

Sibelius, the Nazis and the Political Culture of Finland

Antti Vihinen

I would like to begin my presentation with a rare tone document. It is one of the few examples of Sibelius's voice. He is giving a small speech, some words of thanks, in April 1942. The speech was broadcast to Berlin on 10th of April 1942, where a festive act to honour Sibelius and his music was taking place. It was the founding ceremony of the German Sibelius Society: notably Sibelius himself did not take part in the actual occasion – he had sent one his daughters to represent him. This is how it goes:

“Mit tiefer Freude danke ich für diese warmen Worte, Herr Generalintendant. Die grosse Sympathie für mein Vaterland in diesen Zeiten der Schicksalsgemeinschaft und das Interesse für meine Musik, die auch durch die Gründung der deutschen Sibeliusgesellschaft zum Ausdruck gekommen, machen mich stolz und glücklich. Aus den finnischen Wäldern sende ich meinen Gruss an Deutschland, das strahlende Land der Musik.”[1]

I found this document some ten years ago in the archives of the Finnish Broadcasting Company YLE in Helsinki. As far as I know, it had been lying untouched and unheard in the archives for five decades before I came to look for it. When I heard it for the first time, I was greatly surprised, because this tone document has been quoted from the 1960's onward in a dramatically different way. In Ernst Tanzbergers Sibelius biography[2] Sibelius's words have been changed, or rather, they have been edited. Five words were left out by Tanzberger who was working for Sibelius's German publisher Breitkopf & Härtel. These five words are “In diesen Zeiten der Schicksalsgemeinschaft” – “in these times of a community of destiny.” Why did Tanzberger leave out these five little words?

There is a simple explanation to this: the phrase “A Community of Destiny” refers to Nazi vocabulary, especially to Alfred Rosenberg's theories of the mythical north and the fateful battle between the German Nordic races against the “wild east” and Bolshevik Russia. In the 1960's when Tanzberger published his book, Breitkopf & Härtel was all too keen to forget the close ties between Sibelius and the Nazi Germany. And fifteen years after the war this boring and mesmerizing propaganda, its special vocabulary, employed by both Rosenberg and Goebbels, was still very much in the memory of the people. Of course, in Germany there was a good reason not to remember this fateful partnership between Sibelius and the Nazis, between Finland and the Third Reich.

Perhaps one should not overestimate the importance of a missing sentence, a sentence of five words only, however, one should also not underestimate it. The Nazi admiration for Sibelius had begun already well before the spring of 1942, as a matter of fact well before the National-Socialist party seized the power in Germany in January 1933. This was mainly due to Rosenberg's theories, largely appreciated by the right-wing nationalist parties and various political dreamers of the 1920's and 1930's.

Alfred Rosenberg, often called the “high priest of the Nazi-ideology,” was born in Tallinn, and went to school in Riga and Moscow. He was the offspring of a Baltic-German family, and because of his family name, he was often suspected to have Jewish blood in his veins. This was not the case: Rosenberg was a fanatic anti-Semite and nationalist thinker, and he joined the NSDAP among the first believers in the movement. He has often been ignored when the origins of the Hitler-regime have been studied: as a matter of fact, the first scholarly analytical biography of Rosenberg was published in Germany only a few years ago. However, in the case of Sibelius, Rosenberg's thoughts and theories were of major importance, – I would even dare to say that they were crucial.

Being of Baltic-German origin, Rosenberg perhaps had a better knowledge and understanding for the Baltic region and the Finns than the other Nazi leaders did. Rosenberg's interest in Sibelius was a result of his admiration for the “Nordic myths” and the “Nordic race”. His thoughts were presented in his notorious book the “Myth of the 20th Century.” According to Rosenberg, the myth of the Nordic race, its rebirth and its future, was to have its victorious beginning among the peoples of Germany, England, Scandinavia – and Finland.[3] He saw these peoples as the “source of the Nordic power”[4] and the primary proof of his racist theories for the supremacy of the Nordic race. Music played a special role in his thinking: Richard Wagner – the Aryan Hero of Rosenberg and the Nazis – was the only 19th century philosopher to deserve a chapter of his own in Rosenberg's book.

