



**Primacy of Ideology? The Confiscation and Exchange of
"Degenerate Art" in the Third Reich.**

**A Thesis Presented to the Centre for European Studies
and**

General Linguistics

The University of Adelaide

In Partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

By Chiew-Lee Khut

October 2001

ABSTRACT**THE PRIMACY OF IDEOLOGY? THE CONFISCATION AND EXCHANGE OF "DEGENERATE ART" IN THE THIRD REICH.**

The campaign against "degenerate art" is conventionally depicted by historians as an ideologically driven crusade against those artists whom the National Socialists branded as "degenerate". This aim of this thesis is to show how in practice the National Socialists sacrificed ideological considerations to the material advantages that could be gained from the sale of "degenerate art". In practice the term "degenerate" was extended beyond modern art to include French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art, specifically because they were highly saleable. This is evinced by the sales of "degenerate art" which were conducted by the *Reichministerium für Volksklärung und Propaganda* (RMVP). The record of the sales compiled by the propaganda ministry in the summer of 1941, provide conclusive evidence that the Reich government compromised its ideological position for financial gain. The sale of "degenerate art" conducted by order of the Reich at the *Galerie Fischer* auction in Lucerne in 1939, provides further evidence that the practice of confiscation was economically driven.

The diminishing importance of ideology is evinced by the purchase of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art by German officials and museums between the period 1941 and 1942. That German museums sought to replenish their depleted collections with acquisitions of French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art, suggests that while this art was regarded as "degenerate" in theory, in practice museums were able to purchase "degenerate art" without any difficulties. The fact that German museums were allowed to purchase officially proscribed art again suggests that the commercial exploitation of "degenerate art" took precedence to the ideological justifications which had originally been employed to provide the justification for the practice of confiscation.

The willingness for German officials to benefit commercially from the disposal of "degenerate art" is also evinced by their disposal of "degenerate art" through a series of exchanges between 1941-1943. The method of exchange became a favoured means of acquisition after the issuance of an edict prohibited the transportation of "degenerate art" to the Reich. The sustained demand for "degenerate art" among German dealers after 1941 is also indicated from their

eagerness to engage in exchanges and sales involving officially proscribed art in the period between 1941-1943.

STATEMENT

This work contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university, or other tertiary institution. To the best of the author's knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text. The author hereby gives consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to express my greatest thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Peter Monteath, whose ideas and opinions were invaluable in the writing of this thesis.

I also owe a special thanks to several people, who provided the archival sources consulted in this thesis. These include Kenneth Heger from the *National Archives* in Washington D.C. He kindly provided me with a list of *Detailed Interrogation Reports* of the *Office of Strategic Services*; Alex Chanter, and Barney Perkins, from Special Collections at the *National Art Library*, of the *Victoria and Albert Museum* in London. They provided me with information about the Nazi-compiled typescript list of "degenerate art". I would especially like to thank Dr. Röder, the curator of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum*, Krefeld, who gave me photocopies of some of the correspondence of the museum during the Nazi period. She also gave me a book courtesy of the museum, which comprises of letters of correspondence from this period. I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr. Andrea Raschèr from the *Bundesamt für Kultur* (Swiss Federal Office of Culture), who spoke to me about the complicity of Swiss art dealers in the trade in looted art during the Second World War. He also gave me a book written by Thomas Buomberger, a Winterthur historian, who the Swiss Federal Office of Culture consulted for information on the topic of plundered art.

I am greatly indebted to Marc Burri for translating articles from German to English. He also accompanied me on many visits to library of the *Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule* in Zurich, to photocopy articles from the *Völkischer Beobachter*. He was also very helpful in arranging my visit to *Bundesamt für Kultur* in Berne.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	II-III
STATEMENT.....	IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	VI
INTRODUCTION.....	1-17
NATIONAL SOCIALIST CULTURAL POLICY.....	1-9
METHODOLOGY, AIMS, AND SOURCE MATERIALS.....	10-13
STRUCTURE.....	14-17
CHAPTER 1 - THE EVOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALIST VISUAL ARTS POLICY IN THE PERIOD 1929-1937.....	18-39
THE RISE OF THE <i>KAMPFBUND FÜR DEUTSCHE KULTUR</i> , 1929-1933.....	19-27
THE EMERGENCE OF THE <i>NSD-STUDENTENBUND</i> OPPOSITION, 1931-1935.....	28-32
THE STRUGGLE FOR MODERN ART AS SEEN BY THE <i>VÖLKISCHER BEOBACHTER</i> IN THE PERIOD 1934-1935.....	33-39
CHAPTER 2 - THE CONFISCATION AND DISPOSAL OF GERMANY'S PUBLIC COLLECTIONS OF "DEGENERATE ART", 1936-1941.....	40-66
THE <i>ENTARTETE KUNST AKTION</i>	43-47
THE <i>GALERIE FISCHER AUCTION</i> , LUCERNE, SWITZERLAND, 30 JUNE 1939.....	48-55
THE <i>ENTARTETE KUNST TYPESCRIP</i> T.....	56-66
CHAPTER 3 - THE CONFISCATION AND DISPOSAL OF "DEGENERATE ART" IN FRENCH COLLECTIONS, 1940-1943.....	67-88
THE ORIGIN AND FUNCTION OF THE <i>EINSATZSTAB REICHSLEITER ROSENBERG</i>	68-81
THE PURCHASE OF FRENCH IMPRESSIONIST AND MODERN ART BY GERMAN MUSEUMS AND OFFICIALS, 1941-1943.....	82-88
CHAPTER 4 - EXCHANGES OF "DEGENERATE ART" CONDUCTED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE ERR, 1941-1943.....	89-105
CONCLUSION.....	106-112
APPENDICES.....	113-146
1. THE <i>ENTARTETE KUNST TYPESCRIP</i> T.....	113-118
2. THE SCHENCKER PAPERS/ PART 1. "ACCESSIONS TO GERMAN MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES DURING THE OCCUPATION OF FRANCE.....	119-133
3. THE SCHENCKER PAPERS/ PART 2 "PURCHASES OF WORKS OF ART IN FRANCE DURING THE OCCUPATION AND ON THE BEHALF OF GERMAN DEALERS AND OFFICIALS".....	134-141
4. LETTER FROM DR. SABINE RÖDER, CURATOR OF THE <i>KAISER WILHELM MUSEUM</i> , DATED 12 MAY 1999.....	142

5. LETTER SIGNED BY HERMAN LANGE'S SECRETARY TO A DR. MUTHMANN LANGE, DATED 21 JULY 1942.....	143
6. CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE COMMANDER OF THE ARMED FORCES IN FRANCE, DATED 27 MAY 1942.....	144
7. LETTER FROM A REGIONAL OFFICE IN DÜSSELDORF TO DR. KÖHN IN <i>THE FOLKWANG MUSEUM</i> IN ESSEN, DATED 20 MAY 1942.....	145
8. LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF THE KAISER WILHELM MUSEUM FROM THE PROVINZIAL-FEUERSICHERUNGS-ANSTALT, DATED 17 APRIL 1942.	146.
LETTERS OF CORRESPONDENCE.....	147-155
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	156-167

INTRODUCTION - NATIONAL SOCIALIST CULTURAL POLICY

The inaugural exhibition of German art was held at the *Haus der Deutschen Kunst* in Munich on 19 July 1937. A festive procession from *Prinzregentenstrasse* to the Maximilian monument preceded the exhibition opening, which also marked the opening of the first official building erected under the Nazi régime. Adolf Hitler stated in his speech inaugurating the *Haus der Deutschen Kunst*:

When the cornerstone of this building was laid, it was with the intention of constructing a temple, not for so-called modern art, but for a true and everlasting German art, that is, better still, a house for the art of the German people, and not for any international art of the year 1937, '40, '50 or '60. For art is not founded on time, but on peoples.¹

The exhibition, entitled the *Große Deutsche Kunstausstellung*, represented the development of a new German art based upon Nazi racial ideology. The exhibition of officially approved art established a canon by which acceptable styles of art could be defined, with naturalistic and representational art providing the standard by which all styles of art were to be measured. The aestheticisation of Nazi ideology through heroic sculptures that idealised the masculine form, and peasant and family motifs that extolled the virtues of domesticity, rendered art as a tool of Nazi propaganda.

The exhibition of "degenerate art" provided an antithesis to the expression of the Nazi aesthetic embodied in the *Große Deutsche Kunstausstellung*. The *Entartete Kunstausstellung* was officially opened at the *Archäologisches Institut* in Munich on 19 July 1937. Carl Schneider, the director of the Heidelberg Clinic was invited to prepare the opening address, but was replaced by Adolf Ziegler, the president of the *Reichskammer der bildenden Künste* (Reich Chamber for Visual Arts). Schneider's speech entitled, "Entartete Kunst und Irrenkunst", expounded upon the theory of the degeneracy of the avant-garde, a theory which had gained widespread popularity in the fin de siècle. Schneider's speech re-appeared as a short essay in the psychiatric journal *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten*. The theory of degeneracy provided the psychiatric basis for the Nazi campaign against modern art. The term "degenerate art" encompassed non-representational styles of art, such as Impressionism, Expressionism, and Cubism, which were branded as "degenerate". Ziegler appropriated the term in his

¹ Adolf Hitler, "Speech Inaugurating the 'Great Exhibition of German Art', 1937", in *Theories of Modern Art: A Sourcebook by Artists and Critics*, Herschel B. Chipp ed., (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), p. 475.

opening address, which made a superficial comparison between the avant-garde and the insane: "All around us you see the monstrous offspring of insanity, impudence, ineptitude, and sheer degeneracy. What this exhibition offers inspires horror and disgust in us all". In Ziegler's words the exhibition of "degenerate art" marked the turning point in the development of Nazi cultural politics: "Our patience with all those who have not been able to fall in line with National Socialist reconstruction during the last four years is at an end."²

The dimly lit rooms of the *Archäologisches Institut* provided a contrast to the classical architectural style of the *Haus der Deutschen Kunst*, where the exhibition of officially approved art was being held. A narrow staircase led to the upper floor of the building where the exhibition began. Ludwig Gies's *Crucified Christ* dominated the main wall on the upper level. A label that bore the words: "This horror hung as a war memorial in the cathedral of Lübeck", appeared beside a photograph of the cathedral where the sculpture had been originally displayed. The first room contained other pictures with religious themes, including Emil Nolde's altarpiece depicting the life of Christ, which dominated the length of the first room. An unintelligible heading reading "Insolent mockery of the Divine under Centrist rule" appeared above.³

The second room, which was much smaller in size, featured works by Jewish artists, categorised under the heading "Revelation of the Jewish racial soul". Jankel Adler, Marc Chagall, Lasar Segall, Hans Feibusch, Hans Katz, Gert Wollheim, and Ludwig Meidner were among the artists represented in this room. Quotations from speeches by Nazi dignitaries containing anti-Semitic references were emblazoned across the far wall of the second room.⁴

In the third room, which was partitioned in half, works by Otto Mueller, Emil Nolde and Max Pechstein were placed under the headings "German farmers - a Yiddish view", and "The Jewish longing for the wilderness reveals itself - in Germany the Negro becomes the racial ideal of degenerate art". The end of wall in the third room contained pacifist and anti-militarist works representative of the *Neue Sachlichkeit* (New Objectivity), arranged under the heading "Deliberate sabotage of national defence".

² Adolf Ziegler, speech opening the "Entartete Kunst" exhibition, July 19, 1937, in Peter Adam, *The Arts of the Third Reich*, (London: Thames & Hudson, 1992), p. 123.

³ Mario-Andreas von Lüttichau, "Entartete Kunst, Munich 1937: A Reconstruction", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), pp. 49, 51.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 52.

Kirchner's *Self Portrait of a Soldier* and Grosz's satirical etching depicting the crucifixion of Jesus with gas mask entitled "*Shut up and do your duty*" were displayed prominently on this wall. The "Dada wall" in room three displayed several works by Kurt Schwitters. An excerpt taken from a speech Hitler had delivered at the Nuremberg rally in 1934, which ridiculed Dadaism as "idiot art", appeared across the length of this entire wall.⁵

The works by the artists associated with *Die Brücke* (The Bridge), including Erich Heckel, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Emil Nolde, Max Pechstein, and Karl Schmidt-Rottluff dominated room four, which was characterised by the absence of propagandistic slogans and speeches.⁶ Their absence provided a contrast with room five, which contained untitled abstract watercolours by Kandinsky, arranged under the heading "Madness becomes method". Next to Kandinsky's watercolours were a group of urban landscapes by Lyonel Feininger, Karl Schmidt-Rottluff, and Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, placed under the heading "Nature as seen by sick minds".⁷

The entire length of the southern wall in room six was devoted to works by the German Impressionist artist, and former member of the *Berliner Sezession* (Berlin Secession), Lovis Corinth. This collection of pictures was grouped under the title "Decadence exploited for literary and commercial purposes." The seven pictures included in this room had been produced after the artist had suffered a debilitating stroke. The Nazi art critics attributed Corinth's departure from his earlier naturalistic style to his stroke, and the inclusion of the artist's later works were used to draw a parallel between the artist's illness and the non-traditional use of colour and figural composition. The purchase price (which was not converted into the new reichsmark currency introduced in 1924) was placed beneath each art work with a red sticker which bore the words, "Bezahlt von den Steuergroschen des arbeitenden deutschen Volkes" (paid for by the taxes of the German working people). Above the door leading to this room a slogan appeared stating "They had four years time". This made reference to the period from 1933 to 1937 as being sufficient time for artists to bring their artistic representations in line with the official National Socialist aesthetic as defined by Hitler. The exhibition concluded in room seven, which contained several paintings by academy professors

⁵ Mario-Andreas von Lüttichau, "Entartete Kunst, Munich 1937: A Reconstruction", in "*Degenerate Art: The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*", Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 54.

⁶ Ibid. p. 59.

⁷ Ibid. p. 61.

responsible for the promotion of modern art that appeared under the subtitle reading "These are the masters who have been teaching German youth".⁸

The formulation of an official Nazi aesthetic based upon certain ideological principles, which the *Große Deutsche Kunstausstellung* embraced, was intended by its organisers to represent the apparent triumph of Nazi ideology and Führer absolutism. However, if the success of the exhibition is to be measured by its attendance records, these were down on the figures of its counterpart. Approximately 60,000 visitors attended the inaugural exhibition of German art in Munich, in comparison to 2,009,899 visitors who attended the exhibition of "degenerate art" in the period between 19 July 1937 and 30 November 1937.

The *Entartete Kunstausstellung* is conventionally depicted as a *coup de théâtre* by scholars. This event is commonly used to symbolise the triumph of reactionary forces in the battle over modern art. The traditional school of interpretation portrays this event as a milestone in the formulation of an official Nazi visual aesthetic. However, this conventional depiction of Nazi cultural politics provides a misleading representation of cultural life in the Third Reich. The simplicity of this representation of cultural life is appealing at first glance. However a second glance reveals anomalies and contradictions of Nazi visual arts policy. The evolution of the Nazi cultural policy was far more complex and contradictory than such a conventional reading of the state's patronage of the fine arts, and cultural events, such as the *Große Deutsche Kunstausstellung* and the *Entartete Kunstausstellung* permits.

It is not surprising that conventional views of Nazi visual arts policy and practice have focused so firmly on the role of Hitler, since the personage of Hitler, and the centrality of his ideas to Nazi policy have occupied a central position in the historiography of the Third Reich. This is particularly true of historical research produced in the immediate postwar period, which focused almost entirely on the personality of Adolf Hitler. The inseparability of the personality of Hitler from National Socialism led to the development of wholly biographical approaches which portrayed Hitler as the personification of evil, for example Trevor-Roper's classic *The Last Days of Hitler*, or Alan Bullock's *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny*. Hitler, says Bullock was a "consummate actor,

⁸ Mario-Andreas von Lüttichau, "Entartete Kunst, Munich 1937: A Reconstruction", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 63.

with the actor's and orator's facility for absorbing himself in a role and convincing himself of the truth of what he was saying at the time he said it."⁹

The emphasis non-German scholars placed on the personality of Hitler during the immediate postwar period led to the development of a one-dimensional biographical approach, which tended to neglect the importance of political, economic, social, cultural, intellectual and psychological factors. The marked tendency to demonise Hitler, especially by non-German historians, contrasted to studies produced by West German historians which emphasised the discontinuity of Germany's present and past, by accentuating the singularity of the Nazi phenomenon. In contrast, studies produced by East German historians emphasised the importance of underlying structural forces on historical developments, and portrayed Hitler as a puppet of monopoly capitalism.

The notion of Hitler as the all powerful leader at the head of a highly organised state machinery, once regarded by historians as a well established truth, was for the first time placed under scrutiny in the early 1960s. The exploration of the "polycratic" or "pluralistic" features of the Nazi régime became the subject of intense interest in the European historiography by the late 1960s and early 1970s. Hans Mommsen, Edward Peterson, and Martin Broszat represent the main proponents of the "functionalist" approach, in which decisions are seen as being functionally linked together, (thereby limiting the centrality of Hitler in decision making processes).

In an article entitled "National Socialism: Continuity and Change" Mommsen portrayed Hitler as a "weak dictator". He did this by demonstrating how the efficient functioning of the state was impeded by Hitler's personal rule, or lack thereof. Mommsen stated that: "Instead of functioning as a balancing element in the government, Hitler disrupted the conduct of affairs by continually acting on sudden impulses, each one different, and partly delaying decisions on current matters". The survival of Hitler's dictatorship was according to Mommsen "held together externally by the Führer myth", and depended upon the personal allegiance which ultimately resided in Hitler's charismatic appeal.¹⁰

The pressures which multiple agencies within the system placed upon Hitler's ability to rule were also explored in Edward Peterson's study on the Nazi administration

⁹ Hugh Trevor-Roper, *The Last Days of Hitler* (Pan Books: London, 1968), p. 54.

¹⁰ Hans Mommsen, "National Socialism: Continuity and Change" in *Left-Wing Intellectuals between the Wars, 1919-1939*, Walter Laqueur and George Mosse eds., (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 196.

and bureaucracy.¹¹ The scholarly studies produced by Hans Mommsen, Edward Peterson, and Martin Broszat led to the diminution in the overall importance of the personality of Hitler in the Third Reich.

The challenge posed by the "functionalist" approach resulted in the emergence of a division between the exponents of the conflicting interpretational approaches, which dominated European historiography. Foremost among the exponents of traditional history were Klaus Hildebrand and Andreas Hillgruber, who staunchly defended the traditional historical approach, which allocated central importance to the conscious motives and actions of individuals. In an article entitled "Monokratie oder Polykratie? Hitlers Herrschaft und das Dritte Reich", Hildebrand defended the axiomatic premise of "the absolute centrality of Adolf Hitler within the system".¹² In 1973 in an article entitled "Politische Geschichte in moderner Sicht", Hillgruber issued a call for a return to the traditional historical approach which allocated central importance to the conscious motives and actions of individuals, rather than the underlying "structural determinants". Hillgruber's rejection of the "exaggerated and modish claims of 'social history'", was based upon the premise that this would lead to the substitution of empirical evidence for ill-defined concepts and theoretical abstractions.¹³ In 1975, in an article entitled "Moderne Politikgeschichte oder 'Große Politik der Kabinette'?" Hans Ulrich Wehler rejected Hillgruber's defense and defined these as positive developments, which had introduced greater conceptual rigour to historical scholarship.¹⁴ The ensuing debate prompted a fundamental re-examination of the nature of historical scholarship and methodology.

The tenacity of the functionalist approach to withstand the battle waged by the "intentionalists" was demonstrated by Martin Broszat's authoritative analysis of the internal structure of the Nazi régime *The Hitler State: The Foundation and Development of the Internal Structure of the Third Reich*. Broszat's study fundamentally changed our

¹¹ Edward N. Peterson, *The Limits of Hitler's Power*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

¹² Klaus Hildebrand, "Monokratie oder Polykratie? Hitlers Herrschaft und das Dritte Reich", in *Der Führerstaat*, Hirschfeld and Kettenacker ed., p. 75, cited in introduction of Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems & Perspectives of Interpretation*, (New York: Routledge, 1993).

¹³ Andreas Hillgruber, 'Politische-Geschichte in moderner Sicht', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 216, (1973), pp. 529-52, cited in introduction of Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems & Perspectives of Interpretation*, (New York: Routledge, 1993).

¹⁴ Hans Ulrich Wehler, 'Moderne Politikgeschichte oder "Große Politik der Kabinette"?', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 1, (1975), pp. 344-69, cited in introduction of Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems & Perspectives of Interpretation*, (New York: Routledge, 1993).

perception of the Nazi régime by introducing the notion that the bifurcation of Nazi agencies impeded, rather than augmented, the efficient running of the bureaucracy:

The institutional form of 'Führer absolutism' did not portend as is often mistakenly presumed, a strengthening of the hierarchical solidarity and uniformity of the state and Party as a whole, but implied a growing antagonism between the individual office holders, as well as an end to legal and administrative regularity, and in the last resort to a 'denationalisation' of the system.¹⁵

The controversy, which emerged between the exponents of these opposing interpretational approaches, has characterised the broad development of historical research on National Socialism. These questions of the general interpretation of the Third Reich have found expression specifically in the historiography relating to Nazi cultural policy and practice. The conflict between the two opposing authorities in Nazi cultural politics was first documented in Hildegard Brenner's 1963 *Nationalsozialistische Kunstpolitik*.¹⁶

The conventional "intentionalist" approach is represented by early studies on Nazi art looting, such as Thomas Howe's *Salt Mines and Castles*, and the less academic treatment of Nazi art looting provided by David Roxan and Kenneth Wanstall's *The Jackdaw of Linz: The Story of Hitler's Art Thefts*.¹⁷ These are essentially narrative accounts of the plunder of Europe's art treasures by Nazi leaders.

While there are admittedly few historians who identify unreservedly with a simple "intentionalist" approach, the "intentionalist" approach has continued to find expression up to the present day. Studies such as Peter Reichel's *Der schöne Schein des Dritten Reiches: Faszination und Gewalt der Faschismus*, which explains cultural policy in terms of Hitler's ideology and master plan, may be identified as examples of "intentionalist" approaches to Nazi cultural policy.¹⁸ In contrast, Jonathan Petropoulos' study, entitled *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, represents an implicit critique of the "intentionalist" approach described above. Petropoulos has argued that the "functionalist" approach is applicable to Nazi cultural policy since the same principles, which were operative in Nazi

¹⁵ Martin Broszat, *The Hitler State: The Foundation and Development of the Internal Structure of the Third Reich*, (London: Longman, 1981).

¹⁶ *From Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, Hajo Holborn ed., (New York: Vintage Books, 1972).

¹⁷ David Roxan and Kenneth Wanstall, *The Jackdaw of Linz: The Story of Hitler's Art Thefts*, (London: Cassell, 1964).

¹⁸ Peter Reichel, *Der schöne Schein des Dritten Reiches: Faszination und Gewalt der Faschismus*, (Munich: Hanser, 1991), p. 372.

foreign and racial policy, also determined the evolution of Nazi cultural politics. Petropoulos' second study entitled *The Faustian Bargain* seeks to explore the relation between the radicalisation of Nazi racial and cultural policies:

With respect to the cultural sphere, one sees progression from persecution in the professional realm (dismissing Jewish and left-wing employees) to the expropriation of Jewish property (part of the efforts to dehumanise victims) to the spoliation of cultural property of neighbouring countries, and in certain cases (especially the East), outright destruction.¹⁹

Petropoulos distinguishes his own study from similar studies by other historians: "While other scholars have described the bureaucratic overlap in a number of spheres, this study has demonstrated that redundancy, or to use Hannah Arendt's term the 'multiplication of offices', occurred in the arts administration."²⁰ In *The Faustian Bargain*, Petropoulos examines the collaboration of art experts with Nazis. Petropoulos' study constitutes a critique of the "intentionalist" approach through its examination of how art historians, art dealers, art journalists and artists, were not simply reactive to policies, but actually conceived of initiatives and influenced Nazi officials to amend ordinances:

...while the figures in the art world discussed here must be regarded as second rank when viewed with respect to the entirety of the political and social structure of the Third Reich, they were not merely reactive to policies and programs of the Nazi state. They often conceived initiatives and then presented these plans to the leaders for approval. Alternatively, they induced the Nazi elite to amend orders.²¹

In a sense this thesis seeks to do the same, by revealing how the practice of art confiscation was conceived primarily as a means by which art dealers and officials could enrich themselves, while maintaining an external appearance maintaining public morality.

Petropoulos' study remains the most definitive account of the evolution of Nazi visual arts policy, written to date. There are several narrative accounts of the plunder of Europe's cultural treasures, which make excellent reading. Included among this category is Lynn Nicholas' *The Rape of Europa* and Hector Feliciano's *The Lost*

¹⁹ Jonathan Petropoulos, *The Faustian Bargain: The Art World in Nazi Germany* (Penguin: London, 2000), p. 6.

²⁰ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 309.

²¹ *Ibid.* p.7.

Museum.²² The most recently published account of Nazi art plundering is Peter Harclerode and Brendan Pittaway's *The Lost Masters*.²³ The topic of the art restitution has been examined in a similar fashion to the author's mentioned above, by Elizabeth Simpson in her book *The Spoils of War*. Other contributions to this discussion have been made by Marc Masurovsky, Gerlad Aalders, Oliver Rathkolb, Sarah Jackson, Constance Lowenthal, Cynthia Salzman, Patricia Kennedy Grimstead, Anja Heuss, Wolfgang Eichwede, Ulrike Hartung, Ulrich Bischoff, Gert Kerschbaumer. The fate of Germany's collections of modern art which were confiscated in the *entartete Kunst Aktion* is also well documented in "*Degenerate Art*": *The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, edited by Stephanie Barron.²⁴ In addition, the book's contributors, including von Lüttichau, Peter Guenther, Andreas Hüneke and Christoph Zuschlag have published articles on this topic. A reconstruction of the *Entartete Kunstausstellung*, entitled "Rekonstruktion der Ausstellung 'Entartete Kunst' " was first published by Lüttichau in 1987.²⁵ The very interesting topic of the traffic in looted art in neutral Switzerland has been excellently documented in Thomas Buomberger's study, entitled *Raubkunst Kunstraub*. Buomberger's book represents the most authoritative study exploring the art transactions arranged between Swiss dealers and German officials that exists to date.²⁶ A history of the sale of Germany's public collections of *entartete Kunst* to the *Kunstmuseum Basel* has also been documented by Georg Kreis in his study entitled "*Entartete Kunst*" für Basel.²⁷

²² Lynn Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1994), & Hector Feliciano, *The Lost Museum: The Nazi Conspiracy to Steal the World's Greatest Artworks* (New York: Basic Books, 1997).

²³ Peter Harclerode & Brendan Pittaway, *The Lost Masters: The Looting of Europe's Treasurehouses*, (London: Orion, 1999).

²⁴ "*Degenerate Art*": *The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum, 1991).

²⁵ Mario-Andreas von Lüttichau, "Rekonstruktion der Ausstellung 'Entartete Kunst' ", in *Die "Kunststadt" München 1937: Nationalsozialismus und "Entartete Kunst"*, Peter-Klaus Schuster ed., (Munich: Prestel, 1987).

²⁶ Thomas Buomberger, *Raubkunst Kunstraub: Die Schweiz und der Handel mit gestohlenen Kulturgütern ur Zeit des Zweiten Weltkriegs* (Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1998). Buomberger is an authority on the subject of the traffic in looted art in Switzerland during the Second World War. Dr. Andrea Raschèr gave me a copy of Buomberger's book courtesy of the *Bundesamt für Kultur* (Swiss Federal Office of Culture).

²⁷ Georg Kreis, "*Entartete*" *Kunst für Basel*, (Basel: Wiese Verlag, 1990). Dr. Katharina Schmidt, the director of the *Öffentliche Kunstsammlung Basel*, informed me in a letter dated May 29, 1999, that an account of the acquisition of "degenerate art" by the gallery is provided by Kreis in this particular book, that was available from their bookshop.

Methodology, Aims, and Source Materials

While the controversy between the "intentionalist" and "functionalist" position has dissipated, and few historians identify unreservedly with either the simple "intentionalist" or "functionalist" position, its application, notably to the realm of National Socialist cultural policy, has produced some interesting findings in this thesis. The contradictions between Nazi theory and practice which emerge from this study of the Nazi confiscation and exchange of modern art, serves to highlight the link between the topic of art confiscation and exchange to the broader debate in the literature of National Socialism.

This study seeks to examine the disposal of "degenerate art" in the context of the historiographical controversy about the interpretation of National Socialism outlined earlier in this chapter. The primacy of ideology in the formulation of an official National Socialist aesthetic remains a distinguishing feature of the evolution of National Socialist visual arts during the period between 1933-1937. The aim of this thesis, however, is to show that ideology had not gained a stronghold over cultural policy. On the contrary, a study of art policy and practice as they relate to confiscation, reveals that ideology failed to retain a dominant influence after its apparent triumph in 1937. As such this thesis constitutes a critique of the "intentionalist" school of interpretation.

This thesis undertakes an examination of the evolution of official policy on art in the Third Reich, with an emphasis on the practice of confiscation. The discrepancies which emerged between confiscation procedure in theory and in practice, illustrates how the evolution of cultural policy from 1937 onwards became increasingly characterised by the diminution in importance of ideology.

The sale of the Reich's collection of confiscated art at the *Galerie Fischer* auction in Lucerne, Switzerland in June 1939 provides evidence that economic considerations outweighed ideological objections to the sale of "degenerate art". The fact that the ideological justifications employed to legitimate the confiscations were not consistent with the practice of confiscation provides evidence that visual arts policy ceased to be driven by ideology considerations post 1937.

The selection of primary sources has been limited to the reports compiled by the Allies, with four exceptions. Firstly, the *Völkischer Beobachter*, the official newspaper of the NSDAP. Secondly, the inventory compiled by the *Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda* (Institute for German Cultural and Economic Propaganda). Thirdly, the letter register of the *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg* (ERR). The letters of correspondence of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* in Krefeld are the final exception.

The reports of the Art Looting Investigation Unit (ALIU) provide an excellent source of information on Nazi art looting, and forms the basis of the supporting documentation to support the central thesis of this dissertation. The Office of Strategic Services was responsible for the establishment of the ALIU in November 1944. Its aim was to investigate the plunder of Europe's art treasures with the established an interrogation facility at Berchtesgaden. The field investigations of the ALIU performed by Lieutenants Theodore Rousseau, of the National Gallery in Washington, James Plaut, of Boston's Institute of Modern Art, and Lieutenant S.L. Faison, art professor of William's College, constitute a major primary source and form the basis of chapter three.

The staff at the *National Archives Record Administration Textual Reference Division* in Washington D.C. have pointed out that most of the wartime records of the ALIU have been declassified for many years. Greg Bradscher, Assistant Chief of the Archives II Textual Reference Branch, estimates that only fifty percent of wartime records detailing assets looted by the Germans during the Second World War were subject to classification. Bradscher has estimated that of those records that were originally classified, seventy-five percent of those that had been classified were relocated to unclassified stack areas in 1982; fifteen percent in the period between 1982-1989; five percent in 1990-1994; and the remaining five percent in 1995-1997. These archives were declassified after the United States Congress voted to declassify wartime records detailing Germany's wartime financial transaction in 1997.²⁸

The *National Archives* holds the entire collection of the records of the ALIU. Included among these records are issued three Consolidated Interrogation Reports (CIRs), which document the nature and extent of Nazi looting operations in German-occupied countries. The first CIR, entitled *Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France*, examines the confiscations performed by this agency in German-occupied France. The second CIR, entitled *The Goering Collection*, examines the methods used by Reichsmarshal Göring and his agents to acquire works of looted art from occupied countries.²⁹ In addition to the CIRs, the MFA&A Branch issued fifteen detailed interrogation reports (DIRs) investigating key figures involved in art looting. The DIRs provide an account of the wartime activities of individuals identified in connection with

²⁸ Greg Bradscher, "Searching for Documents on Nazi Gold", *The Record*, May 1997.

²⁹ The existence of the final CIR entitled "Linz: Hitler's Museum and Library" was disclosed by two journalists, David Roxan and Ken Wanstall in 1964. This report investigates the origins of Hitler's Linz collection by the official purchasing agents and private art dealers involved, are fully documented in this report.

their involvement and affiliation with German art looting agencies, and their relationship to various German officials. The involvement of Swiss dealers in the trade in looted art is the subject of the Monuments Fine Arts and Archives Branch, *Report of Mission to Switzerland*.³⁰

The Allied restitution efforts are documented by Richard A. Johnson in a report entitled *Protection, Restitution, and Reparation of Objets d'Art, and other Cultural Objects*. This report is listed under the file name "Restitution Background Material", and is amongst the records of *The American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Historic Monuments in War Areas*. The records pertaining to the subject of art restitution after the Second World War are held in the *National Archives* and are included in the so-called *Ardelia Hall Collection*. The collections consists of over 500 boxes including, *The Final Report -Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Section*, under file "Final Reports - Reparations and Restitution"; and *Transfer of Works of Art or Cultural Material of Value or Importance*, under the file "387, Restitution Reports".³¹

A copy of an inventory compiled by the *Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda* in the summer of 1941, as a final record of the sales of "degenerate art", is held by the *Victoria and Albert Museum* in London. This inventory lists 16,558 works of art confiscated from collections in 101 German galleries in alphabetical order. Heinrich Robert Fischer, a leading London art dealer, and co-founder of the *Marlborough Fine Art Gallery* gave the museum the inventory as part of his bequest in October 1996. The second volume of the inventory has not been used as a primary source in any secondary literature surveyed, and thereby constitutes an important primary source.³² The inventory has not as yet been published, or written about, with the exception of an article by Martin Bailey, which appeared in the *Art Newspaper* in May 1997.³³

³⁰ Cooper, Douglas, *Report of Mission to Switzerland*, Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Branch, December 1, 1945, the *National Archives*, (Washington, D.C.), record Group 239, box 82.

³¹ *Final Reports - Reparations and Restitution*, 30 December 1948, Records of Property Division, Records of the Reparations and Restitution Branch, Reports and Related Records Re: Restitution, 1945-1950, the *National Archives*, (Washington, D.C.). *Transfer of Works of Art or Cultural Material of Value or Importance*, 6 December 1946, Records of the Property Division, Records of the Reparations and Restitution Branch, Reports and Related Records Re: Restitution, 1945-1950, the *National Archives*, (Washington, D.C.), record Group 260.

³² *Entartete Kunst*, (Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda, 1942), *The National Art Library*, *Victoria and Albert Museum*, London.

³³ Martin Bailey, Revealed: What Happened to the "Degenerate" Art in Germany's Museums, from G to Z", *The Art Newspaper*, No. 70, May 1997. p. 4.

The *Imperial War Museum* in London has a copy of a report of the letter register of the ERR, which documents the systematic plunder of Europe's art collections by this agency entitled, *The Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg: An Analysis of the Captured Letter Register of the ERR*. In addition to the aforementioned records, a semi-official record of the daily affairs of the MFA&A Branch has been preserved at the Imperial War Museum, which provides an insight into the enormous quantities of art looted by the Germans during the war.³⁴ The diary of Miss A.O. Popham, a member of the small staff of this branch, details telephone conversations, discussions in person, staff movements and developments. It provides an insight into the *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg's* systematic plunder of Europe's cultural patrimony.

The letters from the Nazi period belonging to the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* in Krefeld have also been consulted. These letters provide conclusive evidence of the failed opposition of several museum directors from the Rhineland and Nazi politicians, against the *entartete Kunst Aktion*, and their subsequent efforts to purchase nineteenth and early twentieth century French art to replenish their collections of modern art.³⁵ The museum's curator, Dr. Sabine Röder, has kindly made a selection of letters available for my research.

³⁴ *The Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg: An Analysis of the Captured Letter-Register of the ERR, October 29, 1940 through March 1941*, the Imperial War Museum, London, FO 645, box 349.

³⁵ Dr. Sabine Röder, curator of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum*, Krefeld, letter addressed to Chiew-Lee Khut, 12 May 1999. See appendices for copy of original letter.

Structure

The first chapter undertakes to explain the evolution of Nazi visual arts policy and the origins of the policy of confiscation. This chapter discusses the debate over modernism within the NSDAP and its repercussions in the development of Nazi visual arts policy. The struggle which emerged between the *Nationalsozialistische Gesellschaft für deutsche Kultur* (National Socialist Association for German Culture) and the *NSD-Studentenbund* (National Socialist Students' Association) for control over the development of Nazi cultural policy is discussed in some length.

The official newspaper of the NSDAP, the *Völkischer Beobachter*, is used as a primary source for this chapter, since the views expressed in this newspaper best represent those of the Party and state. The perspective of the *Völkischer Beobachter* on the National Socialist student rebellion illustrates how visual arts policy was re-fashioned in the course of the Party's leadership struggle. The student rebellion failed to bring about the liberalisation of the National Socialist visual arts policy, thereby allowing the *Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur* (Combat League for German Culture) to gain a foothold in that area. The consolidation of National Socialist power was thereby completed with the elimination of dissension within the ranks of the NSDAP and the formulation of an official National Socialist aesthetic.

The second chapter explores the confiscation and disposal of Germany's public collections of modern art, and discusses the historic auction conducted by *the Galerie Fischer*, Lucerne on 30 June 1939. The aim of the second chapter is to demonstrate the declining influence of ideology on visual arts policy by examining the sale of "degenerate art" to German officials, museums and art dealers. An inventory compiled by the RMVP in the summer of 1941 as a final record of the sales of "degenerate art", has been utilised to provide further evidence that confiscation procedure was not consistent with the political and ideological justifications employed to legitimate the confiscations.³⁶ The typescript compiled by the Reich Ministry for Propaganda and Enlightenment has not been used in any of the existing literature cited above.

