

Despre unul Victor Klemperer

De TIBERIU SCHATTELES

Este interesant de vazut de cate ori o persoana de importanta dubioasa este descoperita, laudata, apoi uitata, iar descoperita, iar uitata... s.a.m.d. Oare de ce? Voi incerca sa raspund la aceasta intrebare considerand rolul filologului german Victor Klemperer in istoria recenta a antisemitismului camuflat chiar si in tara lui de origine si analizand limbajul lui in articolul anexat, scris in engleza acum aproape un deceniu si jumatate, distribuit pe vremea aceea doar unor prieteni din Canada, USA si Europa de Vest, care au avut astfel ocazia de a descoperi sau, in unele cazuri, re-descoperi pe Klemperer. Public acel articol, pentru ca, se pare, ca acest Klemperer ca a fost din nou descoperit. Ce-i drept, subliniind unele merite reale ale lui, caci are unele, dar gasesc ca imaginea trebuie completata. Cred ca textul meu va fi foarte util pentru cei care vor sa se lamureasca despre variantele antisemitismului evreiesc.

Dar sa va povestesc aventurile mele cu cartile autorului mentionat.

A fost odata ca niciodata ... Am fost student la Universitatea (de fapt Universitatile) din Cluj cand, in 1947, am descoperit prima editie a cartii LTI - Lingua Tertii Imperii - Notizbuch eines Philologen semnate de Victor Klemperer. M-am apucat de lectura si am descoperit unele lucruri interesante despre limbajul politico-ideologic al celui de al treilea Reich, adica cel nazist. Nu era singura publicatie despre acest subiect, dar era singura care putea fi publicata in RDG sau DDR si oriunde la est de cortina. Ca alte lucruri cu tema similara publicate dincolo de zid, ar mai fi atras atentia si asupra caracteristicilor acelei Linguae utilizate in propaganda ideologica comunista. Un exemplu este o carte publicata partial inca in 1945 , si apoi completata si republicata intr-un nou volum in 1957, de arieni puri, si inca accesibila, in prima sa varianta, la renascuta Librarie Loebel din Timisoara: Aus dem Wörterbuch des Unmenschen a fost scris de trei autori care au scos la iveala tot ce ei nu puteau sa publice in timpul dictaturii hitleriste. In cartea lui Klemperer am aflat lucruri tehnic interesante despre acel LTI folosit cu virtuositate de Goebbels. Dar eu am mai gasit si rudimentele unei alte limbi, camuflate de autorul care se voia mare german, dar care nu a fost acceptat ca atare de nazisti. El a folosit ocazia sa introduca o noua varianta a limbii pe care eu am numit-o in articolul ce urmeaza LRH - adica Lingua Renegati Hebraei.

Nu eram singurul care a remarcat acest lucru. In 1969, cand am fost in DDR in cadrul unui program de schimburi academice, m-am intalnit cu multi care aveau aceeasi parere despre Klemperer ca si mine. Si nu numai evrei! - Apoi, Klemperer a fost uitat. Dar nu pentru totdeauna. Dupa schimbarea de regim au fost decoperite scrierile lui biografice,

scrierile unui "adevarat german", nascut evreu din intamplare. In schimb, LRH in jurnalul lui nu mai era camuflata. Decat doar in unele editii... discrete. Astfel ca putea fi laudat. Si a fost laudat. Si multi cititori, cei care n-au primit decat variantele epurate, l-au laudat si ei. Atunci m-am apucat sa scriu articolul care este publicat in cele ce urmeaza.

E bine ca articolul sa ramana in engleza, caci veti avea mai putine dificultati cu acesta limba decat ar avea cu limba romana copiii, nepotii, stranepotii sau prietenii din noua diaspora timisoreana.

VICTOR KLEMPERER'S LANGUAGES

Returning from an extended foreign trip, while reviewing the mail and journals accumulated on my desk, I chanced upon the June 2000 Commentary and in it on Daniel Johnson's review of the philologist Victor Klemperer's memoirs, some of them, namely those titled "*I will bear Witness*", and published by Random House. This is something I would call a sanitized edition of the memoirs in two volumes covering the 1933-45 period, twice abridged, once by the German editor and then by the English translator. The review by Daniel Johnson is good as far as it goes, only it doesn't go far enough. If the German and the American publisher were "considerate", which was a terribly difficult job, the reviewer should have been less so. Because the book testifies - for whoever can read! - not only about Nazi atrocities, physical and "linguistic", but also about something else which considerate reviewers tend to neglect, leaving thereby untouched a plethora of fallacious arguments used by those engaged in "post-Goldhagen" ideological cover-up exercises. This second layer of testimonies could itself be the subject of yet another *linguistic* research applying the method developed by Klemperer when studying the Nazi lingo. Such analysis would show that the (most recently!) celebrated philologist was himself the dupe of the same "weaknesses" as the Nazis, only unaware of it because of his morbid spite for Jews. And covered-up - often just by neglect, as in the case of Daniel Johnson - by apologetic reviewers, or by those who are in search for an effective palliative, if not a cure for the Goldhagen syndrome. Yet a study of this kind would not

be complete if based only on the antiseptically abridged variety of the mentioned memoirs. Fortunately some of the missing elements can be reconstituted from the author's earlier writings as well as from various other published sections of his diaries. Among these there is Klemperer's *Curriculum vitae* for the period 1881-1918, "discovered" by German publishers and public during the last period of the crumbling DDR or GDR, the East German Communist state.*)

*)*Curriculum vitae - Jugend um 1900* was first published in 1989 at the nightfall of DDR-Communism by Rütten & Loening and the "Siedler Verlag" in Berlin, and then again by the *Aufbau Verlag*, Berlin, in 1999.

A relevant complement would also be the 1945-1949 diaries published by the Berlin Aufbau Verlag in 1999, carrying a quotation from the text as its most appropriate title: "And now I am sitting between all the chairs" - *So sitze ich denn zwischen allen Stühlen* (subsequently referred to as *Stühlen*).

Though Klemperer may be relatively new to North-American readers, his name is better known to many coming from behind the Iron Curtain. Not so much for his writings on French literature - you would be much better off reading yourself the relevant French authors - as for his LTI: *Lingua Tertii Imperii*, or "The Language of the Third Reich", first published in East Germany in 1947 as *Notizbuch eines Philologen*, or "Notebook of a Philologist", and after fifty years, all of a sudden, translated also in English and published twice, once in 1997 (E. Mellen Press, annotated) and then 1999 (Athlone Press). This "oversight", just as the publication of the witness-memoirs 40 years after the death of the author, is itself worth some systematic critical scrutiny. True, the *witness* memoirs could not have been published in their present form in East Germany during the communist era. Yet it seems that few in the West have taken notice of the LTI, even though *it was* available for translation. Why? After all, the LTI was always referring to, and quoting from the not-yet published diaries, while its recently so much praised merits, as far as linguistic analysis is concerned, were still the work's own. And this should not

be denied here. But in spite of efforts made, not least by Klemperer himself using his "personal channels", we learn from him that "a translation into the American [i.e. American-English - T.S.] is out of question; there is no publisher or public for such; a new chief-editor at the *Aufbau Verlag* already told me something to this effect." ["*eine Übersetzung ins Amerikanische nicht zu denken; dafür finde sich kein Verleger u. kein Publikum, Ähnliches hat mir schon ein neuer Oberlektor des Aufbauverlags gesagt.*"] (Stühlen, v.1, p.582-583)

Even though they tried hard. So, once again: why was nobody *earlier* interested in the translation? The outline of an answer to this question should be subsequently submitted, since it is of great relevance for the understanding of a most recent variety of the Holocaust's ideological history.