In 1930's Germany and, indeed, in Finland, Rosenberg's ideas gained popularity, even among serious scholars and academics. One must only read the horrendous and glorifying reports and books of Olavi Paavolainen, one of the most

important Finnish authors of the 1930s, about the Nazi movement and the Nuremberg Party Rallies, to get a picture of a mesmerized intellectual fascinated by the power of the Nazi ideology.[5] Although Paavolainen to some extent remains sceptical towards Nazism, and even condemned it later, he too adapts and comments the “Nordic Thought”[6] in his book, as well as Rosenberg’s idea of “political landscape” and a “Community of Destiny of the Baltic Sea.”[7] Interestingly, Sibelius also used the very same phrase “A Community of Destiny” in his radio speech to Germany in 1942.

I am afraid this was a widespread way of thinking among Finnish intellectuals in the 1930’s and 1940’s. It is also typical for the political culture of Finland that Paavolainen’s book has been reprinted in Finland several times after the war, even in 2003, in its original length and without critical commentary. However, I think Paavolainen expresses the general feeling in Finland regarding Rosenberg’s theories precisely, when he writes that: “The Nordic thought is through and through a German invention, which all Scandinavians and we Finns receive with amazed gratitude rather than immediate excitement.”[8]

“With amazed gratitude”? Those are his exact words. What does he mean by that?

Ever since the declaration of independence in December 1917, Finnish society has desperately been looking for allies and acceptance from other countries. The rise of the Soviet Union and Russia, the traditional “enemy” and threat to the Finns, combined with the strong right-wing political tendencies in Finland in the 1930’s, made Germany the logical ally. After all, it was Germany that helped us in gaining independence by sending military troops to Finland in 1918. The German army in Finland was led by general Rüdiger von der Goltz. His son was Joseph Goebbels’ attorney. Some parts of Finnish society admired Germany boundlessly. And, indeed, they adapted most of the Nazi jargon as part of their own identity. So, when Alfred Rosenberg, for many Finns a distinguished scientist and widely acknowledged race hygienist, published his book hailing the Finns as saviours of the Aryan Race, the blue-eyed Finns were simply flattered. Finally somebody had noticed us! Finally we had a true friend and ally against Russia! The Finns, like Paavolainen, were filled with gratitude.

It is this very same gratitude that gave resonance to Sibelius’s speech from 1942. He praises Germany as “the shining country of music” now joined in battle against Bolshevism with his Fatherland. And he expresses his deepest gratitude to his German admirers, whatever their political function or conviction may be: they make him “proud and happy”. In 1942 Berlin this speech was, of course, understood as a political message for the common cause of the Finns and Germans in the East, especially as Sibelius was underlining the “Community of Destiny” phrase. One year earlier, at the beginning of the German-Finnish attack against Soviet Union, Sibelius was using another common Nazi phrase, when his statement was published as a press release in the USA. I have often been criticised for my view on this matter, but I still think Sibelius’s declaration was simply pure fascist propaganda. In 1941 “The barbaric hordes of the East” was a phrase used by both Sibelius and Goebbels.[9] However, we must bear in mind that both Sibelius’s speech of 1942 and his statement of 1941 were probably written by the officials of the Finnish Foreign Ministry, and the rhetorical guideline was dominated by political correctness and diplomatic handshakes.