The typescript, which lists the fate of 16, 558, works of "degenerate art" confiscated by the National Socialists, provides conclusive evidence that the sales were extended to include works by French nineteenth and twentieth century artists which had

³⁶ *Entartete Kunst*, (Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda, 1942), *The National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, London*.

been branded as "degenerate". In practice the term "degenerate" extended beyond works produced since 1910 to include Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art.

The third chapter examines the confiscations of Jewish-owned artworks effected by the *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg* (ERR). Since Jewish collections comprised the principal source of "degenerate art" chapter three examines the confiscations of Jewish-owned property in occupied France between 1940 and 1942. The aim of the third chapter is to explore the transformation of the nature of the ERR's mission, and examine how the principal mission of this agency became the confiscation of Jewish owned property for the purposes of commercial exploitation. The fact that the ideological nature of this agency's mission was sacrificed to satisfy the demand for "degenerate art", which was created by Reich officials and German museums and art dealers, supports my contention that ideological considerations were sacrificed to commercial interests.

The sales of artworks confiscated by the ERR is also the subject of chapter three. The reports issued by the MFA&A Branch based upon a study of the files found in the Paris Office of Schenker, "Internationale Transporte". The letters from the Kaiser Wilhelm museum during the Nazi period provide the basis for the final chapter.³⁷ The opposition of several museum directors from the Rhineland and Nazi politicians of the city against the *entartete Kunst Aktion*, and their efforts to purchase 19th and early 20th century French art to replenish their collections of modern art, are brought to light in this closing chapter.³⁸ This chapter examines the sales conducted by the Reich in the period 1941-1943 and relates this subject back to the more general discussion of the role of ideology in the cultural history of the Third Reich.

The purchase of "degenerate art" by German officials and museums after the issuance of an edict against the transportation of "degenerate art" to the German Reich, is used in the concluding chapter as evidence of the diminished role of ideology in visual arts policy. The sale of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art to German museums is cited on this occasion as an example of how the Reich government was prepared to sacrifice those very same ideological considerations, which it superficially appeared to adhere to.

³⁷ Cecil Gould, "Accessions to German Museums, and Galleries during the Occupation of France (The Schenker Papers, Part I)", April 5, 1945, & "Purchases of Works of Art in France during the Occupation by and on the behalf of German dealers and officials (The Schenker Papers, Part II)", the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 81.

³⁸ Dr. Sabine Röder, curator of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum*, Krefeld, letter addressed to Chiew-Lee Khut, May 12, 1999.

The diminishing importance of ideology is evinced by the purchase of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art by German officials and museums between the years 1941 and 1942. The fact that German museums were allowed to purchase officially proscribed art again suggests that the commercial exploitation of "degenerate art" took precedence over the ideological justifications which had originally been employed to provide the justification for the practice of confiscation. That German museums sought to replenish their depleted collections with acquisitions of French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art, suggests that while this art was regarded as "degenerate" in theory, in practice museums were able to purchase "degenerate art" without any difficulties.

In practice the edict against the importation of "degenerate art" to the Reich encouraged German officials to participate in one-sided exchanges. The willingness of German officials to benefit commercially from the disposal of "degenerate art" is also evinced by their disposal of "degenerate art" through a series of exchanges conducted during the period 1941-1943. The method of exchange became a favoured means of acquisition after the issuance of an edict prohibited the transportation of "degenerate" art to the Reich.

The fourth chapter examines the exchanges of French Impressionist and 20th century paintings for Old Masters and German 19th century pictures conducted by the ERR. This chapter is based primarily upon *Consolidated Interrogation Report No.1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg* and *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Goering Collection*.³⁹ The exchanges illustrate the Reich government's willingness to sacrifice certain ideological considerations in the interests of commercial exploitation. The twenty-eight exchanges conducted by the ERR from the period between February 1941 through November 1943 were inspired by the organisational edict against the transportation of "degenerate" art to Germany. This chapter examines the exchanges conducted by the ERR in France, and Switzerland. The method of exchange constituted a significant aspect of the formation of Göring's personal collection and became Göring's favoured method of acquisition. The sustained demand for "degenerate art" among

³⁹ J.S.Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: Activity of Einsatzstab Rosenberg, 15 August 1945* (Office of Strategic Services Art Looting Investigation Unit), the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.) & Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Goering Collection, 15 September 1945*, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

German dealers after 1941 is also indicated from their eagerness to engage in exchanges and sales involving officially proscribed art in the period between 1941-1943.

CHAPTER 1 - THE EVOLUTION OF THE NAZI VISUAL ARTS POLICY IN THE PERIOD 1929-1937.

The conventional historical depiction of Nazi cultural policy, that has its focus on ideology, provides a somewhat misleading representation of cultural life in the Third Reich. The evolution of Nazi visual arts policy, for example was far more complex and contradictory, than a conventional reading of visual arts policy of this period first suggests.

This first chapter undertakes to explain the evolution of Nazi visual arts policy during the period spanning from 1929-1936. It does this firstly by examining the importance of cultural associations, such as the *Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur* (KfdK), in the formulation of a Nazi visual arts policy in the period prior to Hitler's rise to power. The discussion in this chapter of the role of the KfdK in the rise of National Socialism is primarily based upon research presented by Alan E. Steinweis. His study *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reich Chambers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts* constitutes the principal source of information about the rise of the KfdK.¹

This chapter also explores the struggle that emerged between the KfdK and the *NSD-Studentenbund* (National Socialist Student Association), for control over the development of cultural policy. It also explores the repercussions of this conflict on the formulation of an official visual arts policy in the period after 1933.

The reportage of the conflict by the official newspaper of the NSDAP, the *Völkischer Beobachter*, has also been employed in this chapter as a means to attitudes toward modern art in official Party circles. The existence of debate over modernism in various editions of the *Völkischer Beobachter* is cited in this chapter, as evidence illustrating the broad scope for discussion over aesthetic issues prior to the year 1935.²

¹ Alan E. Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reich Chambers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts*, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), pp. 42, 44.

² The articles from the *Völkischer Beobachter* that are cited in this chapter are held in the library at the *Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule*, Zurich. These articles were translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

The Rise of the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur in the period 1929-1933.

The KfdK contributed greatly to the transformation of the NSDAP's image, from its grass-roots beginnings into the culturally sophisticated image which it later projected to the rest of the world. The cultivation of a culturally sophisticated image was to prove particularly instrumental in the rise in the popularity of the NSDAP among Germany's cultural and economic elite. It is important to understand the means by which this was achieved in order to better understand its implications upon the development of Nazi cultural policy, in particular, the practice of art confiscation.

The role of the KfdK is central to understanding the evolution of Nazi cultural policy, especially since the KfdK played a crucial role in the rise of hostility towards the avant-garde, both among the Party and its supporters. The elaborate theories about the degeneracy of the avant-garde, which were espoused by the Party's spokespeople, and their conservative allies, are significant because these same theories later form the theoretical basis for the government's practice of art confiscation.

During the period spanning from 1928-29 the NSDAP transformed itself from a fringe movement into a leading political party. It achieved this through instituting a series of organisational reforms, which were aimed at transforming the movement's appeal among Germany's educated and propertied classes. The success of these organisational reforms enabled the movement to rise to prominence in German politics within a period of four years.³

The leadership of the NSDAP had achieved little success in shedding its plebeian image prior to 1933, in spite its poor recruitment efforts among working classes. In realisation that the Party's electoral success hinged upon widening its appeal among a wider section of the electorate, the Party set about shedding the "blue collar" image. The leadership achieved this rapid transformation firstly through the creation of new auxiliaries for university students, teachers, lawyers and other professional groups. The Party leadership recognised from an early stage that, although the educated and cultural elite comprised a minority of the electorate, their support conferred social respectability upon the movement. In response to this problem, the leadership instigated a series of organisational changes.⁴

³ Alan E. Steinweis, "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur", *Central European History*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1991. p. 408.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 409.

The first step that was taken occurred in January 1929, when the Party agreed to re-name the *Nationalsozialistische Gesellschaft für deutsche Kultur* (National Socialist Association for German Culture), the *Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur* (Combat League for German Culture). This change in name reflected the Party's desire to appeal to a broader audience. The decision to re-name the association, and not to restrict entry to the association to NSDAP members, was aimed at broadening the association's appeal to groups that had refrained from joining the Party because of its association with the working class. Since the Party relied on the subscriptions and donations of its members to finance its program of activities, it was essential to the survival of the Party that this was rapidly achieved.

The conspicuous absence of references to the Party and Adolf Hitler in the official newsletter of the KfdK after 1929 succeeded in cultivating the image that the KfdK remained above party politics. The membership of several publishers and writers on the association's executive committee, such as Dr. Philipp Lenard, Hugo Bruckmann, Paul Schultze-Naumburg, and Karl von Shirach, also lent an image of social respectability and sophistication to the KfdK.⁵

In the same year, the KfdK launched a series of lectures, which were aimed at educating Germans about the importance of the preservation of Aryan race and its culture. In February 1929 the KfdK sponsored public lectures, including music recitals, theatrical performances and literary readings, which proved enormously successful recruiting new members to both the KfdK, and later the NSDAP.⁶

The KfdK publicised its cultural program in the organisation's official newspaper, the *Mitteilungen des Kampfbundes für deutsche Kultur*. The decision to publicise the KfdK's cultural attractions not only in the official newspaper of the NSDAP, *Völkischer Beobachter*, but also in the *Mitteilungen des Kampfbundes für deutsche Kultur*, was probably aimed at converting the KfdK's less political readership to the NSDAP.⁷

Othmar Spann, the theorist of the corporate state and member of the Board of Directors of the KfdK received the honour of delivering the inaugural lecture, entitled

⁵ Alan E. Steinweis, "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur", *Central European History*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1991, pp. 408-09.

⁶ Christoph Zuschlag, "An 'Educational Exhibition': Precursors of *Entartete Kunst* and Its Individual Venues", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 83.

⁷ Herbert Phillips Rothfeder, "A Study of Alfred Rosenberg's Organisation for National Socialist Ideology", (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan: University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1963), p. 43.

"The Cultural Crisis of the Present". Other lecturers, included Alfred Heuss, an eminent musicologist, who delivered a lecture entitled "The Crisis of German Music", in which he referred to the destructive impact of "Negro-Jew Jazz" on European culture. In April 1929, the Party's own self appointed ideologue, Alfred Rosenberg, developed upon his theme in greater depth, in a lecture of the alleged nefarious effects of "Negro" culture.⁸

The theoretical framework for the cultural views of the KfdK were provided by Alfred Rosenberg, in his book entitled *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts: Eine Wertung der seelisch-geistigen Gestaltenkämpfe* (The Myth of the 20th Century: An Evaluation of the Spiritual and Intellectual Confrontations of Our Age). This book, which was published in 1930, became the unofficial primer of the Party's cultural views. Although *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhundert* was never officially endorsed by the NSDAP it provided the theoretical justification for the battle against modern art launched by the anti-modernist forces within the Party.⁹

In this book, the author sought to intensify existing prejudices about the degeneracy of the avant-garde, through the association of modern art with pornography, homosexuality, venereal disease, racial miscegenation and Jewish-Bolshevism. Not surprisingly, the same views espoused in this book later provided the theoretical basis for the confiscation of "degenerate art". Walter Hansen also explored the alleged degeneracy of the avant-garde in a pamphlet entitled "Judenkunst in Deutschland". This article purported to explore the nefarious involvement of Jews in the promotion of modern art.¹⁰ Hansen was later recognised as one of the individuals responsible for conceiving the *entartete Kunst Aktion*.¹¹

The emergence of the KfdK as a front organisation for the NSDAP became increasingly apparent in 1930. Whilst the association remained an unofficial organ of the NSDAP, the influence of the KfdK on the Party increased with its president, Alfred Rosenberg's, rise to prominence in the activities of the association. The KfdK first began to exert a pronounced dominance over cultural affairs in Thuringia, following the appointment of Wilhelm Frick to the post of Minister of Interior and Minister of Popular

⁸ Alan E. Steinweis, "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur", *Central European History*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1991, pp. 408-09.

⁹ Alfred Rosenberg, *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts: Eine Wertung der seelisch-geistigen Gestaltenkämpfe* (München: Hoheneichen Verlag, 1939).

¹⁰ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 54.

¹¹ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 54-56.

Education in 1930. The appointment of hard-line anti-modernists to key positions within his ministry, including Hans Severus Ziegler as "Culture, Art and Theater Specialist", and Paul Schultze-Naumburg as head of the State Academy of Art, suggested that the *völkisch* program of the KfdK would form the basis for the Nazi cultural policy. The issuance of "Ordinance against Negro culture" on 5 April 1930, aimed at the elimination of "immoral and foreign racial elements in the arts", and the subsequent purge of German Expressionist art from the Weimar Ducal Museum in November 1930, also pointed in the same direction.¹²

The activism of the KfdK during the early years of the "struggle" also contributed to the rise in organised opposition to modern art by amateur art societies and other reactionary groups. In 1930 cultural associations and leagues of the far-right organised themselves into the *Führerrat des Vereinigten Deutschen Kunst und Kultur Verbands* (Führer's Council of United German Art and Cultural Association). The KfdK launched a series of public lectures aimed at raising the association's profile in an effort to gain leadership of these organisations and associations in 1931.¹³

The NSDAP gained a foothold in the universities following the electoral success of the *NSD-Studentenbund* in the student union elections. The *NSD-Studentenbund* won control of the national students' union in the summer of 1931.¹⁴

The KfdK attempted to capitalise on the situation by sponsoring a series of public lectures by Paul Schultze-Naumburg, entitled "The Struggle Over Art". Schultze-Naumburg became a spokesman for the KfdK's cultural platform, and delivered a series of lectures in universities in 6 cities in 1931.¹⁵ Schultze-Naumburg reiterated the ideas he had expounded in his treatise on his lecture circuit: "For, just as in German politics, a battle over life and death rages in German art today. Alongside the struggle for power, the struggle for art must be fought with the same earnestness and the same decision, if we do not want to sacrifice the German soul".¹⁶ During his final two lectures violent scuffles erupted between left wing activists and NSDAP activists, and members of the

¹² Alan E. Steinweis, "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur", *Central European History*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1991, p. 408.

¹³ *Ibid.* pp. 408-09.

¹⁴ Geoffrey J. Giles, "National Socialism and the Educated Elite in the Weimar Republic", in *The Nazi Machtergreifung*, Peter D. Stachura ed., (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983), p. 50.

¹⁵ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 29.

¹⁶ Barbara Miller Lane, *Architecture and Politics in Germany, 1918-1945*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 159.

Sturmabteilung, which were present to eject any disruptive audience participants removed them from the auditorium.¹⁷

The KfdK succeeded in broadening the appeal of the association among educated segments of the community. In the period between April 1929 and January 1932, the membership of the KfdK swelled from 300 to 2,100, and although its membership was not comparable in size to that of political parties, an inordinate proportion of elites gained membership to the association. The National Socialist dominance of the KfdK became more pronounced after the Reichstag elections in July 1932. The NSDAP polled 37.8% of the vote, doubling its representation from 107 to 230 seats.¹⁸ In 1932 the Berlin chapter of the KfdK published a declaration of its adherence to the National Socialism in its publication, *Deutsche Kultur Wacht*. The front page of the first issue featured an article endorsing the NSDAP. The second issue contained a declaration of support for Hitler signed by fifty-four university lecturers and professors. The *Deutsche Kultur Wacht* became a forum for issues concerning the structural reform of the visual arts.¹⁹

In the years prior to the Party's seizure of power the KfdK performed an important role in establishing a support base for the movement. The KfdK appeared guaranteed of securing a position of dominance in the realm of cultural policy following the National Socialists' assumption of power. In the period between January and February 1933 membership in the KfdK rose rapidly from 6,000 to 38,000. The rapid rise in membership of the KfdK between January and February 1933 confirmed the leadership's goal of assuming hegemony over the cultural bureaucracy.²⁰

However the KfdK's organisational structure, which was based upon semi-autonomous regional associations rather than a centralised party-style organisation, was ideally suited to promoting regional activism. The failure of the KfdK to gain leadership of the national administration of the culture professions in the winter of 1933 proved detrimental to the organisation's survival. The formation of an alliance between Hans Hinker, the founder of the Berlin chapter of the KfdK, and Goebbels posed the first threat

¹⁷ Alan E. Steinweis, "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur", *Central European History*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1991, p. 408.

¹⁸ "Degenerate Art": *The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 396.

¹⁹ Geoffrey J. Giles, "National Socialism and the Educated Elite in the Weimar Republic", in *The Nazi Machtergreifung*, Peter D. Stachura ed., (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983), p. 50.

²⁰ Alan E. Steinweis, "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur", *Central European History*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1991, p. 408.

to the KfdK's leadership challenge. The appearance of articles concerning misdirected funding of the arts and inefficient administration and regulations of the culture professions prompted Hinkel, to broker a deal with the propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels, which required artists who were members of the NSDAP to join the KfdK. The transformation of the association into a professional association foreshadowed the institutionalisation of the culture professions.²¹ The deal brokered between Goebbels and Hinkel gave the leadership of the KfdK the mistaken impression that the KfdK would assume responsibility over the regulation of the culture professions. In actuality, the alliance between Hinkel enabled Goebbels to gain control over the affairs of the KfdK through shifting the centre of the association's activities from Munich to Berlin.²²

The influence of the KfdK declined throughout June 1933. The *Reichsbund Volkstum und Heimat* (Reich Folkhood and Home League) under the leadership of Professor Karl Alexander von Müller emerged as a rival to the KfdK. In June 1933 Rosenberg unsuccessfully attempted to incorporate the KfdK, now the single largest cultural association, into the National Socialist cultural bureaucracy. The unofficial status of the KfdK within the organisational hierarchy of the state and Party brought the KfdK into conflict with the newly created *Reichskulturkammer* (RKK).²³

The issuance of a Führer decree on 30 June 1933 invested unlimited control over the cultural bureaucracy in the hands of Goebbels.

Goebbels the Reichsminister of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda has jurisdiction over the whole field of spiritual indoctrination of the nation, of propagandising the state, of cultural and economic propaganda, of enlightenment of the public at home and abroad; furthermore, he is in charge of the administration of all institutions serving this purpose.²⁴

The enactment of a law creating the RKK on 22 September 1933, which acknowledged Goebbels as its head, was followed by the promulgation of a Decree for

²¹ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 27, 47.

²² Alan E. Steinweis, "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur", *Central European History*, vol. 24, no. 4, p. 435.

²³ *Ibid.* p. 408.

²⁴ Alexander Hardy, *Hitler's Secret Weapon: The Managed Press and Propaganda Machine in Nazi Germany* (New York: Vantage, 1967), p. 28.

the Implementation of the Reich Chamber Law on 1 November 1933, which outlined its tasks, structure and membership policies.²⁵

The RKK was comprised of chambers for the press, radio, film, theatre, music, literature and the visual arts. Initially membership in the RKK was not mandatory, and individuals in the culture professions were expected to join of their own volition. Entry into the RKK was not restricted to members of the NSDAP, however applicants were required to submit certification of their "Aryan" ancestry, and former membership in the communist party automatically precluded entry into the RKK.²⁶ Following the enactment of the Directive for the Execution of the Reich Chamber Law on 1 November 1933 membership in the RKK became compulsory. All persons engaging "in the creation, the reproduction, the intellectual or technical adaptation, the dissemination, the maintenance, the sale or the mediation of the sale of cultural assets", were required to join if they wished to continue working in their prospective field of employment. The RKK underwent a rapid decline in membership after membership of the RKK was made mandatory for the culture professions.²⁷

The appointment of several members of the KfdK to positions within the propaganda ministry and the RKK deprived the KfdK of its effective leadership. Several former members of the KfdK rose to occupy key positions within the RKK. Hans Hinkel was appointed *Reichskulturwalter* in the RKK's central office. Otto Laubinger became head of the *Reichstheaterkammer* (Reich Theatre Chamber). Heinz Ihler, was made executive director of the *Reichsmusikkammer* (Reich Music Chamber). The presidency of the *Reichsschrifttumskammer* (Reich Literature Chamber) was given to Hanns Johst, and Eugen Höning, received the presidency of the *Reichskammer der bildenden Künste* (Reich Chamber of the Visual Arts).²⁸

The KfdK's failure to gain a foothold in the bureaucracy before the creation of the propaganda ministry and RKK, combined with the formation of an alliance between Goebbels and Dr. Ley in 1933, secured the RKK's control over the cultural bureaucracy.

²⁵ Alan E. Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reich Chambers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts*, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), pp. 42, 44.

²⁶ Jan-Pieter Barbian, "Literary Policy in the Third Reich", in *National Socialist Cultural Policy*, Glenn R. Cuomo ed., (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), pp. 172-73.

²⁷ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 28.

²⁸ Alan E. Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reich Chambers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), p. 28.

The KfdK's influence in cultural matters diminished after the formation of an alliance with *NS-Gemeinschaft Kraft durch Freude* (National Socialist Association Strength through Joy). In late 1933 Ley approached Goebbels about the creation of a cultural department in his organisation, the *NS-Gemeinschaft Kraft durch Freude*. Goebbels agreed to assist Ley in the designing the cultural program for Ley's workers' organisation, the *Deutsche Arbeitsfront* (German Labour Front) (DAF) and contrived the motto "Kraft durch Freude" (Strength through Joy). The formation of an alliance between himself and Dr. Robert Ley succeeded in undermining the position of the KfdK, which had remained outside the state structure.²⁹

However, by July 1933, relations between Ley and Goebbels had become acrimonious as an outcome of Ley's endeavour to assume direction over the KdF. The formation of an alliance between Rosenberg and Ley resulted in the merging of the KfdK with the *Reichsverband "Deutsche Bühne"* to form the *NS-Kulturgemeinde* (NS Cultural Community) (NS-KG) in June 1934. The forging of an alliance between the leaders of these respective associations with the creation of the NS-KG, was calculated to weaken Goebbels control over the administrative bureaucracy and prevent the RKK from gaining dominance in cultural affairs.³⁰

The efforts of the *völkisch* faction to gain ascendancy through the implementation of their reactionary cultural program failed to meet with success. The redoubtable efforts of the KfdK to regain its position of prominence were set back again after Hitler delivered a speech at the annual party rally in Nuremberg on 1 September 1933. The speech, entitled "German Art as the Proudest Justification of the German People" implicitly rejected the KfdK's program. The importance of this particular speech was paramount, because it was his first public pronouncement on art since becoming Chancellor of Germany. Hitler's speech constituted a major disappointment to the KfdK. His declaration that "today's tasks require new methods" and that "those who think that the representatives of the cultural decadence, which now lies behind us, can be the

²⁹ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 38-40.

³⁰ Jonathan Petropoulos, "A Guide through the Visual Arts Administration of the Third Reich", in *National Socialist Cultural Policy*, Glenn R. Cuomo ed., (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), p. 125.

standard bearers of the future", implied his rejection of the cultural program espoused by the KfdK.³¹

The appointment of Hans Weidemann to the vice-presidency of the *Reichskammer der bildenden Künste* (Reich Chamber for Visual Arts) exacerbated the factional divide emerging within the Party and government. Weidemann's inclusion of works by Ernst Barlach and Emil Nolde in the exhibition of German religious art in the Chicago exhibition entitled "Century of Progress", and his organisation of an exhibition of modern German Expressionist painting and sculpture entitled *Dreißig Deutsche Künstler* (Thirty German Artists), which opened at the Galerie Ferdinand Möller in Berlin on 22 June 1933, earned him notoriety. Following his appointment to a position in the cultural office of the *NS-Gemeinschaft Kraft durch Freude* a series of exhibitions in factories and work places was sponsored by the KdF featuring the founders of German Expressionism, including Pechstein, Schmidt-Rottluff, Nolde and Barlach.³²

The leadership challenge between members of the KfdK and their rivals within the Party and government precipitated the eventual demise of the KfdK, once it became apparent that the battle the leadership of the KfdK had waged to gain control over the cultural bureaucracy had been lost. The threat posed by the KfdK to RKK was neutralised by Goebbels soon after the creation of the RKK. The growing influence of the RKK enabled key opponents of the KfdK to rise to positions of prominence within the expanding cultural bureaucracy. This presented a unique opportunity for pro-modernist elements within the Party and state to change the development of the National Socialists cultural policy. The potential for Nazi cultural policy to be moderated by more liberal elements within the government was further strengthened by the emergence of the *NSD-Studentenbund* as youthful opposition to the KfdK.

³¹ Barbara Miller Lane, *Architecture and Politics in Germany, 1918-1945*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 180.

³² Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 39.

The Emergence of the *NSD-Studentenbund* Opposition in the period 1931-1935.

The period between 1933-1934 was characterised by the emergence of opposition to the reactionary cultural views espoused by the KfDK from within the Party. The cultural policies espoused by the KfDK aroused opposition from the "liberal" faction of the NSDAP, particularly among the *NSD-Studentenbund*, which had succeeded in gaining control of national students' union in the summer of 1931.

In the spring of 1933 the *NSD-Studentenbund* emerged as an outspoken critic of the *völkisch* aesthetic. The Berlin branch of the *NSD-Studentenbund* sponsored a public forum on modern art at the University of Berlin. Otto Schreiber, the deputy of the Berlin chapter of the *NSD-Studentenbund* led the student rebellion. In a speech he delivered at the auditorium of the *Humboldt University* of Berlin on 29 June 1933, denounced the reactionary elements within the Party for preventing the National Socialist revolution from being carried over to the visual arts. The student opposition leader heralded the German Expressionists as the heirs of Germany's artistic heritage, embracing the irrational aspects of Expressionism. Schreiber's antics made him the target of criticism from Rosenberg.³³

The leader of the Berlin chapter of the *NSD-Studentenbund*, Dr. Fritz Hippler, and the educational director of the association, Dr. Johann von Leers, delivered a series of lectures exploring the affinities between Expressionism and National Socialism.³⁴

Goebbels too shared the sentiments of the students. On the artist's seventieth birthday, Goebbels celebrated Edvard Munch's as "the spiritual heir of the Nordic nature". He also endorsed German Expressionism and described the *Neue Sachlichkeit* (New Objectivity style) as "the German art of the next decade" during a speech he made on 8 May 1933. His avowed support for the *NSD-Studentenbund* is also evident in a speech he gave inaugurating the RKK on 15 November 1933:

German art needs fresh blood. We live in a young era. Its supporters are young, and their ideas are young. They have nothing more in common with the past, which we have left behind us. The artist who seeks to give the impression to this age also must be young and he must create new forms.³⁵

³³ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 23-24.

³⁴ Hildegard Brenner, "Art in the Political Struggle of 1933 and 1934", *Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, Hajo Holborn ed., (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 403.

³⁵ Ehrhard Behr, "Nazi Cultural Politics: Intentionalism vs. Functionalism", *National Socialist Cultural Policy*, Glenn R. Cuomo ed., (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), p. 14.

Pro-modernist elements within the KdF also lent their support to the student rebellion. Hans Weidemann endorsed the actions of the *NSD-Studentenbund*, and published a defence of Expressionist art with Otto Schreiber, entitled *Jugend kämpft für deutsche Kunst* (Youth Defends German Art). The article condemned the efforts of reactionary forces to foist their doctrinaire ideas upon the youth:

The attempts of uncreative persons to lay down dogmas in art criticism is a nightmare to all young artists in our movement... The National Socialist students are fighting against reaction in art, because they believe in art as a living force of development and because they wish to prevent the previous generation of German artists from being disavowed.³⁶

The declarations of support for the students' protest in the liberal press increased the ground swell of support for the *NSD-Studentenbund's* opposition. In November 1933, the Expressionist poet and early supporter of the NSDAP, Gottfried Benn, published an essay in defence of German Expressionism in the arts journal *Deutsche Zukunft*. Benn envisaged the stylistic qualities of Expressionism would provide the basis for a renaissance of the visual arts under National Socialism. Benn's impassioned defence of Expressionism was reprinted in *Kunst und Macht* in 1934.³⁷ Hippler and Leers delivered a lecture before a crowded audience in the main auditorium of the Humboldt University in Berlin on 29 June 1933 criticising the restoration of "Wilhelminian academicism". Otto Schreiber delivered the final paper of the seminar that directly criticised the RKK.³⁸ Their outspoken criticism of the government resulted in the enforcement of disciplinary measures, and on 14 July 1933, the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* published a statement by Otto Schreiber recanting his earlier position. Walter Hansen, one of the RMVP officials responsible for conceiving the *entartete Kunst Aktion*, pronounced that the student rebellion constituted a political revolt, "a manoeuvre of falsification directed against national art and the racial principle."³⁹ Hans Hinkel, the State Commissioner, expelled Hippler and Schreiber from the Berlin chapter of the *NSD-Studentenbund* for their role in organising the exhibition of German Expressionists, entitled *Dreißig Deutsche Künstler*. Hinkel and Hippler threatened disciplinary measures against "all

³⁶ Hildegard Brenner, "Art in the Political Struggle of 1933 and 1934", *Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, Hajo Holborn ed., (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 403.

³⁷ Henry Grosshans, *Hitler and the Artists* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983), pp. 73-4.

³⁸ Hildegard Brenner, "Art in the Political Struggle of 1933 and 1934", in *Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, Hajo Holborn ed., (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 405

³⁹ Hildegard Brenner, "Art in the Political Struggle of 1933 and 1934", in *Republic to Reich*, Hajo Holborn ed., (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 406.

those who twist the words of sincere National Socialists and so attempt to bring division into the front of the true new German art." The opposition to the exhibition from within the Party resulted in the withdrawal of the *NSD-Studentenbund's* sponsorship of the exhibition before its opening at the *Galerie Ferdinand Möller* on 22 July 1933.⁴⁰ The closure of the exhibition on the orders of the Thuringian Minister of Interior, Wilhelm Frick on 25 July 1933 foreshadowed the implementation of a hard-line anti-modernist policy in the province of Thuringia.⁴¹

However, the attendance of Nazi dignitaries at an exhibition of Italian Futurist Art, entitled *Aeropittura* in Berlin in March 1934, suggests that the "liberal" faction continued to exercise a marginal influence over the direction of cultural policy in Berlin.

The student rebellion ultimately failed in achieving a liberalization of the government visual arts policy. The political radicalism of the *NSD-Studentenbund* proved detrimental to the political survival of the organisation. The political ramifications of Schreiber's protest were not lost by Rosengerg, who labelled him a cultural Otto Strasser", (a reference to the left-wing Nazi expelled by the Party in 1930).⁴² The murders of Ernst Röhm and other *Sturmabteilung* (Storm Division) leaders on 30 June 1934 brought an end to the revolutionary phase of the National Socialist struggle. The withdrawal of liberal factions' support of the *NSD-Studentenbund* in late 1934 led to the rapid decline in the association's activism. The youthful rebellion that had characterised the revolutionary phase of the National Socialist revolution ended in failure in 1934.⁴³

The appointment of the students' leader, Otto Schreiber, to an official post in the Fine Arts section of the *NS-Gemeinschaft Kraft durch Freude* marked the end of the rebellion and the compromise of its leadership. The KdF permitted Otto Schreiber and Hans Weidemann to organise exhibitions of modern art in factories, but as a concession prohibited the event from being publicised and restricted the exhibition to plant employees.⁴⁴ The re-fashioning of the National Socialist cultural policy which took place after the repression of the student rebellion illustrates the changing face of cultural policy

⁴⁰ Hildegard Brenner, "Art in the Political Struggle of 1933 and 1934", in *Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, Hajo Holborn ed., (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 406.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* p. 406.

⁴² Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 40.

⁴³ Karl Dietrich Bracher, "Stages of Totalitarian 'Intergration': The Consolidation of National Socialist Rule in 1933 and 1934", in *Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, Hajo Holborn ed., (New York: Pantheon Books).

⁴⁴ Hildegard Brenner, "Art in the Political Struggle of 1933 and 1934", in *Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, Hajo Holborn ed., (New York: Pantheon Books), p. 403.

in the tumultuous period between 1933-1935. This period was characterised by the absence of a clearly defined National Socialist aesthetic. The existence of a pro-modernist faction within the Party and government provides evidence that a unified visual arts policy remained elusive.

The consolidation of National Socialist power was completed with the elimination of dissension within the ranks of the NSDAP and the formulation of an official aesthetic. In the period between 1933-1934 the organisational and legal basis was laid for the expansion of state control in preparation for the purge of the Party's revolutionaries. The murders of Ernst Röhm and other leaders of the SA on 30 June 1934 ended the revolutionary phase of the power struggle. The failure of the student rebellion to achieve a liberalisation of visual arts' policy, allowed the *Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur* (Combat League for German Culture) to momentarily gain a foothold over visual arts policy. However the rise of the RKK thwarted the efforts of the KfdK to assume control over the cultural bureaucracy.

The *Nacht der langen Messer* (Night of the Long Knives) ushered in the next phase of the National Socialist revolution. In his essay entitled "Stages of Totalitarian 'Integration': The Consolidation of National Socialist Rule in 1933 and 1934" Karl Dietrich Bracher described this phase as:

The definitive consolidation of the totalitarian leadership state required the cessation of the revolutionary impetus which had often made it difficult for the National Socialist leadership to control its own forces and was now replaced by the pseudo-legal, though no less brutal, domination of the central government. This was the purge or house-cleaning stage characteristic of every revolution. The purge was directed against the party's dissatisfied revolutionaries, first of all the SA leadership, who for reasons of competition disapproved in particular of Hitler's compromise tactics toward the Wehrmacht.⁴⁵

Hitler's reluctance to dictate cultural policy in period between 1933-1934 should be seen in the context of the political conflict that characterised the National Socialist revolution in the early years of the struggle. Hitler's decision to relinquish his support of the *völkisch* faction after the consolidation of the National Socialist revolution had been completed was characteristic of his Machiavellian rule. Hitler's toleration of the reactionary elements within the NSDAP was motivated by political necessity.

⁴⁵ Karl Dietrich Bracher, "Stages of Totalitarian 'Intergration': The Consolidation of National Socialist Rule in 1933 and 1934", in *Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, Hajo Holborn ed, (New York: Pantheon Books).

Hitler tolerated the KfdK as long as it did not pose any political danger, unlike Röhm and other leaders of the SA who threatened to destabilise his rule. Once the National Socialist consolidation of power had been completed the interests of the *völkisch* faction were subsumed to the interests of totalitarian integration.⁴⁶ In an essay entitled "Art in the Political Struggle of 1933 and 1934" Hildegard Brenner perfectly summarised the situation:

Once Hitler had seized power, he no longer needed the support of the *völkisch* faction. But he did not break with them at once because in 1933 and 1934 the consolidation of the National Socialist power was not yet complete.⁴⁷

⁴⁶Karl Dietrich Bracher, "Stages of Totalitarian 'Intergration': The Consolidation of National Socialist Rule in 1933 and 1934", in *Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, ed. Hajo Holborn, (New York: Pantheon Books). p. 425.

⁴⁷Hildegard Brenner, "Art in the Political Struggle of 1933 and 1934", in *Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, ed. Hajo Holborn, (New York: Pantheon Books). p. 403.

The Struggle for Modern Art as Seen by the *Völkischer Beobachter* in the period 1934-1935.

The evolution of the NSDAPs attitude towards art and art criticism has been documented by Barbara Rao in her thesis entitled, "The Development of the German National Socialist Point of View on Art and Art Criticism as Seen in the *Völkischer Beobachter*, 1920-1937".⁴⁸ This chapter does not attempt to develop upon Rao's original thesis, but is intended to illustrate the evolution of Nazi cultural policy. It is interesting that Rao chose to examine the NSDAPs attitude toward art and art criticism in the *Völkischer Beobachter*, especially since it was not an arts magazine, but an official newspaper of the Party. There are surprisingly few references to the debate on modern art, with significantly greater coverage of sports events. Nevertheless, as the official newspaper of the NSDAP the attitudes espoused in this newspaper may be interpreted as representative of the official visual arts policy. The coverage of the debate in the official Party newspaper does provide an insight into the development of the Nazi visual arts policy, which illuminates the ideological dimension of Nazi cultural policy. This chapter thus provides a foundation for the next chapter that examines the practice confiscation.

The KfdK's attacks against liberal elements within the Party and Goebbels is evinced by the publication of several articles in the *Völkischer Beobachter* in 1934 and 1935. The debate over modern art was sporadically reported in the NSDAP's official newspaper, the *Völkischer Beobachter* between 1933 and 1935. The references to the factional rivalry within the NSDAP in the official newspaper provide evidence that a unified visual arts policy remained elusive. The lack of a clearly defined National Socialist aesthetic is evinced by the emergence of a debate over modern art in the *Völkischer Beobachter* in the period between 1934-1935.⁴⁹

A perceptible shift occurred in the newspaper's coverage of the debate after the editorship of the newspaper changed. The influence of the KfdK is more pronounced in the original Munich edition of the *Völkischer Beobachter* which was published between 1920-1932. The influence of the liberal elements within the NSDAP, also known as the

⁴⁸ Barbara L. Rao, "The Development of the German National Socialist Point of View on Art and Art Criticism as Seen in the *Völkischer Beobachter*, 1920-1937", (MA thesis, California State University, 1985). The ideas and views espoused in this newspaper have been interpreted by Rao as representative of the official visual arts policy, because it was the official newspaper of the NSDAP.