Ever since the current Klemperer fuss I read anew my GDR copy (1975 re-edition) of the LTI, which turned out to afford some interesting and revealing comparisons with all the lately published memoirs.*)

*)The complete title: *LTI - Notizbuch eines Philologen*, in *Verlag Philipp Reclam jun., Leipzig*. Subsequent quotations are from this edition which corresponds almost exactly with the 1993 re-edition; I prefer to use my own translation, while offering the reader the possibility to check on it by quoting in brackets the relevant section of the original text.

If anybody has time and patience enough to follow-up on the subject here to be only outlined, he/she would easily discover enough material in the Klemperer publications for yet another work to be titled: LRH. LRH? Yes: *Lingua Renegati Hebraei*. Such researcher will have no trouble to find in the memoirs, published under whatever title and whichever time division, numerous examples illustrating the points to be subsequently made. Just employ Klemperer's own analytical approach to the Nazi

lingo, while being always aware of the bias originating in the author's pathological self-denial. But never forget to compare the LTI, the memoirs and their *publishing history*(!!), because it is relevant for *ideological history*. Let us now go about the subject proper.

There is a great variety of perfectly sane renegades. There are those who just don't give a damn, then there are others whose opportunism earns them rewards deemed to be worthwhile, and finally there are the *convinced* assimilationists. This latter class includes individuals who want to become something else than what they are. *They know* that there is a difference between what they are and what they aspire to be. If they are perfectly sane. But then there are some who are not, or not always. They don't want to be something else because they firmly believe that *they are* something else. And when some terrible blow is visited upon them, laying bare that which they were denying, then two things might happen according to the individual's degree of sanity. Or, perhaps, dignity. Or what remained of it. One class of such individuals may, belatedly, awaken. Numerous distinguished examples of such could be quoted. But then there are those who will deny the obvious, and morbidly search for somebody to blame. Klemperer belonged to this latter category. His general concept was: the Jews don't "really" exist, at least not in the "West". Therefore, guilty are those Jews who think they really exist, because they have caused those who persecute them to be what they are. If this line of reasoning seems silly, read again Klemperer's several books, and also compare their development. It should open your eyes. True, sometimes in his many autobiographical exercises he also deviates from this line of reasoning. Sanity emerges for a short while producing often very interesting associations. In Daniel Johnson's article in the June 2000 *Commentary* some examples are quoted. Yet such moments of lucidity are then swallowed again by a new fit of pathological mythmaking which the reviewers neglect.

The analysis of the various texts requires, as said, the comparison between the LTI, the witness-bearing volumes, the *Curriculum Vitae* as well as several other writings of the philologist. I start with the LTI which is the latest written, yet the earliest published. Of course, it has been reviewed quite often. However, this discussion will not

only stress aspects "neglected" by past reviewers but also put them in a wider and very revealing context. I read LTI soon after its publication in 1947 as a student of the university of Cluj (*Kolozsvár* [H] or *Klausenburg* [G]) in Romania/Transylvania. The author confessed that it was based on some war diaries of his, but these were at the time not yet published as such. Now I know, since I read the recently published diaries as well, what the many reasons were which made their publication within the Communist orbit impossible. The frequent intimation of some sort of an ideological cocktail made of Communism, Zionism and Nazism was unacceptable in the Eastern block; be it when some Jew was qualified as a Zionist-Bolshevist, or when it was suggested in various, rather peculiar formulations, that Nazism is a form of Communism. Well, the 1947 publication had to reckon with the fact that Communism could no more be "mixed" with Zionism! Of course. But one thing could remain, namely that in some connection Zionism and Nazism were, in various formulations no less odd than the above mentioned ones, offshoots of one-another. So a new editing of the diaries was to be produced to accommodate the needs of the new masters of the land. And Klemperer obliged with the LTI purported to be only a "linguistic analysis"; still very interesting as analysis of the Nazi idiom - though by far not the only one in expert literature - but full with all the ancient insinuations of what may be called "Jewish anti-Semitism". If he had been a believing communist he would have had an excuse. But he was not - though he joined the Party! Yet he did something he couldn't do under the Nazis: he served totalitarian propaganda with some of *his* ideas coinciding, when re-tailored, with *theirs*. And it was an instant success. But not for a long time. Soon after the first edition, the Soviet Union recognized, among the first, the new state of Israel, and the book was "forgotten". For awhile nobody qualified anymore Zionism as a form of racism and nobody quoted from the LTI. Jewish communist-front organizations all over the Eastern Block praised the Soviet Union as "the great friend of the Jewish people". The LTI had to be put aside for other times. Those times were to come. Right after the Suez crisis, in 1957, it was re-issued, and then again in 1975. Was all this a coincidence? Ever since, the LTI received praises and criticism, but nobody put it in the context of Klemperer's other writings by just simply employing his now so much praised method. So let us now do just that: **while keeping in mind the *method*, we should compare the "Notes of a philologist"**

with those of the "witness" and several other of his writings. The method concentrates on the Nazis' manner to re-employ the dictionary by perverting the words' meaning. Klemperer called this "distortion (or perversion, or corruption) of values" - *Wertumkehrung* (LTI, p.30). Correctly. Only he himself also practiced the same art.

As far as the analysis of usage is concerned, Klemperer could teach many about how people become slaves of an ideology by simply not purging, or at least controlling their own vocabulary. The essential conclusion of the LTI, that the ideas of any monster can easily infiltrate people's thinking by inadvertently adopting his usage, is supported by whatever we may find when carefully observing the common parlance of innocent television watchers in our days. However, this does not mean that we would re-interpret the *victim's usage* into a *source of the monster's idiom*. After all the monster's terminology is extracted from the same dictionary as everybody else's, *before being contextually perverted*. Yet this is exactly what Klemperer does - he perverts the word-stock of the victim to suit his own ideological purpose by proclaiming it a frequent source of the Nazi idiom. This happens very often through anecdotic details or stories conjured up from memory about characters with whom the author shared the Nazi workhouse. They are purported to be typical "LTI victims" - and not only victims! They are re-fashioned, to suit the perverse side of his linguistic analysis, into carriers of that language which *itself* engendered, at least partially, the LTI.

I will try to clarify the above outlined assertion by quoting a few cases offered in Klemperer's various writings. And to stress it once again: it will be important for this argument to emphasize the difference between the presentation of cases and ideas in the LTI and the memoirs, as well as in the more recently published, yet much older, *Curriculum Vitae* in two volumes, covering the 1881-1918 period in the author's life. Making his ghetto-mates pass a mental review in his memory Klemperer, the teacher of French literature, came upon the idea of writing one day something analogous to La Bruyère's *Les Caractères*. A rather Jewish version of it. Rudiments of such a work can be found in all his here to be discussed writings, some of the cases being interesting in themselves. But his, often twisted, "linguistic" message is put through by making some of

the *caractères* of his confined surroundings act in his, Klemperer's, ideological theatre.

The following two characters and their stories are paradigmatic for Klemperer's discourse, and therefore quite suitable as introductory examples to this discussion. In a section of the LTI (p.206-207) we are told, first, about a Jewish doctor in the work-house, who before 1933 never thought of himself as a Jew but only as

"[being] thoroughly German as well as physician ... and regarded Nazism as just an erring or a malady which would go by without a catastrophe."

["*ganz und gar Deutscher und Arzt ... und hatte den Nazismus für eine Verirrung oder eine Erkrankung gehalten, die ohne Katastrophe vorübergehen würde.*"]

He now addressed the Jews of the workhouse by imitating the Nazi manner, using the same insulting *language* thus expressing the same spite for them as the brown shirt wearing supervisors. So we have him presented as the example of one who becomes instrument and victim at the same time in a "linguistic sense". Nothing implausible about this. Many of us "therefrom" or from "thereabouts" met characters of this kind, yet only few would agree with Klemperer's assessment of Dr. P.'s attitude:

"To me it seemed symbolic of the Jews' total subservience."