Sibelius’s own role in his politicization process in Germany has been a topic of fierce discussions and speculations. There are two extreme positions: On the one hand, some scholars want to see Sibelius as a key figure of the Finnish and German Nazi-minded organisations, even as an irresponsible collaborator, willingly working for the SS.[10] Simultaneously, among the most energetic and pathetic admirers of Sibelius, we encounter the often used explanation of the “unpolitical” character of the composer, and, indeed, of music as a whole. They want to see Sibelius as a balloon drifting unintentionally in the blue skies of the arts, untouched by earthly matters, such as politics. The most fantastic attempts to understand Sibelius’s cooperation with the Nazi leaders as “unpolitical” and involuntary action have been delivered by the Finnish media. According to some newspapers and Finnish music critics, Sibelius’s eyes were already in such a bad shape in the 1940’s that he could barely read the newspapers. This again serves as an explanation for his unawareness of politics and the world around him. Furthermore, according to his advocates, the 77-year-old senile Sibelius probably did not even know what the SS was.[11] Nevertheless, he was able to make confused diary entries, filled with a sense of guilt, in 1943 about anti-Semitism and racial laws of Germany[12], thus breaking his long silence of almost ten years. In 1942 he was also able to give an interview to an SS reporter, wishing a speedy victory for Germany.[13] And again in 1942, he was able to write a letter to Helmuth Thierfelder, praising the Finnish-German “brotherhood-in-arms” now fighting together for “the better future”.[14]

But still I don’t see him wearing the black uniform of the SS. Nevertheless, he did collaborate. However, I find it hard to believe that Sibelius would have been totally unaware of the political importance of his action. I also think he was far more political as a person and as a symbol than generally thought. I agree with almost everything Ruth-Maria Gleissner writes in her book, but I don’t agree with the title, with the thesis of the “unpolitical” Sibelius. As a comparison I could

argue, that Hitler was thought to be “unpolitical” by the Nazis. He was above politics, and he himself claimed he hated everyday politics and thought he was rather an artist than a politician. As we can see, the aura of being “unpolitical” can be truly dangerous... Music played a central role in the “Beauty State”[15] of the Nazis. It was the seemingly “unpolitical” reservation of the totalitarian state and government. And, as Andreas Novak puts it: “This is why claims of someone being unpolitical and only serving the cause of art during the National-Socialist era, are based on reality modelled after the war.”[16] I think this applies to both Furtwängler and Sibelius.

However, it seems that Sibelius was not directly involved in the official diplomatic discussions leading to the founding of the "German Sibelius Society" in 1942. Sibelius's broadcast speech in Berlin was a climax of a certain political development thoroughly researched and documented by Ruth-Maria Gleissner, both in her article of 1998 and dissertation of 2002.[17] We can trace a whole political battle between Rosenberg's guardians of the Nazi ideology and the Goebbels' ministry of propaganda officials. Both were trying to be first to promote the cause of Sibelius's music in Nazi Germany. In the end – as always – Goebbels won the race and enthusiastically wrote in his diary: “The Finns want us to do more for Sibelius. I have given orders for the founding of the German Sibelius Society.”[18] So, it was the ministry of propaganda acting on a Finnish request, thus underlining the importance of the political and military alliance. One of the reasons for this sudden outburst of admiration and acknowledgement towards Sibelius was certainly the ongoing battle in the eastern frontier, which by that time – in the spring of 1942 – seemed to be victorious and soon over. This seems to be the case especially because the ministry of propaganda in Berlin and Goebbels personally were so deeply involved in it. Moreover, they seem to have acted on the request of the Finns, so presumably discussions between the Finnish diplomats and officials of the Propagandaministerium had been taken place.

I say presumably, because we do not know this for sure. I have studied the archive of the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, but have not found any clear indication as to who or what actually made the suggestions to the Germans to promote Sibelius. The Finnish Embassy and its own archives in Berlin were destroyed completely in the bombings of 1943, and I think there we would have found the answer. However, something can be anticipated from the documents of the Helsinki archive.

The Finnish diplomat Hans Martola and composer Yrjö Kilpinen seem to have been the actual initiators. Kilpinen was a convinced Nazi, and may have been acting on Sibelius's behalf on purely ideological reasons. Perhaps he and the Finnish diplomats were on a mission of their own. However, it is hard to believe that Sibelius was unaware of their doings, had not known anything about it. It is more likely, that he had at least given a go-ahead signal for the two. By 1942 Sibelius was well aware of his status in Nazi-Germany, and the political union between Finland and Germany gave him more reasons for enthusiastic moods.