⁴⁹ All of the articles by National Socialist art critics published in the *Völkischer Beobachter* which have been cited in this thesis were made available for my research by the *Eidgenössische*

Berlin faction, is clearly discernible in the Berlin edition of the newspaper that was published between 1933-1937.⁵⁰

The KfdK became particularly outspoken in its criticism of the Propaganda Ministry after the failure to win its bid for power in June 1933. During Rosenberg's editorship the *Völkischer Beobachter* emerged as critic of the "liberal" faction received from the RMVP. The KfdK undermined the credibility of RKK through the *Völkischer Beobachter*. On 9 July 1933, and 15 July 1933, two editorials appeared in the *Völkischer Beobachter* condemning the actions of the *NSD-Studentenbund*, entitled "Revolution in der bildenden Kunst" (Revolution in the Fine Arts), and "Revolutionäre an Sich" (Revolution for its own Sake).⁵¹ In a speech Rosenberg delivered at a KfdK meeting in Berlin, entitled "Tradition and New Art" Rosenberg warned against confusing political revolution with revolution in the visual arts, "It is inadvisable to transpose terms originating in the political struggle for power... to the struggle over creation in the plastic arts."⁵² In an article published in the *Völkischer Beobachter* on 14 July 1933 the protest of the *NSD-Studentenbund* was denounced as "revolution for its own sake" which "will destroy all the values of the past in order to appear more revolutionary". The article branded Expressionism as "cultural Bolshevism" in the guise of artistic innovation and called for a deliberalisation of the visual arts.⁵³ Hitler reiterated these sentiments in a speech he delivered in September 1933 when he demanded "there be no wrangling or small selfish quarrels among the brothers of the Great German Fatherland".⁵⁴

However after Rosenberg was appointed head of the *Aussenpolitisches Amt der NSDAP* (The Foreign Policy Office of the Party), the supervision of the *Völkischer Beobachter* was delegated to the deputy editor, Wilhelm Weiss. Weiss's editorship of the *Völkischer Beobachter* was characterised by the development of a more balanced

Technische Hochschule in Zurich, Switzerland. The articles that are cited above were translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

⁵⁰ Robert Scholz, "Zur Wiedereröffnung des Berliner Kronprinzenpalais", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 19 December 1933. Scholz's article is an example of Scholz's efforts to reconcile German Expressionism and National Socialism. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

⁵¹ A. Rosenberg, "Revolution in der bildenden kunst", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 9 July 1933. _____, "Revolutionäre an Sich", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 15 July 1933. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

⁵² Hildegard Brenner, "Art in the Political Struggle of 1933 and 1934", in *Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, Hajo Holborn ed., (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 405.

⁵³ Alfred Rosenberg, "Revolutionäre an Sich", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 15 July 1933. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri

coverage of events. The fact that Weiss was a member of the Executive Committee of the *Reichspressekammer* (Reich Press Chamber), that formed a sub-section of the RKK that came under Goebbels' jurisdiction is of some interest. This provides an explanation for why the publicity of the KfdK's program was relegated to the advertisement section, and why only a quarter of the activities organised by the KfdK were reported by the *Völkischer Beobachter* during Weiss' editorship.⁵⁵

A review of the exhibition at the *Kronprinzenpalais* in Berlin which appeared in the *Völkischer Beobachter* on 19 December 1933, characterised the more even handed coverage of events under Weiss' editorship. The review, by Robert Scholz, entitled "Zur Wiedereröffnung des Berliner Kronprinzenpalais", explored the affinities between German Expressionism and National Socialism. Scholz remarked that the "intensity with which the sensual impression of nature is metaphysically transmitted" in the pictures of Erich Heckel and Karl Schmidt-Rottluff "is typical of Germans".⁵⁶

However, there is evidence that Weiss's editorship had already become less impartial by October 1933. Weiss's editorship of the *Völkischer Beobachter* underwent a process of deliberalisation after Hitler pledged to cleanse German art of "degenerate" influences within four years during the ceremony commemorating the laying of the cornerstone of the *Haus der Deutschen Kunst* (House of German Art) in October 1933. The articles that appeared in the *Völkischer Beobachter* reflected this change. Robert Scholz, an art critic for the *Völkischer Beobachter*, who had favourably described Erich Heckel and Karl Schmidt-Rottluff as typically German, advocated a purge of Germany's public museums of "degenerate art" in a memorandum he issued in 1933, entitled "Reform der staatlichen Kunstpflege" (Reform of State Patronage of the arts). In 1934 the KfdK was renamed the *Nationalsozialistische Kulturgemeinde* (National Socialist Culture Community). The NS-KG emerged as a sharp critic of the RKK. Goebbels and Eugen Hönig, the president of the RkdbK came under fierce attack from the NS-KG for

⁵⁴ Barbara Miller Lane, *Architecture and Politics in Germany, 1918-1945* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 180.

⁵⁵ Herbert Phillips Rothfeder, "A Study of Alfred Rosenberg's Organisation for National Socialist Ideology" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan: University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1963), p. 52.

⁵⁶ Robert Scholz, "Zur Wiedereröffnung des Berliner Kronprinzenpalais", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 19 December 1933. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

their failure to take disciplinary action against the members of the Berlin branch of the *NSD-Studentenbund*.⁵⁷

The publication of a series of articles in the *Völkischer Beobachter* in early 1934 represented a significant departure in Weiss' style of impartial editorship. In an article published in the *Völkischer Beobachter* on 16 January 1934, entitled "Fiasko der Kunstkritik", "liberal" elements within the party were criticised for hailing "that all the degenerate art of the last decades is revolutionary and therefore National Socialistic. Dadaism as well as international Idiot-art and primitive Negro-art imitations must be understood as expressions of the Nordic-Germanic soul".⁵⁸

The perceptible deliberalisation of the cultural bureaucracy in late 1933 was accompanied by the enforcement of several laws and directives against art criticism. The enactment of the *Schriftleitergesetz* (editor's law) in October 1933, that required editors to abide by directives issued by the RMVP provided a logical continuum. In a *Bürgerbräukeller* speech on 9 April 1929, Hitler had attributed the rise of modern art to the promotion of the avant-garde in the liberal press: "All of this so-called modern art of today would not be thinkable without its propagation through the work of the press. The press first makes something out of this crap."⁵⁹ The role of the press was again emphasised in his speech inaugurating the *Haus der Deutschen Kunst* in July 1937, "Judaism had taken possession of those means and institutions of communication which form, and thus finally rule over public opinion".⁶⁰ Hitler demanded Weidemann tender his resignation as vice president of the RKK after Weidemann recommended Emil Nolde as president of the chamber. Weidemann resigned from his vice presidency in November 1933 and was reassigned to a lower position within his ministry.⁶¹

In 1934 the KfdK was renamed the *Nationalsozialistische Kulturgemeinde* (National Socialist Culture Community). The NS-KG emerged as a sharp critic of the RKK. Goebbels, and Eugen Hönig, the president of the RkdbK came under fierce attack from the NS-KG their failure to take disciplinary action against the members of the Berlin

⁵⁷ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 38-40.

⁵⁸ "Fiasko der Kunstkritik", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 16 January 1934. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

⁵⁹ *Bürgerbräukeller* speech, 9 April 1929, cited in Klaus Backes, "Adolf Hitler's Einfluß auf die Kulturpolitik des Dritten Reiches", (Ph.D. diss., Ruprecht-Universität, Heidelberg, 1984), p. 373.

⁶⁰ Adolf Hitler, "Speech Inaugurating the 'Great Exhibition of German Art', 1937", in *Theories of Modern Art: A Sourcebook by Artists and Critics*, ed. Herschel B. Chipp, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), p. 475.

⁶¹ Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich* (London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1970), p.27.

branch of the *NSD-Studentenbund*.⁶² A series of editorials appeared in the *Völkischer Beobachter* in 1934 reflecting reactionary tide that had taken hold. Scholz conceded that the National Socialist revolution had entered its second phase, in an article published in the *Völkischer Beobachter* on 16 March 1934, entitled "Hausse in Verfallskunst". Scholz stated "... we have never disputed Barlach's strong creative talent. Nevertheless, nobody can deny us the right to declare that the mental attitude of most of his works has nothing to do with the heroic, life-loving formal expression of the new German art... National Socialism is now in its second phase of the revolution, that stage where 'the ideas' become the new content of the governmental and social structure... We want nothing else but a German art which has grown out of the powers of the race awakened by Adolf Hitler."⁶³

The uncertainty about the development of the visual arts policy ended in September 1934, when Hitler intervened to resolve the factional division that had emerged within the NSDAP over modern art. The controversy over Expressionism ceased after Hitler's delivery of a speech at the annual party rally in Nuremberg on 4 September 1934.⁶⁴ Hitler denounced Cubists, Futurists, and Dadaists for creating disunity within the National Socialist movement. He also singled out for attack the reactionary forces within the Party:

The National Socialist Nation must watch out for those backward-thinkers who think they must pass on to the future a 'Teutonic art' which has been created out of the bizarre world of their own romantic ideas about the National Socialist revolution.⁶⁵

In a letter he addressed to Rosenberg dated 25 September 1934, Goebbels implored Rosenberg to "stop this war of words" since he had "neither the time nor inclination to partake in it".⁶⁶

⁶² Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 65-70.

⁶³ Robert Scholz, "Hausse in Verfallskunst", *Völkischer Beobachter*, March 16, 1934. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

⁶⁴ Donald E. Gordon, *Expressionism: Art and Idea* (London: Yale University Press, 1987), p. 181.

⁶⁵ Adolf Hitler, opening speech at the annual Nuremberg Rally in 1934, cited in Barbara L. Rao, "The Development of the German National Socialist Point of View on Art and Art Criticism as Seen in the *Völkischer Beobachter*, 1920-1937", (MA thesis., California State University, 1985), p. 83.

⁶⁶ Barbara L. Rao, "The Development of the German National Socialist Point of View on Art and Art Criticism as Seen in the *Völkischer Beobachter*, 1920-1937", (MA thesis., California State University, 1985), p. 92.

The connection between social revolution and the avant-garde was broached in an editorial which appeared in the 11 December 1934 issue entitled "Kultur, Organisation und Politik". The editorial, which explores the association between revolution and art, constitutes an attempt to undermine Goebbels' authority as the minister of the RMVP, and president of the RKK, by explaining his support of the student faction in terms of his ignorance about art matters:

he lays claim to determine the tasks of organisation, politics, social questions, propaganda as well as culture and science... without having ever been interested in culture and art and without having understood the struggle of the last decade and has fallen into the hands of exactly those art aesthetes whom we have fought against for fourteen years.⁶⁷

The political repercussions of the student rebellion manifested themselves in the profound change that took place in early 1935. The issuance of an ordinance on 10 April 1935 that required art exhibitions to be authorised and issued with a permit by the president of the RKK, brought the culture professions under the firmer control of the RKK.⁶⁸ An address by Hitler at the annual Nuremberg Party rally in September 1935 sealed the fate of the avant-garde. His declaration that "One will no longer discuss or deal with these corrupters of art. They are fools, liars, or criminals who belong in insane asylums or prisons" represented Hitler's most resolute statement against modern art.⁶⁹

Goebbels refrained from avowing, in public at least, his support of abstract and Expressionist styles of art after this speech. His journal entry of 13 October 1935 reveals Goebbels' renewed sense of confidence: "Discussion with the Führer.... Sharp against Rosenberg. He will prohibit Rosenberg's cultural program. He approves all of my suggestions. He is very pleased." An account of the closure of the *Kronprinzenpalais* is recorded Goebbels' journal entry of 15 December 1935: "With the Führer at midday. Göring also there. Questions about building. Questions about painting. It is still very upsetting. The crap must be cleaned from the Kronprinzenpalais."⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Alfred Rosenberg, "Kultur, Organisation und Politik", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 11 December 1933. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

⁶⁸ Ehrhard Bahr, "Nazi Cultural Politics: Intentionalism vs. Functionalism", in *National Socialist Cultural Policy*, Glenn R. Cuomo ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), p. 16.

⁶⁹ Adolf Hitler, "Speech Inaugurating the 'Great Exhibition of German Art, 1937', Munich" in *Theories of Modern Art: A Sourcebook by Artists and Critics*, Herschell B. Chipp ed., (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968), p. 474.

⁷⁰ Goebbels, *Tagebücher*, pp. 526, cited in Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press), p. 49.

The issue of the autonomy of the fine arts was laid to rest after the poet Ernst Wiechert delivered a speech at Munich University condemning the government's attack on artistic freedom, which resulted in his arrest and summary imprisonment.⁷¹ The transformation the visual arts policy had undergone in the past two years found expression in the brutal suppression of Wiechert's opposition. The change in atmosphere is evinced by the lack of discussion about modern art in the *Völkischer Beobachter* after 1936. The debate about modernism ceased after the enactment of the "Decree Concerning Art Criticism" on 26 November 1936 which permitted only factual reporting of art events. This promulgation of the decree against art criticism prevented further discussion on art issues from within the Party.⁷² In November 1936 Goebbels pressured Hönig to hand in his resignation, and appointed Adolf Ziegler, a hard line anti-modernist, as president of the RkdbK.⁷³

The regression of the Nazi visual arts policy back to its anti-modernist beginnings was inextricably linked to the fateful end of the revolutionary phase in the National Socialist dictatorship. The end of debate over modern art brought about by the purge of dissenters within the Party, and precipitated the development of a unified visual arts policy. The official Nazi visual arts policy embraced neither anti-modernism nor liberalism, and was far less ideologically driven than one might first assume.

⁷¹ Henry Grosshans, *Hitler and the Artists*, (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983), p. 80.

⁷² Joseph Wulf, *Presse und Funk im Dritten Reich: Eine Dokumentation* (Gütersloh: Sigbert Mohn Verlag, 1964), pp. 90-110.

⁷³ Alan E. Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reich Chambers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), p. 58.

CHAPTER 2 – THE CONFISCATION AND DISPOSAL OF GERMANY’S PUBLIC COLLECTIONS OF “DEGENERATE ART” IN THE PERIOD 1936-1941.

The *entartete Kunst Aktion* is typically depicted as a turning point that marked the apparent triumph of ideology. The *entartete Kunst Aktion* is commonly depicted as a fanatically inspired action that attests to the triumph of Nazi ideology in the Third Reich. This portrayal of events, however, is significantly different from the picture that emerges from the examination of the *entartete Kunst Aktion* that follows in this chapter.

The examination of the practice of confiscation which follows, reveals that how the *entartete Kunst Aktion* was conceived as a means to exploit Germany’s public collection of art commercially. This contention is supported by the fact that its terms of reference of the commission charged with the disposal of *entartete Kunst* were broadened to include French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art, which was highly saleable on the German and Swiss art markets. The members of the Committee for the Disposal of Degenerate Art, many of whom were dealers themselves, would have known that Germany’s museums comprised of collections Impressionist and Post Impressionist art, rivalled only by those in France.¹

The emergence of debate over the proposal to conduct a sale of the confiscated art attracted criticism confirms the existence of division within the ranks of the NSDAP. However criticism of the proposed sale of “degenerate art” on ideological grounds dissipated after Hitler authorised the auction Germany’s public collections of modern art. The sales conducted by order of the Reich reveal that the government was concerned foremost with raising revenue from the sale of Germany’s public collections of modern art.

The importance of realising the propagandistic potential of sale of “degenerate art” appears to have occupied a position of secondary importance. This is evinced by the fact that the Reich commissioned the *Theodor Fischer Galerie* to conduct an auction of “degenerate art” in Lucerne in 1939. Had the Reich government desired to make use of the propagandistic potential of the auction, it could easily have done so, in a similar fashion to the exhibition of defamed artists which had been held in Munich in July 1937. However the Reich government chose not to, the event received little coverage in Germany itself.

The Reich government’s decision to authorise a non-German dealer to conduct the auction, was taken precisely because the Reich government wanted to

¹ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 56.

avoid attracting the negative publicity which would accompany an auction by a German dealership. Instead the Reich government chose Theodor Fischer, a Swiss dealer to conduct the auction in Lucerne, Switzerland. The fact that Fischer was asked to withdraw any reference that the sale was by order of the Reich confirms this.

More importantly, the auction enabled the Reich government to gauge international demand for art that it branded as "degenerate". The market for French Impressionist art virtually collapsed with the cessation of trade between Great Britain and the United States. The value of French Impressionist and modern art depreciated, especially after the German occupation of France in June 1940. The depreciation in value of *entartete Kunst* has been noted by Jonathan Petropoulos's study of the Nazi visual arts policy:

Goebbels and those in charge of the *entartete Kunst* action settled for very modest results, especially after the outbreak of the war, when the value of the modern works plummeted. Disposal, not income, became their primary concern.²

The record of sales of *entartete Kunst* conducted by the Reich after the declaration of war reveal that Impressionist and Post Impressionist art generally commanded lower prices, than those recorded on the eve of the Second World War. The rediscovery of an inventory compiled by the *Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda* (Institute for German Cultural and Economic Propaganda) as a final record of the sales of "degenerate art", has confirmed the depreciation in the prices for French Impressionist and modern works. The inventory also constitutes a source of primary evidence that while the that value of modern, Impressionist and Post Impressionist art plummeted, a sustained demand existed for works by better known pieces by French Impressionist and modern artists, such as Picasso's *Absinthe Drinker* sold to Bernhard Boehmer for SFr 24,000.³

The fact that there existed a sustained demand for well known pieces by Impressionist and Post Impressionist artists casts aspersions over the notion that the stockpile of "degenerate art" had become virtually unsaleable. The exceptional prices

² Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 83.

³ "Entartete" Kunst: Typescript Inventory (Germany. Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda). Alex Chanter and Barney Perkins from the Victoria and Albert Museum kindly provided me with information about the inventory, including copies of two information sheets produced by the museum's Press Office, shortly after the list was acquired. I visited the National Library of the Victoria and Albert Museum during a trip to London in early August 1999 and studied the inventory. For conservation reasons, the

commanded for high quality examples of Impressionist and Post Impressionist art may have contributed to the Reich government's decision to pursue the famous collections owned by prominent Jewish families in Europe in 1941.

original typescript could not be photocopied, but I did manage to obtain a partial photocopy of the microfilm copy.

The *entartete Kunst Aktion*

Initially, ideology assumed a position of great importance in the confiscations, and was the driving force behind the initiative. However, the evolution of the *entartete Kunst Aktion* from a series of localised initiatives to a centralised program, demonstrates how the practice of confiscation became increasingly organised, and assumed the dimensions of a business venture.

The campaign against modern art was initially limited to the enforced removal of works from the exhibition of "Contemporary Art in Berlin" held in Munich in 1935. Included among those artists whose works were confiscated were Emil Nolde, Max Beckmann, Erich Heckel and Lyonel Feininger. The campaign was later extended in 1936 to include the confiscation of Expressionist and non-representational art from the *Berlin Nationalgalerie's* modern art section. The confiscations were temporarily suspended for the duration of the Olympic Games in Berlin in August 1936. On October 30, 1936 an order was issued for the closure of the modern wing of the *Berlin Nationalgalerie* in the *Kronprinzenpalais*. Bernhard Rust ordered the dismissal of Alois Schardt from his post as director, and the subsequent closure of the modern section of the *Berlin Nationalgalerie* in 1936. Works by Ernst Barlach, Käthe Kollwitz and Wilhelm Lehmbruck, which had originally been included in the Prussian Academy's jubilee exhibition in 1936, were withdrawn from the exhibition opening.⁴

Count Klaus von Baudissin, the museum's Nazi appointed director, issued an order for the removal of works of "degenerate" nature from the *Folkwang Museum* in Essen in August 1936. The sale of the collection abroad was then organised by Baudissin and Ferdinand Möller. In an article entitled "Das Essener Folkwangmuseum stösst einen Fremdkörper ab" Baudissin defended the sale of confiscated art on the grounds that "the high price attained could benefit a type of art for which we really care".⁵ The sale of several modern works from the *Staatliche Galerie Moritzburg Halle* to the Vömel and Abel galleries proceeded in 1936, after the director received notification from the RkdbK that the chamber had no objections to the sale in the collection.⁶ The Rkdbk's authorisation of the sale of modern works from museum collections indicates that from the outset, ideological considerations were sacrificed to commercial interests. This anomaly was evident to Professor

⁴ Henry Grosshans, *Hitler and the Artists* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983), p. 6.

⁵ Count Klaus von Baudissin, "Das Essener Folkwangmuseum stösst einen Fremdkörper ab", *National-Zeitung* (Essen), August 18, 1936. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

Heise, then director of the museum in Lübeck. Heise remarked of the government's practice of confiscation: "What I thought especially cheap in this operation was the fact that one was offered these pictures right away for repurchase. I was secretly offered virtually all of the museum paintings confiscated in Lübeck. One or two of them I was able to buy, the others I got friends to purchase."⁷

The Prussian education minister, Bernhard Rust, announced the commencement of the purge of museum collections of modern art during a speech he delivered to the *Akademie der Künste*. In November 1936 Goebbels had to obtain special authorisation from the Führer to seize works of "degenerate art" for the purpose of the exhibition, since neither Goebbels nor the RdbK possessed formal authority over the collections in state and municipal galleries. The administrative basis for the elimination of modern art was laid on 30 June 1937 Adolf Ziegler was empowered to sequester Germany's public collections of art produced since 1910, encompassing the Reich, its Laender and individual municipalities works for the purposes of an exhibition "degenerate art".⁸

Ziegler was appointed to head a special commission established to oversee the confiscation of "degenerate art", known as the *Kommission zur Verwertung der Produkte entarteter Kunst* (Commission for the Disposal of Degenerate Art). The commission's members included other known opponents of modern art, including Count Klaus von Baudissin, Wolfgang Willrich, Hans Schwetzer, Walter Hansen, and Robert Scholz. The appointment of key anti-modernists to the committee indicates that ideology continued to occupy a position of importance, albeit diminished.⁹

The fact that the confiscations were extended to include works by non-German artists, produced before 1910 indicates that the Reich government conceived of the initiative as a means to derive profits. The term "degenerate" was extended beyond Expressionist art to include French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art because this art was highly sought after on the international art market. The commission declined Baudissin's proposal to extend the confiscation of modern art to include works held in private collections, and limited its confiscation to

⁶ "Degenerate Art": *The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, ed. Stephanie Barron (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 122.

⁷ John Henry Merryman, *Law, Ethics, and the Visual Arts*, "Artistic Freedom and its Limitation", (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), p. 261.

⁸ *Der Kunstverein in Bremen: Kunsthalle Bremen* (KulturStiftung der Länder, 1992), p. 13. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

⁹ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 56.

Germany's state and municipal collections.¹⁰ The commission's decision not to extend its jurisdiction to include privately owned collections, is perplexing since other aspects of the Nazi *Kunstpolitik* point to towards the progressive radicalisation of directive bearing on the sequestration of art. This perhaps enabled the Reich government to maintain an appearance of propriety, and seemingly legitimise the ideological grounds for the confiscations.

The committee proceeded to confiscate collections of "degenerate art" throughout 1936. The selection committee used Carl Einstein's *Die Kunst des 20. Jahrhunderts* (The Art of the Twentieth Century) as a guideline of examples of "degenerate art".¹¹ The commission selected 730 of the works of art for inclusion in the *Entartete Kunstausstellung*. These included works by artists associated with *Der Blaue Reiter*, such as Wassily Kandinsky, Franz Marc, August Macke, Heinrich Campendonk, and Paul Klee. Artists associated with the *Die Brücke* such as Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Erich Heckel, Karl Schmidt-Rottluff, Max Pechstein, Emil Nolde) also were included, as well as the *German Dadaists*, Raoul Hausmann, Kurt Schwitters, and Max Ernst, and the *Neue Sachlichkeit* artists such as George Grosz, Otto Dix.¹²

In an effort to introduce regularity to the practice of confiscation, Ziegler ordered all public museums to compile an inventory of their collections of German art produced since 1910 in early July 1937. Dr. Waldmann, the director of the Kunsthalle Bremen, received a letter from Ziegler on 9 July 1937, ordering him to compile an inventory of his museum's holdings, including the acquisition price, the date of purchase, and the name of the museum curator responsible for authorising the purchase.¹³

The publicised sale of modern works by Ferdinand Möller and Count Klaus Baudissin, the newly appointed director of the *Museum Folkwang* in Essen in 1936, provided an indication that the propagandistic potential of a sale of "degenerate art" would legitimate the confiscation of Germany's museum holdings. The Reich Chamber for Visual Arts had replied to the director of the Halle museum that it had no objections to the sale of the museum's modern collection in 1936. The sale of

¹⁰ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 56.

¹¹ Berthold Hinz, *Art in the Third Reich* (New York: Random House, 1979), p. 24.

¹² Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 57.

¹³ Adolf Ziegler, letter addressed to Der Präsident der Reichskammer der bildenden Künste, 9 July 1937, cited in *Der Kunstverein in Bremen Kunsthalle Bremen* (KulturStiftung der Länder: Der Kunstverein in Bremen, 1992), p. 14. Translated from the German to the English

German Expressionist works to the *Kunsthandlung Bammann and Möller Galerie* by the *Düsseldorf Museum* occurred early 1937. The fact that the sale went ahead provided an indication that the sale of "degenerate" art would continue unopposed.¹⁴

However, this was not always the case. The *Bremen Kunsthalle* opposed the confiscations on the grounds that they were not performed in accordance with the guideline set out by the *Kommission zur Verwertung der Produkte entarteter Kunst*. Professor Emil Waldmann, the director of the museum, protested against the confiscation of a work by Georges Rouault on the grounds that his work could not be classified as "German" *Verfallskunst* since he was French, arguing that in this case Ziegler's authority was not valid. In a letter Waldmann addressed to the Reich Chamber for Visual Arts Waldmann asked when he could expect its return to the museum because a painting which had been attributed to a German artist was actually by a French artist. The worsening of relations between the *Kunsthalle Bremen* and the *Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda* (Reich Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda) is evident in the formal letter exchange between the two bodies. In a letter Waldmann addressed to Rudolf Hetsch, (an official in the Ministry of Propaganda), dated 10 October 1938, Waldmann protested against the confiscation of Leo von König's study *Judgement of Paris*, which the museum had declared as a lending from a private holding. The same letter goes on to protest against the confiscation of Kokoschka's *Parisian Opera* on the grounds that the picture the *Kunstverein Bremen* had donated RM 50,000 towards the picture's purchase.¹⁵

The existence of disunity within the ranks of the NSDAP over the disposal of "degenerate" art is evinced by opposition to the sale of modern pictures to the *Möller Galerie* by the *Düsseldorf Museum* and the *Kunsthandlung Bammann Galerie* by Robert Scholz, the head of Rosenberg's fine arts department.¹⁶ Ernst Gosebruch, the former director of the *Folkwang Museum* in Essen offered the Halle town council RM 30,000 for Emil Nolde's *The Last Supper* in a letter addressed to the mayor of Halle,

for my research by Marc Burri. This book was given to me as a gift by the *Kunsthalle Bremen*.

¹⁴ Andreass Hüneke, "On the Trail of Missing Masterpieces: Modern Art from German Galleries", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles, Los Angeles County Museum, 1991), p. 122.

¹⁵ E. Castens, Vorsitzter des Kunstvereins Bremen, letter addressed to Herrn Präsidenten der Reichskammer der bildenden Künste, Berlin, cited in *Der Kunstverein in Bremen Kunsthalle Bremen* (KulturStiftung der Länder: Der Kunstverein in Bremen, 1992), p. 15. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

¹⁶ Andreas Hüneke, "On the Trail of Missing Masterpieces", cited in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 123.

dated 15 June 1937. Scholz declined Gosebruch's offer on 2 July 1937, on the grounds that "the material advantages of the sale would have to take place according to higher political considerations".¹⁷ Scholz's decision to withdraw Nolde's *The Last Supper* from sale, and include it in the *Entartete Kunstausstellung*, provides evidence of the importance ideological factors in the weeks leading up to the opening of the *Entartete Kunstausstellung* in Munich.

The decision to compensate museums for losses which had been incurred as a result of the *entartete Kunst Aktion* was taken to allay criticism and prevent the emergence of factional division within the government over the disposal of "degenerate art". The RMWEV issued a circular in March 1938 which insisted that the profits derived from the sale of the "degenerate art" be placed at the disposal of the RMVEW to compensate state museums for their losses.¹⁸

The *entartete Kunst Aktion* has often been interpreted by historians as an expression of Nazi racial ideology translated into policy. However the conventional depiction of the *entartete Kunst Aktion* as a triumph of National Socialist ideology provides a misleading representation. This representation of events ignores the existence of a debate over whether confiscated should be sold. The sale of "degenerate art" had been objected to on political and ideological grounds prior to the decision by Hitler to auction the saleable art works. The presence of debate over the disposition of "degenerate art" indicates that a unified visual arts policy remained elusive. This tension within the Nazi bureaucracy over the sale of "degenerate art" highlights the internal dynamics of the régime.

The picture that emerges from the events leading up to exhibition is more complex than first appears. There is evidence of internal division within the Party and government over the development of Nazi visual arts policy. There is also evidence of this division being resolved after 1936. What does emerge from this picture is the decline in the importance of ideology in the practice of confiscation. This is especially true after 1939, when the government decided to auction its stockpile of "degenerate art". The more hard-line approach became particularly pronounced in early July 1937, in the weeks preceding the exhibition of "degenerate art".

¹⁷ Andreas Hüneke, "On the Trail of Missing Masterpieces", cited in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 123.

¹⁸ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 83.

The Galerie Fischer Auction, Lucerne, Switzerland, 30 June 1939.

The 780 paintings, 3,500 graphic works, watercolors, and drawings that the committee deemed "saleable" were stored at *Schloss Niederschönhausen* pending the decision on their fate. The remaining 16,000 works were crammed into an empty grain store at *Köpenickerstraße* in Berlin. The administration of the storage facilities was initially entrusted to Adolf Ziegler and Walter Hoffmann, the General Secretary of the RkdbK. In late 1937 Goebbels transferred control over the administration of the storage facilities from the Reich Chamber for the Visual Arts to the Reich Ministry for Propaganda, which enabled his ministry to secure his control over the disposal of the "degenerate art" by gaining control over the finance of the facility. By the end of 1937 the storage facilities at *Schloss Niederschönhausen* and *Köpenickerstraße* were overflowing with confiscated art. In March 1938, the Propaganda Ministry reported that 16,558 examples of "degenerate art" had been confiscated from state museums throughout the German Reich since June 30, 1937.¹⁹

The decision to sell the stockpile of confiscated art was not taken until some time after the confiscations. Karl Haberstock, a Berlin art dealer, proposed the sale of a collection of "degenerate" art to Hitler in 1938, however he remained uncommitted to the idea of a sale. Haberstock was especially eager to obtain a commission for the sale of the "degenerate art" since his dealership had an agency in London and could easily arrange the sale of art confiscated from Germany's public collections.²⁰

After Hitler's approval of Haberstock's proposal to auction the "saleable" art works stored at *Schloss Niederschönhausen* an expert commission was established to oversee the sale of "degenerate art". In a letter he addressed personally to the Führer, on 20 May 1938, Haberstock expressed his concern over the legality of a sale of confiscated art and suggested a legal provision legalise the confiscations before any sales could proceed. On 31 May 1938, a law was passed which retroactively legalised the confiscations of "degenerate art", and laid the legal basis for the confiscation of art works without compensation and their subsequent sale.²¹

In May 1938, Goebbels authorised the establishment of the *Kommission zur Verwertung der Produkte entarteter Kunst* (Commission for the disposal of degenerate art). The *Kommission zur Verwertung der Produkte entarteter Kunst*

¹⁹ Alan E. Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reich Chambers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), p. 145.

²⁰ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 78.

²¹ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 78-79.

which convened periodically between 1938-1941, was nominally chaired by Goebbels, who charged Franz Hofmann, assistant department head at the RMVP, with overseeing the commission's administration. Four government officials and three art dealers were appointed to the commission. Adolf Ziegler, the president of the RkdbK, Hans Schweitzer, *Reichsbeauftragter für Künste Formgebung* (Reich commissioner for artistic design) was among these. Heinrich Hoffmann, the official photographic reporter of the Reich and Robert Scholz, the head of the department of fine arts at the Rosenberg bureau were also appointed to the commission. Karl Haberstock, Carl Meder, a consultant for the Reich Chamber for the Visual Arts, and Max Tauber, an antiquities dealer were also on the committee. The committee also included well known art dealers, such as Karl Buchholz and Ferdinand Möller of Berlin, Bernhard A. Boehmer of Güstrow; and Hildebrand Gurlitt, of Hamburg. They were responsible for arranging the sales and exchanges on behalf of the Reich government.²²

The mounting stockpile of art works attracted attention from the major international auction houses, eager to win the lucrative commission to sell the art on behalf of the Reich. In June 1938 the Paris based firms *Wildenstein & Co.* and *Seligmann & Co.* made overtures to the Propaganda Ministry and Reich Chancellery regarding the purchase of confiscated art. The *Colnaghi Gallery* in London and the *Fides* firm in Zürich made an offer to the Ministry for Propaganda to buy the entire stock in October 1938. In a letter addressed to the ministry by the *Colnaghi Gallery*, dated 19 October 1938 the firm stressed its suitability to conduct a sale of "degenerate art". It suggested that since it was the only English firm that had declined to exhibit modern artists, or recommend the collection of works of modern art to any of their clients, it could conduct a sale of "degenerate art":

We are probably the only English firm that has never shown degenerate art from any country nor recommended it to any of our clients, since the whole of this trend in all its vulgar dishonesty is repugnant to us.²³

The letter then went on to enquire about buying the stock suggesting that a sale would be wise whilst there was still an international demand for such art:

Your stance towards this humbug art is beginning to find such widespread approval abroad, that in spite of the efforts of Jewish dealers,

²² Stephanie Barron, "Modern Art and Politics in Prewar Germany", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 135.

²³ Martin Bailey, "The National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum. Revealed: What happened to the "degenerate" art in Germany's museums, from G to Z", *The Art Newspaper*, No. 70, May 1997, p. 4.

the international market for such products may start to give way.²⁴

The *Colnaghi Gallery* failed to win the contract to sell the collection of confiscated art, and the decision about which dealer would be commissioned to sell the stockpile of "degenerate art" was not made until 1938.

In the autumn of 1938, Theodor Fischer, a Lucerne dealer, was invited by Karl Haberstock to view the collection of confiscated art at the *Köpenickerstraße* and *Niederschönhausen* storage facilities. During his visit, Fischer and Haberstock discussed the details of the proposal to auction the confiscated artworks. In a report Haberstock submitted to the Reich Ministry for Propaganda detailing his meeting with Fischer, he estimated that the sale would raise "about thirty thousand English pounds".²⁵ A copy of Haberstock's report was given to Martin Bormann, who forwarded it on to Hitler who approved the sale. Hitler's decision to give Fischer the commission to sell the confiscated art was influenced by Fischer's large international clientele and his position as the *Führer der Bundes Nationalsozialistischer Eidgenossen*, the Swiss auxiliary of the NSDAP. The *Kommission zur Verwertung der Produkte entarteter Kunst* was convened to decide the precise details of the auction. The commission approved the Propaganda Ministry's proposal to offer 125 confiscated art works for auction at the *Galerie Fischer*, and fixed reserve prices for those works of art considered to be of exceptional value during its inaugural meeting on 17 November 1938.²⁶

The role that art dealers occupied in the *entartete Kunst Aktion* has been the subject of controversy. Scholz attributed not only the sales of "degenerate art", but the entire disposal action to the efforts of the three dealers appointed to the commission in his book entitled *Architektur und bildende Kunst, 1933-1945*.²⁷ However in Jonathan Petropoulos' study of the administration of the visual arts in the Third Reich, entitled *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, Petropoulos disputed Scholz's claim that the idea to dispose of *entartete Kunst* was conceived by those art dealers appointed to the commission:

Scholz, who wrote his book with continuing sympathy for both National Socialist art and the government's cultural policies, overlooked the

²⁴ Martin Bailey, "The National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum. Revealed: What happened to the "degenerate" art in Germany's museums, from G to Z", *The Art Newspaper*, No. 70, May 1997, p. 4.

²⁵ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 81.

²⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 80-81.

²⁷ Robert Scholz, *Architektur und bildende Kunst, 1933-1945* (Preußisch Oldendorf Schütz, 1974), p. 45.

galvanising role played by Goebbels in the disposal scheme. Art dealers did not exploit the Nazi government, but rather, Goebbels employed the dealers²⁸.

The inclusion in the *Galerie Fischer* auction of works by non-German artists and works produced before 1910, such as Gauguin's *Aus Tahiti*, reveals that the commission charged with the confiscation of art from German museums had extended its original commission to include Impressionists and Post-Impressionists.²⁹ Since the members of the *Kommission zur Verwertung der Produkte entarteter Kunst* were all well informed about art matter it is highly unlikely that they had confiscated Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art without knowing they were by non-German artists and were produced before 1910. The decision to confiscate Impressionist and Post-Impressionist works was motivated by the recognition that these works were highly saleable and could expect to bring in high sales at auction.

Franz Hofmann, the head of the visual arts department of the Reich Ministry of Propaganda, suggested that the artworks be emptied from the Köpenickerstraße storage facility, which was needed for the storage of grain. Hofmann made a suggestion to Goebbels to destroy the "unsaleable" artworks remaining in storage on 12 December 1938.³⁰

Hofmann's proposal to destroy the art works stored at the *Köpenickerstraße* facility met with the disapproval of other members of the disposal commission. Robert Scholz, head of the department of fine arts at the Rosenberg bureau, and art dealers Karl Haberstock and Max Taeuber remained confident buyers could be found for the pictures and opposed the idea of destroying the remaining contents of the warehouse. However Hofmann's proposal to empty the contents of the storage facility was authorised by Goebbels and the remaining unsold works were removed on 22 February 1939. On 20 March 1939, 1,004 paintings and 3,825 drawings that had deemed "unsaleable" were destroyed in a bonfire outside a fire station in Berlin before a small crowd of official onlookers.³¹

A small portion of the stock at the *Köpenickerstraße* warehouse escaped destruction in the fire of 20 March 1939, and remained in storage until the end of the Second World War. The precise number of paintings destroyed has been disputed by Wilhelm Arntz. In a series of articles published in *Das Schönste* in 1962, Arntz

²⁸ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 78.

