁰² Barron, 197
¹⁰³ Barron, 197
¹⁰⁴ Barron, 197
¹⁰⁵ Paret, 28
¹⁰⁶ Barron, 197-8
¹⁰⁷ Barron, 197

-
- ¹⁰⁸ Grosshans, 5
¹⁰⁹ Grosshans, 79
¹¹⁰ Barron, 197
¹¹¹ Grosshans, 77
¹¹² Barron, 197
¹¹³ Quoted in Aline B. Louchhiem, "Beckmann Paints the Inner Reality." *New York Times*. 13 June (1948)
¹¹⁴ Buenger, Barbara Copeland, ed. *Max Beckmann: Self-Portrait in Words*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997. 4-5
¹¹⁵ Lackner, Stephan. *Max Beckmann; Memoirs of a Friendship*. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1969. 15
¹¹⁶ Buenger, 4-5
¹¹⁷ Buenger, 2
¹¹⁸ Buenger, 5-6
¹¹⁹ Barron, Stephanie. *Degenerate Art: The Fate of the avant-garde in Nazi Germany*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991. 202
¹²⁰ Grosshans, Henry. *Hitler and the Artists*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983. 41
¹²¹ Lackner, Memoirs. 18-9
¹²² Barron, 202
¹²³ Lackner, Memoirs. 19
¹²⁴ Buenger, 8
¹²⁵ Buenger, 8
¹²⁶ Buenger, 8
¹²⁷ Lackner, Stephan. *Max Beckmann*. New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc, 1991. 50
¹²⁸ Buenger, 8
¹²⁹ Barron, 203
¹³⁰ Lackner, Max Beckmann. 56
¹³¹ Buenger, 9
¹³² Buenger, 10-11
¹³³ Barron, 203
¹³⁴ Lackner, Max Beckmann. 54
¹³⁵ Lackner, Memoirs, 14
¹³⁶ Grosshans, 51
¹³⁷ Barron, 203
¹³⁸ Werner, 1-2
¹³⁹ Werner, 2-4
¹⁴⁰ Buenger, 7
¹⁴¹ Werner, 2-4
¹⁴² Werner, 7
¹⁴³ Werner, 5-10
¹⁴⁴ Werner, 5 and Buenger, 2
¹⁴⁵ Werner, 5
¹⁴⁶ Barron, 203
¹⁴⁷ Barron, 203
¹⁴⁸ Lackner, Memoirs, 14-5
¹⁴⁹ Barrons, 203
¹⁵⁰ Barron, 202
¹⁵¹ Lackner, Memoirs, 16-7
¹⁵² Barron, 202-03
¹⁵³ Grosshans, 79
¹⁵⁴ Barron, 202-3
¹⁵⁵ Barron, 204
¹⁵⁶ Barron, 204
¹⁵⁷ Grosshans, 88-89
¹⁵⁸ Barron, 204
¹⁵⁹ Barron, 204