["*Mir selber schien sie symbolisch für die gänzliche Unterworfenheit der Juden.*"]

If it was "symbolic" of anything it might have been of characters similar to Dr.P. who often crossed our way in those (only those?) days. But professor Klemperer puts also those who kept - or regained! - their dignity in the same pot with Dr.P. Thus he provides the parallel example of a certain Bukowzer

"who repented the German character, the liberalism and Europeanism of his past, and became vehemently upset whenever hearing a word of disdain, or just indifference towards Judaism, coming from a Jew."

["der das Deutschtum, den Liberalismus und Europäismus seiner Vergangenheit bereute und in heftigste Erregung geriet, wenn er von jüdischer Seite ein Wort der Abneigung oder auch nur der Lauheit dem Judentum gegenüber hörte."]

Bukowzer talked back - and was dismissed in the LTI as just another "LTI victim" alike to Dr.P. Why? Because when talking back he repeatedly said:

"I don't permit to be defamed, I don't tolerate that our religion be defamed."

["Ich lasse mich nicht diffamieren, ich dulde nicht dass unsere Religion diffamiert wird!"]

What is "linguistically" wrong with this? What made Klemperer call him an *LTI Höriger*, or "bondage serve of the LTI" along with Dr.P.? Well, we are told, and it may be true, that *diffamieren* was a preferred foreign expression of Hitler's, and that the "Fuehrer" often used it in his apologetic demagoguery stressing that "*Ich lasse mich nicht diffamieren*" or "I don't let myself be defamed". But should parts of the German language, along with its borrowed foreign words, not be used anymore because it served such a great variety of individuals employing its vocabulary to express fundamentally conflicting opinions and attitudes? But then Bukowzer may have known something of which Klemperer, ever ignorant in matters Jewish, may never have heard. It is that the Anti-Defamation League existed since 1913 in association with the B'nai B'rith, the German branch of which was founded in 1882. Or is this turn of the argument just a trick of Klemperer's to scratch off the surface of his conscience the bad feeling caused by the change of mind of an individual who used to share his views in the past, by putting him now in the same pot with Dr.P.? The affirmative answer to this question will be clear to anybody who will go farther in the study and see how the hidden idea is developed in the subsequent chapter on ... *Zion*. In the meanwhile, however, we may ask ourselves about what happened to Bukowzer. We read that he died along with many other "LTI bondage slaves". Yet why does he not appear in the "*I will bear witness*"? One thing is, however, clear: Bukowzer, in Klemperer's LTI interpretation, served perfectly well the DDR

edition. But still not as well as Mr. Seliksohn, our next example. Him we meet in the Zion chapter of the LTI, as well as in the memoirs. Yet these turn out to be two different Seliksohns. We must compare these two *caractères*, representing purportedly the same person but portrayed in two different ideological garbs.

In the second volume of "I Will Bear Witness" Mr. and Mrs. Seliksohn appear as some sort of regular social partners of the Klemperers. The initiative seems to have come from the Seliksohns. Who were they? The man was an "eastern Jew from the district of Kharkov" (v.II, p.66). To be an "eastern Jew", an *Ostjude*, was of course enough for Klemperer to resist any approach. Such one was viewed as "too forward and . . . very disagreeable", and as for Seliksohn it was also said that "he makes no bones of his Communism" (v.II, p.28). The *Ostjude* was certainly an anti-Semitic stereotype often used also by some we may call "Germans of the (more or less) Jewish religion" to stress their own purported excellence. It is one of the very much used expressions to be found in the LRH dictionary. But then this "Communist" and Eastern Jew lent him a book about the *kibbutzim* in Palestine, and Klemperer came to the conclusion that "the Zionist Bolsheviks are pure National Socialists!" (v.II, p.47). Still some contacts were developed because Seliksohn had "secret sources for potatoes" which he, a diabetic, traded with the Klemperers for dried vegetables. After all, wasn't Seliksohn an *Ostjude*, one of those with a special talent to find "secret sources"? Consequently they socialized. And discussed, and contradicted each other, but quite mildly. First. Seliksohn tried to convince Klemperer to become something of a *Nazionaljude*, a Jew claiming to belong to a nation among other nations, or even a Zionist. It didn't work, because: "I was only a German, I could not act in any other way; the National Socialists are not the German nation, the German nation of today is not all of Germany." The entire phrasing could tell you a lot about basic LRH, especially the mysterious last statement. One thing was sure that while "the National Socialists [were] not the German nation", the "Zionist Bolsheviks" were their purest incarnation. And then the Seliksohns were deported and died (II,p.205).

But Seliksohn had a second coming in the Zion chapter of the LTI. He even moved his birthplace to Odessa. This must have been quite a move because, while there

exists an Odessa in Ontario, Canada, and at least three in the US, there is no such in the "district of Kharkov", where he was earlier born. He underwent also a number of other changes: he did not talk about "his Communism", unlike in the memoirs where he made "no bones of it", and he did not prove to be a "Zionist Bolshevist" either. But he still was able to find potatoes and be kind to the Klemperers, though

"I could never quite understand why, and it always moved me a little that he offered to both of us genuine sympathy even though he hated everything of German character [*Deuschtum*]."

["*ich habe nie recht begriffen, weswegen, und es hat mich immer ein bisschen gerührt, das er uns beiden wirkliche Sympathie entgegenbrachte, obschon er alles Deuschtum hasste...*"] (LTI, p.213)

Quite a nice guy was this Seliksohn, even to a person who thought of himself to epitomize *alles Deuschtum* in the Nazi-imposed Jewry while "the German nation of today [was] not all of Germany". But Klemperer himself proved once again to be a "bondage serve of the LTI" when using the term *Deuschtum*. Well, we may also use the word for what it is worth, but we did not first regard as proto-Nazi somebody borrowing terms from the same dictionary as the Nazis, just because the later gave these expressions a contextually perverse use enhanced also by the frequency of usage. Yet Klemperer, unaware of his own LTI-bondage, here and elsewhere as to be shown, puts now words in the mouth of Seliksohn which he did not yet use in the "memoirs". Why? Because in this book published in East Germany the Zionist had to be shown as being in some kinship with those who prevented Klemperer from being a good German, yet *without being akin to the Communists!* Since such was Seliksohn in the *Memoirs*. And disapproved along with the "bolshevists" of the Kibbutzim. Now Klemperer and Seliksohn came to discuss literature. German literature by Jews. Patriotic literature, that is. Thus, some poem about the love for Germany written by the Zionist-to-be Julius Bab is quoted by Klemperer. And Seliksohn first qualifies Bab as a "*Literaturjude*" or "Literature-Jew" - which is the only way to translate the Nazi qualification, not likely to get into the mouth of a Zionist. Did he thus prove again to be a bondage slave of the LTI? Not quite, yet worse than that!

Trying to deny the genuine character of the writings of these patriots-turned-victims, the "Eastern Jew" quotes the Nazi dictum: "*Wen ein Jude deutsch schreibt lügt er*" or "When a Jew writes in German, he lies". They could not be real Germans, only lying about it or being silly. Hence, Klemperer - the one who wrote the LTI! - implies that Seliksohn implies that the Nazis were right. They were also right when some Jewish Nazi-stooge proclaimed: "*hinaus mit uns*" or "out with us!". Only, so Seliksohn, the Nazis just plagiarized the Zionists:

"'Out with us' is older than the *Hitlerei*, and it is not us who speak the language of the victor but it is Hitler who learned from Herzl".
["*Hinaus mit uns' ist älter als die Hitlerei, und nicht wir sprechen die Sprache des Siegers, sondern Hitler hat von Herzl gelernt*"]
(LTI, p.215).