In 1941 and 1942 Kilpinen and Martola made their tour in Germany visiting the high-ranking Nazis. They met both Rosenberg's and Goebbels' trusted men. Kilpinen with his naive faith in the ideology of the Nazis was good for the Rosenberg people, a diplomat like Martola good for aspects of foreign policy and thus a useful tool for Goebbels. This situation caused a battle between the rivals Rosenberg and Goebbels. With Goebbels, the issue with Sibelius was politics and pragmatism rather than ideology of race, and perhaps this way Sibelius was rescued from racial studies of his background, from scientific proof of his Nordic heritage and blue eyes as well as other Aryan voodoo-stories.

Perhaps Sibelius was really lucky, if I am allowed to use the expression of fortune in this context, because the Rosenberg men probably would have made more obscure use of Sibelius, had they had more power in this matter. No doubt the Rosenberg people would have hailed Sibelius as the “Finnish Wagner”, and argued in the way the musicologist and national-socialist believer Fritz Metzler did when he examined the “purity of the major chord” out of racial perspective. He studied the folk music of European peoples and came to a surprising conclusion: in request of the Holy Grail of the pure major chord he found the answer in the wilderness of Lapland. The further north one would go, he claimed, the purer the major chord would get. In order to demonstrate this confusing statement Metzler studied 850 folksongs from Lapland. He then compared the tonal structure of the music from the north with that of the east and of the south. In the late 1930's Germany this topic was discussed seriously and widely among the musicologists and other scientist of the country.[19]

I can only imagine, how these people would have interpreted the majestic C-major accord at the end of Sibelius's Seventh Symphony...

Yet again we must ask: who was behind the founding of the 1942 Sibelius Gesellschaft? Alas, the information we can get from the archives of the Finnish Foreign Ministry in Helsinki does not help us much further. In February 1943, during the final defeat of the German Sixth Army in Stalingrad and a year after the founding ceremonies of the Sibelius Gesellschaft, the Finnish Embassy in Berlin reported to the Helsinki headquarters about the activities of the society. The

report was written by the secretary of the embassy, Mr. Hans Martola. He quotes a letter he had received from the officials of the Gesellschaft.[20] It is a normal and harmless report. However, it is striking that the anonymous German official – most likely Heinz Drewes, the chairman himself – uses the familiar “Du” instead of the normal “Sie” when he writes to Martola. This means, that the ties between the two men were close, maybe so close, that they, naturally with the backing of the ambassador Kivimäki, together orchestrated the whole Sibelius Gesellschaft affair. “The German Sibelius Society” is asking Mr. Martola to deliver the report also directly to Sibelius.

Hans R. Martola was a standard diplomat, but we must bear in mind that his boss, ambassador Kivimäki, was a convinced Nazi. Martola’s reports from Berlin are moderate; it seems to me he did not have any particular sympathies for the Nazi regime. He may have acted purely in good faith and for the cause of Finland and Sibelius, and simply taking the benefit of the propitious situation. This is what diplomats often do.

With Yrjö Kilpinen the story is completely different. Kilpinen was a member of the “Finnish Reichunion” (Suomen Valtakunnan Liitto), an obscure organisation that admired Germany and the Nazis beyond all proportions. Their leader, Mauno Vannas, was planning to seize power and establish a Nazi state in Finland. Other members of the organisation were for example the sculptor Wäinö Aaltonen (whose Sibelius statue can be found at the Main entrance hall of the Sibelius Academy in Helsinki) and professor Rolf Nevanlinna. Given the lack of critical approach to history in Finland, one may wonder at the astonishing development in the country after the Second World War. Mauno Vannas still has a memory statue in his birthplace Uusikaupunki, and Yrjö Kilpinen was the first representative of music who became professor at the Finnish Academy in 1948. Sibelius and Kilpinen were both involved in the Ständiger Rat für die Internationale Zusammenarbeit der Komponisten, an organization founded by Goebbels and chaired by Richard Strauss. Sibelius was one of the vice-presidents of this notorious council, but Kilpinen was the actual member, doing all the dirty work. However, in the case of the “German Sibelius Society”, this connection must have been important for both Sibelius and Kilpinen.