-
- 160 Grosshans, 6
161 Lackner, Memoirs, 84-5
162 Grosshans, 113
163 Grosshans, 7
164 Lackner, Memoirs, 26
165 Barron, 204
166 Lackner, Memoirs, 26-37
167 Lackner, Memoirs, 37
168 Lackner, Memoirs, 66
169 Grosshans, 109-111
170 Lackner, Memoirs, 81-84
171 Buenger, 3
172 Barron, 204
173 Lackner, Memoirs, 106-110
174 Lackner, Memoirs, 36
175 Lackner, Max Beckmann. 126
176 Lackner, Memoirs, 115-8
177 Lackner, Memoirs, 86
178 Buenger, 9 and Lackner, Memoirs, 86
179 Schlemmer, Oskar. *The Letters and Diaries of Oskar Schlemmer*. Ed. Tut Schlemmer. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1972. 400
180 Barron, Stephanie. *Degenerate Art: The Fate of the avant-garde in Nazi Germany*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991. 337
181 Schlemmer, The Letters. 385
182 Schlemmer, Oskar. *Oskar Schlemmer: The Baltimore Museum of Art*. Ed. Arnold L. Lehman and Brenda Richardson. Baltimore: The Museum, 1986. 9
183 Barron, 336
184 Schlemmer, BMA. 22
185 Schlemmer, BMA. 22
186 Barron, 336
187 Schlemmer, BMA. 23
188 Schlemmer, BMA. 24
189 Schlemmer, BMA. 24
190 Schlemmer, BMA. 39
191 Schlemmer, BMA. 39
192 Schlemmer, BMA. 23, 43
193 Schlemmer, BMA. 39-40
194 Schlemmer, BMA. 40
195 Schlemmer, BMA. 40
196 Schlemmer, BMA. 24-9
197 Schlemmer, BMA. 29
198 Barron, 336
199 Schlemmer, BMA. 29
200 Droste, Magdalena. *Bauhaus, 1919-1933*. Koln: B. Taschen, 1990. 158
201 Droste, 158
202 Schlemmer, BMA. 49
203 Schlemmer, BMA. 49-51
204 Schlemmer, BMA. 51-7
205 Schlemmer, BMA. 72-3
206 Barron, 335
207 Barron, 336
208 Schlemmer, BMA. 32
209 Barron, 336
210 Schlemmer, BMA. 60
211 Schlemmer, BMA. 63-6

-
- ²¹² Schlemmer, Oskar. Radio Interview on "Schlesische Funkstunde." 30 November 1930. Printed "Oskar Schlemmer: Monographic and Oeuvrekatalog der Gemälde, Aquarelle, Pastelle und Plastiken." *Karin von Maur* 1 Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1979. 194
- ²¹³ Schlemmer, BMA. 32
- ²¹⁴ Schlemmer, BMA. 32
- ²¹⁵ Schlemmer, BMA. 32
- ²¹⁶ Schlemmer, BMA. 34
- ²¹⁷ Droste, 227
- ²¹⁸ Nicholas, Lynn H. *The Rape of Europa: the Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War*. New York: Knopf, 1994. 8-9
- ²¹⁹ Droste, 227
- ²²⁰ Schlemmer, BMA. 32
- ²²¹ Barron, 336
- ²²² Barron, 336
- ²²³ Nicholas, 12
- ²²⁴ Barron, 336
- ²²⁵ Barron, 336
- ²²⁶ Schlemmer, BMA. 33-4
- ²²⁷ Barron, 335
- ²²⁸ Barron, 336
- ²²⁹ Barron, 336
- ²³⁰ Barron, 336
- ²³¹ Barron, 336-7
- ²³² Schlemmer, BMA. 77
- ²³³ Schlemmer, BMA. 77
- ²³⁴ Barron, 337
- ²³⁵ Barron, 337
- ²³⁶ Barron, 337
- ²³⁷ Barron, 337-8
- ²³⁸ Barron, 336
- ²³⁹ Barron, 338
- ²⁴⁰ Barron, 338
- ²⁴¹ Barron, 338
- ²⁴² Barron, 338
- ²⁴³ Schlemmer, BMA. 79-80
- ²⁴⁴ Barron, 338
- ²⁴⁵ Schlemmer, BMA. 80
- ²⁴⁶ Barron, 338
- ²⁴⁷ Barron, 338
- ²⁴⁸ Schlemmer, BMA. 21
- ²⁴⁹ Schlemmer, BMA. 9
- ²⁵⁰ Schlemmer, BMA. 39
- ²⁵¹ Dube, Wolff Dieter. *The Expressionists*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 1985. 24-5
- ²⁵² Bookbinder, Judith A., "Figurative Expressionism in Boston and its Germanic Cultural Affinities: An Alternative Modernist Discourse in Art and Identity." (Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1998.) 50
- ²⁵³ Barron, Stephanie. *Degenerate Art: The Fate of the avant-garde in Nazi Germany*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991. 198
- ²⁵⁴ Barron, 337-8
- ²⁵⁵ Bookbinder, 10
- ²⁵⁶ Bookbinder, 10-2
- ²⁵⁷ Bookbinder, 23
- ²⁵⁸ Bookbinder, 28
- ²⁵⁹ Bookbinder, 44-5
- ²⁶⁰ Bookbinder, 45
- ²⁶¹ Bookbinder, 52

