

REFERENCES CITED

HÖFER, András

1981 *Tamang ritual texts I. Preliminary studies in the folk-religion of an ethnic minority in Nepal*. Beiträge zur Südasienforschung, Bd. 65. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

1994 *A recitation of the Tamang shaman in Nepal*. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag. (Nepalica, 7.)

1996 Response to Steinmann. *European Bulletin of Himalayan Research* 10: 57–61.

SAMUEL, Geoffrey

1997 Review of Höfer 1994. *Asian Folklore Studies* 56: 192–94.

SKORUPSKI, Tadeusz

1982 Review of Höfer 1981. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1982(2): 205–207.

STEINMANN, Brigitte

1996 Review of Höfer 1994. *European Bulletin of Himalayan Research* 10: 37–56.

Geoffrey SAMUEL

University of Newcastle

Australia

EUROPE

HAAS, WALBURGA, Editor. *Volkskunde und Brauchtumpflege im Nationalsozialismus in Salzburg: Referate, Diskussionen, Archivmaterial*. Bericht zur Tagung am 18. und 19. November 1994 in der Salzburger Residenz. Salzburger Beiträge zur Volkskunde, Band 8. Salzburg: Salzburger Landesinstitut für Volkskunde, 1995/96. 400 pages. ISBN 3-901681-00-0.

While it may not seem of importance to review a publication of the proceedings of a folklore meeting held in Austria in a journal devoted to Asian folklore studies, this is not at all the case, as we shall presently see. Unfortunately, there is a general perception that, in contrast to German scholars, Austrians have stubbornly resisted coming to terms with their role in supporting National Socialist Volkskunde (folklore). This book, which is not for the uninitiated, will document how deeply Austrian scholars are now delving into the past of *Volkskunde* and *Brauchtumpflege* (promotion/cultivation of customs). It is for all practical purposes an internal working document that includes theoretical and practical papers presented at a meeting held in November 1994 in Salzburg. In attendance were Austrian and German folklore specialists, history and sociology scholars, directors of local and regional *Heimatschutz* (homeland preservation) societies, as well as local citizens, all of whom met to discuss the often avoided topic of *Volkskunde* and *Heimatpflege* (homeland preservation/cultivation) during the National Socialist years. The book is divided into three parts, the first of which presents the papers read at that gathering, as well as brief reports from several working groups, on folk song, folk dance, costumes, and two papers that deal with the history and the conceptual nature of the *Heimatwerke* (homeland work [societies]). Following each of these subsections, there is also a good selection taken from the recorded and transcribed discussions that followed. The second part includes a one-hundred page section by Gert Kerschbaumer, called "Reconstruction and Documentation," which will be discussed in more detail below, and brief interviews with five *Zeitzeugen* (witnesses to the times). Finally, there is a third part devoted to the business of the Institute that sponsored the meeting, the Salzburger

Landesinstitut für Volkskunde, followed by an obituary of Richard Wolfram, the *Ordinarius* for *Volkskunde* at the University of Vienna.

In Part I the papers are clearly divided into four sections, even though there are no subsection headings. The first three papers were delivered by well-known German folklorists, Helge Gerndt (University of Munich), Konrad Köstlin (who has since become the *Ordinarius* for *Volkskunde* at the University of Vienna), and Wolfgang Brückner (University of Würzburg). These papers only indirectly address the announced topic, but are clearly intended to lay a theoretical basis for the papers and discussions to follow. It seems clear that these papers were intended for scholars who are dealing with the history of *Volkskunde*, but in the subsequent discussion it is apparent that this kind of theoretical presentation is not well received by those who are more involved in the practical side of traditions and customs. The introductory theoretical papers thus provided the practitioners a platform for criticizing historical scholarship on the discipline of *Volkskunde* as being *zu hochwissenschaftlich* (too scholarly).

The second section in Part I includes the most interesting presentations, first because the individuals are four of the best-known scholars dealing with the history of *Volkskunde* in Austria: Olaf Bockhorn (Vienna) and Helmut Eberhart (Graz), who have long worked together on the history of Austrian *Volkskunde*; Ulrike Kammerhofer-Aggermann, the director of the Salzburger Landesinstitut; and Gert Kerschbaumer (Salzburg). These papers directly address the theme of the meeting: Salzburg and the institutes, individuals, and tendencies associated with *Brauchtumspflege*. These three scholarly papers are then followed by presentations by two individuals who seemingly came to present their ideas, not their scholarship, e.g., “the lie about the brown [NS] roots of custom promotion and practice” (H. Dengg, 133), or a rambling and somewhat apologetic statement by a practitioner during NS who maintained that a “danger arises that the treatment of the theme doesn’t deal with history the way it should be looked at, but merely opens old wounds” (W. Leitner, 143). The subsequent discussion clearly reflects the divisions that existed before the conference, divisions that resulted in open accusations and statements of frustration on the part of many. “You missed the point.” “Herr Dr. Kerschbaumer is obsessed with the idea of uncovering everything that is hidden and concealed here. That is his weakness... as the youngest son [of Kuno Brandauer, the man you are attacking], it is not easy for me to take a position.” “I am perhaps the only one here who was brought before the Folk Court for [suggesting] the separation of the Ostmark [Austria] from the Reich, and I spent ’40, ’41, and ’42 in prison.” “It doesn’t make sense to say... communism did that too, during the NS regime that was also done by biologists, medical people and so forth.” “I have kept silent thus far because I am not used to dealing with the tone of voice that is being used here.”