It is easy to see that it is no more the case that "the Zionist Bolshevists [were] pure National Socialists". It is rather so, according to the LTI, that the Nazis were Zionists. And we may also notice that Klemperer's earlier quoted "Zionist-Bolshevist-Nazi" cocktail smacks so very much of Hitler's own "*Jüdisch-Bolschewistisch-Plutokratisch*" ragout. He certainly learned to master the LTI. We only miss the *Freimaurerbagage*, or the Freemason-rabble, to complete the above formula. Was somebody in the professor's family a *Freimaurer*?

Before continuing with Seliksohn's second coming, it is worthwhile to remind how Klemperer got into the bondage of a new *lingua*, that of the Communists. Because this process is convergent with the Seliksohn parable. The now Communist-blessed most-German professor of French literature - this time, at last, with tenure - first remembers the Nazi days when he met on a street

"a furniture-moving workman who was attached to me from two [past] movings - all good folks, smacking after the CPG [Communist Party of Germany]"

"ein Möbelträger, der mir von zwei Umzügen her zugetan ist - gute

Leute alle, riechen sehr nach KPD" (LTI, p.178)

and who grabbed his hands saying a few encouraging words. This labourer, as some other "good folks [*gute Leute alle*]... [who] smacked of the Communist Party of Germany", was now to be praised. With which anybody who also remembers such people, can only wholeheartedly agree. But in comparison with the tone of the *Memoirs*, this little insertion was only part of the new language game. This shows most pertinently when Klemperer talks about Hitler's anti-Semitism which

"connects him with the dullest mass of the people which, in the machine age, does not consist of the industrial proletariat and only partly of the rural population, but [consists] mainly of the compressed crowd of petit-bourgeois."

"verbindet ihn mit der dumpfsten Volksmasse, die im Maschinenzeitalter nicht etwa aus dem industriellen Proletariat, auch nur zum Teil aus der Landbevölkerung, vielmehr aus der Menge des zusammengedrängten Kleinbürgertums besteht." (LIT, p.185)

Nice new terminology. Not that the expressions were not clearly defined, but they were not part of the professors earlier vocabulary in any context. Not even Seliksohn, when he was still a "Zionist-Bolshevist", may have used them. But Klemperer now discovered a new term he hardly may have used in his "witness bearing" past: industrial proletariat. *It* was free of guilt! Just as the "labouring peasantry", as was called in the Communist *lingua* that part of the "rural population" which were not kulaks. The *Kleinbürger* or petit bourgeois was the main culprit. Can't you see it? (Isn't it strange that most of those who are recently so enthusiastic about the "witness" are themselves of that class? Even though Klemperer calls them "the dullest mass of the people" united with Hitler by their racism. That sounds almost as if Goldhagen had called them "willing executioners".)

Seliksohn, as we know, died and was never able to defend himself against the

utterly perverse distortions of Zionist ideas being attributed to him. And purportedly extracted from two volumes of Herzl he earlier lent to the professor. Thus, the ideas born in the mind of the much praised Klemperer about conceptual identities between Herzl and Hitler, while reading these volumes, could easily be used for the benefit of all those who may try to regain their comfort in the post-Goldhagen age. After all it was a "Jew" who said it. Isn't it? Here is a sample:

"In these two volumes one could find, if willing, the proofs for much of what Hitler and Goebbels and Rosenberg have brought up against the Jews, without commanding an unusual ability in interpretation and distortion."

["In diesen zwei Bänden lässt sich bei entsprechenden Willen Beweismaterial für vieles zu finden, was Hitler und Goebbels und Rosenberg gegen den Juden vorbringen, es bedarf dazu nicht übermässige Geschicklichkeit im Auslegen und Verdrehen".] (LTI, p.220).

Hence, they just had to borrow from Herzl. Luckily there are also differences to be quoted. Though Herzl has "very great affinities with Hitlerism" he still "dodges the blood definition". N.b.: he "*dodges it*"! Klemperer even makes a quite surprising concession:

"Herzl never advocated the subjugation or, indeed, extermination of foreign nations, he never espoused the idea of election and the claims of domination of a race or a people over the rest of the lesser humankind, [ideas] which are at the foundation of all Nazi horror. He asked only equal rights for a group of oppressed, only a modestly measured safe space for a group of mistreated and persecuted people."

"Herzl geht nirgends auf unterdrückung und nun gar Ausrottung fremder Völker aus, er verfährt nirgends die allem nazistischen

Greuel zugrunde liegende Idee von der Auserwähltheit und dem Herrschaftsanspruch einer Rasse oder eines Volkes der gesamten niedrigen Menschheit gegenüber. Er verlangte nur Gleichberechtigung für eine Gruppe Unterdrückter, nur einen bescheiden bemessenen sicheren Raum für eine Gruppe Misshandelter und Verfolgter." (LTI, p.220-221).

Then what constitutes the common denominator? Among others the repeatedly used term "Jewish people" - *Jüdisches Volk* - which is a "Nazi term" and which is incommensurable for Klemperer who, thereby, cannot be ... German. The *term* clearly associated to a *concept* having a real-world equivalent, known as such and recognized by most, bothered Klemperer. And therefore the *wir*, the "us" annoyed him too, as we learn from a confession in a sideline stating that

"just because I had to say 'us', I thought this to be a narrow and vane self-delusion."

["eben weil ich 'wir' sagen musste, hielt ich dies für eine enge und eitle Selbsttäuschung] (LTI, p.184)

And he, naturally, recognizes that no choice other than the "self-delusion" was available, while making at the same time a partially sound analysis of why Hitler needed not only anti-Semitism but particularly its racist variety. The Jewish *bête noire* was necessary and had to be preserved as such. Because

"a man may change his attire, his tradition, his culture or his religion, but not his blood."

["sein Kleid, seine Sitte, seine Bildung und seinen Glauben kann der Mensch wechseln, sein Blut nicht."] (ibid. p.186)

And Klemperer has done this as many others, but they couldn't dupe Hitler who found also some sort of "allies" in the early days of his *Kampf*. Where? We read that

"in the Galician Austria [better: Austrian Galicia - T.S.] a compressed crowd of Jews doesn't want by any means to give up its separate existence, thus supplying time and again material of illustration and proof to those who talk about the un-European people, the Asian race of the Jews."

"im galizischen Österreich will eine gedrängte Judenmasse ihr Sonderdasein durchaus nicht aufgeben und liefert denjenigen, die von dem uneuropäischen Volk, von der asiatische Rasse der Juden reden, immer wieder Anschauungs- und Beweismaterial." (ibid.)

Since otherwise the Nazis might have been very embarrassed. But then they had the *Ostjude*, ready also in the dictionary of Klemperer, who offered good excuses for their anti-Semitism. It seems that without *Ostjuden* the Nazis would have been altogether confounded by that good old "enlightenment". The one in which you can easily disappear while giving up creed, tradition, culture and attire. Some enlightenment. (One wonders whether the purported Voltaire scholar Klemperer ever saw the Vichy edition of Voltaire's anti-Semitic texts. No single word falsified in it!)

The *Zion* chapter in the LTI was of course acceptable to the Communists. And still we may ask ourselves whether being acceptable meant also that it was imposed on the author. Was Klemperer under any obligation to write it? Reading all his memoir varieties we know that this wouldn't have put much strain on him. But we also find out that even the manager of the Communist publishing house was embarrassed and intended to produce some changes, perhaps in a new edition. One of Klemperer's diary entries from early October 1948 testifies for that. It was about his birthday celebration. Members of the faculty, e.g. a Catholic professor Winter, as well as Ernst Wendt, the Communist *Aufbau Verlag's* head, were present. And at the table:

"The conversation turned to the *Ostjuden* and Zionism. - Wendt asked me to change the Hitler-Herzl comparison, it is held against me; I answered that it follows from my chapter that Herzl was no

Hitler-man, and anyhow I hate the Jewish nationalism, - and Winter proved himself very philo-Semitic and almost a Zionist. The *Ostjuden* are good people, and even though the Jewish nationalists were acting very badly (right now: the Bernadotte assassination) they are still very much to be pitied and are very brave people."