-
- ²⁶² Bookbinder, 8, 26
²⁶³ Bookbinder, 23-6
²⁶⁴ Bookbinder, 57
²⁶⁵ Bookbinder, 26
²⁶⁶ Bookbinder, 26
²⁶⁷ Bookbinder, 34
²⁶⁸ Bookbinder
²⁶⁹ Bookbinder, 27-8
²⁷⁰ Bookbinder, 58
²⁷¹ Beckmann, Max. *Max Beckmann in Exile*. New York: Guggenheim Museum and Harry N. Abrams, 1996. 25
²⁷² Beckmann, In Exile, 8
²⁷³ "For the Virtual Museumgoer" *John Harvard's Journal*. 16. 1 September-October (2003). 80.
<http://www.Harvardmagazine.com>

Works Cited

- Barlach, Ernst. *Ein selbsterzahltes Leben*. Berlin, 1928. 63
- Barlach, Ernst. "Letter to Reinhard Piper." *Die Briefe*. 2. April 11 (1933)
- Barron, Stephanie. *Degenerate Art: The Fate of the avant-garde in Nazi Germany*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991.
- Beckmann, Max. *Max Beckmann in Exile*. New York: Guggenheim Museum and Harry N. Abrams, 1996.
- Bookbinder, Judith A., "Figurative Expressionism in Boston and its Germanic Cultural Affinities: An Alternative Modernist Discourse in Art and Identity." (Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1998.)*
- Buenger, Barbara Copeland, ed. *Max Beckmann: Self-Portrait in Words*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Bunce, William C., trans. "Guide Through the Exhibition: Degenerate Art." *Entartete Kunst*. Redding: Silver Press Fox, 1972.
- Burleigh, Michael, and Wolfgang Wippermann. *The Racial State: Germany 1933-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Droste, Magdalena. *Bauhaus, 1919-1933*. Koln: B. Taschen, 1990.

-
- Dube, Wolff Dieter. *The Expressionists*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 1985.
- “For the Virtual Museumgoer” *John Harvard's Journal*. 16. 1 September-October (2003). 80. <<http://www.Harvardmagazine.com>>
- Grosshans, Henry. *Hitler and the Artists*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983.
- Lackner, Stephan. *Max Beckmann; Memoirs of a Friendship*. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1969.
- Lackner, Stephan. *Max Beckmann*. New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc, 1991.
- Lehmann-Haupt, Helmut. *Art Under a Dictatorship*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Nicholas, Lynn H. *The Rape of Europa: the Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War*. New York: Knopf, 1994.
- Paret, Peter. *An Artist Against the Third Reich: Ernst Barlach, 1933-1938*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Petropolous, Jonathan. *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Quoted in Aline B. Louchhim, “Beckmann Paints the Inner Reality.” *New York Times*. 13 June (1948)
- Schlemmer, Oskar. *Oskar Schlemmer: The Baltimore Museum of Art*. Ed. Arnold L. Lehman and Brenda Richardson. Baltimore: The Museum, 1986.
- Schlemmer, Oskar. Radio Interview on “Schlesische Funkstunde.” 30 November 1930. Printed “Oskar Schlemmer: Monographic and Oeuvrekatalog der Gemälde, Aquarelle, Pastelle und Plastiken.” *Karin von Maur 1* Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1979. 194
- Schlemmer, Oskar. *The Letters and Diaries of Oskar Schlemmer*. Ed. Tut Schlemmer. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1972.
- Werner, Michael. *Max Beckmann*. New York: Siegfried Gohr, 1994.
- Wistrich, Robert S. *Weekend in Munich: Art, Propaganda, and Terror in the Third Reich*. London: Pavilion, 1995.