The third and fourth subsections of Part I represent reports on various customary practices, singing, dancing, costumes, etc. This is then accompanied by a rather lengthy piece by Reinhard Johler and Herbert Nikitsch (Vienna) on the *Heimatschutz* (homeland protection) movement. If the subsequent discussion is any indication, these reports primarily trace the historical development of the various practitioners of customs and little of the previous controversy appears in the discussions.

In Part II Gert Kerschbaumer has assembled perhaps the most authoritative listing of archive materials dealing specifically with *Volkskunde* in Salzburg during National Socialism. In this volume he offers other scholars the results of his encyclopedic “documentation” to be used in “reconstructing” the history of *Volkskunde* in Austria, and specifically in Salzburg. All of the archives are listed, from the Bundesarchiv (Federal German Archive) in Koblenz to the numerous homeland society archives in Austria. Categories are then established, such as the infamous Rosenberg Bureau and the SS Ahnenerbe (Office of Ancestral Inheritance), plus many other groupings, followed by what the researcher will find in each of these archival

sources that particularly applies to Salzburg and more generally to Austria. What Kerschbaumer has presented is an exhaustive outline of the sources necessary to write a complete documentary of the discipline of *Völkskunde* in Salzburg during this era. It is as if one almost had a flowchart to work from. It is here that Kerschbaumer offers us a brief look at the importance of this volume for Asian scholars, particularly those interested in Tibet. On page 274, under section 1.5. "Das Ahnenerbe der SV," we find the following:

1.5.6. **Forschungsstätte für Innerasien und Expeditionen** [Research Post for Inner Asia and Expeditions] in the "Ancestral Inheritance" in Munich: SS-Tibet-Expedition Dr. Ernst Schäfer (Bundesarchiv Koblenz R 21/682), Tibet Show of the SS Expedition in the "House of Nature" (landscape pictures and dioramas by Jung-Ilsenheim), visit of Schäfer and Sven Hedin (*Salzburg News* 18.12. 1942, 2 and 18.1.1943, 3), relocation of the Munich Research Post to Mittersill in the Pinzgau (Bundesarchiv Koblenz NS 21/828).

This brief reference seems innocuous enough until one realizes that this is a reference to that portion of the SS Ancestral Inheritance that sent expeditions to Tibet, ostensibly to climb yet unconquered peaks, but whose members were certainly also carrying out activities (spying?) for the NS regime. The most famous figure was the climber Heinrich Harrer, who spent "seven years in Tibet," who became a friend of the Dalai Lama, and who fled with him when the Chinese took over the "province" of Tibet. The positioning of *Völkskunde* in the SS Ancestral Inheritance alongside other departments (here the Research Post for Inner Asia and Expeditions) indicates the worldwide scope of SS research interests. While most of their work was directed toward Europe, we can see here that Asia was also very much a part of this NS vision.

In the second subsection of Part II there are five interviews with *Zeitzeugen*. The program for the conference indicates that thirty-five men and women were contacted and twenty-one were actually interviewed. The five interviews chosen for inclusion were selected from these. All five were involved with *Brauchtumspflege* in one way or another, and all were somewhat defensive in their answers about the NS period. Friedrike Proding, who was the assistant to Richard Wolfram in Salzburg, offers statements concerning her NSDAP membership: her brother-in-law was put in the Dachau KZ and she joined under the assumption that this would help in acquiring his release. She also maintains that she did not know the Ancestral Inheritance belonged to the SS, and that her Professor Wolfram was simply a museum director. Finally, there is the obituary for Richard Wolfram, which carefully presents his record, accurately, but with no negative evaluation. Anyone who knows that Richard Wolfram was a high-ranking folklorist in Himmler's Ancestral Inheritance can easily see the care with which this obituary was written, and the subtext that underlies it. The Salzburger Landesinstitut für Volkskunde has received the *Nachlaß* [personal papers and library] not only of Richard Wolfram, but also of two other individuals who are of importance for the NS period: Karl Haiding and Karl von Spieß. This material makes Salzburg one of the most important archives in the German-speaking world for the history of the discipline of *Völkskunde* in the twentieth century, and it is important in such a publication as this to present information, even an obituary, accurately and without prejudice. That will be the role of those scholars who carry out in-depth investigations of the discipline, the individuals, and the institutes developed during the period that, almost without exception, continued well into the last years of this century.

In his résumé of the papers in Part I, the Salzburg sociologist Justin Stagl says that he learned from the meeting that (a) Alpine festival culture has been marketed in Salzburg since

time immemorial, whereby (b) its appropriation by National Socialism and by official *Brauchtumpflege* after 1945 could develop, and where (c) the responsible individuals were often the same. Olaf Bockhorn has spoken elsewhere about an "inner-Salzburg debate." This volume in the Salzburg *Volkskunde* series is the clearest documentation needed to underscore his statement. Austria is dealing with the dark history of *Volkskunde* during National Socialism, but the papers, discussions, and the documentation included here indicate that the path is still a long one, even sixty years after the *Anschluß*. In some cases the mind-set of that period continues to survive, as we have been able to see in the discussions.

Good scholars are at work here. This is an important book.

James R. DOW
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa USA