"Das Gespräch kam auf die Ostjuden u. Zionismus - Wendt hat mich gebeten, den Vergleich Hitler-Herzl zu ändern, man verüble ihn mir; ich habe geantwortet, dass Herzl kein Hitlermann sei, gehe aus meinem Capitel hervor, im Übrigen sei mir der jüd. Nationalismus verhasst, - u. Winter erwies sich als sehr philo-semitisch u. beinahe zionistisch. Die Ostjuden seien gute Leute, u. wenn die jüdische Nationalisten auch sehr schlimm vorgingen (eben jetzt: der Mord an Bernadotte), so seien sie doch sehr bemitleidenswert u. sehr tapfere Leute." (Stühlen, v.I, p.596)

The Communist publisher was embarrassed by the *Zion* chapter, while the Catholic professor rejected the implication of Klemperer's semantics: *Ostjuden* was a respectable designation with historic and geographic connotations; and those signified by the term were respectable people and not *klempererwise* detestable. And the "Jewish nationalists" were brave fighters to the Catholic professor.

Still it would be unfair to forget the moments of recognition which a good text may have impressed on the litterateur Klemperer. Thus we read a confession written by the "witness" in a "deviationist" moment yet never repeated in the LTI:

"I am reading Shmarya Levin's *Childhood in Exile*, 1935. A great work of art. Content tremendously interesting, very important for the last book of my Curriculum. ... For the first time draws on me that *Zionism is humanism*. The book was lent to me by the Seliksohns." (Vol. II. p.8-9 - January 19, Monday.)

But then the Seliksohns stopped lending such books for the author of the LTI.

The English connection of Zionism, as presented by Klemperer, is also worth to be studied, not least because of its interesting "linguistic" implications. We may start with an entry from July 24, 1942, in the witness memoirs:

"I recently had the most conclusive evidence of the tremendous harm that Herzl caused us".

The reader, when reading this phrase, will certainly be in great suspense, waiting for the disclosure of that "most conclusive evidence". And if he is a very careful reader, he may also be eager to find out who are those "us", that first person plural to whom, most obviously, *now* also Klemperer was forced to belong. Some inadvertent concession to the LTI? Was it not *Selbsteuschung* - self-delusion? No explanation. But the wait for the "most conclusive evidence" will be eased by the fact that the answer follows right away, and it reads as follows:

"An acquaintance of Kätchen's brought a copy of the *Deutsche Ukrainezeitung* [German Ukraine newspaper], of about July 11, with her. In it there was a remarkably undirty article about the 'Jewish nation'. [In quotes, mind you, courtesy of Victor Klemperer. But then who is "us"? - T.S.] The author quoted a memorandum to Lord Landsdowne found among Herzl's literary remains. (I do not think that it is a forgery, because tone and expression correspond very precisely with similar outpourings in the Zionist writings.) I cannot quote word for word, but the meaning was something like this: If England espouses the establishment of a Zionist state, then it [England] will gain many thousands of Jews in every country as admirers, supporters, propagandists and agents. From that National Socialist Germany

naturally concludes that there is a Jewish nation, which in its totality is an enemy and whose German parts are now betraying it. And on this precisely it bases its legal claim to treat us, at best, as prisoners of war, but preferably as traitors. With the general shortages the general terror is increasing, too, and with it especially that practiced against the Jews." (v.II, p.106)

A detailed analysis of Klemperer's (not the Nazis!) perverse, or rather silly "reasoning" displayed in the above quoted instance, would yield extremely interesting results. Firstly because it is a remarkable sample of the morbid search by a would-be "German" to blame for his failure somebody else than those with whom he attempted, unsuccessfully, to identify. However, the quotation, which is a concentrate of much of the Herzl-cum-Zionism blubbering in the memoirs, could be even better understood as representative for a type, and not only for Klemperer as an individual, by perusing yet another diary section included in the earlier quoted *Curriculum Vitae*. This diary, obviously prepared at some time for publication, would be worth reading to cast additional light on the abridged and now so widely spread "witness bearing" volumes. Here we will find out about Klemperer's own attempt to produce himself as a good German. Definitely not one ready to sell his country to the English! - something worth to be stressed in what follows and in connection with the above quotation.

In 1913, after a long string of scholarly and professional failures he was sent, on the recommendation of a celebrated and obviously rather charitable romanist, prof. Karl Vossler, to the University of Naples in Italy as "lecturer" of German. This without the *protégé* having a proper command of the Italian language. It was something we would call today an "academic exchange". No wonder he was not particularly happy with it, though he didn't have many choices. Being finally overwhelmed by some scaring form of chauvinism, Klemperer joined the German army as a volunteer, well before Italy entered the war. As a soldier he was a failure, just as an academic. (Later, in 1918, he became even a temporary revolutionary.) But the man who much later will blame in his diaries the Zionist "agents of the English" for his being downgraded to a Jew, was clean of any suspicion. As a good German soldier, he was now marching on the tune of the "*Hasslied*

gegen England" - the "Song of Hatred against England". The author was Ernst Lissauer, a Jew who denied any connection to the Jewish people and who put his rather modest surrogate-talent in the service of German-imperial hatemongering. The Lissauer-Klemperer connection, conveniently "forgotten" by reviewers, is relevant to much of the present discussion. Therefore let us pay some attention to it.

In the LTI, Klemperer mentioned again Lissauer. Or rather he made Seliksohn - who was no more around to confirm or deny the quote - say something about "*Lissauer's affektierten Hassgesang*" (LTI, p,214) or "the affected hate song of Lissauer". So we have just a simple and rather mild (what is "affected"?) dismissal of some "youthful errors" burdening the conscience of Klemperer in the days when the Nazi soldiers were marching to the tune of the "*Engellied*" singing "*wir fahren gegen Engeland*" - "we march against England". And don't forget: this Nazi song was a loving lullaby compared to Lissauer's. What was in this "hate song" and how did Klemperer *really* relate to it?

The "*Hassgesang gegen England*" is a proclamation of war ideology.*)

*) All subsequent Ernst Lissauer quotations are from: *Der brennende Tag - Ausgewählte Gedichte*, Schuster & Löffler, Berlin 1916.

About the French and the Russian it says just that "*wir lieben sie nicht, wir hassen sie nicht*" or "we don't love them we don't hate them". "We" just fight them to protect "our" borders, which were considered to be along the Vistula river and in the Alsace. As for hate:

"We have only one single hatred ... we have only one single enemy."

"*Wir haben nur einen einzigen Hass ... wir haben nur einen einzigen Feind*".

And who was that unique, most hated enemy?

"We all have only one enemy: England."

"Wir haben alle nur einen Feind: England."

Klemperer, for a variety of reasons, literary as well as very personal ones, had not much regard for Lissauer. All this changed later, and for rather un-literary reasons, because during the war it so happened that

"the Song of Hatred against England [contained] an indignation and a passion which in 1914 all of us felt to be just and which all of us shared."

["der Hassgesang gegen England [enthielt] eine Entrüstung und eine Leidenschaft, die wir 1914 alle als recht empfanden und alle gleichermassen fühlten."] (*Curriculum v.I.*, p.281-282)

Wir alle - all of us. No exception! But then, early in the war days, while being in the still non-belligerent Italy, during a conversation with two Americans about the *Hasslied*, just published in the *Messagero* in Italian translation, one of them, a German-American

"declared that he is totally unable to understand such an antediluvian hatred as the one against an entire nation."