²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 79.

³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 82.

claimed that the Reich Ministry for Propaganda exaggerated the number of pictures that were destroyed to impress Hitler. However, since there is no evidence to substantiate his claim, the figures compiled by the ministry remain the only guide as to the fate of the collection of confiscated art.³² Arntz's contention that the RMVP deliberately overstated the number of pictures which were destroyed is highly contentious, given that in summer of 1941, when the RMVP report was compiled, the raising of foreign currency through the disposal action had already taken precedence over ideological considerations.

The terms of the contract signed between the *Galerie Fischer* and the Reich Ministry for Propaganda stipulated that the *Galerie Fischer* receive a fifteen percent commission on the sale of each item, with the exception being a six percent commission on the items deemed to be of significant value.³³ In addition, the contract stipulated that the RkdbK receive a seven and a half percent commission fee for acting as a supervisory agency for the "Aryanization" of art works.³⁴ The contract signed between the Reich Ministry for Propaganda also stipulated that notice of the impending sale be publicised in the leading international art journals, *The Burlington Magazine* (London), the *Gazette de l'Hôtel Drouot* (Paris) and *Art News* (New York).³⁵ In a letter he addressed to several international galleries and museums Fischer stated that the proceeds of the sale would fund the purchase of new acquisitions for those museums effected by the confiscation.³⁶ Fischer removed the reference in the catalogue raisonné that the sale was "by order of the Reich" after the Ministry of Propaganda instructed him to do so.³⁷

³¹ Georg Bussmann, "'Degenerate Art': A Look at a Useful Myth," in *German Art in the 20th Century: Painting and Sculpture 1905-1985*, eds Christos M. Joachimides, Norman Rosenthal & Wieland Schmied (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1985), p. 121.

³² Wilhelm Arntz, "Bildersturm in Deutschland: Das Schicksal der Bilder", *Das Schönste*, vol. 8, No. 6, June 1962, p. 33. Translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri.

³³ Stephanie Barron, "The Galerie Fischer Auction" in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 137.

³⁴ Alan E. Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reich Chambers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), pp. 146, 159.

³⁵ Stephanie Barron, "The Galerie Fischer Auction", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 138.

³⁶ Lynn H. Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War* (New York: Knopf, 1994), p. 4.

³⁷ Stephanie Barron, "The Galerie Fischer Auction", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 137.

It would be correct to assume that if the Reich government's sale of "degenerate art" had been conceived out of ideological considerations, it would have capitalised on its propagandistic potential in a similar fashion to the *Entartete Kunstausstellung*. However, the sales were not well publicised in Germany. The Reich Ministry for Propaganda was more interested in commercial profits, than realising the propagandistic potential of the sale of "degenerate art". This is evinced by the fact that the Reich government commissioned Theodor Fischer, a Swiss dealer to conduct an auction of "degenerate art" in Lucerne. The fact that the auction was by order of the Reich was not publicised because the government did not wish to dissuade international buyers from attending the auction. Fischer was aware of this concern and sent letters to prospective buyers assuring them that the proceeds of the auction would be used to replenish the collections of German museums. The absence of references in the catalogue *raisonné* that the sale was by order of the Reich also supports this conclusion.³⁸

The *Galerie Fischer* displayed the collection described as "*Gemälde und Plastiken moderner Meister aus deutschen Museen*" ("Modern Masters from German Museums") in the Guildhall in Zürich between 17 May and 27 May 1939. During the month of June the collection was displayed in the *Grand Hôtel National* in Lucerne where the auction was to be held. The "saleable" art works were auctioned by the *Theodor Fischer Galerie* in the *Grand Hôtel National* in Lucerne on 30 June 1939. The auction, which was publicised in art magazines, attracted much international attention, and an article on the sale appeared in the *London Times*.³⁹

The notably high standard of the auction pieces and expectation of low reserve prices attracted interest in Switzerland with the cantonal parliament of Basel City authorising credit for the Basel museum to purchase works of art at the auction.⁴⁰ The auction promised a great windfall for those art dealers interested in making a short-term financial gain from the quick-fire sale. Several international dealers remained convinced that the proceeds of the auction would be used to finance Germany's war preparations, and boycotted the auction in protest. However

³⁸ Stephanie Barron, "The Galerie Fischer Auction", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum, 1991), p. 139.

³⁹ *Ibid.* p. 138.

⁴⁰ Georg Kreis, *Entartete Kunst für Basel. Die Herausforderung von 1939* (Basel, 1990). I originally wrote to Katharina Schmidt, the director of the *Öffentliche Kunstsammlung Basel* for details about the acquisition of "degenerate art" by the museum. In a letter dated 22 June, 1999 she advised me that unfortunately their archive was not accessible, but recommend Professor Kreis' book for an account of the museum's acquisition of these paintings.

many collectors and dealers decided to leave their ideological conviction aside, and save the art works from an uncertain fate.⁴¹

The *Galerie Fischer* auctioned 108 paintings and 17 sculptures on behalf of the German Reich on 30 June 1939. The sales figures were on the whole disappointing, with the exception of several post-Impressionist paintings that recorded exceptionally high sales prices. Van Gogh's *Self Portrait* sold for SFr 175,000, exceeding its reserve price of SFr 45,000. The German Expressionists recorded low sales, however competitive prices were paid for their non-German counterparts.⁴²

The majority of the artworks were sold to private collectors and dealers. The United States represented three quarters of the sales, with many items being acquired by private collectors in the United States. These American dealers included, William R. Valentiner, Alfred H. Barr Jr., Hilla von Rebay, Emmy Scheyer and I.B. Neumann, and expatriate art dealers, Carl Nierendorf, Kurt Valentin. Only a small fraction of the artworks were sold directly to public galleries; the Liège Fine Arts Museum and the Arts Museum in Basel figured prominently among these.⁴³

The remaining thirty eight lots of unsold paintings and sculptures were offered for sale at a smaller and less publicised auction held at the Theodor Fischer Galerie, in Lucerne, at the end of August 1939. The art works offered for sale at the second auction attracted scarcely any international interest and the sales figures recorded for the auction were poor. Fischer kept possession of eleven unsold pictures. He later sold the remaining stock from the auction to another Swiss dealer.

The proceeds of the Galerie Fischer auction were deposited in an account held with the Bank of Switzerland, and later transferred to a bank account in London and converted to pounds sterling.⁴⁴ A report submitted by RMVP estimated that the Galerie Fischer auction netted SFr 70,940. The revenue derived from the initial auction represented the largest single contribution to the entire disposal action. In his closing report, dated, 4 July 1941, Goebbels estimated that the disposal action had resulted in the sale or exchange of an estimated 300 paintings and 3,000 works of graphic art. A report submitted by the RMVP stated the government had raised RM

⁴¹ Stephanie Barron, "The Galerie Fischer Auction", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum, 1991), p. 139.

⁴² *London Times*, July 4, 1939, p. 14b.

⁴³ Stephanie Barron, "The Galerie Fischer Auction", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum, 1991), p. 145.

681,394 in foreign currency from the disposal action. The proceeds of the sales of "degenerate art" were held in an account at the Reichsbank managed by the Reich Ministry of Propaganda. The ministry as the trustee of the *Sonderkonto entartete Kunst* (Special Account for Degenerate Art) was authorised to make withdrawals to compensate state museums for their losses with purchases of officially approved art.⁴⁵

Whilst the government was not legally obliged to pay compensation to German state museums who had lost their holdings as a result of the disposal action, state museums did receive partial compensation for losses they had incurred. A memorandum to the *Preußisches Staatsministerium* from Göring, dated 17 December 1939, states that the following amounts were paid in compensation. The *Frankfurt Städtische Galerie* received RM 150,000 for van Gogh's *Dr. Gachet*. The *Folkwang Museum* in Essen received RM 100,000 in compensation for Cézanne's *The Quarry*; and the *Berlin Nationalgalerie* received two instalments of RM 150,000 for van Gogh's *Garden at Daubigny*, and RM 15,000 for four lesser known works by Paul Signac and Edvard Munch.⁴⁶ An internal Ministry of Propaganda memo 15 April 1942 explained "this compensation is not founded on legal obligation, but comes exclusively from reasons of fairness". In an effort to avoid any insinuations that this constituted an admission of guilt or impropriety, Dr. Lucerna, an official in the ministry, specified in a letter to Rust, dated 29 April 1942, that payments to state museums be deemed as grants rather than compensation.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Stephanie Barron, "The Galerie Fischer Auction" in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991). p. 137.

⁴⁵ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996) pp. 76-82.

⁴⁶ *Preußisches Geheimes Staatsarchiv* (Prussian Privy State Archives) Berlin-Dahem, Rep. 90, Akte 2464, Bl. 58-61, Goring to the *Preußisches Staatsministerium* December 17, 1939, cited in Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p.80.

⁴⁷ John Dornberg, "The Mounting Embarrassment of Germany's Nazi Treasures", *ARTnews*, September 1988, p. 134.

The *entartete Kunst* Typescript

The primacy of material considerations over ideology is apparent in the shift away from an ideologically driven visual arts policy that occurred after the approval was given for the *Galerie Fischer* auction to proceed. However opposition to sale on political and ideological grounds did not lead to the adoption by the Reich government of an ideologically driven approach towards the disposal of the confiscated art. The approval of the *Galerie Fischer* auction provided the first indication that the material advantages of the sale of "degenerate art" would be allowed to take precedence over ideological considerations. However, the stipulation in the contract with the *Galerie Fischer*, namely that the art works must be sold abroad, indicated that ideology continued to occupy a position of importance, albeit substantially diminished. The prohibition on the sale of "degenerate art" in Germany, provides evidence of the Reich government's efforts to reach a compromise between the ideological and material considerations. The influence of ideological considerations on the subsequent sales of "degenerate" art that were conducted between 1937-1941 progressively diminished.⁴⁸

The members appointed to the commission established to oversee the disposal of "degenerate art" in June 1938 were instructed to "avoid even the semblance of private dealings on the art market in order to obviate all harmful propaganda that foreign countries might use against Germany". This suggests the commission was conscious that the sale of art by its members would evoke criticism and allegations of official corruption. Karl Haberstock's appropriation and subsequent sale of a painting by Gauguin in 1938, provides further evidence that members of the commission did not refrain from dealing in the impounded art.⁴⁹

Although the official attitude towards the sale of art continued to be influenced by ideology, in practice ideology exercised marginal influence on the selection of dealers chosen to arrange the sale of the confiscated collection of art. However, the belief that ideological considerations may have influenced the decision as to which dealers would be chosen to conduct the sales of impounded art is evident from the emphasis the *Colnaghi Gallery* placed on being the only English firm

⁴⁸ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 82.

⁴⁹ Andreas Hüneke, "On the Trail of Missing Masterpieces: Modern Art from German Galleries" in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed., (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), p. 125.

that had not exhibited modern artists.⁵⁰ Hitler's decision to give the commission to the *Galerie Fischer* was influenced by the fact that Fischer was the only dealer in Switzerland with sufficient capital to conduct business on an international scale. While Fischer did possess impeccable Nazi credentials, the decision seems to have been based upon his business acumen, rather than his politics. The principal reason why he won the contract to action the impounded art lay in the fact that he had an established clientele, capital, and expertise to enable him to conduct business on a large scale.

There is very little indication that ideological considerations played a significant role in the appointment of dealers by the commission. Although ideology occupied an important position in Nazi visual arts policy in theory, in practice ideological principles were sacrificed in the interests of material gain.

While the preparations were still under way for the *Galerie Fischer* auction, four dealers were commissioned by the Reich government to sell the remaining art works abroad; Karl Buchholz, Ferdinand Möller, Bernhard Böhmer and Hildebrand Gurlitt.⁵¹

The appointment of Bernhard Böhmer and Hildebrand Gurlitt highlights the inconsistency that emerged between policy and practice. Böhmer was a close friend of the Expressionist artist Ernst Barlach and an avid promoter of German Expressionism. Gurlitt, the chairman of the *Hamburg Kunstverein* (Art Association) had been responsible for the acquisition of the museum's modern collection before his dismissal from his post as the director of the Zwickau museum in Saxony. The decision to appoint a museum director that had been vilified in the official campaign against "degenerate art" suggests that his Nazi credentials, or lack thereof, were of secondary importance to his reputation as an established Hamburg dealer. The *Galerie Ferdinand Möller* had also actively promoted Expressionist art, organising the *Dreißig deutsche Künstler* in 1933, and an exhibition of watercolors and woodcuts by Christian Rohlf in 1937. In a letter addressed to the wife of the German foreign minister, Joachim von Ribbentrop, Möller had expressed his opposition to the Lucerne auction, and recommended the sale of the impounded art be conducted by German dealers. However, there is no tangible evidence, other than this, to suggest that Möller received the appointment through Ribbentrop's intervention. These anomalies provide evidence that ideology did not remain a driving force in National

⁵⁰ Martin Bailey, "The National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum. Revealed: What happened to the "degenerate" art in Germany's museums, from G to Z", *The Art Newspaper*, No. 70. May 1997, p. 4.

Socialist cultural policy. The decision to appoint Möller is likely to have been influenced by his successful sale of the collection of the Folkwang Museum in Essen in 1936.⁵²

In 1977 Robert Scholz, who had advocated the purge of Germany's public museums in 1933, remarked that the art dealers appointed to dispose of the impounded art had conceived of the sales as a means of inexpensively acquiring French modernists from German holdings. Scholz retrospectively criticised the sales stating that, "There can be no doubt that this demonstration was indefensible as an action, even if it did include, for the most part, examples of the most appalling artistic decadence". Scholz, had earlier praised Möller as a person of integrity "for whom the art market is not only a job, but at the same time a matter of innermost conviction", only later to accuse him of conceiving the *entartete Kunst Aktion*. Scholz stated:

As later became clear, the instigators of this clean-up operation were henchmen in the pay of individual art dealers who wanted to get their hands on the frozen assets of the different museums, in other words, works such as those of the French modernists that were internationally recognised.⁵³

The extension of the confiscations to include works by non-German artists produced before 1910 indicates that there may be substance to Scholz's claim that the art dealers appointed by the Reich government conceived the exchanges and sales as a means to acquire saleable French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist pictures.

The precise details of the fate of the 16, 558 objects confiscated from Germany's public museums is disclosed in an inventory compiled by the *Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda* (Institute for German Cultural and Economic Propaganda). The inventory was compiled as a final record after the sales of impounded art had been completed in the summer of 1941. The war had made sales difficult and had forced the hasty conclusion of the sales in the summer. The 480 page inventory, comprises two volumes listing in alphabetical order confiscations effected from museums in cities in the summer and autumn of 1937.⁵⁴ The first

⁵¹ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 76.

⁵² Andreas Hüneke, "On the Trail of Missing Masterpieces: Modern Art from German Galleries", in *"Degenerate Art": The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, Stephanie Barron ed. (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum, 1991), p. 127.

⁵³ Robert Scholz, *Architektur und bildende Kunst 1933-1945* (Preussisch Oldendorf: Schütz, 1977), pp. 45-46.

⁵⁴ The confiscations are listed in alphabetical order in *"Entartete" Kunst: Typescript Inventory* (Germany. *Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda* (Institute for German

The first volume is 232 pages long and begins with confiscations from museums in cities beginning from Aachen to Greifswald. The second volume, which runs into 248 pages, lists the remaining museums from Göttingen to Zwickau. Andreas Hüneke, a German scholar verified the authenticity of the second volume and estimates that “up to 60% of the details are new”.⁵⁵

The details of the sales of “degenerate art” conducted by the Reich government had never been precisely determined since the record compiled by the *Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda* (Institute for German Cultural and Economic Propaganda) which were held at the *Bundesarchiv* in Berlin were incomplete. The two copies of the inventory held at the *Bundesarchiv* at Potsdam are bound in their original cardboard and list works of art seized from museums beginning from Aachen to Griefswald. One of these is the original reference copy kept by the Reich Ministry for Propaganda, and contains handwritten annotations. The copy of the inventory held by the *Neue Nationalgalerie* (The twentieth century collection of the *Berlin Nationalgalerie*) lists works seized from museums from Aachen to Chemnitz. The final copy that is held by the *Victoria and Albert Museum* in London represents the single complete record of the inventory.

This copy has been preserved close to its original condition. A description of the inventory was provided in two information sheets that were produced by the museum’s Press Office shortly after the list was acquired. The first page of volume one has been removed and both volumes are bound in quarter black cloth and beige paper over boards distinctive of the 1970s. The typescript, which is not available for loan, has been photocopied and made available to the public in the Readers Room. The photocopied version is of poor quality, with the edges of the pages obscured and some entries barely legible.⁵⁶

Heinrich (Harry) Robert Fischer, the co-founder of the *Marlborough Fine Art Gallery* in London donated the inventory to the *Victoria and Albert Museum* as part of his bequest. Fischer had established his own bookshop and publishing house in Vienna and immigrated to the United Kingdom shortly before the outbreak of the Second World War. Fischer was interned on the Isle of Man following the declaration

Cultural and Economic Propaganda), vol. 1. The copy held by the *National Library* at the *Victoria and Albert Museum*, London, was used to form the basis of this chapter.

⁵⁵ Martin Bailey, “The National Art Library, Victoria and Albert museum. Revealed: What happened to the “degenerate” art in Germany’s museums, from G to Z”, *The Art Newspaper*, No. 70, May 1997, p. 4.

⁵⁶ The description of the inventory is contained in two information sheets produced by the museum’s Press Office shortly after the list was acquired. A photocopy of these sheets was given to me by the *Victoria and Albert Museum*, courtesy of Alex Chanter, Special Collections, the *National Art Library*.

of war, and later joined the British Pioneer Corps. In 1946 Fischer co-founded the Marlborough Fine Art Gallery, with fellow Austrian, F.K. Lloyd, whom he had met during his service in the British Pioneer Corps, which specialised in French nineteenth and early twentieth century art. During the 1950s the gallery organised solo exhibitions of Nolde, Barlach, Schiele and Kokoschka, and in 1959 mounted the critically acclaimed exhibition *Art in Revolt: Germany 1905-1925*. Fischer's association with Lloyd ended in 1971 when Fischer and his son, Wolfgang Fischer, established the Fischer Fine Art Gallery.⁵⁷

During the 1960s Fischer began collecting documentary material about the German Expressionist movement and professed his intention to devote more time to his collection after his retirement. However Fischer's collection of material on the German Expressionists was never thoroughly catalogued since he never officially retired. In an interview conducted by *The Art Newspaper*, Wolfgang stated that since his father had not discussed his acquisition of the inventory with him he was unaware of the special provenance of the inventory. Wolfgang stated that although his father rarely discussed the details surrounding his individual purchases with his son, "My father was certainly not aware himself of the uniqueness of this 'Degenerate art list' as he would have discussed it with me. My guess is that it was part of a mixed lot and that he assumed there were many other copies, if not printed lists of such a typescript produced by the Nazi bureaucracy." Wolfgang told *The Art Newspaper*, "The boxes of this collection remained unopened in my step mother's house and I only heard about the gift when she had already given it to the V & A."⁵⁸ The historical importance of the inventory not discovered until Elfriede Fischer presented her husband's collection of 69 rare books and journals to the museum in October 1997.⁵⁹

The inventory reveals what happened to the remaining collection of unsold art stored in the *Köpenicker Strasse* warehouse. The name of the city and institution from which the art works were taken appears at the top of each page. Below the institution appears the name of the artist in the left column. Beside artist's name, appears an inventory number, followed by the title, a letter indicating the type of medium (for example painting or sculpture), and finally the name of the dealer. In the far right hand column a letter appears indicating if it was destroyed, exchanged or sold, and the sale price.

⁵⁷ The information about Harry Fischer is based on the information sheets produced by the Victoria and Albert Museum's Press Office shortly after the list was acquired.

⁵⁸ Martin Bailey, "How the list came to England", *The Art Newspaper*, No. 70, May 1997, p. 5.

⁵⁹ The information about Harry Fischer is based on the information sheets produced by the Victoria and Albert Museum's Press Office shortly after the list was acquired.

The presence of works by non-German artists confirms that the committee charged with overseeing the confiscation of artworks from Germany's public museums extended the confiscations beyond the decree of June 30, 1937. This decree empowered the president of the Reich Chamber of Visual Arts:

to select and secure for an exhibition works of German degenerate art since 1910, both painting and sculpture, which are now in collections owned by the German Reich, individual regions, or local communities which insult German feeling, or destroy or confuse natural form, or simply reveal an absence of adequate manual and artistic form.⁶⁰

Included among those pictures confiscated from the *Landesmuseum* in Hannover was Henri Matisse's *Portrait of Cocteau*. The inventory also reveals some pictures were returned to museums where they had originally been removed. Franz Marc's *Red Deer* returned to the *Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlung* in Munich. Edvard Munch's *Four sons of Dr. Linde* also returned to the *Museum Behnhaus* in Lübeck.⁶¹

The presence of an "X" in the inventory was used to denote works of art that had been destroyed, a "T" those exchanged, a "B" those which were placed in storage and an "E" those which were exhibited as "degenerate art". There appears to be no correlation between the presence of "degenerate" subject matter, and the incidence of an "X" in the right hand side of column of the ledger, which is used to denote works of art which have been deemed unsaleable and destroyed. This would appear to suggest that the sale or destruction of a particular item was dependent upon whether buyers could be found. Among the prints recorded in the inventory as having been destroyed were Dufy's *Seabattle*, and Pablo Picasso's *Mother and Child*, which had originally been confiscated from the *Staatliches Museum in Saarbrücken*. The inventory reveals that Otto Dix's *The Trench* was purchased by Bernhard Böhmer in January 1940 and not destroyed. Franz Marc's *Red Deer* was also purchased by Böhmer, and not destroyed as previously thought.⁶²

The four dealers appointed by the *Kommission zur Verwertung der Produkte entarteter Kunst* (Commission for the Disposal of Degenerate Art) appear throughout the typescript. Other dealers, including Theodor Fischer (Lucerne), Earald Halvorsen

⁶⁰ Joseph Goebbels, June 30, 1937 decree issued to all German museums, *Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen*, Munich, cited in Stephanie Barron, "1937: Modern Art and Politics in Prewar Germany" in *Degenerate Art: The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, ed. Stephanie Barron (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum, 1991), p. 19.

⁶¹ "Entartete" Kunst: Typescript Inventory (Germany. Institut für Deutsche Kultur- und Wirtschafts-propaganda (Institute for German Cultural and Economic Propaganda), vol. 1. The copy held by the National Art Library at the Victoria and Albert Museum,

⁶² "Entartete" Kunst: Typescript Inventory (Germany. Institut für Deutsche Kultur- und Wirtschafts-propaganda) . vol. 1 & 2. The first volume list entries from cities from A-G, and the remaining cities, such as Weimar's *Staatliche Kunstsammlung* appear in volume 2.

(Oslo), and Emmanuel Fohn appear at regular intervals in addition to the authorised dealers, Dr. Hildebrand Gurlitt (Hamburg), Karl Buchholz (Berlin), Bernhard Böhmer (Güstrow) and Ferdinand Möller (Berlin).⁶³

The inventory discloses that there was sustained demand for works by such internationally renowned artists such as Henri Matisse, Paul Gauguin, and Pablo Picasso that were branded by the Nazis as "degenerate".⁶⁴ Vilstrup Emmanuel Fohn, an Austrian born artist and dealer based in Italy, appears on the list for arranging a series of exchanges of "degenerate" pictures for works of art by German Romantic artists in 1939.⁶⁵ He also was responsible for orchestrating a series of exchanges in 1939, involving the exchange of German Romantic painters for a consignment of "degenerate" art. Fohn received Marc Chagall's watercolour, *Above the Town*, confiscated from the *Mannheim Kunsthalle* in an exchange. Fohn also received a print by Modigliani, *Young Girl*, confiscated from the *Staatliches Museum* in Saarbrücken.⁶⁶

The inventory reveals a strong demand for works by Chagall which had earlier been branded as prime examples of Jewish corruption and decadence. The records of sales of paintings by Chagall provide an indication that the propagandist potential that could have been gained from a publicised destruction of the artist's paintings was sacrificed for pecuniary gain. The fact that works by Chagall were offered for sale highlights the discrepancy between policy and practice. The decision to sell Chagall's *Elderly Jew* confiscated from the Landesmuseum in Wiesbaden to Ferdinand Möller provides an interesting example. This decision indicates the propagandistic potential a publicised destruction of works of confiscated art was secondary to the material benefits of the sale of the artist's work. Several pieces by Chagall were also purchased by Gurlitt, including *Violinist*, originally belonging to *Wiesbaden Landesmuseum*, *Pogrom Street* from *Hamburg Kunsthalle*, *Rabbi* from the *Staatliches Museum* in Saarbrücken, and *Family Scene* from *Staatliche Galerie* in Stuttgart.⁶⁷

The fact that Gurlitt also acquired several paintings by Gauguin suggests that the demand for the Post-Impressionists remained strong irrespective of their being branded as "degenerate" by the National Socialist government. Gurlitt

⁶³ "Entartete" Kunst: Typescript Inventory (Germany. Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda), vol. 1. p. 2-8.

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 2.

⁶⁵ Ibid. p. 6.

⁶⁶ The sustained demand for works by such artists has also been documented Martin Bailey's article, "How the list came to England", *The Art Newspaper*, No. 70, May 1997.

purchased Gauguin's print, *Exotic Scene* originally belonging to the Hamburg *Kunsthalle* by for SFr 80, with Gauguin's print *Rider* from *Mannheim Kunsthalle* for SFr 100. Theodor Fischer also purchased several works by Gauguin including *From Tahiti* which had been confiscated from the *Städtische Galerie und Städelsches Kunstinstitut* for SFr 50, 000.⁶⁸

Gurlitt also purchased works by several works by Picasso, including a *Still Life*. Gurlitt acquired this print which had been confiscated from the *Hamburg Kunsthalle* for SFr 60. He also purchased Picasso's *Three Graces* originally from the *Staatliche Kunsthalle* in Karlsruhe for SFr 40, *Peasant Family* which had been removed from *Mannheim Kunsthalle* for SFr 60, *Dance Scene* formerly in the collections *Stadtmuseum* in Ulm for SFr 20, and *Man's Head* from *Landesmuseum* in Wiesbaden for SFr 20. Fohn also acquired several Picasso's through exchange, including *Self Portrait* confiscated from the *Landesmuseum* in Hannover and *Portrait of a Man* confiscated from the *Landesmuseum* in Hanover.⁶⁹

Fischer also collected works by Picasso, including *Woman's* confiscated from the *Städtische Galerie und Städelsches Kunstinstitut* in Frankfurt for SFr 8,000. The inventory also reveals Böhmer paid SFr 24,000 for Picasso's *Absinthe Drinker*. This picture was highly saleable and had been confiscated from the *Kunsthalle* in Hamburg.⁷⁰

The inventory also reveals a sustained demand for Matisse. A print by Matisse *Portrait of Cocteau*, which was confiscated from the *Landesmuseum* in Hannover was sold to Gurlitt for SFr 60. Fischer purchased Matisse's *Three Women* for SFr 9,100 and *River Scenery* for SFr 5,100. Bernhard Böhmer acquired only one piece by Matisse.⁷¹

There was also a sustained demand for works by Munch. Eerald Halvorsen, an Oslo dealer, acquired several works by Munch through the contacts he established through Karl Buchholz in 1939. Halvorsen's name recurs most frequently in the inventory under the entries for paintings by Munch. Halvorsen is recorded in the inventory in connection with the purchase of seventeen works by Munch which cost £ 6,000. Included among those paintings he is recorded as having purchased are a *Landscape* confiscated from the *Wallraf Richartz Museum* purchased for £ 450; a *Self Portrait* from *Mannheim Kunsthalle* for which he paid £ 350; *Woman in Blue*

⁶⁷ "Entartete" Kunst: Typescript Inventory (Germany. Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda), vol. 1.

⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 7.

⁶⁹ Ibid. p.10.

⁷⁰ Ibid.p.12.

⁷¹ Ibid. p.16.

confiscated from the Hamburg Kunsthalle for £100. He also acquired several prints inexpensively, including *Sin* removed from Hannover Landesmuseum for £10 and *Bathing Woman* sequestered from Kunsthalle in Kiel for £5.⁷²

The inventory compiled by the Institute for German Cultural and Economic Propaganda confirms that the dealers had often acquired modern art at very competitive prices. The inventory confirms Petropoulos' claim that "Goebbels and those in charge of the *entartete Kunst Aktion* settled for very modest results, especially after the outbreak of the war, when the value of modern art plummeted. Disposal, not income, became their primary concern."⁷³

Göring's name appears in the inventory in only a few instances, since the principal source of French Impressionist and twentieth century paintings for the Göring Collection originated from French collections supplied to him by Parisian dealers.⁷⁴ The *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg* constituted his secondary source of French paintings. The appointment of Göring to the honorary position in the *Preußische Akademie der Künste* (Prussian Academy of Art) on 15 July 1937 gave Göring a stake in the lucrative *entartete Kunst Aktion*. Göring's interest in the disposal of "degenerate art" emerged when he granting himself discretionary powers over the disposal of the confiscated items:

Concerning the dispensation of all expurgated objects, so far as they belong to the state, a list will be placed before me, and I will make the decision.⁷⁵

In the spring of 1938 fourteen works were recorded as being acquired by Göring. Van Gogh's *Daubigny's Garden Wheat Field* and *Young Lovers*, Marc's *The Tower of Blue Horses* and *Three Deer*, Munch's *Embrace*, *Encounter by the Sea*, *Melancholy*, and *Snow Shovelers*, and Signac's *Port*, all from the *Berlin Nationalgalerie*; Cézanne's *Quarry* from Essen and van Gogh's portrait of *Dr. Gachet* from the Frankfurt museum, Marc's *Deer in Wood* from the museum in Halle, and Gauguin's *Horseman on the Beach* confiscated from the *Wallraf Richartz Museum* were among the paintings transferred into Göring's custody.⁷⁶

⁷² "Entartete" Kunst: Typescript Inventory (Germany. Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda), vol. 1 & 2.

⁷³ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 83.

⁷⁴ "Entartete" Kunst: Typescript Inventory (Germany. Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda) . vol. 1. pp. 2, 6. [See Appendices].

⁷⁵ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 79.

⁷⁶ Ibid. p. 79.

Van Gogh's portrait of *Dr. Gachet* is listed in volume one of the inventory alongside the entry for the *Städtische Galerie und the Städelsches Kunstinstitut* under the heading Frankfurt/Main, and is recorded as having gone to the Reichsmarschall [see appendices]. The absence of a purchase price in the right hand column of the inventory provides a strong indication that Göring acquired this picture without payment.⁷⁷ The reappearance of the second volume of the entry has revealed that Gauguin's *Horsemen on the Beach*, confiscated from the Wallraf Richartz Museum in Köln was not sold to Karl Haberstock, but acquired by Göring. The appearance of Göring's name in the right column indicates that Haberstock must have arranged the sale of the picture on Göring's behalf, and that the ownership of the picture subsequently passed to Haberstock [see appendices].⁷⁸

However a memorandum Göring addressed to the *Preußisches Staatsministerium* dated 17 December 1939, states that the *Frankfurt Städtische Galerie* received RM 150,000 for van Gogh's *Dr. Gachet*. It also records that the *Folkwang Museum* in Essen received RM 100,000 in compensation for Cézanne's *The Quarry*. Two payments of RM 150,000 for van Gogh's *Garden at Daubigny*, and RM 15,000 for four works by Paul Signac and Edvard Munch The *Berlin Nationalgalerie* are also recorded. Munch's *Four Sons of Dr Linde* which had been confiscated from the Museum Behnhaus in Lübeck and Franz Marc's *Red Deer*, which had been confiscated from the *Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlung Munich* were recorded as returned.⁷⁹

The sales of confiscated art recorded in the inventory compiled by the Institute for German Cultural and Economic Propaganda in the summer of 1941 provide conclusive evidence that the confiscation procedure was not consistent with the political and ideological justifications employed to legitimate the confiscations. The decision to sell the stockpile of art rather than allow it to be destroyed was motivated by the realisation that there was a market for "degenerate" artists. In doing so, the Reich government left itself open to one of the main criticisms the National

⁷⁷ Göring's acquisition of Portrait of *Dr Gachet*, originally confiscated from the *Städtische Galerie und Städelsches Kunstinstitut*, Frankfurt/Main is cited in "Entartete" Kunst: *Typescript Inventory* (Germany. *Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda*). vol. 1. p. 6.

⁷⁸ Göring's acquisition of Gauguin's *Horsemen on the Beach*, originally confiscated from the *Wallraf Richartz Museum*, Köln is cited in "Entartete" Kunst: *Typescript Inventory* (Germany. *Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda*). vol. 2. p. 2.

⁷⁹ *Preußisches Geheimes Staatsarchiv* (Prussian Privy State Archives) Berlin-Dahem, Rep. 90, Akte 2464, Bl. 58-61, Göring to the *Preußisches Staatsministerium* December 17, 1939, cited in Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 80,81.

Socialists had directed against the influence of Jews over artistic activity, their alleged reduction of artistic creativity to economics.

CHAPTER 3 – THE CONFISCATION AND DISPOSAL OF “DEGENERATE ART” IN FRENCH COLLECTIONS, 1940-1943.

The second chapter provided an examination of the Reich government's disposal of public collections of “degenerate art” in Germany between 1936 and 1939. The purpose of the previous chapter was to demonstrate that the sales conducted by the Reich were principally conceived as a means to derive profits. Since Jewish collections in France represented the principal source of “degenerate art”, the following chapter examines the confiscations of Jewish-owned property in occupied France between 1940 and 1943.

The aim of this chapter is to demonstrate Alfred Rosenberg's failure to perform the mission assigned to the ERR, by illustrating how the principle mission of this agency became the confiscation of Jewish owned property for the purposes of commercial exploitation. The fact that the ideological nature of this agency's mission was sacrificed to satisfy the demand for “degenerate art”, which was created by Reich officials, German museums and art dealers, supports my contention that ideological considerations were sacrificed to commercial interests. The *Schencker Papers, Part 1: Accessions to German museums and galleries during the Occupation of France* constitutes the primary source for the analysis on the acquisition of a number of “degenerate” pictures by German museums. *The Schencker Papers, Part 2, Purchases of Works of art in France during the Occupation by and on the behalf of German dealers and officials* forms the basis for the analysis of acquisitions made by German dealers and officials.¹

¹ Cecil Gould, *The Schencker Papers, Part 1. "Accessions to German museums and galleries during the Occupation of France"* & *The Schencker Papers, Part 2 "Purchases of Works of Art in France during the Occupation by and on behalf of German Dealers and Officials*, the National Archives (Washington D.C), record group 239, 81.

The Origin and Function of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg

In June 1940 the *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg für die besetzten Gebiete* was established by the *Aussenpolitisches Amt* (Foreign Political Office) of Reichsleiter Alfred Rosenberg. Due to Alfred Rosenberg's position as *Beauftragter des Führers für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Schulung und Erziehung der NSDAP* (Plenipotentiary of the Führer for the Supervision of the Entire Intellectual and Ideological Training and Education of the NSDAP), the supervision of the ERR came under his authority. Following Hitler's decree of 29 January 1940, which authorised the creation of a library for the *Hohe Schule* the ERR principal purpose was to organise the collection of research materials in occupied countries. Prior to the establishment of the ERR Rosenberg had acquired books either through direct purchase or through material confiscated by the SS. The ERR's initial role was to assist Rosenberg to obtain printed material for *Hohe Schule's* large reference library. The ERR authority over confiscated material stemmed from Rosenberg's request for Hitler's permission to confiscate libraries and archives from Freemasons, Jews and other enemies of National Socialism.²

The legal basis for the confiscations performed by the *Einsatzstäbe im Westen* (The Office for the Occupied Countries of the West) was established with the issuance of an order by Field Marshall Keitel, the Commander in Chief of the Wehrmacht. The order instructed General von Brauchitsch, the Commander in Chief of the German Army in France to assist the *ERR* to seize libraries of Masonic lodges.³ The directive extended the ERR's jurisdiction to include libraries and art treasures belonging to Jews in the Western occupied territories. The issuance of a directive by Hans Lammers, chief of the Reich Chancellery on 5 July 1940, which ordered all state agencies to render assistance to the ERR, extended the ERR's authority to include the sequestration of Jewish-owned art collections.⁴ Until this time the confiscation of ownerless Jewish collections in the German-occupied zone fell under the nominal charge of the German military commander

² James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*. pp. 3,4, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

³ *Ibid.* p.5.

⁴ Lammers to die *Obersten Reichsbehörden und die dem Führer unmittelbaren unterstehenden Dienststellen*, 5 July 1941, Nuremberg Document PS-154, cited in Herbert Rothfeder, *A Study of Alfred Rosenberg's Organisation for National Socialist Ideology* (The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1963), p. 361.

for France, and the German Embassy in Paris. The confiscations in the German-occupied zone had originally been performed by the German Embassy, under the authority of Joachim von Ribbentrop.⁵ Rosenberg's failure to fulfil the terms of his original commission, is illustrated by the fact that the ERR did not fulfil the ideological role for which it was originally established. The weakness of Rosenberg's commission, and Rosenberg's lack of authority within the Party hierarchy, prevented Rosenberg from being able to fulfil the ERR mission.⁶

The inability for Rosenberg to exercise any authority to execute the ideological mission of the ERR allowed Göring to manipulate the organisation to acquire art for his personal collection and for the purpose of exchange. The transformation of the ERR into an art looting agency represented a significant departure from the ERR's original mission to supply the *Hohe Schule* with research materials to advance the Party's ideological propaganda.