Because of his political attitudes, Kilpinen was greatly favoured by the Germans. Indeed, he seems to have been the actual link between Sibelius and the Nazis. Kilpinen and the “Finnish Reichunion” represented the extreme right-wing political orientation in Finland, and their Nazi sympathies were no secret. The roots of the “Reichunion” organisation can be traced at the IKL (Isänmaallinen Kansanliike, “Patriotic Peoples’ Movement”) and Lapuan Liike (“Lapua Movement”), the fascist political movements of the 1920’s and 1930’s. Sibelius and his wife Aino took part in the activities of Lapuan Liike. We know that Aino had deep political sympathies for the “Lapua movement”, and this may be one explanation for Sibelius’s own action in the 1930’s and 1940’s. During the Finnish-German alliance in 1941–1944, the IKL had its member in the cabinet. The organisation was banned four days after the end of the war in Finland, in September 1944. However, in the winter of 1941–1942, Kilpinen could easily approach both the Embassy of Finland in Berlin and the ministries of the Third Reich and he would have been admitted entry everywhere.

With the separate peace treaty between Finland and Soviet Union in September 1944 the Finnish-German alliance came to an end. This meant the end of the first Sibelius Society in Germany, too. However, it did not mean the end of discussion about Sibelius’s role in the Nazi Germany. Emigrants returning to Germany, for example Theodor W. Adorno, took over the central positions of cultural life in Germany, and Sibelius, the favourite of the Nazis, was now in trouble. Until now this Sibelius-Nazi problem has been something the Finns simply could not understand or accept. Adorno’s arguments were met and rejected in Finland with profound studies of the Sibelius scores instead of studies of the political and social background of Adorno’s critique. This can be explained by the special characteristics of the Finnish nationalism. As a matter of fact, Sibelius and the Nazis could be regarded as a textbook example and case study of Finland’s political culture.

With regard to the Finnish national identity it has always been much more important to underline the elements “what it is not”, rather than “what it is.” The differences with the neighbours create the identity. A small nation, especially when it is surrounded by big and powerful cultures, often creates a survival strategy by mystifying and whitewashing its past and its questionable political actions. I describe this phenomenon as a mechanism of “defensive nationalism”.

In the case of post-war Finland defensive nationalism could be described as a series of collective denials based on at least five inabilities of the society and its political culture:

Inability to understand the process of dealing with the past, in German “die Vergangenheitsbewältigung”, in post-war Germany and its reflection on Finland.

Inability to understand Finland’s own participation in the Nazi coalition of the war of extermination, “Vernichtungskrieg”, further, the claim of the “uniqueness” of Finland’s role in history and especially in the World War II. (“Separate war” thesis)

Inability to understand historical processes as actions of a nation and society of a different time and space and not as actions of the individual in question ("Me" = Finland)

Inability to understand national heroes (like Mannerheim and Sibelius) as international or cosmopolitan figures and thus deprive them of the right to be individuals and independent subjects free from Finnish culture and Finnish connection. At the same time the urge to present these heroes outside of Finland as "typical for Finland" and trying to make Finnish nationalism internationally acceptable as the only possible interpretation for their art and actions.

Inability to accept thoughtful dissent from the majority's "common truths", strong tendency to marginalize people differing from the mainstream and to explain their behaviour on the basis of their personality. Simultaneously the strong need for consensus and to "shoot the messenger".