"erklärte, er könne ein so vorsintflutliches Gefühl wie den Hass gegen ein ganzes Volk überhaupt nicht verstehen".

And Klemperer?

"I passionately defended that fat Lissauer and said that by his hate song he speaks my mind and the mind of all of us."

["Da nahm ich den dicken Lissauer leidenschaftlich in Schutz und sagte, er spreche mit seinem Hassgesang mir und uns allen aus der

Seele."] (*Curriculum* v.II, p.252)

Thus one can understand how Herzl's purported letter spoiled Klemperer's chances to be accepted as a true German. We also understand something else. On the very same page(!) of the *Curriculum*, the man whose mind was spoken by the *Hasslied* writes:

"Time and again I said to myself that a better humankind is living in Germany, and a kind destiny allowed me to be born a German."
["*Wieder und wieder sagte ich mir, in Deutschland lebe doch eine bessere Menschheit, und ein gütiges Schicksal habe mich als Deutschen zur Welt kommen lassen.*"]

Lissauer, though patriotically approved, was not forgiven for having once made disparaging remarks about Klemperer's own poetic exertions. Therefore the latter received with joy the success of yet another war poem written by an Austrian. It was different from Lissauer's because it was not hate mongering, just simply patriotic and extolling soldierly virtues. It was written by a Jewish lawyer and litterateur from Vienna, named Hugo Zuckermann. And Klemperer was happy for what he thought to be the proof that:

"not all Austrian Jews are Zionists"
["... *nicht alle österreichische Juden sind Zionisten.*"] (*Curriculum* v.II, p.200)

Well, it so happened that Zuckermann, who died of his wounds in a military hospital, *was* a Zionist. Yet he fought and died for his native country without teaching hatred while still praising the good, valiant soldier. This seems to have been perfectly compatible with *his* Zionism.

But hatred and the language of hatred was part of becoming a "good German", by some definitions. For Klemperer it was occasionally embarrassing and he didn't really

have a clean conscience when he skidded into it. An entry, once again from the *Curriculum Vitae*, should offer some insight into this. The date is from Friday, August 28, 1914, and reads:

"We dropped Zeppelin bombs on the city of Antwerp. There is yet no provision in International Law against this horror. And even if such would exist, it would be bypassed. International law is a scarecrow which even the silliest sparrow isn't taking seriously."

["Wir haben Zepelinbomben in die Stadt Antwerpen geworfen. Es gibt gegen diese Grausamkeit noch keine Bestimmung des Völkerrechts. Und wenn es eine gäbe, würde man sie umgehen. Das Völkerrecht ist eine Vogelscheuche, die selbst der dümmste Spatz nicht ernst nimmt."] (*Curriculum*, v.II, p.198)

Honest and sincere. The reader may also agree with what he says about International Law while adding that it can also be conveniently reinvented for every occasion when the powerful try dirty tricks on some small country. But then, Klemperer recalls that he is a good German, later in the

"Evening. - I reproach myself those lax lines from the afternoon for showing a lack of patriotism. I passed by a quiet group of people, those who line up daily in front of the War Ministry on the Ludwigstrasse. That's were information about [human] losses is provided; the tenth list has already been issued."

["Abend. - Ich werfe mir meine flauen Zeilen vom Nachmittag als Mangel an Patriotismus vor. Ich kam an der stillen Gruppe vorüber, die täglich in der Ludwigstrasse vor dem Kriegsministerium steht. Dort wird Auskunft über Verluste erteilt; es ist schon die zehnte Liste erschienen."] (ibid.)

Can one not still be a patriot without approving the deliberate and ruthless bombing of civilian habitations? One could, perhaps, but during WW-I Klemperer himself joined the German propaganda machine employing the newspeak of what we may call the LSI -

Lingua Secundii Imperii, probably fully aware of his volunteer "bondage". A variation on the "Belgian theme" should give an additional illustration of this.

Soon after his return to Germany in 1915 he published an article on "The Last Peace Months in Italy" in which he denounced that country's warmongers.^{*)}

**)Die letzten Friedensmonate in Italien in Kriegshefte der Süddeutschen Monatshefte, München, April-September, 1915.*

He also expressed in the article conditional appreciation for the restraint-preaching Neapolitan philosopher Benedetto Croce. But then it turned out that Croce was utterly upset with Germany's aggression against neutral Belgium:

"Well, the same Croce who was so bitterly upset by that mixture of [Italian] fanaticism and self-delusion ... the same man had yet no understanding for the sincerity of the declaration made by the Chancellor of the Reich on the first war meeting of the *Reichstag* concerning the infringement upon Belgium's pseudo-neutrality [perhaps "feigned neutrality" would be more appropriate - T.S.]. Croce, this great admirer of the German character, called this the fruit of the Bismarck doctrine and revolting brutality.

["Nun, derselbe Croce der sich über solche Mischung aus Fanatismus und Selbstbetrug bitterlich ärgerte ... derselbe Mensch hatte doch kein Verständnis für die Aufrichtigkeit der Erklärung, die der deutsche Reichskanzler in der ersten Kriegssitzung des Reichstages über die Verletzung der belgischen Scheinneutralität abgab. Croce dieser grosse Verehrer deutschen Wesens, nannte das die Frucht Bismarckscher Lehre, nannte es abstossende Brutalität."] (p.442)

If you appreciate the positive side of Klemperer's linguistic critic in LTI then you also

should consider carefully the quoted sentence. First, it may be recalled that the *Reichskanzler*, by far not the type of warmonger as the Kaiser or his generals, was rather apologetic about the unprovoked aggression against the tiny nation. But he did not use the term *Scheinneutralität*! This was a term which may have been invented by the propaganda agencies to cover-up the most atrocious and murderous aggressive acts during WW-I, an expression used and spread by Klemperer himself - at a time when his right to be German was not yet revoked. Later in time he may have realized how a specific *lingua* was invented to justify this, which in August 1914 was still found to be unpleasant yet patriotically acceptable. By Klemperer. But during the second World War he was deprived of the privilege of being a patriotic German and pushed in the same house with *Ostjuden* while the Nazis went about doing the same, and worse, to English cities. And they invented a term for that: *Coentrieren*. "To coentriize" a city meant to make it equal to the ground, as the *Luftwaffe* has done with the English city. And the term is subjected to comparative analysis in the LTI (p. 134ff). (One may miss, of course, an examen of Hitler's pledge that "*wir werden die englische Städte ausradieren*" - "we will erase the English cities". "*Ausradieren*" seems to have been, reluctantly, approved by the professor for Antwerp.) During the first World War the word *Antwerpieren* was not yet invented, but it is not likely that Klemperer would have been particularly bothered by it. He didn't yet bother to discover how words cover-up unpleasant things. He rather invented some himself. And they didn't always cover-up very much. It was in those days when he declared that by the "hate-song [Lissauer] speaks the mind of all of us", that he translated *neutrality* in *feigned neutrality* when cities in small, neutral countries, had to be patriotically *ausradiert*. It was at the same time when Lissauer, in yet another poem about "England Dreams" [*England träumt*] was singing the virtues of an early form of *Coentrieren*, the Zeppelin bombing of London:

"The sky resounds
Ever blaring, ever faster,
Listen to the roaring propeller
England dreams ... England groans."
"Der Himmel tönt,

*Immer heller, immer schneller,
Horch, es brausen die Propeller
England träumt ... England stöhnt."*

This was written on September 2, just five days after Klemperer's evening recollection of his dutifully patriotic sentiments which justified the Zeppelins bombing Antwerp. Later, some others, who "didn't really do it", may also have washed away from their conscience, with patriotic excuses, the disturbing knowledge about the mass murder of civilians. In what *lingua* would you translate this state as "ignorance"? As for the bombings, they had a lucky consequence for our philologist. When the allied bombers destroyed - *ausradiert* - Dresden on February 13, 1944 - anything but a glorious act of war - Klemperer was able to hide during the disarray and escape Nazi vengeance.