After the Rosenberg Office was invested with the important commission over the confiscation of Jewish-owned art by the Reichschancellery the *Amt Westen* emerged as the dominant Nazi art looting agency.⁷ The primary theoretical function of the ERR was removed with the issuance of the directive of 5 November 1940. This directive placed the sequestration of Jewish owned art collection under the authority of the ERR. From this date henceforth the principal function of the *Einsatzstäbe im Westen* became the confiscation of Jewish property for the purposes of commercial exploitation.

The transformation in the nature of the function of the ERR from its original theoretical mission became apparent from the commencement of its operations from its Paris headquarters at the *Hôtel Commodore* in July 1940. The *Amt Westen's* disinterest in the collection of material for exploitation in the "struggle against Jewry and Freemasonry" became apparent early on from the organisation's activity. This is demonstrated by the fact the *Amt Westen* became primarily interested in the confiscation of Jewish owned art collections from October 1940.

The captured register of letters and messages of the *Hauptarbeitsgruppe Frankreich* of the ERR provide a detailed record of correspondence about the confiscation of the illustrious Rothschild family collections between the period October

⁵ James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*. p. 3, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 5.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 5.

20, 1940 to March 9, 1941. The earliest correspondence concerning the Baron Maurice de Rothschild collection is dated from 22 October 1940. The Maurice de Rothschild collection included a fine selection of Dutch and Flemish works, highly prized by Hitler and Göring. The Maurice de Rothschild collection was confiscated from the château of Armanvilliers in Siene-et-Marne in late 1940.⁸

The Edouard de Rothschild collection, which represented the largest of the Rothschild family's collection, was even more highly esteemed by Hitler and Göring, and included masterpieces, such as Vermeer's *Astronomer*. The captured letter register reveals that the location of the Edouard de Rothschild collection was identified in a letter addressed to the Military Command on 11 November 1940. Walter Andreas Hofer, Göring's principal purchasing agent inspected the Edouard de Rothschild Collections that had been stored in the *Banque de France* and the *Crédit Lyonnais* in September 1941. The Baron Robert de Rothschild collection, which included Renaissance enamels, several masterpieces, including Jan Van Eyck's triptych *Virgin and Child, with Saints and Donor* and a selection of modern art, also attracted the interest of Hitler. The letter register includes correspondence concerning the imminent seizure of the Robert de Rothschild collection at the Château of La Versine and the impending seizure of Edmund de Rothschild on November 19, 1940; and the Henri de Rothschild, and his son Philippe de Rothschild Collections on February 11, 1940.⁹

The Paul Rosenberg collection, which represented the principal source of "degenerate" pictures, was sequestered from the *Banque Nationale de Crédit Inc* in Lisbourne on 6 April 1941. Göring's principal purchasing agent, Walter Andreas Hofer, made a selection of paintings from the Paul Rosenberg Collection stored in the Jeu de Paume for the purposes of exchange on 14 September 1941. Two art dealers named Yves Perdoux and Count de Lestang disclosed the location of Paul Rosenberg's collection of nineteenth and twentieth century art, stored in Rosenberg's family residence

⁸ *The Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg: An Analysis of the Captured Letter Register of the ERR, October 29, 1940, through March 9, 1941, the Imperial War Museum (London), FO 645, box 349. p.1.* The captured register of letters and messages also contains information about the liquidation of the Freemasons' Lodge in France, Belgium, and Holland.

⁹ *The Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg: An Analysis of the Captured Letter Register of the ERR, October 29, 1940, through March 9, 1941, the Imperial War Museum (London), FO 645, box 349. p.11.*

at Floriac to the German Embassy in return for a consignment of confiscated modern paintings based upon ten percent of the total appraisal value of the collection.¹⁰

Lucie Botton, a former employee of the Seligmann firm disclosed the location of the Seligmann family collection to the German Embassy.¹¹ The correspondence concerning the liquidation of other prominent Jewish family collections, including Alphonse Kann's is dated from 12 November 1940, and the Levy Brothers' is dated from 19 November 1940.¹² The ERR list of 20 October 1942 reveals that "degenerate" pictures confiscated from the Levy-Benzion and Kann Collections were removed from the ERR repository at the *Jeu de Paume* to Neuschwanstein on 12 December 1941, after the issuance of an edict against the importation of "degenerate art" to the Reich. Lohse said that the removal of "degenerate art" to Germany took place against the Führer's orders because these collections were regarded as the best examples to be confiscated to date, and desirable for exchange purposes.¹³

In the autumn of 1940 and spring 1941 the Berheim-Jeune collection which included works by Courbet, Corot and painters of the Barbizon school was confiscated by the ERR. His son Alexandre Berheim's impressive collection of Impressionists, included works by Monet, Renoir, Pissarro, Sisley, Cézane, Seurat, Bonnard, Vallotton, as well as several works by Post-Impressionists, such as van Gogh were also seized. By mid-November 1940, the ERR had confiscated the Rothschild, David Weil, Seligmann, Kahn, Rosenberg, Berheim, and Wildenstein collections.¹⁴ The confiscations of Jewish-owned art effected after this date, with the exception of the Max Wasserman Collection and several pictures from the David Weil Collection, were not of great artistic value.¹⁵ The collections of Jean and André Seligmann deposited in the Credit Lyonnais in Paris

¹⁰ Hector Feliciano, *The Lost Museum: The Nazi Conspiracy to Steal the World's Greatest Works of Art*, (Basic Books: New York, 1997), pp. 70-72.

¹¹ Peter Harclerode & Brendan Pittaway, *The Lost Masters: The Looting of Europe's Treasurehouses*, (Orion: London, 1999), p.29.

¹² *The Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg: An Analysis of the Captured Letter Register of the ERR, October 29, 1940, through March 9, 1941*, p.9, the Imperial War Museum (London), FO 645, box 349.

¹³ Theodore Rousseau, *Confiscated Interrogation Report No. 2. The Göring Collection, 15 September 1945*. p. 131, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

¹⁴ *The Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg: An Analysis of the Captured Letter Register of the ERR, October 29, 1940, through March 9, 1941*, p. 10, the Imperial War Museum (London), FO 645, box 349. The annex to the main report contains lists of personnel and their positions within the organisation.

¹⁵ James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*. p. 17, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

were confiscated in July 1941 after their inspection by Walter Andreas Hofer, Göring's principal purchasing agent and Director of his gallery at Carinhall.¹⁶

The seizure of the David Weil collection elicited criticism from the art protection unit named the *Kunstschutz*. The *Kunstschutz* even informed the museum's director about the impending threat posed to the collection. On April 8, 1941 the collection had been evacuated to the *Louvre's* repository in Souches.¹⁷ Count Franz Wolff Metternich, head of the *Kunstschutz*, emerged as an outspoken critic of the confiscations performed by the ERR, and intervened on behalf of French curators to preserve France's artistic patrimony.¹⁸

After February 1941 the ERR extended its confiscation to include non-Jewish owned works in the possession of the Jewish collector, Arnold Seligmann. The radicalisation and lawlessness of the confiscation procedure is evident a letter dated 9 February 1941 that authorised the confiscation of works of art of American ownership held with Seligmann.¹⁹

The confiscation of Jewish-owned art was later extended to cover works in public museums. In a letter General Keitel issued to the German Military Commander in Occupied France on 17 September 1940 the ERR was authorised to secure all *herrenlos* (ownerless) cultural property which had been donated to the French state by the enemies of the National Socialists since 1 September 1940:

Ownership transfers to the French state or similar transfers completed after this date are irrelevant and legally invalid (for example, Polish and Slovak libraries in Paris, possessions of the Palais Rothschild or other ownerless Jewish possessions).²⁰

¹⁶ Theodore Rousseau, *Confiscated Interrogation Report No. 2. The Goering Collection*, 15 September 1945. p. 28, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

¹⁷ Hector Feliciano, *The Lost Museum: The Nazi Conspiracy to Steal the World's Greatest Works of Art*, (New York: Harper Collins, 1997), p. 92.

¹⁸ Michael Gibson, "How a Timid Curator With a Deadpan Expression Outwitted the Nazis," *ARTnews*, vol. 80, June 1981, p. 105. After the war Metternich was awarded the French Legion of Honor for his efforts to prevent acts of plunder by the German occupational authorities.

¹⁹ *The Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg: An Analysis of the Captured Letter Register of the ERR, October 29, 1940, through March 9, 1941*, the *Imperial War Museum* (London), FO 645, box 349. p. 11.

²⁰ Letter from General Keitel to German Military Commander, France, dated 17 September 1940, cited in attachments in James.S.Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box, 75.

The part of the Rothschilds' family collection entrusted into the care of the director of the French national collections at the Louvre became subject to confiscation since the order extended the jurisdiction of the ERR to include the confiscation of property. The extension of the confiscations to include Jewish owned collections in the custody of French museums also elicited strong criticism from the French government. The matter became the subject of an official French report by the French General Commission for Jewish Questions. On 25 July 1941 the official report which enumerated the grievances of the French government was lodged with the German Embassy and the High Command.²¹

Gerhard Ukital, the chief of the ERR for all occupied territories, prepared an internal memorandum which dismissed the objections by the French authorities to the confiscations on 3 November 1941. In response to official French protests Göring instructed Dr. Bunjes, an official in the *Militaerverwaltung-Abteilung Kunstschutz* (Monuments and Fine Arts section of the German Military Government), to prepare a report addressing the concerns of the French government. Bunjes' report entitled "French Protests against the Safeguarding of Ownerless Jewish Art Properties" was submitted on 16 May 1942. Bunjes' findings exonerated the German government. The report found that the Compiègne armistice of 1940 was an agreement signed between Germany and France, and as such had only bound the Germans to respect the rights of the French people, and not Jews or Freemasons.²² Bunjes denied the French authorities access to museums where inventories were being compiled on the grounds that this would leave the Germans vulnerable to French espionage. The report concluded with a recommendation that no action be taken to address the French protests, and that matters pertaining to art confiscations be resolved by Hitler personally.²³

The first deliveries of confiscated art arrived at the *Jeu de Paume* in the Tuileries in late October 1940. Göring arrived to inspect the confiscated collection on 2 November 1940. Göring was able to commandeer paintings from the stockpile of confiscated collections stored at the *Jeu de Paume* through his domination of the ERR office in Paris. The issuance of an order by Göring on 5 November 1940 extended the jurisdiction of the ERR to include the confiscation of ownerless Jewish collections, which enabled

²¹ James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*. p. 18, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

²² *Ibid.* p. 19.

²³ *Ibid.* p. 19.

hin to plunder works of art from collections belonging to France's oldest and wealthiest Jewish families. The order stated that confiscated artworks removed to the *Louvre* were to be reserved in descending order for the Führer, Reichsmarshal, the *Hohe Schule*, German museums, and for sale by auction in France. The proceeds of the sale of confiscated art in Paris were to "be assigned to the French state in benefit of French dependents of war casualties". The fact that the Göring order ranked the *Hohe Schule* in third place, when the ERR had originally been established for the purpose of collecting research material for the *Hohe Schule* provides evidence of the transformation of the ERR's original mission. The ERR clearly emerges as a plundering agency with the sole purpose of commercial exploitation of confiscated artworks in this period.²⁴

Hitler's right of disposition over the confiscated artworks was reiterated in a Hitler order (*Vorbehalt*) signed by Hans Lammers on 18 November 1940. The order clearly stated that all confiscated works be transported to Germany, and placed at the Führer's personal disposal "with a view to preventing any possible abuse from the outset".²⁵ This order entrusted the disposal of confiscated artworks to Dr. Hans Posse, his chief art adviser and director of the Dresden Gallery. Göring was able to gain control over the ERR's repository at the *Jeu de Paume* and commandeer large quantities of confiscated art for his personal collection since enforce Posse did not use his mandate. Posse had unlimited funds at his disposal to make purchases for the Hitler's Linz Collection, and rarely acquired artworks for Linz directly from the ERR repositories. The majority of Jewish-owned works confiscated by the ERR in Paris were placed at Göring's disposal with the exception of 53 paintings, which were chosen by Hans Posse for Hitler. There is no evidence of corruption on Rosenberg's part, he did not acquire works of art the ERR for himself, nor did he receive any proceeds of the sales conducted by the ERR.²⁶

In early December 1940, Robert Scholz, the official responsible for the professional conduct of artistic affairs under the jurisdiction of the *Amt Rosenberg*, travelled to Paris to determine the extent of Göring's direction over the activities of the ERR in Paris. Scholz reported that confiscation proceedings were not ideologically

²⁴ Göring order, dated 5 November 1940, cited in attachments in James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in Franc, 15 August 1945*, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

²⁵ Hitler Order, signed by Lammers, dated 18 November 1940, cited in attachments in J.S.Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

consistent with the political function of the Rosenberg office and recommended the termination of the ERR operation in France. Scholz reported that the *Amt Westen* had functioned entirely in Göring's interests, and informed him of Göring's plan to transport his selection of confiscated artworks to Berlin.²⁷ In response to the findings of this report, Rosenberg ordered Scholz to obtain clarification from Hitler's headquarters about the irregularity of this procedure. Scholz reported his findings to Dr. Hansen, assistant to the Reichsleiter Bormann, on 11 December 1940. Bormann requested him to communicate the matter to Dr. Posse, however, no reference was made to Göring, and the matter of Göring's exploitation of ERR material remained unresolved. In March 1941 Rosenberg dispatched Scholz to attempt to stop another large transfer of ERR material to Germany by Göring. His efforts proved unsuccessful with Ukital and von Behr informing him that the transfer had already commenced on his arrival in Paris.²⁸

Göring assumed greater control over the operations of the ERR after Kurt von Behr's promotion to head ERR operations in France. Göring was able to acquire large consignments of "degenerate art" from the ERR with the assistance of von Behr.²⁹ Although the terms of reference of the *Amt Westen* were laid down by the *M-Beauftragte der Dienststelle* in Berlin, which transmitted instructions to the various subsections of the office in Paris, the affairs of the Paris branch were dominated by von Behr, who commandeered confiscated art on Göring's personal behalf. This arrangement was mutually beneficial for both individuals with Von Behr profiting directly from the sale of pictures to Göring. Von Behr received a percentage of the proceeds of an auction of a group of paintings confiscated by the *Dienststelle Westen* in 1943.³⁰

In early 1941 Göring appointed Dr. Bruno Lohse, an official in the Paris *Deinststelle*, as his personal representative. Lohse was provided with documents signed by Göring ordering all German military and civilian units to render assistance to him. Lohse was also charged with the responsibility of organising exhibitions of ERR material

²⁶ J.S.Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*, p. 46, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

²⁷Ibid. p. 46.

²⁸ James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*. p. 7, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

²⁹ James S. Plaut, *Detailed Interrogation Report No. 3, 15 August 1945, Subject: Robert Scholz* (Office of Strategic Services Art Looting Investigation Unit), p.2, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 84a.

³⁰ Ibid. p. 49.

for Göring. During the period between November 1940 to December 1941, the staff at the *Amt Westen* prepared ten private exhibitions of newly acquired collections for Göring in the *Jeu de Paume*.³¹

The routine method by which Göring would acquire pictures began with him informing von Behr, the director the *Amt Westen*, to prepare an exhibition of the most recent acquisitions for him to select from forty-eight hours prior to his arrival in Paris. Dr. Bruno Lohse and Günther Schiedlausky would organise a selection of paintings for Göring to choose from, and then the list of Göring's selection, and an appraisal of the paintings, would either be forwarded to von Behr, or Hofer. Von Behr was present during all of Göring's visits to Paris as the officially appointed representative of the Reichsleiter.³²

Göring appointed an "official appraiser" for the French government in order to give his method of acquisition some semblance of legality. The standard estimates that were provided by Beltrand generally exceeded their market value. The over evaluation of these paintings by Beltrand was devised by Göring to increase their value for future sales and exchanges.³³ Göring thereby ensured he had an unfair advantage when the pictures were re-sold or exchanged. Göring's selection of paintings were then packed into cases at the *Jeu de Paume* and transported to Germany under armed escort in sealed carriages on Göring's train. During the period between 8 February 1941 to 24 November 1942 eight transports departed from Paris to Berlin on the following dates: February 1941, 15 March 1941, 3 May 1941, 15 August 1941, 2 December 1941, 14 March 1942, 15 May 1942 and 24 November 1942.³⁴

Göring made no less than twenty visits to the *Jeu de Paume* in a period of two and a half years and acquired approximately seven hundred paintings for his personal collection. Walter Andreas Hofer, Göring's principal buyer in Paris accompanied him on all but one or two occasions. Hofer encouraged to Göring to acquire French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist pictures because he regarded them as particularly suitable for exchange. The exchanges were always weighed heavily in Göring's favour.

³¹ James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in Franc, 15 August 1945e*. pp. 7- 8, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

³² James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in Franc, 15 August 1945*, pp. 23-24, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

³³ *Ibid.* p. 8.

³⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 6, 23.

The appraisals provided by Beltrand were generally well below the market value. Beltrand evaluated a Fernand Léger, two Braques, two Matisse, one Picasso and Chirico for Fr 80,000. The valuations provided by Beltrand were usually lowered further by Hofer in order to obtain more modern pictures for the purposes of exchange. Hofer lowered Beltrand's appraisal for paintings from the Paul Rosenberg collection from Fr 9,030,000 to Fr 3,795,000.³⁵

Between March 1941 and May 1942 Göring received a large consignment of French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist pictures. Included among these pictures were several Impressionist works artists including Géricault, Ingres, Courbet, Cézanne, Manet, Degas, Monet, Renoir, and Lautrec; Post-Impressionist works by Henri Rousseau; and modern works by a Braque, Matisse, Picasso, Bonnard, Laurencin, and Matisse. The first consignment of pictures was conducted on 3 March 1941. Göring acquired four pictures, including Degas' *Madam Camus at the Piano* and Braque's *Still Life with Grapes and Peaches* from the Alphonse Kann collection, together with Corot's *Mme. Stumpf et sa fille* from the Paul Rosenberg collection, and Picasso's *Women at the Races*, from the Lindon collection.³⁶ Göring acquired twenty-five paintings that had originally been sequestered by the German Embassy, and subsequently passed into the possession of the ERR on 12 July 1941. Twelve of the twenty five pictures belonged to the Levy-Benzion collection, including van Gogh's *Portrait of a Man*, and twelve belonged to the Alphonse Kann collection, including Degas' *Three ballet dancers*.³⁷ A single painting by van Gogh, *Flowers in a Vase* belonged to the Lindon collection.

The Rothschild collections, which had arrived at the *Jeu de Paume* on 5 February 1941 packed in their original "Rothschild" cases, represented Göring's most coveted artworks.³⁸ The ERR received all the works of art confiscated by the Embassy, with the exception of fifty three items from the Rothschild collection which were transported to the Führerbau in Munich.³⁹

³⁵ Theodore Rousseau, Consolidated Interrogation Report 2: The Göring Collection, 15 September 1945, p. 137, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

³⁶ Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland*, 1 December 1945, in attachment titled "Looted Works of Art from Collections of Allied Nationals Discovered in Switzerland", p. 3, the National Archives, (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82, 350/77/02/07.

³⁷ Ibid. p. 1.

³⁸ James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*. p. 24, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

³⁹ S.L. Faison, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 4: Linz: Hitler's Museum and Library*, 15 December 1945. p. 60, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

Hofer made a selection of first rate pictures by van Gogh and Cézanne from the collection of the Rothschild family, and several French nineteenth century pictures from the Seligmann collection. The remaining pictures from the Paul Rosenberg collection, which comprised mostly nineteenth century pictures, were deemed unsuitable for exchange, and left to the ERR.⁴⁰

Göring acquired thirty seven French Impressionist and modern works from the Rothschild and Paul Rosenberg collections on three separate occasions on 14 September 1941, 2 December 1941, and 4 December 1941. In a letter Hofer addressed to Göring on 26 September 1941 he advised him of paintings from the Paul Rosenberg collection which included several pictures of outstanding quality that were particularly suitable for exchange.⁴¹ In September 1941 Hofer also reported several high quality pictures among the collection of Edouard, Alexandrine and James Rothschild deposited in the *Banque de France* and the *Credit Lyonnais*. Of these pictures two had belonged to the Rothschilds' family collections, including Cezanne's *The Mill*, that belonged the M. & Mme. de Rothschild, and van Gogh's *Small Landscape*, that belonged to Mme. Myriam de Rothschild. The remaining thirty five pictures came from the Paul Rosenberg collection, and included Cézanne's *Harlequin*, Corot's *Girl in Red Bodice*, Renoir *Danse a la Campagne*, Pissarro's *Rouen Harbour after a Rainstorm*, and van Gogh's *Self portrait with Bandaged Ear*. On 14 May 1942 Göring acquired Renoir's *Portrait of a Girl*, formerly belonging to the Lindon collection, Picasso's *Apple*, which belonged to the Paul Rosenberg collection, and Pissarro's *Country Road* from the Bernheim collection.⁴²

In 1942 Scholz, and von Ingram, the business manager for the Paris *Kunststab*, produced a report on the activity of the ERR which brought a number of irregularities in the confiscation procedure to the attention of Rosenberg. Scholz's report acknowledged the existence of tensions between von Behr and members of his staff, describing the conditions under which they were required to work as "chaotic". He also noted that the ideological mission of the ERR was at odds with the practice of confiscation. The report

⁴⁰ Letter Hofer to Göring, dated 26 September 1941 cited in attachments in Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Göring Collection, 15 September 1945*, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

⁴¹ Letter from Hofer to Göring dated 29 September 1941 in attachments in *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Göring Collection, 15 September 1945*, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

⁴² Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland, 10 December 1945*, in attachment titled "Looted Works of Art from Collections of Allied Nationals Discovered in Switzerland", p. 3, the National Archives (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82, 350/77/02/07.

recommended the termination of confiscatory operations, and the implementation of reforms to regulate the affairs of the ERR.⁴³

On 18 June 1942 in response to the recommendations of Scholz's report, Rosenberg informed Göring that he would no longer be allowed to commandeer confiscated art for his personal use. Rosenberg informed Göring that he would be allowed to retain the professional art historians attached to the *ERR* for consultation and advice only. Von Behr continued to dominate the affairs of the Paris office because Scholz had remained in Berlin where he directed policy from the central office of the *Amt Rosenberg*. Since von Behr's authority stemmed from a different branch of the Rosenberg organization he was able to continue supplying Göring with works of art stored at the ERR repository.⁴⁴ After von Behr's appointment as Director of *Dienststelle Westen* Göring's acquisition of pictures reduced.⁴⁵ Scholz assumed responsibility for the art staff, and von Ingram assumed control over its business administration. Göring's acquisitions ground to a halt after von Behr's dismissal as head of the art staff in January 1943.

Until as late as 1942 a substantial collection of modern art confiscated in France remained in storage in the *Jeu de Paume* and the *Louvre* pending the decision on their fate. The fate of modern works of art belonging to France's national museums was decided upon on 19 July 1943. A special committee convened a meeting in the *Louvre* to decide the fate of paintings branded as "degenerate". The committee deemed any work with a Jewish or Bolshevik bias as "degenerate", and these were set to one side. The Impressionist artists were given a reprieve after Dr. Borchers, an art adviser attached to the ERR, reported that these were classified as "moderately degenerate" and "saleable". Pieces by Bonnard, Vuillard, Matisse, Braque, and Dufy were also set aside for auction in France.⁴⁶

On 27 July 1943 the remnants of the collection of "degenerate art" stored in the *Louvre* which had been deemed unsaleable were incinerated in the grounds behind the

⁴³ James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*. p. 50, the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82.

⁴⁴ James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*. p. 4, the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* p. 11.

⁴⁶ Alan E. Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reich hampers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), p. 145.

Jeu de Paume. The canvasses were stripped from their picture frames before being heaped into the pyre. Between 500 to 600 paintings that belonged to private collections were burned. Included among these were pieces by Miró, Picabia, Valadon, Klee, Ernst, Masson, Léger, Picasso, Kisling, La Fresnaye and Mané-Katz. In August 1944 the remaining collection of Impressionist works that escaped destruction were cleared from the *Jeu de Paume*.⁴⁷

During the German retreat eastwards from France, the remaining artworks were transported to the Slovakian Protectorate. The explanation why these pictures were removed to the Slovakian Protectorate, instead of Germany remains uncertain. In his book entitled *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, Petropoulos stated that "...when forced to retreat eastward from France, they failed to take many modern works for fear of 'contaminating' the Reich (the pragmatic looters did ship degenerate art to the Slovakian protectorate)".⁴⁸ Given the fact that German museums and officials had purchased works of "degenerate art" in 1941 and early 1942, after the issuance of an edict against the transportation of "degenerate art" had come into effect, it is unlikely that there is any substance to Petropoulos's claim. The decision to transport the remaining collection of degenerate art to the Slovakian protectorate, and not the Reich, was more than likely influenced by the fact that the best examples of "degenerate art" had already been sold. The remnants were of insignificant value to remove to the Reich. The enormous quantities of art that were looted by the Germans during the war meant priority was given to removing only the most valuable art objects.

On 1 August 1944 148 crates containing Impressionist works which had been set aside from being destroyed were transported from the *Jeu De Paume* to the railway station, near the gasworks of Aubervilliers, northwest of Paris, where they awaited clearance. The registration numbers of the freightcars were transmitted to French railroad officials by Rose Valland, the museum's curator, The departure of the train-load of art was delayed for 48 hours in Le Bourget by railroad officials. Then as General Leclerc's army advanced to Paris the train was delayed for second time in Aulnay for 18 hours. By sheer coincidence a French company, commanded by the son of Paul Rosenberg, was dispatched by Leclerc to seize the train-load shortly before its departure

⁴⁷ Michael Gibson, "How a timid curator with a deadpan expression outwitted the Nazis", *ARTnews*, vol. 80, June 1981, p. 111.

⁴⁸ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 135.

from Aulnay. When the carriage was opened Paul Rosenberg discovered that it contained several paintings belonging to his father's collection.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Michael Gibson, "How a timid curator with a deadpan expression outwitted the Nazis", *ARTnews*, vol. 80, June 1981, p. 111.

The Purchase of French Impressionist and Modern art by German Museums and Officials, 1941-1943.

The ERR conducted a number of sales of "degenerate art" for Göring in the period between 1941-1943. The names of prominent figures in the Parisian art trade appear on the list. Durand-Ruel, Martin Fabiani, and the Charpentier Gallery appear in an appendix to the *Schenker Report*. The involvement of French dealers confirms the abundance of dealers willing to derive profits from "degenerate art" through their contacts with German officials [see appendices].⁵⁰

The decision by German officials and museums to purchase works by proscribed artists after having sustained heavy losses themselves indicates a willingness on their part to take advantage of the favourable exchange rate. The advantage of the *Reichskassenscheine* over the franc allowed German officials and museums, to purchase French Impressionist, Post-Impressionist and modern art very inexpensively. These pictures were acquired for exceedingly cheap prices in comparison to the prices which works by same school, and of similar quality fetched at the Lange auction in Berlin in September 1941.⁵¹

The sustained demand for French nineteenth century pictures emerges in a letter addressed to Dr. Fritz Muthmann of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum*, Krefeld. The letter signed by Hermann Lange's secretary, dated 21 July 1942 informs Dr. Muthmann that Lange had seen a painting by Sebastian Piombo in Munich, but that it is reserved for Göring and commands an unaffordable price RM 300,000. Lange had the idea for *Verseidag* (presumably the name of his company) to donate a nineteenth century work, maybe a Maillol, Degas or Utrillo. The letter then states that he is unable to judge whether or at what price a Manet, a van Gogh or a Cézanne might be acquired, but he would like to be kept informed by Muthmann about the Paris and Amsterdam markets [see appendices].⁵²

⁵⁰ Hector Feliciano, *The Lost Museum: The Nazi Conspiracy to Steal the World's Greatest Works of Art*, (New York: Basic Books, 1997 p. 150.

⁵¹ *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Goering Collection, 15 September 1945*, p. 164, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.p. 164.

⁵² Letter addressed to Dr. Muthmann signed by Hermann Lange's Secretary, dated 21 July 1942. A photocopy of the original letter from the museum's archives was provided to me courtesy of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum*, Krefeld Museum, by the museum's curator, Dr. Sabine Röder. For the purposes of my research this letter, and other letters, supplied by Dr. Roder have been

The issuance of an edict against the importation of “degenerate art” to the Reich failed to deter German museums and officials from purchasing Impressionist and Post Impressionist art. Impressionism and Post-Impressionism art were not regarded the worst examples of “degenerate art” – a reason which contributed to their appeal among German museums and officials. This is evinced in the case of Fredrich Welz, the owner of the *Galerie Welz* in Salzburg. Welz received a commission from the *Gauleiter und Reichsstatthalter* of Salzburg to purchase furnishings for the *Schloss Klessheim* in Paris. Welz’s selection of furniture, sculpture and paintings supplied by *the Galerie des Beaux-Arts* included pictures by Corot, Monet, Pissaro, Poussin, Seurat, and Signac, which had originally been confiscated from Jewish-owned collections by the ERR. The Galerie Welz in Salzburg also procured a landscape painting by Renoir for Baldur von Schirach, the *Gaullier and Reichsstatthalter* in Vienna. Schirach was well known for his penchant for “degenerate” paintings. He acquired van Gogh’s *Poppies in the Field* with the assistance of the Dienststelle Mühlmann and the director of the Kröller-Müller Museum, Dr. van Deventer, and was also responsible for arranging the purchase of a work by Gustav Klimt and Lovis Corinth by the Wiener Galerie in Austria.⁵³

German banker, Philipp Frank, Wolfgang Krüger, a Berlin publisher, and a Munich collector named Maria Gillhausen were among collectors of Impressionist and Post Impressionist art in Germany. Philipp Frank, the Director of the *Deutsche Bank* in Mannheim purchased a water color by Cézanne, entitled *Pine Trees and Rocks* for Fr 28,000, and a pastel by Pissarro entitled *Spring at Fragny* for Fr 16,000 on 13 February 1941. He later bought a chalk drawing by Degas entitled *Dancer* from Gerard for Fr 55,000 on 18 February 1941. Frau Gillhausen purchased Renoir’s *Cariatides* for Fr 360,000 on 11 March 1941. She also bought Sisley’s *Barges near Rouen* for Fr 200,000 on 31 January 1941, and Vuillard’s *Flower Vase* for Fr 50,000. Wolfgang Krüger Verlag purchased Pissarro’s *Haymakers* for Fr 140,000; Renoir’s *Walk in the Wood* for Fr 160,000; and Vlaminck’s *Snow and Landscape* for Fr 12,000 and Fr 6,000. Kruger Lange also purchased Pissarro’s *Dieppe Cathedral* for Fr 150,000; Renoir’s *Figure Piece*

translated from English to German by Marc Burri. The original untranslated copies appear in the appendices.

⁵³ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 223.

for Fr 160,000; and Corot's *Trees by the River* for Fr 70,000 in a deal conducted in October 1941.⁵⁴

The German art dealer Aloys Miedl, known for selling works to both Hitler and Göring, purchased van Gogh's *Self Portrait with a Bandaged Ear*, Cézanne's *Young Man with a Red Waistcoat*, *Harlequin* and *Still Life*, which had been confiscated from the Paul Rosenberg Collection and acquired by Göring on 14 September 1941, 2 December 1941, and 4 December 1941, together with Cézanne's *The Mill* which had been confiscated from the Rothschild Collection and acquired by Göring on 4 December 1941. Miedl acquired these pictures from Göring for RM 750,000.⁵⁵

The discovery that state galleries were purchasing French Impressionist paintings after the issuance of an edict that forbade the importation of "degenerate art" to the Reich, indicates that the commercial incentive outweighed the risk factor. Several very well known dealers, such as Etienne Bignou, Raphaël Gérard, Martin Fabiani, Gustav Rochlitz, are cited in the index of Paris Art dealers and individuals responsible for the sale of art German museums [see appendices].⁵⁶

The *Folkwang Museum* in Essen had lost 1,273 pieces from its collection during the *entartete Kunst Aktion*, but chose to expand its collection of nineteenth century art in the period spanning from January to May 1941. The museum purchased forty four works originally confiscated from French collections over a period of five months. Included among these were Courbet's *The Cliffs at Étretat after a Storm*, acquired from the Parisian dealer, André Schoeller for Fr 350,000, and works by Boudin, Corot, Daubigny, Daumier, Delacroix, Gericault, Rousseau, and Sisley. Etienne Bignou, Schoeller, Fabini, Raphaël Gérard and Alice Maneau Fabinni sold several confiscated works of art to the *Folkwang Museum* in Essen.⁵⁷

An insight into the museum's negotiations is provided in a letter from a regional administrative office in Düsseldorf to a Dr. Köhn in the *Folkwang Museum* in Essen,

⁵⁴ Cecil Gould, *The Schencker Papers, Part 2. "Purchases of Works of Art in France during the Occupation by and on the Behalf of German dealers and Officials"*, pp. 2, 5-6, 8, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C), record group 239, 81.

⁵⁵ Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Goering Collection, 15 September 1945*. pp. 149-150.

⁵⁶ Cecil Gould, *The Schencker Papers, Part 1. "Accessions to German museums and galleries during the Occupation of France"*, p. 14, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C), record group 239, 81.

dated 21 May 1942. The letter states that the city of Krefeld is prepared to buy the picture in Paris and to pay for it on the condition that the city of Essen makes a contribution of RM 25,000, payable direct to Krefeld. It seems that Essen had released a Corot valued at RM 50,000. The letter states that the opportunity seemed favourable because no transfer formalities would be involved, but a decision would need to be made soon because Bignou was holding it only until 30 June 1942. A copy of the letter was also sent to Dr. Muthmann in Krefeld [see appendices].⁵⁸

The *Städtische Kunstsammlungen* in Dusseldorf, which had the lost 900 artworks from its collection during the *entartete Kunst Aktion* in 1937, purchased sixty eight paintings in 1941, including a Chardin, a Courbet, Poussin, Renoir, and a Sisley. The *Rheinisches Landesmuseum und Provinzialdenkmalamt* in Bonn purchased several pictures, including works by Boudin, Corot, Daubigny, Delacroix, Gericault, and Renoir up until as late as 1943. Several smaller purchases were made by other German museums including the *Städtisches Museum für Kunst und Kunstgewerbe* in Wuppertal-Elberfeld, which purchased pieces by Boudin, Delacroix, Renoir, and Rousseau; and the *Kunsthalle* in Karlsruhe, which purchased a landscape by Sisley.⁵⁹

The *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* in Krefeld, which suffered minimal losses with ninety eight art works confiscated in 1937, also acquired several French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist pictures, including a Boudin, a Courbet, a Delacroix, a Gauguin, a Monet, and two pictures by Renoir and Sisley in 1941.⁶⁰ Gustav Rochlitz, one of the dealers authorised to sell "degenerate art", arranged the sale of Gauguin's *Flower Vase* to the Krefeld Museum for Fr 300,000 in 1941. The delivery of a transport of new acquisitions on 25 April 1942 is noted in a letter addressed to the director of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* from the insurance company *Provinzial-Feuerversicherungs-Anstalt*,

⁵⁷ Cecil Gould, *The Schencker Papers, Part 1. "Accessions to German museums and galleries during the Occupation of France"*, pp. 7-9, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C), record group 239, 81.

⁵⁸ Letter to a Dr. Köhn in the *Folkwang Museum* in Essen from a regional administrative office in Düsseldorf, dated 21 May 1942. A copy of the original letter was supplied from the archives of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* by the museum's curator, Dr. Sabine Röder. This letter was translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri. The original untranslated letter appears in the appendices.

⁵⁹ Cecil Gould, *The Schencker Papers, Part 1. "Accessions to German museums and galleries during the Occupation of France"*, pp. 2, 4-7, 13, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C), record group 239, 81.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* p. 14.

dated 17 April 1942 [see appendix].⁶¹ A certificate issued in France by the commander of the armed forces dated 27 May 1942 certifies that Dr. Fritz Muthmann had acquired a painting by Eugene Boudin titled *Harbour in Antwerp* on behalf of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum*. It furthermore gives permission for its export from France, and its import into Germany is to be free of any kind of tax or customs duty [see appendices].⁶²

In a letter dated 12 May 1999, Dr. Sabine Röder, the curator of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum*, insists that the museum welcomed the opportunity to replenish its depleted collections:

I can assure you, that there isn't the slightest indication that Impressionist paintings were regarded as 'degenerate', or that anyone would see a problem in buying them – at least not here in the region. In fact they seem to have a position kind of 'in-between'. Several museum directors from the Rhineland and even Nazi-politicians of the city objected to the 'Aktion entartete Kunst' and even tried to get back the paintings being confiscated – without success of course. The more they were fascinated by the sudden possibility to purchase at least 19. And early 20. Century-French art for their robbed collections.⁶³

There was a lack of a clear guideline that defined what constituted "degenerate art". The fact that the commission for the disposal of "degenerate art" broadened the definition of the *entartete Kunst Aktion* to include works by French Impressionist artists [see appendices], yet later German museums were able to re-purchase works by the same artists, illustrates this. Furthermore, German museums made no efforts to conceal their purchase of works by Impressionist and Post Impressionist artists, whom the régime had branded as "degenerate". Dr. Röder's letter indicates that there was a lack of secrecy surrounding the acquisition of these pictures:

They were transported together with other works of art by diverse companies and even by the military. They were not treated different to any other work of art, which had been bought at the same time.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Letter to the director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Museum from Provinzial-Feuerversicherungs-Anstalt, dated 17 April 1942. A copy of the original letter was supplied from the archives of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* by the museum's curator, Dr. Sabine Röder. This letter was translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri. The original untranslated letter appears in the appendices.

⁶² Certificate issued by the Commander of the Armed Forces in France, dated 27 May 1942. A copy of the original letter was supplied from the archives of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* by the museum's curator, Dr. Sabine Röder. This letter was translated for my research from German to English by Marc Burri. The original untranslated letter appears in the appendices.