Because of defensive nationalism, the Finns seem to find it very difficult to discuss objectively the connection between Sibelius and Nazi Germany. There are exceptions, of course: Professor Veijo Murtomäki, to name one, has done thorough thinking and makes intellectual and critical approaches in his articles.[21] The Finns, always worried about their reputation outside Finland, immediately start fierce counterattacks whenever the iconic value of Sibelius is put into question. There seems to be an invisible code or owner's manual modelled on a "How to use Sibelius correctly" pattern, which appears promptly in these situations. Thus, claims of Sibelius's alleged Nazi sympathies always face this nationalistic and defensive way of thinking. If these claims are made outside Finland, the Finnish counterattack is often based simply on a diminishing tone of supremacy: "This person does not speak Finnish or Swedish and thus cannot understand the original Sibelius sources." Furthermore, even the sanity of the person is called into question. When Professor Timothy L. Jackson from Dallas, Texas, published his studies about Sibelius and the Nazis, the biggest Finnish newspaper, *Helsingin Sanomat*, wrote, that the good professor was now to be informed "correctly" by Finnish Sibelius scholars. One of these Finns said, that after a few emails changed between him and Jackson the latter "seemed to be calm"[22] again. To me this odd statement includes serious indications and, indeed, accusations of hysterical behaviour of Prof. Jackson, now cured by the mythical serum produced by the one and only Finnish Sibelius Factory of Ultimate Truth. Later, after the paper had refused to print Prof. Jackson's response, *Helsingin Sanomat* claimed with a whole page story and a big headline: "The American professor is the only one who believes in Sibelius's Nazi contacts".[23] Notably, we can read headlines like this, 10 years after the publication of dissertations by Ruth-Maria Gleissner and myself.

This touching, devoted and almost religious attitude towards Sibelius is characteristic for the music society of the country. When the new concert hall plan was promoted in Helsinki a few years ago, the conductor and Sibelius Academy professor Leif Segerstam said, that this hall would be the birth of "Finlandia Jesus"[24]. Everybody even trying to doubt the value of Sibelius as a person or artist inevitably meets the members of the Sibelius Church of Finland, its followers, its priests and holy relicts, its ceremonies and its holy writings. Their temple is the safe haven of stereotypes created for the one and only purpose: to protect the holy relict.

For the Finns the scandals surrounding Sibelius's past, his dealings with the Nazis and the scratching on the surface of the holy national icon are simply too much. A common pattern of pathetic explanations of the "unpolitical and innocent Sibelius" started to flourish promptly after the publications of the theses by Ruth-Maria Gleissner and myself. Simultaneously writings or thoughts of those who wanted to put Sibelius's role and actions into question were either totally ignored or fought against by all possible means. This process has had its nasty moments. Ruth-Maria Gleissner's dissertation from 2002 has never been reviewed in a Finnish speaking newspaper. She has never been invited to Finland to give a lecture or a speech after the publication of her thesis and the same applies to me.

Conclusion: defensive nationalism may be a useful political tool if the existence of a small nation is put into question, in situations like the Finnish-Russian Winter War in 1939–1940. However, defensive nationalism can also be a questionable tool in whitewashing and covering up processes of the nation's history.

In the case of Sibelius, there is no way to deny the close contact between the composer and Nazi Germany. However, we cannot be absolutely sure about his personal political opinion. In the 1930's and 1940's he was the key national figure in Finland: a true national hero. His politicization was almost inevitable.

But rather than judging Sibelius alone, we should more thoroughly study the connection between Finland and Germany during the war. I think this has until now been largely neglected, and this connection seems to have been much deeper than previously thought. And it is within this context that we should regard Sibelius's activities during the National-socialist period in Europe.

[1] http://www.sibelius.fi/media/Audio/Sibeliuksen_radiotervehdys_Saksaan.mp3; for the English translation, see the article by Veijo Murtomäki.