The denial of anti-Semitism is also several times connected by Klemperer to the English and, in a rather odd fashion, to the *lingua* of hatred. There seems to have been no anti-Semitism worth mentioning before the Zionists suggested the idea to the Nazis. How could we find this out? By studying the language of Klemperer telling about his WW-I experience. Thus one day, in the combat area, a fellow characterized as "*etwas rabiater, aber gar nicht bössartiger Bauernbursche*", or a "somewhat rude yet not really malevolent peasant lad", explodes with anger and grief:

"Last night at the seventeenth [regiment] a fellow from my village was slain. That English sowdog, that miserable Jew!"

"*Heut Nacht ist bei den Siebzehnern einer aus meinem Dorfe hingemacht worden. - Sauhund der Engländer, der Jud der elendige!*" (*Curriculum* v.II.p.362)

No doubt every *Sauhund* or "sowdog", a kind of animal specially cloned for the *Reichswehr* vocabulary, must have been identical with a Jew. This was quite usual and nobody would grant additional attention to the obvious. *Intellectual* attention, that is. But Klemperer also denied the obvious:

"Quite obviously 'Jew' was for him just a common invective which

he did not connect with any specifically anti-Semitic significance - I never encountered any anti-Semitic emotions in my frontline environment ..."

["Ganz offenbar war ihm 'Jud' ein allgemeines Schimpfwort, mit dem er keine spezifisch antisemitische Bedeutung verband - ich bin überhaupt in meinem Frontumkreis keiner antisemitischen Regung begegnet ..."]

One may just forget about all this had Klemperer's own *LTI* not taught us how to look behind words. It may be that the "good natured peasant lad" didn't mean by "Jew" anything than a "common invective" or just an expression of anger, but then why did the "Jew" serve better the purpose than any other type? To what *lingua* was the peasant lad in bondage?

Thus the peasant lad was - "quite obviously"? - not an anti-Semite. Such didn't exist in the army or thereabouts! Not much. If you want proofs, examples could be found in the *Curriculum* itself. One pertinent example is on the very same page of the story with the peasant lad. It is about one Levin, chemist by profession, present at the above quoted occurrence and who:

"had already served [in the army] several years before the war, then as non-commissioned officer on the front from the beginning of the war, carried the IC [Iron Cross], yet has not yet been promoted, doubtless because of his strongly stressed Jewish identity."

["hatte schon mehrere Jahre vor dem Krieg gedient, war seit Kriegsbeginn als unteroffizier an der Front, trug das EK, war aber noch nicht befördert, fraglos seines stark betonten Judentums halber."]

Fraglos - beyond question! So what exactly is anti-Semitism? Does it start with the gas

chambers of Auschwitz? Or did the latter come about because in good time not only Arians but also others were willing - and I mean willing! - to overlook certain things? Yet being betrayed, much too late, by their *lingua*. It was, of course, not always necessary to have a "strongly stressed Jewish identity" to be kept out of any favour much more liberally available to an Arian under the same circumstances. What about Lissauer's strongly stressed German identity, the same Lissauer's who so perfectly mimicked in his writings, dubbed poems, the spirit of Teutonic aggression and xenophobia?

"His Song of Hatred against England became one of the best known war poems and netted him an Imperial medal; and had the author not been called Lissauer, of all things, and been also of non-Arian strain, one would see now new forms of honouring [him]"
[*"Sein Hassgesang gegen England wurde eines der bekanntesten Kriegsgedichte und trug ihm einen kaiserlichen Orden ein, und wenn der Autor nicht gerade Lissauer hiesse und ganz unarisches Blutes wäre, so würde es heute zu neuen Ehren gelangen."*]

One just wonders how far would have had to go Lissauer's hatred in order to dissociate him from those obstinate "*Ostjuden*", and what exactly was Klemperer's definition of anti-Semitism. Since everybody else's did not seem to fit his. First he denies the anti-Semitic character of a rude, vulgar, very explicitly anti-Jewish outburst; and then he clearly shows that two very differently "meritorious" Jews are discriminated against as part of a normal procedure.

The *Curriculum* offers the reader the possibility to discover Klemperer's own peculiar anti-Semitism and its interesting linguistic implications. When denying the existence of such in the army, while telling the story of the chemist Levin and the occurrence with the peasant lad, he stresses that the only form of anti-Semitism in the army was his own, whenever he encountered a certain Jewish sergeant. Auerbach was the stepson of the poet Richard Dehmel, a 100% arian author of patriotic war songs, but otherwise a much better poet than Lissauer. Indeed a poet. Just as his Jewish wife. Now

Auerbach was very popular with the troops being a jester and a wit, but also because standing up to the officers for the lesser guy. Therefore he was called a "fine Jew". Apparently there were also some such. Not for Klemperer though. Here is the reason:

"He never did anything wrong to me yet he sorely irritated my upset nerves with his sarcastic haughtiness, his all-knowing and all criticizing."

"Mir selber tat er nichts Übles, aber er fiel mir durch seine spöttische Überlegenheit, sein Alleswissen und -aburteilen qualvoll auf die gereizten Nerven." (Curriculum, v.II, p.427)

And consequently:

"he pushed me into an anti-Semitic mood."

"mich selbst drängte er in antisemitische Gefühle".

Auerbach was, of course, not very patriotic when he poked fun of Dehmel whom he characterized as *"der einzige noch immer begeisterte Kriegsfreiwillige"* or "the only remaining enthusiastic war volunteer". This may have been a reflection of his above quoted character. But because of the Jewish sergeant, Klemperer got into some linguistic trouble. While anti-Semitic sentiments were overpowering him, the young philologist still couldn't use the appropriate terminology to characterize Auerbach. He was just perplexed:

"Why am I ashamed to use that *Jargon* expression which alone could characterize his [Auerbach's] nature ... why do I not call him simply a chutzpah-ponem?"

"Warum schäme ich mich eigentlich, das Jargonwort zu gebrauchen, das allein sein Wesen erfasst ... warum nenne ich Auerbach nicht einfach ein Chuzpeponim?" (ibid. p.427-428)

But like Seliksohn so the *Jargon* had a second coming. Apart from being the language of the *Ostjuden* it served now a peculiar function within the Stalinist variety of Communism. It became *the* language of the Jews. In some East European countries you could even go to jail when caught giving private Hebrew lessons, because Hebrew was the "Zionist language". However, Yiddish was OK. And Klemperer obliged with his "patriotic" variety of the Communist language policy:

"Of course, only a Germanist by profession knows that it is exactly the *Jargon* which expresses the attachment to Germany maintained by the Jews throughout the centuries, and that their [the Jews] pronunciation is widely consistent with that of a Walter von der Vogelweide and Wolfram von Eschenbach, and I would like to know the professor of Germanistics who may have brought this to the attention [of his students] in his seminar during the Nazi era."
["*Das gerade im Jargon die durch Jahrhunderte bewahrte Anhänglichkeit der Juden an Deutschland ausdrückt und dass ihre Aussprache sich weitgehend mit der eines Walter von der Vogelweide und Wolfram von Eschenbach deckt, dass weiss natürlich nur der Germanist von Metier, und ich möchte den Professor der Germanistik kennen, der während der Nazizeit in einem Seminar darauf aufmerksam gemacht hätte.*"] (LTI, p.86)

One thing is sure, that *before the Nazi era* Klemperer was himself loath using an expression of the *Jargon*, of which he was later to tell us that it represented "*die durch Jahrhunderte bewahrte Anhänglichkeit der Juden an Deutschland*" or "the attachment to Germany maintained by the Jews throughout the centuries", and that it is closely related to the language of the medieval poets Walter von der Vogelweide and Wolfram von Eschenbach. And a "Germanist by profession" could have said *him* a lot more on the subject including the fact that the first written rendition of some old German legend-poetry was in *Jüdisch-Deutsch* or German-Jewish, or that Goethe wasn't loath taking private tuition of that idiom. Klemperer did not know much about this and hence flip-

flopped - in the same book! - between being ashamed to use the expressions current with that "*gedrängte Judenmasse ... im galizischen Österreich*" or "compressed Jew-crowd ... in the Galician Austria" for which he had only spite, and the stress on the fact that their "pronunciation" was "widely consistent" with that of early German poets. One could write an ample study about this partial aspect of the LRH but Klemperer's own condition would by no means be better explained than by the phrase with which he concludes the Auerbach section:

"Thus I was between the [social] layers in complete isolation"

"So war ich zwischen den Schichten innerlich ganz isoliert."