⁶³ Dr. Sabine Röder, curator at the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum*, cited in letter to Chiew-Lee Khut, May 12, 1999. A copy of this letter appears in the appendices.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

The fact that German museums did not experience any difficulties acquiring French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art for their collections, suggests that the curators responsible for the purchase of these pictures had not complied with the edict against the transportation of "degenerate art" to the Reich. It is possible that they failed to do so, because the edict was poorly enforced. The decision by German museums to purchase works by proscribed artists, after having already sustained heavy losses during the *entartete Kunst Aktion* indicates a renewed confidence that French Impressionist art no longer continued to be regarded as "degenerate", and thereby was not subject to the edict.⁶⁵

It appears that the main obstacles for the importation of "degenerate art" to Germany were not put in place by German authorities, but by French customs authorities. The French customs authorities declared that the values stated for the works of art were too low, and refused to grant export licenses without documentation that the works of art in question were purchased for the prices stated. The export licenses were eventually obtained after being brought before the German military command in France.⁶⁶ The fact that export licenses were obtained from the highest military authority indicates that because Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art occupied a position in-between, it was not difficult to obtain an export license.

The contrast between confiscation in practice and in theory manifested itself most obviously in anomalies such as these. This enterprise was also encouraged lacklustre enforcement of the edict against the transportation of "degenerate art" to the Reich by the German authorities. The laxity of the German authorities in enforcing the edict is also apparent from the fact that Adolf Wüster, a cultural attaché of the German Embassy in Paris, conducted the purchase pictures on behalf of the Düsseldorf and Krefeld museums. Another example is Gustav Rochlitz, one of four dealer commissioned by the Reich government to sell the stockpile of "degenerate art". Rochlitz was responsible for arranging the sales of Gauguin's, *Flower Vase* to the Krefeld Museum for Fr 300,000. He would have known that Gauguin was regarded as "degenerate" since he was a member of the Committee for the Disposal of Degenerate Art. Rochlitz's decision

⁶⁵ Dr. Sabine Röder, curator at the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum*, cited in letter to Chiew-Lee Khut, May 12, 1999. A copy of this letter appears in the appendices.

⁶⁶ Cecil Gould, *The Schencker Papers, Part 2. "Purchases of Works of Art in France during the Occupation by and on the Behalf of German dealers and Officials"*, pp. 2-3 the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, 81.

to ignore the edict and broker a deal with the *Krefeld Museum* illustrates the poor enforcement of the edict.

Chapter 4 - Exchanges of "Degenerate Art" Conducted Under the Auspices of the ERR, 1941-1943.

This chapter examines the exchanges of "degenerate art" conducted under the auspices of the ERR in France, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Italy. The first part of this chapter deals exclusively with the *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg* (ERR) exchanges conducted in Paris, whilst the second half of this chapter examines the exchanges which took place in Switzerland and Italy. This chapter is based primarily on both the *Consolidated Interrogation Reports* and *Detailed Interrogation Reports* compiled by the United States Office of Strategic Services. The investigations performed by Douglas Cooper for the Monuments Fine Arts and Archives Branch of the Office of Strategic Services also constitutes a major source of primary source material in this chapter.¹

The method of exchange became common place following the issuance of an edict against the importation of "degenerate art" to the German Reich in 1941. However the introduction of a ban on the importation of "degenerate art" to Germany failed to impact upon the demand for such artists. The exchanges conducted under the auspices of the ERR provide evidence that the ideological mission of the ERR was of secondary importance to the commercial exploitation of the confiscated art. Furthermore the profits which Göring, Ribbentrop and Bormann derived from the exchanges suggests that their investment yielded an excellent return.

A considerable quantity of Impressionist and modern pictures appeared on the Parisian art market after the German high command in France authorised the ERR to sequester from Jewish art collections on September 17, 1940.² The idea to dispose of confiscated Impressionist and modern paintings through exchange was conceived by von Behr as a means to enlarge the Göring collection. Von Behr had originally proposed a plan to Gerhard Ukital, the chief of the ERR in Berlin, and Dr. Gritzbach, Göring's civilian Chief of Staff, to smuggle Impressionist and modern

¹ James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75. Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Goering Collection, 15 September 1945*, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75. James S. Plaut., *Detailed Interrogation Report No. 4., Subject: Gustav Rochlitz, 15 August 1945*, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 84a. Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland, 10 December 1945*, the National Archives (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82.

² James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*. p. 3, the National Archives (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

paintings to Portugal, which he planned to barter for uncut diamonds. The plan was abandoned in favour of the method of exchange.³

Göring acquired a considerable quantity of French nineteenth century pictures from the ERR repository in September 1941. He acquired these for the express purposes of exchange. Between 1941-1943 these acquisitions became the subject of exchanges. The use of exchanges became Göring's preferred method of acquisition, since it allowed him to acquire pictures without incurring any expense. Hofer encouraged Göring to acquire French nineteenth century pictures because a substantial profit margin could be made from their re-sale or exchange, due to his insistence upon low appraisals.⁴

Twenty eight formal exchanges of confiscated art were conducted by von Behr, the Deputy Director of *Amt Westen* in Paris between February 1941 and November 1943. Of these exchanges, eighteen were conducted on the behalf of Göring, seven for Hitler, two for Ribbentrop, and one for Bormann. The exchanges were arranged from the *Amt Westen* headquarters in Paris, with Rosenberg's Berlin office providing perfunctory approval of the exchanges of mostly French Impressionist and modernist paintings for old masters and German nineteenth century paintings.⁵

The exchanges conducted by the ERR, with the exception of those arranged by von Behr were all made with independent art dealers, with no official connection to the ERR. Eighteen of the twenty-eight exchanges were arranged through Gustav Rochlitz. Adolf Wüster was involved in two, as was Max Stöcklin, and Arthur Pfannsteil. The *Galerie Neupert* of Zurich was involved in a single exchange that it had conducted on the behalf of the art dealer Alfred Boedecker of Frankfurt. A single exchange was also arranged with Dr. Alexander von Frey of Lucerne, and the *Galerie Almas-Dietrich* of Munich, and the Amsterdam dealer Jan Dik.⁶ The majority of exchanges were arranged through the German art dealer, Gustav Rochlitz.

³ James S. Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1: Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, 15 August 1945*, p. 26, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 84a. Bruno Lohse attributes the idea to smuggle contemporary paintings into Portugal and exchange them for uncut diamonds to von Behr, who he says, originally approached Gerhard Ukital and Dr. Grizbach with the plan.

⁴ Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Goering Collection, 15 September 1945*, p. 176, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

⁵ James Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg, 15 August 1945*, p.25, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

⁶ Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland, 10 December 1945*, in attachment titled "Looted Works of Art in Switzerland: German Methods of Acquisition", p.2, the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82.

Rochlitz secured these contracts through his extensive contacts in the art market in France, Germany and Switzerland.

The exchanges conducted by the ERR in Paris between 1941-1943 reveal the blatant commercial exploitation of artworks confiscated by the Reich. The demand for French Impressionist and modern works continued to thrive despite the fact that these works of art were branded as "degenerate" by the National Socialists. Their status as "degenerate art" was obviously mitigated by the fact that they were also highly saleable. The sustained demand among German dealers for works by degenerate artists is evident, especially in the case of Gustav Rochlitz.

Rochlitz's first business association was formed in 1925 with the *Galerie Weder* in Lucerne. Rochlitz later entered into a partnership with Dr. Stoeri in Zurich, and an association with the *Galerie van Diemen* in Berlin, before establishing the *Muralto Galerie* in Zurich in 1924. His association with the *Galerie Weder* ended in 1928, followed by the failure of his venture with Stoeri in 1931. In 1932 the Swiss authorities refused Rochlitz permission to conduct business in Switzerland on the grounds of his German citizenship. Rochlitz established an art dealership in Paris under the name of his bookkeeper, Paul Weil, in 1932. His gallery, which was located in the *Cite Bergere* in Montmartre, moved to the rue de Rivoli in 1936. Following the declaration of war, Rochlitz was interned at Colombes by the French authorities. He later secured his release on the grounds of his daughter's French citizenship. He was interned for the second time at Bassens in April 1940, and was released by the *NSDAP Auslands Organisation* on 20 June 1940 after the fall of Paris. After his release from Bassens, Rochlitz remained in Paris but did not re-open his business on the rue de Rivoli. Rochlitz secured a *laissez-passer* authorising unlimited travel between Occupied and Unoccupied France with the assistance of, Dr. Bruno Lohse, who acted as an intermediary in a series of exchanges conducted by the ERR in Göring's behalf.⁷

According to a report prepared by Lieutenant James S. Plaut, the director of the Office of Strategic Services, Art Looting Investigation Unit, Rochlitz benefited from the commercial exploitation of "degenerate art", receiving paintings in the ratio of ten for one in several instances:

Every exchange in which Rochlitz was involved weighed heavily (by international art market standards) in his favour. In several instances, he received paintings in the ratio of ten for one and,

⁷ James S. Plaut., *Detailed Interrogation Report No. 4., Subject: Gustav Rochlitz*, 15 August 1945, pp. 1-4, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 84a.

of those received, many were more valuable individually than the single object which he relinquished...The group of pictures which came into his hands included a number of celebrated masterpieces of French paintings of the 19th century, works which would command impressive prices in the open market, yet which he obtained in return for questionable "old masters" of inferior quality... simply because National Socialist propaganda had tagged all modern French painting as "unwanted degenerate art".⁸

Rochlitz made ten trips between Paris and the French Riviera from 1941 to 1943 to secure pictures for Göring, who had first choice of works of art which he acquired in Unoccupied France. Rochlitz received eighty-two pictures from the eighteen exchanges that he conducted with various Reich officials.⁹ Rochlitz stated that he conducted negotiations with the ERR through Lohse, and met Hofer on only two occasions. Of these eighteen exchanges conducted by the ERR with Rochlitz, twelve were for Göring. The first exchange which the ERR conducted was concluded on 3 March 1941. During a visit to the *Jeu de Paume*, Rochlitz made a selection of eleven pictures from a group of confiscated paintings assembled at *the Jeu de Paume* by Scholz, Lohse, Schiedlausky and Kuntze. The ERR received Titian's *Portrait of a Man*, and a still life by the Dutch painter Jan Weenix, in exchange for eleven paintings by Cézanne, Corot and Degas, together with eight paintings by Renoir, Sisley, Picasso, Matisse and Braque from the Kann, Rosenberg-Bernstein, Lindenbaum, and Georges Bernheim collections. The paintings which were the subject of this exchange were confiscated by the ERR in mid-November, 1940.¹⁰

The exchange seems to have been inspired by the edict against the transportation of "degenerate art" to Germany. Gerhard Ukital, the chief of the ERR in the occupied territories, approved the exchange of the Titian for a selection of pictures which "according to our German conception, are out of the question for transfer to Germany" in February 18, 1941. A reference by Ukital is also made to the difficulty in obtaining foreign currency, and how the exchange presented "an opportunity to acquire for the German Reich an important painting without spending foreign currency."¹¹

The ERR conducted a second exchange for Göring's with Rochlitz on 11 March 1941. The ERR received a German sixteenth century painting, a Flemish

⁸ James S. Plaut., *Detailed Interrogation Report No. 4., Subject: Gustav Rochlitz*, 15 August 1945, p. 11, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 84a.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 27-28.

¹¹ *Ibid.* This particular letter from Ukital to Rosenberg was dated 18 February 1941, and appears in the attachments of report.

painting attributed to Janssens, and a portrait by Franz Kreuger in exchange for Renoir's *Reclining Nude* valued at Fr 200,000, and Matisse's *Oriental Woman* valued at Fr 80,000. Göring had originally wished to acquire the Kreuger through exchange after receiving photographs of the pictures in Berlin, but decided not to take it when he saw it in Paris. The Kreuger was later placed at the disposal of the Reichschancellery. Rochlitz owned a one hundred percent interest in all three pictures and fared well from the deal, especially considering Hofer had advised Göring not to acquire the Janssens which he disputed as Italian.¹²

Von Behr signed the contract for the third exchange conducted by the ERR for Göring with Rochlitz in Paris on 17 March 1941. In this exchange the ERR acquired Raffaellino del Garbo's *Madonna and Child* and F. Wouter's *The Bath*, for Picasso's *Portrait of a Woman* and two abstractions, a still life by Manet, Sisley's *River Scene*, Boudin's *Seascape* and Pissaro's *Tuileries Gardens*.¹³

On 7 April 1941, the ERR conducted a fourth exchange for Göring with Rochlitz. Rochlitz had originally offered two paintings by Von Os to Scholz for the Halle Museum, but was unable to purchase them because of a shortage of foreign currency, and decided to acquire them through the method of exchange. The ERR received Von Os' *Flower Still Life*, in exchange for Cézanne's *Bathers* valued at Fr 100,000, and Renoir's *Head of a Girl* valued at Fr 50,000. The von Os paintings were later used in exchange for a Vermeer conducted with the art dealer Alois Miedl.¹⁴

A fifth exchange was finalised by the ERR for Göring with Rochlitz in Paris on 5 May 1941. The ERR received the School of Fontainebleau's *Dianna* in exchange for Monet's *Street Scene with Banners* and 3 paintings by Matisse, *Landscape*, *Interior* and *Figures at a Table*.¹⁵

On 9 July 1941 Rochlitz acquired a large consignment of confiscated French Impressionist pictures. Rochlitz received eighteen pictures in exchange for a sixteenth century North Italian painting *Portrait of Lavinia*. The eighteen pictures that were the subject of this exchange were listed as the following. First appeared Degas' *Three Dancers*, and *Woman with Parasol*. Manet's *Studio Scene* and Renoir's *Two Nudes* and *Seated Nude* are also listed. Boudin's *The Beach at Trouville* and Cézanne's *Flower Piece* appear listed along with Toulouse Lautrec's *Cafe Scene*.

¹²James Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg*, 15 August 1945, p.29, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

¹³ *Ibid.* p. 30.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 32.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 32.

There are also Sisley's *Spring Landscape*, and *River Scene* and Morisot's *Déjeuner al Fresco*. Monet's *Children on a Staircase with Sunflowers*, Utrillo's *Monmarte*, Bonnard's *Still Life*, Signac's *Mont St. Michel*, and Matisse's *Seated Girl* and Braque's *Still Life* feature in this change. Most interesting of all is the inclusion of Picasso's *Struggle of the Centaurs*. Rochlitz's acquisition of the Picasso reveals that Rochlitz must have remained confident buyers could be found, even for modern art which had been labelled "degenerate" by the Nazis.¹⁶

The ERR conducted a seventh exchange for Göring with Rochlitz in Paris on 3 December 1941. The ERR received Jan Breughel's *The Harbor of Antwerp* in exchange for four companion figure pieces by Matisse from the Rosenberg-Bernstein Collection. Then Rochlitz acquired Matisse's *Woman at a Piano* and *Woman at a Table* both from the Rosenberg-Bernstein collection that were collectively valued at Fr 10,000, in exchange for Von der Neck's *Female Nude with Children* on 10 December 1941. On 9 February 1942 Rochlitz acquired seven pictures through an exchange, including two paintings by Braque, a Chiroco and Picasso's *Still Life*, and Matisse's *View Through a Window* and *Still Life* in exchange for Leger's *Knight in Armour*.¹⁷

Rochlitz acquired a Gauguin and two paintings by Pissarro in exchange for Roelant Savery's *Noah's Ark* as part of an exchange finalised on 25 February 1942. The ERR conducted an exchange for Göring with Rochlitz in Paris on 10 March 1942. The ERR received a Florentine sixteenth century painting in exchange for Matisse's *Woman in a Red Coat* and *Woman with Red Hair*, Modigliani's *Portrait of a Woman*, and Renoir's *Portrait of a Girl*.¹⁸

The ERR conducted a final exchange for Göring with Rochlitz on 27 November 1942. The ERR received Matisse's *Woman in Blue and Yellow with Lute*, *Still Life with Tankard* and Utrillo's *Village Street* and *Rue Froideveaux* for Miereveld's *Dutch Girl*, and Luca Giordano's *Joseph the Chaste*.¹⁹

Alexander von Frey, a Hungarian national, and resident in Switzerland, participated in a single exchange with the ERR. On one of his visits to Paris, von Frey was introduced to Dr. Lohse, second in command of the ERR by a German agent named Dr. Buss. Von Frey made a selection of pictures from the ERR depot

¹⁶ James Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg*, 15 August 1945, p. 33-34, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 35.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 37.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* p.29.

and in May 1942 concluded a deal with the assistance of Lohse. The contract was drawn up by von Behr and was signed on 14 May 1942. Von Frey received Renoir's *Portrait of a Girl* from the Lindon collection, Picasso's *Apple* from the Paul Rosenberg Collection and Pissarro's *Country Road* from the Bernheim collection, which had been sequestered by the ERR in 1940/41.²⁰ Von Frey arranged with a friend in the diplomatic service to smuggle the three pictures into Switzerland through the diplomatic bag, where he arranged their sale. The Picasso was sold to a Hungarian dealer, and the Pissarro was sold to Christophe Bernoulli who subsequently sold the picture to the Oerlikon munitions manufacturer, Emil Bührle.²¹ Von Behr conducted an indirect exchange with Rochlitz by on 24 July 1942. On this occasion von Behr was acting on Göring's behalf. The contract for this exchange was drawn up in von Behr's name and not the ERR. The ERR received a School of Fontainebleau oil painting *The Three Graces*, in exchange for Gauguin's *Crucifixion*, and Matisse's *Woman Wearing a Turban and Flowered Blouse, Holding a Fan and Woman in Turkish Dress, Wearing Green Trousers and Embroidered Jacket Seated on Carpet*.²²

The ERR conducted an exchange for Göring with the art dealer Arthur Pfannstiel, a German citizen. Pfannstiel resided in Paris and was employed by ERR as Confidential Assistant. He enjoyed a close relationship with von Behr and through his contacts in the ERR secured several paintings. He provided von Behr with names and addresses of Parisian art dealers and collectors, and his knowledge of the art market in Paris made him indispensable to von Behr. He remained in the ERR through 1941, and accepted a position in the *Sicherheitsdienst*. Pfannstiel undertook two exchanges with the ERR.²³

The ERR conducted an exchange for Göring with Pfannstiel in Paris on March 17, 1941. The ERR received Cornelis Bega's *Farmers Gambling* in exchange for Sisley's *Winter Landscape* and Laurencin's *Girl with a Guitar*.²⁴ An informal exchange was conducted by von Behr for the ERR with Pfannstiel in Paris on March/April 1941. The ERR received a French fifteenth century portrait, valued at Fr

²⁰ Douglas Cooper, *Report to Mission to Switzerland*, in enclosure dated January 15, 1946, from the American Legation, Bern, p. 6, the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82.

²¹ *Ibid.* p. 7.

²² James Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg*, 15 August 1945, p. 40, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

²³ *Ibid.* p. 54.

²⁴ *Ibid.* p. 31.

50,000, in exchange for Degas' *Portrait of a Woman* valued at Fr 100,000.²⁵ Bruno Lohse stated that the deal was conducted on von Behr's personal initiative, and neither Hofer nor Göring was interested in acquiring the picture.²⁶

The ERR conducted a number of exchanges with Rochlitz for the *Reichschancellery*. The first of these was conducted on 26 March 1941. The ERR received Barend Graat's *Aristocratic Family Group*, in exchange for a landscape by Gauguin valued at Fr 50,000.²⁷ The ERR conducted a second exchange for the *Reichschancellery* with Rochlitz on 21 May 1942. The ERR acquired Van Schooten's *Still Life* and Pieter Klaes' *Still Life* in the exchange. The ERR gave Rochlitz three paintings by Matisse, including *Seated Woman in a Blue Dress*, *Seated Woman in a White Blouse*, *Reclining Woman with Still Life Flowers and Fruit* and Corot's *Wooded Landscape*, which had been confiscated from the Rosenberg collection.²⁸

A third exchange was conducted by the ERR for the *Reichschancellery* with Rochlitz on 16 June 1942. The ERR received an Italian fifteenth century painting *Courtiers and Workmen Building a Bridge* in exchange for Renoir's *Girl Reading in Front of a Bunch of Flowers* from the Paul Rosenberg collection. The ERR conducted a final exchange with Rochlitz on 31 October 1942. It is not precisely clear for whom this deal was undertaken. Lohse, who acted as an intermediary for Göring, believes that this exchange was conducted for the *Reichschancellery* and not Göring. The ERR received Jansens Elinga's *Still Life* in exchange for Pissarro's *View of Paris*.²⁹

The ERR conducted one exchange on the behalf of the *Reichschancellery* with the *Galerie Almas Deitrich* in Munich on 28 October 1942. The ERR received two sixteenth century Franco-Portugese panels in exchange for Pissarro's *Harbour of Honfleur in the Rain* originally from the Rosenberg-Bernstein Collection, which was appraised for Fr 200,000.³⁰ Lohse and Scholz had proposed the exchange to the Almas-Dietrich Galerie after they learned that Bormann was interested in the acquisition of the two Franco-Portuguese panels for the *Reichschancellery*.³¹ This exchange was negotiated in Munich and the contract was signed personally by von Behr. The fact that this contract was drawn up by von Behr indicates that the ERR did not oppose the exchange of "degenerate art" to dealerships in Germany, but

²⁵ James Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg*, 15 August 1945, p. 31, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

²⁶ *Ibid.* p. 31.

²⁷ *Ibid.* p. 32.

²⁸ *Ibid.* p. 39.

²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 40.

³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 41.

³¹ *Ibid.* p. 41-42.

actively encouraged German dealerships to acquire "degenerate art" because they provided a source of paintings for Göring, Hitler and the *Reichschancellery*. That German dealerships were able to acquire these pictures after the issuance of an edict against the transportation of "degenerate art" to the Reich provides evidence that the acquisition of picture for highly placed German official took precedence over the ideological mission of the ERR.

This is also evident from an exchange was conducted by the ERR for the *Reichschancellery* with Max Stöcklin. Stöcklin, a Paris based art dealer, who travelled to Switzerland on a regular basis to deal in art. He also acquired Matisse's *View Through a Window* which had been sequestered by the ERR from the Paul Rosenberg Collection in 1940/41, by a direct exchange on 15 June 1942.³² The ERR received Winants' *Woodland Landscape with Figures* and Zeeman's *Small Fishing Harbour*.³³ Stöcklin obtained an import license for *View Through a Window*, and commissioned André Martin to arrange the sale of the picture. Martin offered the picture to a Dr. F. Trussel of Berne, who turned down the offer to purchase the picture. He later approached the museum in Berne which asked Martin to produce proof that the picture has been sold by the *Galerie Rosenberg* before the occupation in 1940. Stöcklin promised to deliver the necessary documents to Martin, but was arrested by the Allies before he could obtain these. At the time of Stöcklin's arrest the picture remained in Neupert's possession.³⁴ An exchange was conducted between Stöcklin in Paris for Hitler on 16 November 1943. Hitler instructed Bormann to authorise the exchange of Matisse's *Female Nude in a Yellow Chair* and Bonnard's *Still Life*, and *Coffee Table* for Rudolf Alt's *The Temple of Faustina*.³⁵

Other highly placed German officials such as von Ribbentrop commissioned dealers, such as Adolf Wüster to acquire confiscated French art. Wüster, who was appointed by von Ribbentrop to a position in the German Embassy in Paris, acted as Ribbentrop's principal buyer. The reason why von Ribbentrop commissioned art dealers to purchase art for him is open to speculation. It is probable that their

³² Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland*, 10 December 1945, in attachment titled "Looted Works of Art from Collections of Allied Nationals Discovered in Switzerland", p. 3. The *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82.

³³ James Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg*, 15 August 1945, p. 40, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

³⁴ Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland*, 10 December 1945, in attachment titled "Looted Works of Art in Switzerland: German Methods of Acquisition", p.7, the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82.

³⁵ James Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg*, 15 August 1945, p. 45, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

connections enabled him to acquire art cheaply. However, he may also have been aware that many of the pictures that he wished to purchase had been branded as "degenerate". By arranging several indirect purchases, he may have hoped to avoid openly flouting the edict against the transportation of "degenerate art" to the Reich. The ERR conducted an exchange on the behalf of Göring with Wüster on the behalf of von Ribbentrop on 24 November 1942. Von Ribbentrop had originally wished to purchase a Delacroix on the open market, but arranged for Wüster to purchase a Gobelins tapestry *Maximilian Hunting Scene* and Albert Cuyp's *The Hen Yard* through Hans Wendland. He later used these in a direct exchange with the ERR in which he received Delacroix's *Lion with a Snake* and Courbet's *Forest Scene*.³⁶ Wüster participated in a second exchange for Ribbentrop on 27 November 1942. Von Behr was responsible for the contract for this exchange and acted on the behalf of Göring. The ERR received Jodocus de Momper's *Chapel of the Rocks* in exchange for Utrillo's *Suburban Street Scene*.³⁷

The sustained demand for French Impressionist art continued until 1943. The ERR conducted an exchange for Hitler with the *Galerie Neupert* for Alfred Boedecker, on 27 April 1943. The ERR received Ludwig Knaus's *Painter Seated on Bough of Tree, Surrounded by Children* which was presented to Adolf Hitler as a birthday gift in exchange for Renoir's *Boy with a Butterfly Net*. The deal was arranged after Hitler and Bormann expressed interest in acquiring the Knaus from the Boedecker. An official from the ERR travelled to Basle with the Renoir. The exchange took place at the railway station in Basle on 7 April 1943.³⁸

In January 1944 negotiations commenced for the exchange of a large consignment of modern pictures with the art dealers, Martin Fabiani and Roger Dequoy. Lohse is believed to have attempted to organise a large with Dequoy and Fabiani exchange of modern pictures in January 1944. All of the pictures involved in this exchange had been confiscated by the ERR. The proposed deal involved the exchange of sixty modern pictures for seven paintings of the eighteenth century, a landscape attributed to Hubert Robert Boucher, four paintings by Guardi and two by Pannini. The exchange did not proceed as planned after Scholz received a recommendation that the exchange was disadvantageous to the ERR.³⁹

³⁶ James Plaut, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1: The Activity of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg*, 15 August 1945, p. 42, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

³⁷ *Ibid.* p. 43.

³⁸ *Ibid.* p. 44.

³⁹ James S. Plaut., , *Detailed Interrogation Report No. 6: Bruno Lohse*, 15 August 1945, 15 August 1945, p. 12, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 84a.

The second half of this chapter examines the exchanges of "degenerate art" conducted by the ERR in Switzerland, Holland and Italy. The ERR represented the second major source of Impressionist and modern paintings for the Swiss dealers. Mr. Theodor Fischer of Lucerne, and Dr. Hans Wendland of Geneva handled the majority of looted paintings that were brought into Switzerland. Fischer, as we have seen earlier, represented the most important dealer in Switzerland, and was the only dealer in that country with a large clientele and sufficient capital to conduct business on an international scale. Fischer had earned the important commission from the Reich government to auction "degenerate art" held at the *Galerie Fischer* in Lucerne, Switzerland, in 1939. Art dealers and firms known to have acted as intermediaries for Fischer include the Hugo Engel, and the *Dreyfus Galerie*, *Schmidlin Galerie* and *Tanner Galerie* of Zürich. Fifty-seven of the seventy-six looted French paintings that appeared on "Official list of Looted Works of Art from Collections of Allied Nationals" had been acquired by Fischer through numerous sales and exchanges. Fischer acted as Wendland's principal purchasing and commission agent in Switzerland. This arrangement was advantageous to Wendland since Swiss laws prohibited him from engaging in business because of his German citizenship. Wendland possessed a virtual monopoly the art market in Paris and was able to secure large consignments of confiscated "degenerate art" from the ERR for the purposes of exchange.⁴⁰ Wendland received a thirty-three percent commission on all art works he acquired for Fischer through either sale or exchange.⁴¹ Lieutenant Theodore Rousseau attributed Hofer and Wendland with conceiving the idea to use confiscated French Impressionist and Post Impressionist pictures in exchanges:

The origin of the idea is not clear, but all evidence points to Hofer and Wendland as the men who were chiefly responsible. Hofer in his letters to Goering repeatedly refers to confiscated pictures as desirable for exchange purposes... Wendland appears to be involved directly or indirectly in almost every case.⁴²

Hofer acquired several pictures from Fischer and Wendland through exchange after the issuance of an edict that prohibited the importation of "degenerate

⁴⁰ Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Göring Collection*, 15 September 1945, p. 111 the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

⁴¹ Douglas Cooper, *Report to Mission to Switzerland*, enclosure dated January 15, 1946, from the American Legation, Bern, p. 8, the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82.

⁴² Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Göring Collection*, 15 September 1945, p. 128, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

art" into Germany. Hofer visited Switzerland at regular intervals to purchase art for Göring's personal collection. During a visit to the *Galerie Fischer* in Lucerne, in February/March 1941, Hofer selected six paintings for Göring's private collection, four Cranachs and two other German pictures, valued at S Fr 153,000. Göring had originally promised to pay in Swiss francs, but later decided to exchange confiscated French Impressionists for Old Masters and German nineteenth century paintings in lieu of payment. A series of exchanges were conducted in early 1941 in Lucerne and Berlin between Göring and Fischer. During a visit to Switzerland in May 1941, Hofer met with Fischer and discussed the exchange of French Impressionist pictures. Fischer agreed to arrange a viewing of the pictures. The ERR removed the twenty-five pictures from the *Neuschwanstein* storage facility on 12 July 1941 for the purposes of an exchange. Fischer arrived in Berlin and viewed these pictures and agreed to the exchange in mid July. The twenty-five pictures arrived in Switzerland on 22 October 1941.⁴³

The first official transaction conducted by the ERR with the *Galerie Fischer* recorded in February/March 1941 involved the exchange of Old Masters for French Impressionist pictures. The *Galerie Fischer* received twenty-five French Impressionist paintings that had been confiscated from French and British collections from the ERR repository at *Neuschwanstein*. In exchange the *Galerie Fischer* gave the ERR Lukas Cranach's *Madonna and Child in a Landscape*; *Crucifixion, with a Knight on Horseback as Donor*, *St. Anne and the Virgin* and *Portrait of a Young Man with Beard*; Lukas Cranach the Younger's, *Portrait of a Bearded Kurfürst*; a Frankfurt master and a Nuremberg School picture.⁴⁴ The paintings included works by Corot, Cottet, Courbet, Daubigny, Daumier, Degas, van Gogh, Monnier, Renoir, Rousseau, Rodin and Sisley.⁴⁵ Twelve of the twenty-five pictures exchanged in this deal formerly belonged to the Levy-Benzion Collection, including Degas' *Bathing Woman Standing* and van Gogh's *Portrait of a Man*. The remaining thirteen paintings came from the Kann and Lindenbaum Collections.⁴⁶ The ERR list of 20 October 1942 reveals that all the paintings involved in this exchange had been removed from ERR repository at the *Jeu de Paume* to *Neuschwanstein* on 12 December 1941. The

⁴³ Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland, 10 December 1945*, attachment a, "Looted Works of Art in Switzerland: German Methods of Acquisition, p.3, the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* p. 3.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* p. 1.

⁴⁶ Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Göring Collection, 15 September 1945*, pp. 129-30, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

removal of the pictures to "degenerate art" to Germany took place against the Führer's orders because Lohse regarded this selection of "degenerate" as the best examples to be confiscated to date.

Fischer secured an export permit from the RkdbK through Bümbling, a Darmstadt bookseller with connections in the local branch of the Reich Chmaner for Visual Arts with a letter stating that Göring had authorised the export of these pictures from Germany. The twenty-five French Impressionist and modern paintings belonging to the Levy-Benzion, Alphonse Kann, and Lindon collections were passed by Swiss Customs on 22 October 1941. Karl Haberstock acquired Paris Bordone's *Venus, Mars and Vulcan* and Tintoretto's *Lot and His Daughters* through an exchange arranged on Fischer's behalf through a Darmstadt book seller and art dealer named Carl Bümbling.⁴⁷

In the autumn and early winter of 1942 Fischer received a large consignment of pictures from Hofer in lieu of payment for a selection of German and Dutch masters which he had purchased from Fischer to the value of Frs 250,000. Wendland suggested that he supply Fischer with a selection of French Impressionist pictures in lieu of payment after Hofer defaulted on his payment. Fischer agreed to the arrangement without appraising the value of the pictures and the consignment of pictures arrived in the autumn and early winter of 1942. Fischer subsequently realised the value of the pictures to be greater than he previously believed when Dr. Fritz Nathan, an art expert from St. Gall, appraised the pictures for the Oerlikon munitions manufacturer, Emil Georg Bührle. Several of the paintings came from the collection of Paul Rosenberg and included works by Corot, Degas, Daumier, Ingres, Monet, Renoir, and Seurat.⁴⁸

In 1942 Bührle, who was among Fischer's list of important clientele finalised negotiations to purchase thirteen pictures from Fischer. Among the pictures that he acquired were Manet's *Dressing Table*, Degas' *Madam Camus at the Piano*, and *Dancers in the Foyer*, which had been confiscated from the Alphonse Kann Collection. Bührle also purchased Sisley's *Banks of the Seine* and Corot's *Sitting Monk Reading*, that had been seized from the Lévy de Benzion Collection. Corot's *Girl in a Red Bodice*, Degas' *The Jockeys*, Manet's *Flowers in a Vase* and Pissaro's

⁴⁷ S.L. Faison, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 4: Linz: Hitler's Museum and Library*, 15 December 1945, p. 48, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

⁴⁸ Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Göring Collection*, 15 September 1945, p. 117, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

Roune Harbour after a Rainstorm, that had originally belonged to the Paul Rosenberg Collection were also acquired by him.⁴⁹

While on the same visit to Switzerland Hofer arranged another exchange with the *Galerie Fischer* on Göring's behalf, which was concluded in April 1941. Hofer had originally agreed to pay Fischer for the pictures in Swiss francs on 5 January 1941 but later arranged an exchange at Göring's insistence. Hofer stated that Wendland had made Fischer's selection of Impressionist paintings for him during one of his visits to Berlin between April and July 1941. Hofer examined the tapestries with Fischer in his gallery in Lucerne in December 1941. Göring agreed to the deal and received the three sixteenth century Brussels Tapestries on 5 January 1942. In return Fischer received Monet's *Seascape*, and Sisley's *Landscape with Orchard*, and Corot's *Girl Reading* in the exchange. All of the pictures that Fischer received in this exchange belonged to the Paul Rosenberg Collection, which had been confiscated in Bordeaux on 14 September 1941.⁵⁰

Hofer organised the sale and exchange of several pictures with Dr. Hans Wendland of Geneva on Göring's behalf in November 1941. The ERR agreed to exchange Rembrandt's *Portrait of an Old Man with a Beard*, and two sixteenth century Brussels tapestries that had been presented to the Princesse de Franceville by Napoleon in 1808 and were collectively valued at SFr 520,000. In exchange Wendland received a payment of SFr 250,000 and twenty-five French Impressionist pictures.⁵¹ Included among the twenty-five pictures were works by Corot, Courbet, Daumier, Degas, van Gogh, Ingres, Manet, Monet, Renoir, Seurat and Sisley. Sixteen of the twenty-five pictures came from the Paul Rosenberg Collection. Wendland suggested that the pictures be smuggled into Switzerland through diplomatic channels. In April 1942, the pictures were sent across the Swiss border in a diplomatic bag. Oswald Rieckmann, former German Consul in Berne, received diplomatic bags containing looted art from Berlin and delivered them to Hofer in Berne. Hofer received the pictures from Rieckmann and later delivered the pictures with SFr 250,00 to Wendland in Lucerne, who then arranged their exchange and sale.⁵²

⁴⁹ Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland*, 10 December 1945, in attachment titled "Looted Works of Art from Collections of Allied Nationals Discovered in Switzerland", pp. 1-3, the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82, 350/77/02/07.

⁵⁰ Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland*, 10 December 1945, in attachment titled "Looted Works of Art in Switzerland: German Methods of Acquisition, p.7, the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82, 350/77/02/07.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* p. 5.

⁵² *Ibid.* p. 7.

The exchanges conducted by the ERR in Switzerland reveal how Wendland, Hofer and Göring conspired to evade German customs laws governing the export of works of art, and also evaded Swiss customs laws by importing pictures into Switzerland through the diplomatic bag. Appendix D of the "Report on Visit of Investigation into Looted Works of Art and their whereabouts in Switzerland" entitled "Swiss Imports of pictures 1939-1944" documents repeated instances of import licenses being secured by private art dealers through contacts with the German occupational authorities. Albert Skira, the son-in-law of Lionello Venturi, the Italian art historian, operated as a clandestine dealer in pictures on the Franco-Swiss border, and was responsible for arranging exchanges of pictures with Neupert Galerie for Renoir.⁵³ The degree of Swiss complicity in the exchange of looted French paintings of the 19th and 20th centuries is evinced by the issuance of an edict by Dr. Willi Raeber, the Vice President of the Swiss Syndicate of Art Dealers. This edict prohibited any member from divulging any information on looted pictures to the Allies in December 1945.⁵⁴

Hofer also orchestrated an exchange for Göring with *the Kroeller-Muller Museum Trustees* in Holland. The exchange took place in late 1940 and early 1941 in Amsterdam and *The Hague*. The *Kroeller-Muller Trustees* received works by Degas, Corot, Fantin Latour, Toulouse Lautrec, van Gogh and Breittner, in exchange for three German pictures in the *Kroeller-Muller Museum's* collection, Hans Baldung Gruen's *Venus and Cupid*; Barthol Bruyn's *Portrait of a Lady*, and Lucas Cranach the Elder's *Venus and Cupid*. The *Kroeller-Muller Museum* was pressured into this exchange as a result of Hitler's insistence that the pictures must be acquired.⁵⁵

Hofer also acted as an intermediary for Göring in an exchange negotiated with Commandatore Eugenio Ventura in Florence. The exchange of eleven works by Italian Masters for nine French nineteenth century pictures was negotiated between 6 December 1942 and 8 March 1943 in Florence and Berlin from 6 December 1942 to 8 March 1943. The pictures exchanged by the ERR included Cezanne *Mont Ste. Victoire* from the Kann collection. Also included in the exchange were Degas *Seated Nude* and Monet's *Landscape with Poplars* and *Winter Landscape*. Renoir's *Seated Nude at the Dressing Table*, and Sisley's *The River Seine at Argenteuil* that had both

⁵⁴ Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland*, 10 December 1945, in memorandum to the Economic Counselor, U.S. Legation, Berne from Lieutenant Commander James S. Plaut, p. 9, the *National Archives* (Washington, D.C.), record group 239, box 82.