- [2] Tanzberger, Ernst: *Jean Sibelius. Eine Monographie*. Wiesbaden 1962.
- [3] See Piper, Ernst: *Alfred Rosenberg. Hitlers Chefideologe*. München 2005, p. 206.
- [4] Rosenberg, Alfred: *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine Wertung der seelisch-geistigen Gestaltenkämpfe unserer Zeit*. München (1930 original), 1935, p. 640.
- [5] See Paavolainen, Olavi: *Kolmannen valtakunnan vieraana*. Helsinki 1936.
- [6] Paavolainen 1936, p. 86–.
- [7] Paavolainen 1936, p. 98–.
- [8] Paavolainen 1936, p. 99.
- [9] See: Vihinen, Antti: *Theodor W. Adornon Sibelius-kritiikin poliittinen ulottuvuus*. Helsinki–Lahti, 2000, p. 89.
- [10] See Jackson, Timothy L.: Sibelius the Political, in: Timothy L. Jackson, Veijo Murtomäki, Colin Davis, Timo Virtanen (eds.): *Sibelius in the Old and New World*. Frankfurt am Main etc. 2010; Jackson, Timothy L., Sibelius and the SS (2010), see in this publication.
- [11] *Iltasanomat* 3.12.2009.
- [12] See: *Jean Sibelius: Dagbok 1909–1944*. Utgiven av Fabian Dahlström. Borgå 2005, p. 335.
- [13] There are different views of to the date of the Sibelius interview. Vesa Sirén thinks it was in 1943 (See Sirén, Vesa: *Aina poltti sikaria*. Keuruu 2000, p. 541), Timothy L. Jackson has later discovered that the interview was actually made already in 1942. (Private correspondence).
- [14] Gleissner, Ruth-Maria: *Der unpolitische Komponist als Politikum. Die Rezeption von Jean Sibelius im NS-Staat*. Frankfurt am Main 2002, p. 38.
- [15] About the Beauty State -thesis, see. Fest, Joachim C: *Hitler*, Frankfurt am Main 1987, p. 526. See also: Reichel, Peter: *Der schöne Schein des Dritten Reiches. Faszination und Gewalt des Faschismus*. Frankfurt am Main 1993.
- [16] Novak, Andreas: "Salzburg hört Hitler atmen." *Die Salzburger Festspiele 1933–1944*. München 2005, p. 11–12.
- [17] Gleissner, Ruth-Maria: Die deutschen Sibelius-Gesellschaften. In Ahti Jäntti/Annemari Vogt/Marion Holtkamp (Hrsg.): *Sibelius und Deutschland. Vorträge des am Finnland-Institut in Deutschland, Berlin, abgehaltenen Symposiums vom 3.–7. März 1998. Berlin*, pp. 199–232. And: Gleissner, Ruth-Maria: *Der unpolitische Komponist als Politikum. Die Rezeption von Jean Sibelius im NS-Staat*. Frankfurt am Main 2002.
- [18] Fröhlich, Else (Hrsg.): *Die Tagebücher von Joseph Goebbels*, Bd. II/3, München etc. 1994, p. 460. This entry is from 12 March 1942.
- [19] See: Wulf, Joseph: *Musik im Dritten Reich. Eine Dokumentation*. Frankfurt/Berlin 1983, pp. 237–239.
- [20] See: Suomen ulkoministeriön arkisto, Helsinki. Berliinin Suomen lähetystön kirje Helsinkiin ulkoministeriölle 23.2.1943. Kirjelmä 1128/348/43.
- [21] Murtomäki, Veijo: Jean Sibeliusen yhteydet natsi-Saksaan eurooppalaisessa kontekstissa. *Musiikki* 41/3–4, 2011, pp. 5–68.
- [22] *Helsingin Sanomat* 5.12.2009.
- [23] See *Helsingin Sanomat* 21.5.2010.

[24] See: Vihinen, Antti: *Musiikkia ja politiikkaa*, Helsinki 2005, pp. 46 and 225.

Antti Vihinen

Antti Vihinen was born in Tampere, Finland, in 1961. He has been managing director of the Sibelius Hall Ltd in Lahti since 1999, and professor of international tourism and cultural management of the Karlshochschule, International University in Karlsruhe, Germany since 2010. He is a Doctor of Philosophy (Musicology, University of Helsinki, 2001) with the thesis *Adorno's Critique of Sibelius – the Political Dimension*. He has also written several other publications and books on Sibelius, Wagner, music, politics and culture.