There he was indeed, and seems to have been ever unable to find a solution to this situation. Others did, as we will see.

Yet another couple of new linguae, one being recognized while the other simply ignored, caused some trouble for the neophyte party member in the GDR. But the reader may find some amusement in Klemperer's own farcical employment of the Communist lingo, which was quite different from that of the "Zionist-Bolshevist" Seliksohn. His earlier mentioned use of the term "industrial proletariat" was only of secondary importance. After all, the term itself can be and could always have been used as a simple designation for a class of individuals with a particular position in the economic process. In a very general sense. However, its Marxist ideological connotation is contextual, and Klemperer, as many others, avoided in the past the use of the lexicographically neutral expression being aware of the ideological connotation it gained by the frequency of a certain contextual usage. Others instead used it precisely because of this. And now the converted philologist joined the latter group. But this was just a paltry case compared to the new employment he gave to the pronoun *wir*, or "we". In the past he avoided it, or used it only by mistake. The reason for this can be easily conjectured from his writings. There were some *wir* with whom he refused to associate, yet with whom he was forced to associate. And then there were some other *wir* who refused to associate with him, or with whom he was not permitted to associate. However, under Communism he used the *wir*

quite frequently as an expression of his new political affiliation. In the *Stühlen* there are numerous examples for this, examples worthy of a study. True, he is not always very comfortable in using it. That is shown when he puts the "wir" in quotes. But then there are other instances when he capitalises it as *WIR*. No, he was not a Communist. Just a small-time opportunist who was uneasy with the usage but took advantage of being authorized to associate with some sort of *wir*. Yet at the same time he sought refuge in a never concluded, linguistic venture: the study of the new lingo in both sides of Germany.

As we read in the *Stühlen*, *LQI* is the acronym he invented for the new "language" to be studied. The third empire or *Reich* is followed by a fourth, *Quartum*, -ii, the language of which is then that LQI. However, there was a problem with this fourth empire: it did not exist because it has been broken up. And Klemperer is terribly bothered by the very terms in the new "jargon" which correctly express this break up. Without any doubt the terminology is system dependent, i.e. dependent on the respective systems in East and West Germany, but the bothersome terms are nevertheless precise. So it is when in West Germany the Soviet Zone was simply called *die Zone*, with no specification, and which then originated the first short note suggesting disapproval in late September 1948. (*Stühlen*, p.592). And then there was the *West* or *der Westen*, and it is not difficult to guess what was meant thereby. But then the LRH is all the time present as well, alongside the LQI, waiting for a dedicated researcher who will find enough material even though the publisher has only too often wedged his sanitizing separations [...] into the text. He may also find out who are all those many persons in the "West" - farther than the German West - whom Klemperer approached in times of the "Zone"-dearth and who were kind to him in many ways. Thus we may get more about a Mrs. Morris in the USA from whom "*ein Liebenswürdiger Brief*" or "a charming letter" arrived; because we could hardly know more about her given that even the author of the diaries had some memory lapses. He asked himself "*wie war nur ihr Judenname in Dresden?*" - "what exactly was her Jewname in Dresden?" She had a *Jewname*. LTI or LRH? Likely both. However, other letters from the United States were more precise. The "*Literaturjude*" Julius Bab did not have problems with the LQI as we find out from the diaries reporting his letter:

"He 'does modestly', he got 'good offers' from Germany, yet he will not come. One hundred friends and relatives of his were murdered, the Nazis are walking around freely, he would always be afraid to shake hands with somebody who might have flung his little niece in the gas chamber. - I want to answer him: 'You must come in spite of all this'"

"Es gehe ihm 'sehr bescheiden', er habe 'gute Angebote' nach Deutschland, werde aber nicht kommen. Ihm seien 100 Freunde u. Verwandte ermordet, die Nazis liefen frei herum, er würde immer fürchten, jemanden die Hand zu schütteln, der vielleicht seine kleine Nichte in den Gasofen gestossen habe. - Ich will ihm antworten: 'Sie müssen trotzdem kommen'". (Stühlen, p.593.)

We never found out about the details of Klemperer's proposals. Did he recommended the "West" of which he also, correctly, said that it is a haven for many a Nazi murderer? Or, perhaps, the "Zone", to join the Communist party? But later, in December, a letter from Bab made it clear that

"He doesn't want to come back, he is a citizen under oath of a state which 'saved his life', and for which his son fought in combat. (USA). He does not believe in Germany;"

"Er wolle nicht zurück, er sei geschworener Bürger eines Staates, der ihm 'das Leben gerettet'. u. für den sein Sohn im Felde gestanden habe. (USA). Er glaube nicht an Deutschland;" (Stühlen I, p.614)

Julius Bab defined his position and, implicitly, Klemperer's character. No language could cover this up anymore: the poet who once wrote the German patriotic song quoted by Klemperer with so much delight, remained loyal to the country which saved his life - and not in quotes! - and for which his son fought.

No final conclusion can be drawn from the quoted, very few yet representative examples. After all they only meant to convince the reader about the need to more thoroughly investigate the character of the LRH because it reveals so much, particularly when employed by Klemperer. And it tells also something about the reception of his various writings. Why did "*I Will Bear witness*" become a bestseller in Germany along with Goldhagen's book carrying those disturbing claims? For once, interesting as some personal revelations may be, and ambiguous as some anecdotes may prove to be, they don't add all that much to the picture *we* have of Nazi Germany. Yet we have the commending reception by so many from among those who would like to question the *willing* collaboration of so many Germans. Do they, such as Federal Chancellor Schröder or Martin Walser, the author so much upset by the "Holocaust industry", find in the memoirs of the "witness" arguments in favour of their position? Hardly, no matter what they may claim. Whether you agree or not with either stance in the debate, you could easily find out that neither of Klemperer's just recently celebrated so many diaries would really adduce any data denying the share of a large section of the general populace in the Nazi crimes. Indeed, lots of interesting notes in *all* the various diaries would offer ample material for yet another collection of *caractères* whose personal developments are explanatory of the mechanics by which Nazi stooges come about. It may also suggest to the more careful reader that the stuff, the "raw material" for such, is still available. Only the agents who address it became more, well, "sophisticated". They celebrate now Jews who, at least from time to time, slip into their usage. This is the perverse employment given to Klemperer's confessions. Not explicitly though. Just by implication. They serve those who hope that the reader will find opinions and ideas about Jews and "Jews", which are not "correct" to be openly said nowadays, except when pronounced by non other than a Jew. And the Klemperer fuss is only more directly revealing than that of other Jewish anti-Semites whose literary merits have been more recently discovered. They are also worth scrutiny by the student of ideological distortions. Yet all this can only be hinted at in an article which is just proposing another look at things "Klemperer saw".

Tibor Schatteles: VICTOR KLEMPERER'S LANGUAGES

Copyright (C) by Tibor Schatteles

OTTAWA 2001