⁵⁵ Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Göring Collection*, 15 September 1945, pp. 140-41, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

belonged to the Rosenberg collection were also acquired in this exchange. Monet's *Walk in the Parc Monceau* and Sisley's *The Thames at Hampton Court* that belonged to the Lindenbaum collection were included in this exchange as well. Most interesting of all the paintings included in this exchange was van Gogh *View of St. Remy* that had originally belonged to the Weinberger collection.

Göring and Hofer had originally insisted on low appraisals when these pictures were sequestered from Jewish collections, but later substituted these figures for appraisals twenty times higher. Two sets of prices were provided for these pictures, the first based on the appraisals made by the *ERR Devisenschutzkommando* whereas the second list was compiled by Hofer on 28 January 1943. The prices marked on Hofer's list exceeded the value of those set by the *ERR Devisenschutzkommando* appraisals. The nine pictures involved in the Ventura exchange are valued at RM 37,750 in the *ERR Devisenschutzkommando* appraisals, whilst the value set afterwards by Hofer's price list is set at RM 540,000, more than fourteen times greater.⁵⁶ The discrepancy between the values set by the *ERR Devisenschutzkommando* appraisals and Hofer's price list provides conclusive evidence that Hofer and Göring conspired to artificially inflate their value for potential exchange. Hofer was cognisant that the value of the pictures was much greater than that provided because he was present when Beltrand appraised the Rosenberg Bordeaux pictures on 14 September 1941.⁵⁷

However important ideological considerations may have been in determining the exchanges, the primary motivation for the exchanges seems to have been the abundance of French paintings which was produced by the introduction of Anti-Semitic laws. The practice of exchange also became more common place because of the shortage of foreign currency. The fact that the French modern paintings were used in exchanges, rather than destroyed, indicates that in practice the confiscation procedure was not consistent with Nazi ideology. Furthermore, the discrepancy between the appraisal values set by the *ERR* and those set afterwards by Hofer, provides conclusive evidence that Göring and Hofer conspired to inflate the value of French pictures for the purposes of exchange.

The role of Switzerland in the traffic in confiscated art emerges clearly from the exchanges examined in this chapter. It has only been in recent years that this subject has received any scholarly attention. In a conversation that I had with Dr.

⁵⁶ Theodore Rousseau, *Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2: The Göring Collection*, 15 September 1945, p. 137, the *National Archives* (Washington D.C.), record group 239, box 75.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* p. 175.

Andrea Raschèr from the *Bundesamt für Kultur* (Swiss Federal Office of Culture) in Berne in 1999 I was informed that the matter had been resolved. The ongoing efforts of Jewish families to recover paintings belonging to their families is the subject of Peter Harclerode and Brendan Pittaway's *The Lost Masters: The Looting of Europe's Treasurehouses*. The authors examine cases of such as Michel d'Auberville's efforts to recover two paintings belonging to the Bernheim-Jeune family. Clearly the fact that families are seeking the return of their family's paintings over fifty years since they were confiscated illustrates the difficulty which these families have experience in trying to piece together the trail of these missing paintings.⁵⁸

The fact that new evidence is constantly coming to light may provide hope that the unknown provenance of many paintings in collections dispersed throughout the world will be discovered. The disclosure that twenty-four art works in the *National Gallery of Australia* in Canberra have passed through the hands of art dealers known for trading in confiscated art, has cast growing concern about the provenance of almost one hundred items in Australian collections.

At least one painting in the *Queensland Art Gallery* and twenty-four pictures in the *National Gallery of Victoria* have suspicious gaps in their ownership records from the wartime period. Brian Kennedy, the director of the *National Art Gallery* said in an interview that "I am open to the possibility – it would not surprise me. The scale of the spoilation was so large mist museums probably have something". Dr. Gerard Vaughan, the director of the *National Gallery* in Victoria, believes none of the paintings in his museum's collection will prove stolen, but as a cautionary measure has listed the paintings with gaps in their provenance on its website.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Peter Harclerode & Brendan Pittaway, *The Lost Masters: The Looting of Europe's Treasurehouses*, (London: Orion, 2000).

⁵⁹ Rick Wallace, Nazi Treasure Hunt: Gallery Looks for Loot", the *Herald Sun*, 18 July 2001, p. 8.

CONCLUSION

The National Socialists' hostility towards Impressionism, Post-Impressionism, and Modernism was visible at an early stage in the history of the movement. Hitler's personal views on race and culture, expounded in *Mein Kampf*, reveal that he had formulated a path of action from the very earliest days of the NSDAP's struggle. The theme of "cultural degeneration" figured prominently in Hitler's analysis of Germany's defeat in the First World War: "One of the most visible signs of the decay of the old Reich has been the slow descent of the general level of culture". The gradual erosion of moral standards "made it possible to drive the healthy aesthetic awareness toward insanity, and thus toward mental readiness for political bolshevism." In order to reverse this process of "cultural degeneration", Hitler demanded that "Theatre, art, literature, cinema, press ... must be cleansed of all manifestations of our rotting world and placed in the service of a moral, political, and cultural idea."¹ The party program of the NSDAP formulated in February 1920, offers a clear statement of the National Socialists' cultural policy. Point 23 of the 25-point Party program demanded "legal action against the tendency in art and literature which undermines our national life, and the closing of cultural events violating the preceding demands".²

The alliance forged between the NSDAP and reactionary cultural associations in the early years of the movement's history proved crucial to the development of an anti-modernist visual arts policy. The existence of a firmly entrenched anti-modernist tradition in Germany enabled reactionary elements within the NSDAP to gain ascendancy in Thuringia in 1930. The Nazis began implementing measures aimed at the elimination of progressive cultural forces in Thuringia after the NSDAP's made sizeable electoral gains in the *Landtag* elections. The pro-modernist faction in Berlin initially perceived these assaults against modernism as isolated acts of provincial philistinism.

Behind the public rhetoric of vehement anti-modernism, however, the Party's formative years between 1929-1933 were characterised by the emergence of a factional division between the anti-modernist and pro-modernist elements within the NSDAP. Hitler showed no inclination to resolve the factional dispute and allowed it to persist until

¹ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971), p. 255.

² Ehrhard Bahr, "Nazi Cultural Politics: Intentionalism vs. Functionalism", in *National Socialist Cultural Policy*, Glenn R. Cuomo ed., (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), p. 8.

he had established the organisational and legal basis for the expansion of the state's control over cultural affairs.

The creation of various new agencies contributed to the emergence of conflicting visual art policies. The establishment of the RKK in particular, promoted internal divisions and factional infighting among the ranks of the NSDAP. The factionalism within the Party was regulated through Hitler's intermittent resolution of disputes that changed the equilibrium of power within the state. Hitler was able ensure that no single faction or individual assumed too much control over policy decisions by skilfully exploiting existing rivalries among various individuals and departments. Hitler's position of supreme authority derived from the fact that he had:

..deliberately destroyed the state's ability to function in favour of his personal omnipotence and irreplaceability, and he did so right from the start... [He] brought about a state of affairs in which the most various autonomous authorities were ranged alongside and against one another, without defined boundaries, in competition, and overlapping - and only he himself was at the head of all of them.³

The worsening of tensions between the reactionary KfdK and the liberal faction within the NSDAP led by the *NSD-Studentenbund* heightened their dependence upon Hitler to arbitrate their disputes. Hitler's initial reluctance to take a firm stand on the controversy over modern art suggests that he remained undecided on who he wanted to administer cultural policy. Rosenberg had from an early stage in the Party's history demonstrated his political ineptitude and incapacity to organise practical affairs, which explains why he chose Goebbels to guide the cultural administration. Hitler's decision to appoint Goebbels to key positions within the government shifted the balance of power substantially in Goebbels' favour. Following the creation of the RKK on 22 September 1933, and the enactment of the Directive for the Execution of the Reich Chamber Law on 1 November 1933 control over cultural policy was concentrated in Goebbels. By this stage he had withdrawn his support of the liberal faction and re-aligned his position with that of Hitler.

The resolution of the debate over modernism occurred once the state assumed greater control of the administration and regulation of cultural affairs through the creation of various agencies, departments and ministries in 1933 and 1934. The situation that

³ Sebastian Haffner, *The Meaning of Hitler* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1979), pp. 43-44.

developed is well described by Robert A. Pois in his article entitled "German Expressionism in the Plastic Arts and Nazism: A Confrontation of Idealists":

The permissiveness that was evidenced in the Rosenberg/Expressionist clash of 1933 was contingent, as might be expected, upon the relatively fluid power situation that existed between the time of Hitler's assuming the position of 'Reichskanzler' and his final consolidation of power in 1934.⁴

Hitler's resolution of the controversy over Expressionism occurred after he issued a warning to both the modernising and reactionary elements within the party at the annual party rally in Nuremberg on 4 September 1934.⁵ Hitler's denunciation of Cubism, Futurism, and Dadaism, and his rejection of *völkisch* kitsch, indicated neither faction would be allowed to gain authority over the administration of the cultural bureaucracy. Hitler declared, "The National Socialist Nation must watch out for those backward-thinkers who think they must pass on to the future a 'Teutonic art' which has been created out of the bizarre world of their own romantic ideas about the National Socialist revolution."⁶ The ambiguity over the direction of the visual arts policy ended with the passage of a decree banning art criticism.

The debate over modern art has a broader significance in the overall scheme of events. The controversy highlights the internal dynamics of the National Socialist system of rule, and illustrates how factional rivalries within the party and government led to the cumulative radicalisation of the government's practice of confiscation.

The *entartete Kunst Aktion* provides an exemplary example of the "polycratic" or "pluralistic" features of the régime. Hitler's establishment of rival agencies, departments and ministries, which derived their authority solely from his personal mandate, reduced the ability of the administrative bureaucracy to operate efficiently which precipitated the radicalisation of policies. As Hans Mommsen suggests "The dynamic development of his

⁴ Robert A. Pois, "German Expressionism in the Plastic Arts: A Confrontation of Idealists", *German Life and Letters*, vol. 2, no. 4., October 1976, p. 211.

⁵ Donald E. Gordon, *Expressionism: Art and Idea* (London: Yale University Press, 1987), p. 181.

⁶ Adolf Hitler, opening speech at the annual Nuremberg Rally in 1934, cited in Barbara L. Rao, "The Development of the German National Socialist Point of View on Art and Art Criticism as Seen in the *Völkischer Beobachter*, 1920-1937", (MA thesis, California State University, 1985), p. 83.

state was not the result of ingenious calculation but was an inner development that in no small measure constrained Hitler himself".⁷

The *entartete Kunst Aktion* ushered in a radical new phase in the administration of the visual arts in the Third Reich. As chapters three and four demonstrated, the progressive radicalisation of the *entartete Kunst Aktion* did not imply that ideological considerations had come to occupy a position of centrality in the practice of confiscation. On the contrary, the radicalisation of the *entartete Kunst Aktion* exemplified the importance which material considerations exercised on the practice of art confiscation. While on outward appearances the *entartete Kunst Aktion* appeared to be ideologically driven, in actual fact this served to mask the considerable material benefits which Nazi officials accrued from the art confiscations.

The *Entartete Kunstausstellung* and *Große Deutsche Kunstausstellung* have conventionally been portrayed as representing a milestone in the evolution of the Nazi visual arts policy. On the contrary, this thesis illustrates that the National Socialist régime projected this image through the artifice of propaganda. The *Entartete Kunstausstellung* and *Große Deutsche Kunstausstellung* represent a propaganda coup, not a triumph of ideology.

The radicalisation of the National Socialist *Kunstpolitik* between the period spanning from 1933-1936 illustrates the declining importance of ideological considerations in confiscation practice. The emergence of opposition to the sale of "degenerate art" within the ranks of the NSDAP highlights the internal dynamics of the National Socialist system of rule.

The existence of opposition to the sale of "degenerate art" within the Party reveals that an ideologically unified visual arts policy remained elusive. The existence of opposition illustrates that even members of the NSDAP questioned the grounds for the government's decision to the sell art confiscated from the *entartete Kunst Aktion*.

The sales and exchanges of "degenerate art" which were conducted by the Reich between 1941-1943 provide ample evidence that the practice of confiscation ceased to be ideologically driven. The extension of the *entartete Kunst Aktion* to include the disposal and sale of "degenerate art" indicates that the principal reason for the confiscations became the commercial exploitation of "degenerate art". The fact that the

⁷H. Mommsen, 'National Socialism: Continuity and Change' in *Left-Wing Intellectuals between the Wars, 1919-1939*, Walter Laqueur and George Mosse eds., (New York: Harper & Row, 1966),. P. 196.

decision was greatly influenced by commercial interests is evident in Hitler's choice of dealers. Of the four dealers authorised to sell "degenerate art", two had been active in promoting German Expressionism.

The commercial exploitation of "degenerate art" is most obvious in the disposal of "degenerate art" by the ERR in German-occupied France. This is evident from the fact that the confiscation of Jewish-owned art collections became the chief function of the ERR during the period referred to by a postwar French government report as "la période de l'hégémonie Göring".⁸

The transformation of the ERR into Göring's personal art looting agency illustrates the declining importance of ideology in the practice of confiscation. With the assistance of Baron Kurt von Behr and his deputy, Dr. Bruno Lohse, Göring gained virtual control of the ERR and changed the mission of this agency from the collection of material for a research institute to the confiscation of Jewish art collections, for his own private gain. Göring's dominance of this agency was so great that it prompted an official investigation into the activities of this agency. Göring's acquisitions diminished after the findings of the official investigation into the activities of the ERR were made known to Göring in June 1942. Between October 1940 and July 1944 the German Military Government and the ERR seized over 20,000 art works from 203 Jewish collections, including the Rothschild's, Alphonse Kann, David Weill, Levy de Benzion, and Seligmann Brothers.

This study has illustrated that the chaotic structure of the ERR undermined the ability of this agency to perform the ideological mission for which it was originally established. The fact that the Berlin office was not kept apprised of the activities of the ERR in Paris promoted administrative confusion. The examination of the activities of the ERR in chapter three illustrated the great extent to that Hitler's actions were limited by "structural determinants" over which he exercised limited control.

The ERR's sale of "degenerate art" to German museums and officials between 1941-1943 provides further evidence of the commercial exploitation of "degenerate art". The sales conducted by the ERR provide conclusive evidence that the Reich government did not hesitate to offer officially proscribed art for sale to German museums and officials. The sales of "degenerate art" which the ERR conducted with German museums and officials highlights between 1941-1943 highlight the inconsistency which

⁸ Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 135.

emerged between theory and practice. Jean Cassou, a curator at the Louvre described the endemic corruption among higher levels of the government as:

...a network of intrigues and dirty deals in which the most redoubtable leaders of National Socialism squabbled and defied each other in a sordid, stubborn struggle for the possession of famous paintings or valuable pieces of sculpture.⁹

The exchanges of "degenerate art" were principally inspired by an organisational edict against the transportation of "degenerate art" to Germany. They did not form a part of any grand plan or strategy, but arose in response to chaotic nature of the confiscation procedure. The fact that the exchanges were an improvised solution suggests that the initiative for *entartete Kunst Aktion* did reside in Hitler alone. The examination of the exchanges in chapter four illustrated that Göring, Hofer and von Behr conceived of the initiative, as a means to acquire paintings without any expense.

The exchanges of "degenerate art" conducted under the auspices of the ERR illustrate Göring's commercial exploitation of "degenerate art". The method of exchange became Göring's favoured method of acquisition following the passage of an edict prohibiting the transportation of confiscated French Impressionist and twentieth century paintings to the Reich in 1941. Chapter four revealed how Göring and Hofer insisted on low appraisals for Impressionists and modern works in the *Jeu de Paume*, then substituted these with higher appraisals before negotiating their sale or exchange. The fact that Hofer and Göring multiplied the Paris appraisals by twenty times indicates commercial interests, rather than ideology motivated these exchanges.

The art dealers appointed by the Reich to oversee the disposal of "degenerate art" had also conceived of the exchanges as a means to derive financial gain. Rochlitz provides an exemplary example of the commercial exploitation of "degenerate art" by individual art dealers. Rochlitz received pictures that were individually more valuable than an single object he relinquished, and in several instances received paintings in the ratio of ten for one in each case.

A number of conclusions can be drawn from this study of the practice of confiscation. The main conclusion of this study is that commercial incentives rather than ideological considerations drove the disposal of "degenerate art" by the Reich

⁹ Jean Cassou, *Le pillage par les Allemands des oeuvres d'art appartenant a Juifs en France* (Paris, 1947), cited in Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 282.

government. In a broader sense the disposal of "degenerate art" by the Reich government expressed the fundamental characteristics, and internal dynamics of the regime.

This thesis has sought to examine the extent to which ideology determined or influenced Nazi art policy and practice. It has done this by focusing specifically on the practices of confiscation and exchange during the period 1936 to 1943. By considering the role of ideology the thesis has almost inevitably entered into the broader debate on the nature of the Third Reich, in which the two sides are customarily designated "intentionalists" and "structuralists" or "functionalists". This thesis has consciously challenged the "intentionalist" position by questioning the primacy of ideology, and the centrality of role of Hitler in Nazi visual arts policy. And in doing, the appropriateness of a "structuralist" or "functionalist" interpretive model, at least as far as the visual arts are concerned has been clearly demonstrated.

1. "Entartete" Kunst: Typescript Inventory (Germany. Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda, 1942), held at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

Inhaltsverzeichnis.

Stadt	Museum	Werke
Aachen	Städt. Museum	20
Altenburg	Staatl. Lindenau Museum	39
Altona	Stadtmuseum	12
Bautzen	Stadtmuseum	22
Berlin	Kupferstichkabinett	647
Berlin	Nationalgalerie	505
Berlin	Stadtbauitz	131
Berlin	Oberachlon. Landesmuseum	8
Bielefeld	Städt. Kunsthalle	127
Bielefeld	Städt. Museum	3
Bochum	Städt. Gemäldegalerie	17
Braunschweig	Herzog Anton Ulrich Museum	14
Braunschweig	Städt. Museum	2
Bremen	Kunsthalle	165
Breslau	Schlesisches Museum	560
Breslau	Schloßmuseum	64
Chemnitz	Kunsthalle	275
Chemnitz	Städt. Kunstsammlungen	366
Darmstadt	Heinrichsches Landesmuseum	82
Darmstadt	Städt. Kunstsammlungen	1
Deisau	Gemäldegalerie	84
Dortmund	Städt. Kunst- u. Gewerhemuseum	70
Dresden	Kupferstichkabinett	365
Dresden	Skulpturensammlung	27
Dresden	Staatl. Akademie für Kunstgewerbe	17
Dresden	Staatl. Gemäldegalerie	150
Dresden	Stadtmuseum	381

Stadt	Museum	Werke
Düsseldorf	Kunstsammlungen Der Stadt	900
Duisburg	Städt. Kunstsammlung	126
Erfurt	Museum der Stadt	591
Essen	Folkwang Museum	1273
Fleheburg	Kunstgewerbemuseum	27
Frankfurt a/M.	Kunstsammelstelle	91
Frankfurt a/M.	Städtische Galerie u. Mädelsches Kunstinstitut	496
Frankfurt a/O.	Stadtmuseum	8
Freiburg i. B.	Städt. Sammlung	157
Gelbenkirchen	Städt. Kunstsammlung	156
Gera	Städt. Museum	27
Görlitz	Kunstsammlung	5
Görlitz	Deutsche Graphikschau	159
Göttingen	Gemäldesammlung der Universi- tät	12
Greifswald	Heimatismuseum	2
Greifswald	Universitätsammlung	14
Hagen	Städt. Museum	166
Halle	Moritzburg Museum	146
Hamburg	Hanseat. Hochschule	65
Hamburg	Kunsthalle	983
Hamburg	Kunstgewerbe-Museum	269
Hamm	Städt. Gustav Lübke-Museum	23
Hannover	Kontormuseum	105
Hannover	Landesmuseum	270
Heidelberg	Kurpfälzisches Museum	4
Husum	Nissen-Stiftung	3
Jena	Kunstverein	203
Jena	Stadtmuseum	70
Kaiserslautern	Gewerbemuseum	85
Karlsruhe	Städtl. Kunsthalle	145

Stadt	Museum	Werke
Kassel	Staatl. Kunstsammlungen	30
Kassel	Städt. Kunsthaus	12
Kiel	Kunsthalle	152
Kiel	Schlewig Holst. Landesmuseum	12
Koblenz	Städt. Museum	2
Köln a. Rh.	Wallraf Richartz Museum	341
Königsberg i. P.	Staatl. Meistertelier	31
Königsberg	Städt. Kunstsammlung	206
Kolberg	Heimatmuseum	2
Konstanz	v. Kossenberg-Galerie	7
Krefeld	Kaiser Wilhelm Museum	98
Leipzig	Museum der bildenden Künste	245
Liegnitz	Niederösterreichisches Museum	2
Lübeck	Museum Behnhaus	210
Magdeburg	Kaiser Friedrich Museum	160
Mainz	Städt. Museum	56
Mannheim	Kunsthalle	584
Marburg	Kunsthistor. Museum der Universität	2
Milheim	Städt. Museum	20
München	Bayr. Staatsgemäldesammlung	126
München	Staatl. graph. Sammlungen	145
München	Städt. Galerie	2
München-Gladbach	Städt. Bildergalerie	72
Minster	Landesmuseum	66
Nürnberg	Germanisches Museum	2
Nürnberg	Städt. Galerie	118
Oldenburg	Landesmuseum	103
Osnabrück	Städt. Museum	3
Recklinghausen	Westisches Museum	38
Rostock	Städt. Museum	15

Stadt	Museum	Werke
Saarbrücken	Städtl. Museum	272
Schwerin	Städtl. Sammlungen	4
Soest	Städt. Museum	61
Stettin	Städt. Museum	307
Stuttgart	Städt. Kunstsammlung	8
Stuttgart	Städtl. Galerie	382
Hlm	Stadtmuseum	160
Wolmar	Städtl. Kunstsammlungen	381
Wiesbaden	Landesmuseum	231
Witten a. d. R.	Märkisches Museum	35
Worms	Gemäldegalerie	10
Wuppertal-Barmen	Ruhmeshalle	82
Wuppertal-Elberfeld	Städt. Bildergalerie	403
Zwickau	König Albert Museum	63

K 8 1 n

Graef-Richartz-Museum

W e r k		Technik	Stand	Devis.	RW
Davringhausen	(14776) Porträt	ÖL	_____	X	
Dehaer	(14894) Herbst	A	_____	X	
Derain	(15749) Südliche Landschaft	ÖL	Buchholz	V	300 Sfr.
Dix	(14780) Eltern des Malers	ÖL	Fischer	V	2100 Sfr.
"	(14789) Gürzenichstraße	B	Fohn	T	
"	(14804) Selbstbildnis	G	Böhmer	T	
"	(14805) Bildnis Klemperer	D	Dr. Gurlitt	V	0,5 Sfr.
"	(14806) Bildnis Nierendorf	A	"	V	10 Sfr.
"	(14807) Blinder	D	"	V	0,5 Sfr.
"	(14859) Feierabend	G	"	V	40 Sfr.
"	(14901) Selbstporträt	D	_____	X	
"	(15015) Der Krieg (Mappe)	D	_____	X	
Dülberg	(14501) Beweinung	D	_____	X	
"	(14863) Bildnis Klemperer	D	B		
"	(14864) Verkündigung	B	B		
"	(15008) Selbstbildnis	D	_____	X	
"	(15009) Selbstbildnis	D	_____	X	
"	(15783) Kleine Stadt	G	_____	X	
Dunken	(14788) Stilleben	ÖL	_____	X	
Ehmsen	(14968) Die Bar	D	_____	X	
"	(14969) Aus dem Irrenhaus	D	_____	X	
"	(15926) Der Mixer	D	B		
Ernst	(15022) Fiat Modes (Mappe)	D			
Esser	(14896) Badende	A			
"	(14897) Musikstilleben	G			
"	(14898) Weibl. Halbakt	A			X
Feigl.	(15021) Zum heiligen Testament	D			
Feininger	(15782) Häuser	T	Böhmer	T	
"	(16290) Spaziergänger	D	B	E	
Felix-Müller	(14970) Mädchen auf dem Diver	D	B		
"	(14971) Kind am Fenster	D	B		
Fuhr	(14777) Lübeck	ÖL	Böhmer	T	
"	(14828) Halbinsel	A	"	V	1 Sfr.
Gauguin	(15748) Reiter am Strand	ÖL	R. Marsch. Göring		

Frankfurt / Main

Königliche Galerie und Städelsches Kunstinstitut

		Werk	Techn.	Stand	Devis.
Feininger	(673)	Marine	D	Böhmer	T
"	(779)	Gate	D	"	V 1 ♂
"	(780)	Windmühle	D	"	T
"	(781)	Benz	D	"	V 1 ♂
"	(830)	Mappe, 12 Holzschn.	D	Fohn	T
Felixmüller	(604)	Menschen über der Welt	D	B	
"	(680)	Erste Schritte	D	B	
"	(681)	Frau am Morgen	D	B	
"	(682)	Bildnis Karl Sternheim	D	B	
Fischer, Joh.	(657)	Fantastische Landschaft	D	_____	X
Fuhr	(825)	Klosterhof	A	Fohn	T
Gangolf	(664)	Bauernpaar mit Kuh	D	_____	X
"	(665)	Apachentanz			
"	(666)	Tanzpferde			
"	(667)	Hürdenrennen			
"	(674)	Weibl. Akt hockend			
"	(675)	London			
Gauguin	(15773)	Aus Tahiti	CL	Fischer	V 50000sfr.
Geiger	(823)	Susanne im Bade	D	_____	X
Gebser	(737)	3 Freunde	D	B	
"	(738)	Skizzenblatt m. 3 Figuren	D	B	
"	(796)	Alter Mann	D	_____	X
van Gogh	(15774)	Bildnis Dr. Gachet		Reichsm. Göring	
Gross	(438)	Dirne bei der Toilette	A	Fohn	T
"	(447)	Idyll	D	_____	X
"	(448)	4 Artisten	A	Dr. Gurliitt	V 10 Sfr.
"	(697)	Mord in der Ackerstrasse	D	"	V
"	(698)	Luise	D	"	V
"	(699)	Männer am Tisch	D	"	V
"	(700)	Zigeunermusik	D	"	V
Grossmann	(545)	Taentzien- strasse	D	_____	X
Hartmann	(711)	Sitzendes Mädchen	D	_____	X
Heck	(439)	Sitzendes Mädchen	D	_____	X
"	(440)	Landschaft	D	_____	X

2. Cecil Gould, *The Schenker Papers, Part 1. "Accessions to German museums and galleries during the Occupation of France"*, the National Archives (Washington D.C), record group 239, 81.

SECRET

Tel : VIC 3858
Ext : 50

Central Control Commission for Germany,
(British Component),
Monuments, Fine Arts & Archives Branch,
Flat 101, Block No. 8,
Ashley Gardens, London. S.W.1.

Ref. : INTR/62875/L/MFA

5th April, 1945.

To :	<u>Copies</u>
SHAEP	30 (including Missions)
U.S. Gp. CC	4
O.S.S.	2
Macmillan Commission	4
Roberts Commission	4
C.A. 20 B.	2
Austrian Commission	2
Interior Div.	2
J.I. Co-ord.	2
Legal Div.	1
Prop: C: (Finance)	1

Subject :- Accessions to German Museums, and Galleries during the Occupation of France (The Schenker Papers, Part I).

Herewith The Schenker Papers, Part I, compiled by M.F.A. & A. Branch, distribution as above.

File

~~Douglas Cooper,~~
~~Squadron Leader,~~

for Director, M.F.A. & A. Branch.

JG/DP.

Accessions to German Museums and
Galleries during the Occupation
of France (The Schenker Papers, Part I).

(This Report is derived from a study of the papers found in the Paris office of the firm of Schenker, "Internationale Transporte". This report only deals with the despatch to German public collections of works of art purchased in France during the Occupation. A further report will be issued concerning similar purchases by German dealers and private collectors, though in point of fact some of the latter appear to have been at times acting on behalf of German public collections.

Introduction

The evidence of the Schenker papers on the purchases made in France on behalf of German Museums during the Occupation, shows a striking geographical unevenness. Broadly speaking, so far as the present papers are concerned, the museums in the Rheinprovinz were first, the rest nowhere. Thus on identifiable pictures alone Krefeld spent 11,253,000 francs, Essen 6,895,550 francs, Bonn 5,450,000 francs, Wuppertal-Elberfeld 992,000 francs and Düsseldorf 3,66,575 francs and 160,000 marks. These are known to be absolutely minimum figures for expenditure, since for many pictures in the Schenker papers the prices paid are not quoted and there were also many pictures bought of which insufficient details emerge to enable them to be identified. In addition, a great quantity of miscellaneous objects of art was purchased by these museums at the same time. The immense value of the works of art thus acquired can be gauged by a statement in the Bunjes papers that the prices paid for those acquired by the Rhine museums were considered, from the German point of view, to be "very reasonable".

This predominance of the Rhineland is not surprising, since it is known from the Bunjes papers that a Rhineland gang, consisting of Appfelstaedt and Benningmann of Düsseldorf and Rademacher of Bonn was particularly active in taking advantage of the favourable currency situation to acquire works of art in France.

1. Aachen : Surmondt Musuem

No pictures purchased in Paris for the Surmondt Museum were recorded with sufficient detail to enable them to be recognised. The following artists, however, were each represented by one work :-

CASSALETTE, CLAIRIN, DIAZ, DOU, EFFINGER, HOLLER, HOOGSTRAATEN, JUSSY, PALMA GIOVANE, ROUSSEAU and TER WEDDER.

There was also a bronze bust by Arno Brcker and a few books, lamps, reliefs and a Gobelins tapestry.

2. Berlin : Kaiser Friedrich Museum

On 10th April 1942 a marble bust was sent via Schenker to the Kaiser Friedrich Museum from Prince Jurisky, 21 rue Washington, Paris. No further entries related to this museum.

3. Berlin : State Museums (Egyptian Department).

The following articles were purchased on behalf of the above department :-

<u>Description of work of art</u>	<u>Dealer</u>	<u>Price Paid</u>	<u>Date</u>
Female head (stone)	Brunnaer	28,000 fr:	5/10/43.
Dog (stone)	"	40,000 fr:	5/10/43.
5 Stele.	Hindamian		30/7/43.
1 Relief with Kings	Sambon		
" " " "	"		
Small wooden figure	"		
Lion's head	"		
Statue of man crouching	"		
Relief of group of men	"		

17 further articles (bas-reliefs, vases etc.) were purchased from Kalebjian.

4. Berlin State Museums. (Islamic Department)

Nine purchases only are recorded for this department in Paris from INDJOUJIAN and KALEBDJIAN. The articles in question consisted of marble plaques, vases etc., but no detailed descriptions, prices or dates were given.

5. Berlin : Jagdmuseum

In August 1942, three cases of paintings were sold to the above museum, apparently by ENGEL.

6. Bonn : Rheinisches Landesmuseum and Provinzialdenkmalamt

(a) Identifiable Pictures

<u>Artist</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Dealer etc.</u>	<u>Price Paid</u>	<u>Date of Transaction</u>
BOSCHAERT	Flower piece		Leegenhoeck	270,000 fr:	
BOUDIN	Port			100,000 fr:	8/9/43.
COROT	Landscape			200,000 fr:	8/9/43.
COUTURE	Female Portrait			150,000 fr:	8/9/43.
CRAESBEECK	Portrait		Leegenhoeck	270,000 fr:	
"	Interior		"	200,000 fr:	
CUYE, A.	Portrait of a boy.			180,000 fr:	8/9/43.

Identifiable Pictures (Cont'd)

<u>Artist</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Dealer etc.</u>	<u>Price Paid</u>	<u>Date of Transaction</u>
DAUBIGNY	Landscape			150,000 fr:	8/9/43.
DELACROIX	Sleeping Lion			150,000 fr:	8/9/43.
DIAZ	Landscape			80,000 fr:	8/9/43.
DONATH	Portrait of Emperor			20,000 fr:	8/9/43.
DROLLING	Landscape			30,000 fr:	8/9/43.
ELSHEIMER	Cupid and Psyche			160,000 fr:	8/9/43.
(School of)					
FERAGUTTI	Interior			40,000 fr:	8/9/43.
FONTAINEBLEAU					
School	Head of a woman			120,000 fr:	8/9/43.
GERICAULT	Lioness			250,000 fr:	8/9/43.
HEEM	Still life		Rochlitz	550,000 fr:	8/9/43.
KOEKOEK, B. C.	Landscape			60,000 fr:	8/9/43.
de MOMPERS	2 Landscapes			550,000 fr:	8/9/43.
MOSTAERT	Attack on a Village	Signed	Alice	80,000 fr:	
Gillis		in	Manteau		
		Monogram			
		& dated			
		1569.			
PIAZZETTA	Praying Woman			150,000 fr:	8/9/43.
RENOIR	Portrait of a			800,000 fr:	8/9/43.
	Child				
"	Girls (nude)			350,000 fr:	8/9/43.
"	Algerian Landscape			200,000 fr:	8/9/43.
VALLERAY-					
COSTER	Still Life		Alice	40,000 fr:	8/9/43.
VAN GOYEN	Skaters		Manteau	350,000 fr:	

(b) Other Pictures

Unspecified paintings by Van Dyck, Huysmans (from Alice Manteau), and Heemskerck (from Leegenhoeck) and a 15th century Cologne school tryptich of the Virgin and Saint were also purchased on behalf of the Rheinisches Landesmuseum, Bonn.

(c) Miscellaneous objects of art etc.

At least twenty to thirty miscellaneous pieces of furniture, some 450 books and a few lamps, chandeliers, and small pieces of sculpture and porcelain were purchased from Paris antique dealers on behalf of the Bonn Provincialdenkmalamt. The official engaged in making the purchases was Dr. Franz Rademacher. One of his purchases (17 Merovingian belt buckles, bought from de HAUKE for 143,000 francs) was, in March 1944, the subject of a prolonged correspondence, involving, inter alia, the Beaux Arts and the Offices des Changes du Service de la compensation. The permit to export these articles was finally obtained on the 9th May, 1944.

7. Dusseldorf: Stadtische Kunstsammlungen

(a) Identifiable Pictures

<u>Artist</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Dimensions etc.</u>	<u>Dealer etc.</u>	<u>Price Paid</u>	<u>Date of Transaction</u>
BACKHUYSEN	Seascape	(Canvas)	74 x 65	Alice Manteau	8,000 fr:	24/2/41.
BERCHEM	Landscape with Shepherd and Shepherdess.	"		Renand	40,000 fr:	
BOSCHAERT, A.	Still Life (Flowers & Fruit).	(Oak)	42.2 x 63.5 Signed	Alice Manteau	40,000 fr:	24/2/41.
BOUDIN	Seascape				10,000 Marks (Sic)	
BRUEGEL, P.	Street Scene.				400,000 fr:	
CHARDIN	Still Life					
CLAES	" "					
CLERCQ Hendrick de	Adoration of Magi			Rochlitz	375,000 fr:	
COURBET	Landscape with Boy				7,500 Marks (Sic)	
COSTER Vallayer	Still Life (ham, hare, bronze bowls etc.)	(Canvas)	102 x 81 signed & dated 1769	Alice Manteau	45,000 fr:	
CUYP, A.	Ruins of Egmont Abbey	Water colour & crayon.		Maurice Gobin	4,500 fr:	
DENK, J.	Interior					
DESPORTES	Still Life				60,000 fr:	16/7/41.
De TROY	Woman at a Spring. (1723)			Avogli Trotti	180,000 fr:	18/4/41.
DUPLESSIS	Landscape			Hotel Drouot (M. Bellier)	23,575 fr:	28/4/41.
EVERDINGEN	Landscape				5,000 Marks (Sic)	
FISCHER von BAYERN	Still Life					
FONTAINEBLEAU School	Venus & Cupid	(Panel)		R. Holzapfel	250,000 fr:	15/7/41.
FRAGONARD	"La Reprimande"	Sketch	29 x 38 (Louis XVI period frame).	Landry	60,000 fr:	20/4/41.

Identifiable Pictures (Cont'd)

<u>Artist</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Dimensions etc.</u>	<u>Dealer etc.</u>	<u>Price Paid</u>	<u>Date of Transaction</u>
FRAGONARD	A Bohemian wearing hat & cape.			Cailleux	150,000fr:	11/7/41
FRANKFURT Master of	"Adoration" Wing of altarpiece & Madonna.					
FRIESZ Otton	Bunch of Flowers					
GERARDIN	Crucifixion					
GOBELINS Tapestry	Count of Savoy			Schmit		
GREUZE	Head of Old Woman	Red Chalk		Maurice Gobin (ex collections Mulnier & de Monchy)	5,000fr:	17/7/41
de HEEM	Flower Piece				10,000 Marks (Sic)	
JOURDEUIL KRAUS	Landscape Girl making music				10,000 fr: 2,500 Marks (Sic)	
KUDAYK	Interior			Rochlitz (ex collection Sedelmayer)	100,000 fr:	3/3/41..
LA TOUR Quentin de	Portrait of C-A. Bertinazzi called Carlin.	Pastel	46 x 38 Carved & Gilt Regency wood frame.	Landry	50,000 fr:	3/3/41.
LIOTARD	Young girl sewing	Pastel			25,000 Marks (Sic)	
LOTTO Lorenzo	Female Portrait					
MAGNASCO	Landscape with Monks.			Avogli Trotti	150,000 fr:	
MENZEL	Head of a Woman Drawing			Renand	20,000 fr:	
MIROU Antoine (attributed to).	Landscape with (Copper) Adoration of Shepherds.		30 x 40	Alice Manteau	86,400 fr:	
MOLLENAER	Amusement Champetre	(Pancl)		Renaud	50,000 fr:	
NEEPS, P.	Interior of a Church	(Wood)		Willens through Lee genhoeck	110,000 fr:	17/7/41.

Identifiable Pictures (Cont'd)

<u>Artist</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Dimensions etc.</u>	<u>Dealer etc.</u>	<u>Price Paid</u>	<u>Date of Transaction</u>
(Attributed to) POUSSIN	Country Road with monument					
PUGET, P.	Design for monument to Louis XIV	Pen & Wash		Maurice Gobin (ex collection Vivant-Denon)	10,000 fr:	
RENOIR	2 Girls				25,000 mks (Sic)	
RICCI	Fertility	(Canvas)		Leegenhoeck	45,000 fr:	17/7/41
(Attributed to) RIZOIS	Romantic Landscape about 1820.				40,000 fr:	13/4/43
ROBERT Hubert	Broken Pitcher	(Canvas)	63 x 79 signed & dated 1758.	Jacques Mathey	225,000 fr:	
"	"Les Gorges d'Ollioules"	Oil	Signed & dated	Cailleux	300,00 fr:	10/7/41
RUSLIN	2 Girls				25,000 Mks. (Sic)	
SISLEY	Landscape				50,000 Mks. (Sic)	
SOLIMENA (Attributed to)	Project for Ceiling			Schmit	10,100 fr:	30/6/41
SPILBERG	Girl at Toilet in a Garden		Signed & dated 166-		60,000 fr:	
TIEPOLO J.B.	Adoration of Magi	Pen & Wash drawing	Signed (Monogram)	Maurice Gobin	28,500 fr:	
"	Caprices (de Vesme Nos. 3-12)			" "	7,000 fr:	
TIEPOLD, D.	Marys at Tomb	Pen & Wash drawing.	Signed	" "	13,500 fr:	
TRILLO	Country Road					
VAN GOYEN	Country Road					
VINCENT	Allegory					
WATTEAU (Attributed to)	Nymphs : (Original carved wood gilt frame).	Paint on Paper.	31 x 38	Schmit	500,000 fr:	9/5/41.

Dusseldorf (Cont'd)

(b) Other Pictures

Further paintings or sketches (of which no subjects or details were specified) were purchased, bearing labels of the following artists (one of each) :-

CAMPHAUSEN, OTTMAR ELLIGER, the Younger, FYT, GUARDI, KRÜGER, LENAIN, LINGELBACH, MURILLO, PELLEGRINI, RUBENS, TOCQUE, VERVEER, WOUWERMANN.

(c) Miscellaneous Objects of Art etc.

An enormous quantity of knick-knacks was also bought for the Düsseldorf collections, consisting of tables, chairs, desks, commodes, bas-reliefs, faience vases and plates, caskets, medallions, Dresden figures, tapestries, mediaeval ivories, clocks, pieces of metal-work, miscellaneous sculptures, enamals, mantelpieces and between 300 and 400 art-historical books.

8. Essen : Folkwang Museum

(a) Identifiable Pictures

Artist	Subject	Medium	Dimensions etc	Dealer etc	Price Paid	Date of Transaction
BAUGE	Tiger rolling			Schoeller	50,000 fr:	
BOUDIN	Sailing boats in Deauville Harbour			Gerard	150,000 fr:	
COROT	Old Harbour at Rouen			Bigneu	450,000 fr:	28/2/41.
"	Horseman on Village Street	(Canvas)	26 x 38	Schoeller	160,000 fr:	15/1/41.
"	Landscape			Fabiani	1,500,000 fr:	
COURBET	Etretat cliffs after the storm			Schoeller	350,000 fr:	
COUTURE (Thomas)	White cock, attached by one leg.			Heim	20,000 fr:	5/5/41.
DAUBIGNY	Storks			Gerard	125,000 fr:	
DAUMIER	"Hercules of the market-place"	Drawing		Schoeller	50,000 fr:	
DELACROIX	Cromwell by the Soffin of Charles I.	Drawing		Gerard	175,000 fr:	
"	Horseman			"	120,000 fr:	
"	Albanian Dancers			Schoeller	150,000 fr:	

(a) Identifiable Pictures (Cont'd)

<u>Artist</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Dimensions etc.</u>	<u>Dealer etc.</u>	<u>Price Paid</u>	<u>Date Transaction</u>
DELACROIX	Hamlet & Ophelia	Etching or Engraving	(1st State)	Gobin	4,500 fr:	5/6/41.
"	Wild Horse attacked by Tiger.					
"	Faust					
DUPRE (Jules)	Farm in the Woods.	(Canvas)	50 x 69	Schoeller (ex coll:Gallice Epernay)	65,000 fr:	14/1/41.
GAVARNI	5 Water- colours				95,000 fr:	
GERICAULT	Horseman	Drawing		Sabatery	3,050 fr:	27/2/41.
"	"Body of Fualdes thrown into the river"	(Painting)				
"	"Horses going to a fair"	"				
"	"The Flemish Farrier"	"				
"	Entrance to Adelphic Wharf.	"				
INGRES	Portrait of Madame Gabriac			Gerard	85,000 fr:	15/1/41.
JONGKIND	Nevers, 1872			Gerard	55,000 fr:	
LANCRET	Family Group					
MAILLOL	Woman with Sash.	Terracotta		Balay	250,000 fr:	
ROBERT (Hubert)	Tivoli		Signed & dated	Schmit	350,000 fr:	16/4/41.
RODIN	Hanako	Water- colour		Schoeller	8,000 fr:	
ROUSSEAU (Th:)	Landscape			Wüster	300,000 fr:	
SISLEY	Landscape			Fabiani	2,000 fr:	

(a) Identifiable Pictures (Cont'd)

<u>Artist</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Dimensions etc.</u>	<u>Dealer etc.</u>	<u>Price Paid</u>	<u>Date of Transaction</u>
TROYON (C.)	The Bird-nest Robbers			Schoeller	130,000 fr:	
VALLAYER- COSTER	Still Life			Manteau	100,000 fr:	
VIGEE LE BRUN	Female Portrait	Pastel		d'Atri	150,000 fr:	

(b) Other Pictures

Other Unspecified pictures by Caresmes and Lemoyne were also purchased (one of each artist).

(c) Drawings

Drawings by the following artists were bought :-

GRAFF, (Anton) (2 drawings), GREUZE, INGRES, MENZEL (3 drawings)
PRUD'HON and Hubert ROBERT.

(d) Miscellaneous Objects of Art

Metal-work and porcelain was purchased but not in very large quantities.

9. Frankfurt-am-Main

On 20th November, 1942, one picture was despatched to the Städtisches Kunstinstitut (Durerstr: 2, Frankfurt a/m) and 101 Kgs of books to the Archäologisches Institut des Deutschen Reiches, (Palmengartenstr: 12, Frankfurt a/m). No other entries related to the Frankfurt public collections.

10. Hamburg : Kunsthalle

A Rubens for this gallery - "Flora and Pomona" - was bought for 2,000,000 fr.

11. Karlsruhe : Kunsthalle

The following pictures were purchased on behalf of the Karlsruhe gallery :-

(a) From Leegenhoeck

Fragonard : Head of an old Man.
" : Scene from the Passion
Heda : Still Life
v. Beyren : Still Life (Fish)
Schwab : Death of the Virgin (c.1510)

(b) From Fabiani

Sisley : Landscape.

12. Kassel : Hessisches Landesmuseum

Some eight paintings (including a male portrait by Mignard) were purchased as well as some twelve pieces of furniture, vases etc. No details of these purchases were recorded.

13. Kassel: Wall-paper Museums (Deutsches Tapeternuseum).

A Gobelins Tapestry was bought on behalf of the above museum on the 29th July, 1942 for 38,000 fr: from Saigue. Wall-papers were purchased as follows :-

<u>Date</u>	<u>Dealer</u>	<u>Price</u>
19/7/42	Feuve	260,000 fr:
29/7/42	Saigne	10,000 fr:
13/7/42	Roy	18,000 fr:
15/7/42	Carlhian	325,000 fr:

14. Krefeld : Kaiser Wilhelm Museum

(a) Identifiable Pictures etc.

<u>Artist</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Dimensions etc.</u>	<u>Dealer etc.</u>	<u>Price Paid</u>	<u>Date of Transaction</u>
AVED	Lady at Dressing-table.			Cailleux	150,000 fr:	
"	Lady in Blue				45,000 fr:	
BACKHUYZEN	Amsterdam Harbour			Landry	80,000 fr:	6/2/42.
BELLE (Alexis Simon)	Portrait of Madame de la Mariniere			Cailleux	250,000 fr:	28/3/41.
BERNARD	Girl with white satin cloak over her shoulders.	Pastel (signed & dated)		Cailleux	35,000 fr:	3/3/41.
BOILLY	Still Life			Aubry	25,000 fr:	
"	Young Woman			Cailleux	300,000 fr:	
BOUDIN	Rotterdam Harbour				190,000 fr:	
"	Trouville Beach			Bignou	400,000 fr:	
CARPEAUX	Faun at the grapevine.	Marble		Schoeller	175,000 fr:	
CLAEUW (attributed to).	Still Life	(Canvas)	94 x 86	Manteau	45,000 fr:	
COELLO (Attributed to).	Female portrait	(Canvas)	68 x 54	Manteau	30,000 fr:	

Identifiable Pictures etc. (Cont'd)

Artist	Subject	Medium	Dimensions etc.	Dealer	Price Paid	Date of Transaction
COURBET	"Painting"			Fabiani	1,500,000 fr:	
COYPEL	Young Woman	Pastel		Cailleux	250,000 fr:	
DELACROIX	Flowers			Fabiani	2,200,000 fr:	
DE TROY	Portrait of M. de Vandieres, later Marquis of Marigny	(Signed)		Cailleux	200,000 fr:	3/3/41.
DULZ (Jacob)	Jovial Company				100,000 fr:	
DUPLESSIS	Male portrait			Trotti	150,000 fr:	
GAUGUIN	Vase of Flowers			Bignou	300,000 fr:	28/2/41.
GERARD (M)	Family picture and an engraving after it.			Cailleux	120,000 fr:	
"	The Letter			Fabiani	150,000 fr:	
Gobelins Tapestries	4 pieces "Children Gardening".				850,000 fr:	
GROS Baron	Portrait of General Joubert.			Gerard	93,000 fr:	
HEINSIUS	Female Portrait			Wüster	90,000 fr:	
"	Male Portrait			Cailleux	60,000 fr:	
JONGKIND	Evening Landscape			Schoeller	150,000 fr:	
"	Antwerp Harbour			"	700,000 fr:	
MAES	Portrait of young man.			Miller	150,000 fr:	
MAILLOL	Female nude	Clay		Fabiani	25,000 fr:	
"	" "	Terracotta		"	30,000 fr:	
MONET	Hunting trophies			Gerard	250,000 fr:	
MOREAU le jeune	Landscape			Fabiani	100,000 fr:	
MOSNIER (J-L)	Woman suckling a child		(Signed & dated)	Cailleux	60,000 fr:	3/3/41.
NATTIER	Madame Adelaide de France as Diana			Schmit		20/1/42.
OMEGANK, B.	A flock			Trotti	100,000 fr:	

Identifiable Pictures etc. (Cont'd)

Artist	Subject	Medium	Dimensions etc.	Dealer	Price Paid	Date of Transaction.
RAVESTEYN	Male portrait		(Dated 1627)	Leegehoeck	40,000 fr:	28/3/41
RENOIR	Guernsey			Bignou	220,000 fr:	28/2/41.
"	Girl	Pastel		Fabiani	300,000 fr:	
SISLEY	Landscape			"	1,200,000 fr:	
TRINQUESSE Louis	Women & Children in a Park	(Canvas)	61 x 51 (Signed & dated 1789) (Louis XVI period).	Landry	140,000 fr:	8/7/41.

(b) Other Pictures etc.

Paintings (subjects undisclosed) by the following artists, were also bought :-

Martin van Cleve (Rochlitz: 45,000 fr:) Largilliere school-piece (Wulster)
Lemercier, Palma Vecchio and Van Son (90,000 fr:).

(c) Miscellaneous Objects of Art

Two packing-cases of miscellaneous objects (mostly porcelain) were despatched from Paris to the Krefeld Gallery.

15. Marburg:

- (a) Kunsthistorisches Seminar: 5 paintings despatched from Paris.
- (b) Kunsthistorisches Institut der Universität: two cases of books and a painting despatched from Paris.
- (c) Kunsthistorisches Museum: On 14th Feb. 1942 a quantity of documents was sent from Paris.

16. Nassau a.d. Lahn: Städtisches Heimatmuseum

On 20th November, 1942, a case of works of art was sent to the above Museum.

17. Strasbourg:

A certain amount of confusion is reflected in the Schenker papers on the subject of Strasbourg, partly because works of art bought in Paris by Philipp Frank, Director of the Deutsche Bank at Mannheim were sent via the Strasbourg Museum and also because Dr. Martin occupied simultaneously the posts of Director of the Kunsthalle at Karlsruhe and Director General of the Oberrheinische Museen at Strasbourg. In consequence of this latter factor, works of art intended for Strasbourg tended to be sent to Karlsruhe. The one work of art recorded in the

Strasbourg (Cont'd)

Schenker papers as sent to Strasbourg and apparently intended for the museum there, was a landscape attributed to Adrien van der Velde, canvas, 67 x 83.5, purchased from Alice Manteau for 275,000 fr:

18. Velbert: Deutsches Schloss und Beschlagsmuseum

On 24/12/42 a case of miscellaneous metal-work was sent from Bricard (Paris) to the above museum for 36,600 fr.

19. Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum

In November 1942 a clavichord by Pascal Taskin was bought in Paris on behalf of the musical instrument section of the above museum, from Labrousse for 127,500 francs.

20. Wuppertal - Elberfeld: Städtisches Museum für Kunst und Kunstgewerbe

(a) Identifiable Pictures

Artist	Subject	Medium	Dimensions etc.	Dealer etc.	Price Paid	Date of Transaction
BOUDIN	Port of Camaret, Brittany	(Canvas)	43 x 64	Schoeller	90,000 fr:	3/3/41.
COUTURE	Flowers		(Signed: carved & gilt wood frame, period Louis XIV)	Aubry	50,000 fr:	13/2/41.
DELACROIX	Arabs shoeing a horse			Matis	With the Ingres 650,000 fr:	3/7/41.
JUPRE, Jules	Landscape		(Signed & dated).	Heim	25,000 fr:	20/2/41.
INGRES	Jupiter			Matis	With the Delacroix 650,000 fr:	3/7/41.
RENOIR	Study of Bather	Drawing		Bignou	150,000 fr:	9/6/41.
ROUSSEAU Th:	Landscape		(Signed)	Aubry	12,000 fr:	13/2/41.
TENIERS the Younger	Landscape with People.	(Wood)	17 x 27 (Signed)	Manteau	15,000 fr:	19/2/41.

(b) Miscellaneous Objects of Art

Porcelain was purchased from Donath for 85,000 fr; (14/5/41), from Recher for 78,600 fr: and from Van der Meersch for 21,000 fr: (4/7/41).

21. Würzburg: Martin von Wagner Museum

Purchases in France for this museum appear to have been decidedly exiguous. - There was a picture of an aqueduct by Bourdon and of a valley with

Würzburg: Martin von Wagner Museum (Cont'd)

fisherman by Vernet (which of that tribe unspecified). Also a few drawings and books. No prices were quoted for any of these articles.

Index of Paris Art Dealers and Individuals who sold Works of Art to German Museums

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>
d'ATRI	23, Rue la Boetie
AUBRY	2, Rue des Beaux-Arts
BALAY, R.	58, Rue de Vauzirard
BENATOV	31, Rue Campagne - Premiere
BIGNOU	8, Rue la Boetie
BRUMMER, E.	126, Rue du Fanbourg St. Honore
CAILLEUX	136, Fanbourg St. Honore
CAMOIN, A.	9, Quai Voltaire
CARLHIAN	22, Place Vendome
DONATH, Etienne	14, Rue Milton
ENGEL, Hugo	22, Boulevard Malesherbes
FABIANI, M.	26, Avenue Matignan
FEUVE, R.	20, Rue de la Chaise
GERARD, Raphael	4, Avenue de Messne
GOBIN, Ro Maurice	1, Rue Laffite
GROSVALLLET (GROVALET)	126, Boulevard Haussmann
HEIM, Madame Georges	3, Rue Dugny - Trouin (also spelt Dugay-Trouin)
HOLZAPFEL, R.	45, Avenue des Peupliers
ENDJOUJIAN, M.A.M.	26, Rue Lafayette
JORET	30, Rue des Sants-Peres
KALEBDJIAN, Freres	52 bis Avenue d'Iena
KELLERMANN	13, Square de Port-Royal
KNOEDLER	22, Rue des Capucines
LANDRY, Pierre	1, Rue Chardin (12, Place Vendome)
LEEGENHOECK, J.O.	230, Boulevard Raspail
MANTEAU, Alice	14, Rue de l'Abbaye
MATHEU, Jacques	50, Avenue Duqucsue
MATIS	5, Avenue Montaigne
MELLER, Dr.	3, Rue du General-Appert
MÜLLER, R.	11, Rue Jean-Ferandi
POPOFF, Alexandre	86, Fanbourg St. Honore
POUMAY	27, Boulevard de Clichy
RATTON, Charles	14, Rue de Mariguan
RECHER, Madame A.	7, Quai Voltaire & 1, Rue Bourdaloie
RENAND	30, Quai de Bethune
ROCHLITZ, Gustav	222, Rue de Rivoli
ROY L & C Soeurs	69, Rue des Mathurius
SABATERY, Mlle. S.	35, Rue Boissy d'Anglas
SAIGNE, Marcel	44, Rue des Mathurius
SAMBON, A.	7, Rue du Docteur- Lancereaux
SCHMIT & Cie	18 - 24 Rue de Charonne
SCHOELLER, A.	13, Rue de Mehanan
STORA, M. & R.	32 bis Boulevard Haussmann
TROTTI, Avogli	88, Rue de Grenelle
TOUZAIN, E. Aine	27, Quai Voltaire
VANDERMEERSCH	23, Quai Voltaire
WANNIECK	29, Rue de Monceau

3. *The Schenker Papers, Part 2 "Purchases of Works of Art in France during the Occupation by and on behalf of German Dealers and Officials, the National Archives (Washington D.C), record group 239, 81.*

SECRET.

Purchases of Works of Art in France during the Occupation by and on behalf of German dealers and officials (The Schenker Papers, Part 2).

condsd I-4

The present report deals with purchases other than those made by German Museums and galleries direct. . In point of fact several of the dealers (e.g. Herbst) were stated to be purchasing on behalf of museums. Others were acting in a variety of capacities, such as furnishing houses taken over by the Party big-wigs, or buying pictures to form the nucleus of new and Party-inspired galleries. A small quantity of goods were sent to prominent Party figures (e.g. Ribbentrop, Speer) apparently for their personal use. Goering, having the fruits of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg at his disposal only figures in the Schenker papers in one instance, and even then no details of the goods sent to him were specified.

List of dealers (Appendix to this report) filed

under Dealers - France

BAMMANN: (11 Blumenstr., Düsseldorf)

Although it is known from the Bunjes papers that Bammann was very active in the French art world surprisingly few purchases by him are recorded in the Schenker papers. In July 1941 he bought three paintings from Roehlitz for 120,000 francs, and, at other times, four from Lenthal, two from Aubry and one from Manteau.

BARTHEL, Dr. (Reichenberg, Sudetenland, Karl Herzogstr. 2.)

The goods for this man were to be sent to the above address (apparently that of the local museum-administration) and consisted mainly of porcelain and glass purchased at a cost of 494,000 francs. Dealers involved were Moreno, Tallémas and Stora.

BREKER, Professor Arno (State Sculpture Workshops, Wriezen a.d. Oder).

Goods to be sent to the above address consisted of pieces of sculpture, twenty tons of plaster (and such personal works of art as Eau de Cologne, gramophone records and wine -- the whole to be sent as military transport. Dealers who supplied the sculpture were the following:-- Alebdjian, Fabre, Jansen, Rudier, Flammarion, Rudin, Champesne.

CARP

Furniture and sculpture to the value of 2,680,300 francs was bought by CARP (apparently a Frenchman) in February 1944. Carp's address was the Hotel Louvois Paris, but he appears to have been buying on behalf of the Hauptwirtschaftslager of the Waffen SS at the Hague.

FRANK, Philipp, (Deutsche Bank, Mannheim).

Frank, described as Director of the Deutsche Bank, Mannheim, bought the following pictures.

<u>Artist.</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Medium etc.</u>	<u>Dealer</u>	<u>Price Paid.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
Cezanne	Pine trees and Rocks.	Water colour (No. 929 in Venturis cat.)	Gobin	28,000 fr.	13/2/41
Courbet	Landscape		Benatov	85,000 fr.	Jan 41.
Degas	Dancer	Chalk drawing	Gerard	55,000 fr.	18/2/41
Gericault	"Assassins bearing body of 'Forlès'".	Crayon drawing	Gobin	15,000 frs.	13/2/41
	Horse	Drawing.	"	30,000 frs.	24/3/41.
Guys	"Entracte"	Water-colour.	Gobin	5,000 frs.	13/2/41.
Pissarro	Spring at Fragny	Pastel	Gobin	16,000 frs.	13/2/41
Rodin	Naked woman dancing.	Water-colour.	Gobin	3,500 frs.	13/2/41

Frank also bought a piece of wood sculpture -- French Gothic Madonna & Child, first half of 14th century -- for 45,000 fr. from Donath.

FÜRST, Hans (Wien VI, Linke Wienzeile 70)

Hans Fürst, dealer in "Altkunst - Stilmöbel" bought large quantities of furniture and small sculptures in France. The descriptions of practically all of these (for which some three quarters of a million francs were paid) is very vague, and the chief interest attaching to this series of papers is a letter to Fürst from Schenkers dealing with the relations between the predatory German dealers and the French Customs. A complete translation of this document follows:-

1st April 1943.

"We informed you in our communication of the 15th March 1943 that the French Customs authorities were putting the greatest difficulties in the way of the despatch of the works of art which you purchased in Paris. The values stated

"We have been forced to raise the matter with the German Military C. in C., France (MFA Department) in order to secure the intervention of this authority. We have had to prove to the French Customs Officials that the works of art in question really were bought at the prices stated.

"We finally obtained the export license when the matter had been gone into by the French Customs at a high level and referred back to the German military C. in C., France (MFA Department).

GILLHAUSEN (Frau Maria, (München, Leopoldstr. 38)

Three expensive pictures were sent to this lady, details as follows:-

<u>Artist.</u>	<u>Subject.</u>	<u>Dimensions.</u>	<u>Dealer.</u>	<u>Price paid.</u>	<u>Date of Transaction.</u>
RENOIR	Cariatides ⁶⁷	30.5 x 41	Landry	360,000fr.	22/3/41
SISLEY	Barges near Rouen (c.1869)		Gerard	200,000fr.	31/1/41
VUILLARD	Flower vase		"	50,000fr.	31/1/41

*This picture stated to have been formerly in the C. Ganne collection and to have been purchased by Gillhausen via Landry from M. Alfred Pacquement, 80 Boulevard Malesherbis, Paris 8.

GROSSE, Dr. R. (Kunstandlung, Berlin, Bellevuestr.16)

The purchases of this dealer were limited to some fifteen to twenty pictures (details unfortunately vague, though a Magnasco stated to be among them) and a small quantity of porcelain.

HABERSTOCK, Karl (Kunsthandlung, Berlin, Kurfürstenstr. 59)

Paintings purchased by this dealer in Paris included a Leda and the Swan by Veronese, a Landscape with Figures by Berchem and a Scene of Family Life by Teniers. He also bought unspecified pictures by Seb. Franck, Schennau, Schiavone, Hillingford, Panninni, Maes, and Königlo together with some twenty three miscellaneous pictures and a few picture-frames and pieces of sculpture.

HERBST, Hans (Dorothongasse 17)

A letter dated the 30th July, 1943, from the office of the German military C. in C., France states that "all the purchases of works of art made in Paris by Dr. Hans Herbst are intended for German Museums." The purchases in question, which were very extensive indeed, were sent to Herbst at the above address (apparently that of the Dorotheum Museum). The goods he purchased amounted in all to 15,218,500 francs. See document See document Set itemized list.

The following are the identifiable pictures purchased.

<u>Artist.</u>	<u>Subject.</u>	<u>Details.</u>	<u>Dealer.</u>	<u>Price Paid.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
van AELST	Flowers	Canvas	Anet	80,000 fr.	
Antwerp School	Adoration of Magi		Bayle	345,000 fr.	
BRUEGEL, J	Landscape & animals	63 x 92; wood	Unni	920,000 fr.	
CHAVANNES	2 Landscapes & figures	Signed and dated 1723	Gal: Voltaire	120,000 fr.	
COQUES (attributed to)	Family Scene		Longy	300,000 fr.	
CRANACH, the elder (attributed to)	Madonna & Child	Wood: 51x34 monogram partly visible	Guidaux	900,000 fr.	
CUYP, J.	Portrait of girl with garland of flowers.	Oak	Anet	125,000 fr.	
DUC, Jacob (attributed to)	Figures in a Room	Oak: 40 x 68	Guichet	450,000 fr.	
HOREMANS	"Joueurs de Quilles"		Bayle	160,000 fr.	
MATSYS (attributed to)	Holy Family	Wood: 78 x 110	Leroux	900,000 fr.	
van der MEULEN	Louis XV & Family at Clagny	Signed.	Gal: Voltaire	220,000 fr.	

<u>Artist.</u>	<u>Subject.</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Dealer.</u>	<u>Price Paid.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
MOSTAERT, G.	Hay Waggon	Oak: 103 x 136	Anet	560,000fr.	
MULIER, Pieter	Sea & Beach.	Oak: 40 x 60 signed in monogram	Olivier	90,000fr.	
van OSTADE	Peasants in Tavern	Oak: 44 x 54 signed and dated 1640.	Vincent	900,000fr.	
" "	Peasants in Barn	Oak: 27 x 36.5 signed.	Catelinean	850,000fr.	
PAEPE	Still Life with Grapes and Oranges	Oak: 28.5 x 21. signed.	Olivier	28,000fr.	
PLATZER	Mythological scene		Bayle	135,000fr.	
POSTE, F (attributed to)	Still Life with Flowers and 2 butterflies.	Canvas: 66 x 53	Olivier	85,000fr	
PYBAS, J (Sic)	?	Wood: Signed 1614	Gaillard	100,000fr.	
PYNACKER	Landscape	Canvas: 59.5 x 73	Anet	42,500fr.	
RAVENSTEIN (attributed to)	Female Portrait		Longy	240,000fr.	
ROBERT, Hubert	"Le Festin"		Fayle	100,000fr.	
ROTTENHAMMER	Mythological scene		Gaillard	140,000fr.	
TENIERS	"History of the Vine"	Canvas: 77 x 146	Pantchoulidseff	900,000fr.	
	Temptation of St. Anthony		Gaillard	170,000fr.	
TREMOLIERE	Venus & Cupid.	Canvas: 97 x 130 signed & dated 1738	Olivier	250,000fr.	
WOUWARMANS	Landscape	Signed	Longy	200,000fr.	

Tapestries purchased by Herbst.

<u>Description.</u>	<u>Period</u>	<u>Dimensions</u>	<u>Dealer</u>	<u>Price Paid.</u>
1. "Scene Galante". A valet serving two figures in foreground. A fountain with figures in centre.	early c.16	254 x 248	"La Bleviniere"	700,000fr.
2. Europa and the Bull (Brussels)	ca. 1700	460 x 315	" "	525,000fr.
3. Figures and animals in a forest. Moated castle in background (signed Brussels)	early c.17	343 x 325	Rene Gerard "La Bleviniere"	700,000fr.
4. Forest with stream and animals. In foreground a camel, in background a moated castle (Arras)	late c.16.	350 x 270	Walser	500,000fr.
5. Two parrots in a mountain forest.	mid. c.17	324 x 440	Entifaund.	275,000fr.
6. King and Queen in triumphal chariot with putti, centre, 2 pages carrying crowns. (Aubusson)	late c.17	470 x 285	Maquet.	80,000fr.
7. Lion hunt. Numerous figures mounted and on foot in a large forest. 2 lions.	mid c.17	308 x 70	Fardolet	714,000fr.
8. Pattern of cabbage-leaves, flowers and birds.	c.16	520 x 238	"Aux Vieux Aubussons"	350,000fr.

In addition to paintings and tapestries Herbst also purchased a certain quantity of furniture and sculpture.

KANITZ, Oberst Graf von (Schloss Capfenberg, bei Lünen, Westphalia)

This man bought two paintings, a large lantern, an Empire writing-desk and a pair of gilt wooden wall-chandeliers. Although his residence was stated to be Schloss Capfenberg, the goods appear to have been sent to Schloss Nassau a.d.Lahn.

KOETTGEN, Franz & HORSTMANN, Edgar (Architects: Krakau, Burg zu Krakau).

This pair purchased furniture, sculpture and miscellaneous knick-knacks in Paris to the tune of at least 1,552,350 francs. Some of the stuff appears to have reached Cracow via Mühlmann's Berlin office, while permits for evading Customs duties were obtained from Mühlmann's office at the Hotel Mayran, Paris. It seems likely that most of the goods were intended for the furnishing of Government Office in Cracow. A letter from the Bau-direktor of the General Gouvernement, Cracow, instructs Schenker to send the invoices to Koettgen and Horstmann.

KRÜGER, Wolfgang (Verlag) (Berlin, Nikolassee, An der Rohwiese 4)
(also Kölpinsee, Insel Usedom, Pommern).

Kruger purchased paintings to the value of 2,435,000 francs, (details of which are as follows), including works by Daubigny, Guys, Reubin, Sisley, Vlaminck, Pissarro. For detailed list see document.

<u>Artist.</u>	<u>Subject.</u>	<u>Details.</u>	<u>Dealer</u>	<u>Price Paid</u>	<u>Date of Transaction</u>
DANBIGNY	Dieppe		Dubourg	65,000fr.	
DUPRE, Jules	Seascape		Gerard	40,000fr.	15/12/42
GUYS, Constantin	Horseman & Ladies.	Water- colour 29½ x 21½	Neuville & Vivien	30,000fr.	1/3/44.
"	"	Riders	Denazit	30,000fr.	15/12/42
"	"	"Deux Elegantes"	"	22,000fr.	15/12/42
"	"	Woman standing	"	15,000fr.	15/12/42
HERVIER, L. A.	Landscape with mills.	Canvas: signed & dated & 1849: 36½ x 23½	Neuville & Vivien.	20,000fr.	1/3/44.
JACQUE, Charles	Cock & hens.	Panel: 15 x 10. (1899)	" "	15,000 fr.	1/3/44.
PISSARRO.	Haymakers. Morning.		Durand- Ruel	140,000 fr.	1/3/41
RAFFAELLI, J. F.	Paris & the Seine in Snow.	Canvas: signed: 92 x 73	Neuville & Vivien	75,000 fr.	1/3/41
"	"	Part of La Rochelle.	" "	85,000 fr.	1/3/41
"	"	Landscape.	Dutoury	30,000 fr.	
"	"	Landscape.	Gerard	30,000 fr.	15/12/42
RENOIR	Walk in the Wood	Pastel (191C)	Durand- Ruel	160,000 fr.	1/3/41
"	Woman	20 x 12½	Barreiro	150,000 fr.	
"	Head of a Woman; blue background	13½ x 12	"	125,000 fr.	
"	The Mills.		"	100,000 fr.	
"	The Fish		"	300,000 fr.	
ROUSSEL	Head of an old Woman		Gerard	15,000 fr.	15/12/42
SISLEY	The Seine from BY.		Gerard	850,000 fr.	29/6/43
"	Nut trees Veneux- Nadon		Durand- Ruel.	85,000 fr.	1/3/41
UTRILLO	Street with Poplars (1917- 1919)		Renon & Celle	35,000 fr.	15/4/41.
VLAMINCK	Snow		Benazit	12,000 fr.	
"	Landscape		"	6,000 fr.	

LAGRAND, R. (13 Rue la Regence, Brussels)

In February - March 1942 this man bought small quantities of furniture and sculpture from Senail, Roblin, Maquet, Recher and Faillet.

WAGNER, AUGER. (Berlin, Nikolasse)

Four paintings were bought by this man in October 1941, viz: Pissarro: Dieppe Cathedral (150,000 fr.) Renoir: Figure piece (160,000 fr.) Delacroix: Landscape (50,000 fr.) and Corot: "Trees by the River" (70,000 fr.). All the pictures came from Raphael Gerard.

MOEDER, R. (Kunsthdlgung, Wien, Margaretenstr.: 54)

This dealer purchased furniture for 132,000 francs in June-July 1942 from Roger, Comoglio and Magnet, and other furniture (prices not stated) from "Galeries Opera", Bernard, Perrotin, Delabur, Ch. Fla. Rayern, Guerin and "Vieux Logis".

MÜHLMANN, Dr. Josef

Dr. Mühlmann appears to have been more active than any other German individual in buying works of art in France, and his activities as reflected in the Schenker papers were so multiple as to be difficult to disentangle.

In the autumn of 1940 Mühlmann was installed at the Hague with the title of "Sonderbeauftragter des Reichskommissar für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete". A certain amount of works of art were sent to him at this address from Paris at this time, but after the early part of 1941 Mühlmann appears to have relinquished this appointment -- at least no more is heard of him in this capacity. Already by February 1941 he is referred to as "Professor Dr. Mühlmann who has been entrusted with the purchase of works of art on behalf of various German authorities..... and who is travelling through Unoccupied France in this capacity". Henceforth an enormous amount of objects d'art were sent addressed to Mühlmann, usually at Berlin (Unter den Linden 27) but once, at least, at Vienna. The Berlin Office seems to have functioned as a clearing-house for works of art coming from Paris in this way, and some at least, were for onward transmission (for instance to Cracow). Mühlmann also appears to have had an office in Paris (Hotel Mayran) which dealt with securing papers giving immunity from Customs dues for works of art purchased by Germans in France.

The bulk of the articles sent to Mühlmann were tables, chairs, carpets, tapestries, stained glass, miscellaneous small sculptures and other objects which could hardly be identified from the descriptions given, but which were exceedingly numerous. Pictures were definitely in the minority; the following are such details as are available concerning them. An insufficient number of items are priced in the Schenker papers to give anything like a complete figure for Mühlmann's purchases which certainly ran into millions of francs).

<u>Artist or School.</u>	<u>Subject.</u>	<u>Dimensions.</u>	<u>Price Paid.</u>	<u>Dealer</u>	<u>Date.</u>
Avignon School	Adoration of Shepherds.	Wood: 121 x 90		(Apparently an Avignon dealer)	
Bibiena, G.	2 pen-drawings of architecture.	49 x 69		(Apparently an Avignon dealer)	
Courbet	"Sea and Beach".				25/5/41
Dutch School.	Madonna & Child	Wood: 36 x 23.5		(Apparently an Avignon dealer)	
Maas, N.	Assembly in the open air.	55 x 72.		Apparently an Avignon dealer)	
Neefs, P.	Interior of a Church.	(Oil on copper)	4,250 marks		
van Os, J.	Still Life (Flowers)	117 x 84		(Apparently an Avignon dealer)	
Peeters.	Seascape.	91.5 x 144		(Apparently an Avignon dealer)	
Schalken	?	33.5 x 27 (Oil on wood)			
Vrancks, Seb.	The attendants of a General.	52.5 x 103 (Oil on wood)			

Unspecified paintings by the following artists were also bought:-
Bega, Bellotto, Bodewyns, Bol, Brugel, J. Dujardin, Kalf, Lambert J. Lincolbach, Melenaer, A. van der Neer, Pannini (3), Peeten, J. Peeters J., Ponté (Francisco da), Verck.

PÖSSENBACHER, Anton ("Werkstätten für Innen-~~ausbau~~, München 5, Jahnstr: 45. Ausstellung räume Odeonsplatz 2).

The goods were sent to Otto Pössenbacher, Jahnstr:45, Munich, while most of the letters were signed Fritz Pössenbacher. The exact relationship of Anton to Otto to Fritz does not emerge with any clarity from the Schenker papers. Full details on Fritz emerge from an authorization dated 11th Sept. 1940 from the office of the "Staatsminister und Chef der Präsidialkanzlei des Führers und Reichskanzlers", which reads as follows:-

"Herr Fritz Pössenbacher of Munich, Jahnstr: 45 born at Munich on the 12th March 1906, military passport (Wehrpass) No: I 06/12/1053/1, has, in the interests of the Reich, been commissioned to procure furniture in France, Belgium and Holland for the building operations of the Führer and Reich Marshal Goering which are to be carried through as quickly as possible....."

While the stuff purchased in Paris in the early days of the Occupation appears to have been sent direct from the dealers to the Maison Pössenbacher, after the first six months it went via a certain Paul Lindpaintner in Paris. The reason for this seems to have been that there was a hitch over transporting the goods purchased in 1940 and Lindpaintner being already in Paris, was called in to accelerate matters -- doubtless owing to the fact that Pössenbacher was catering for the Party big-wigs. It is indeed almost a Leitmotif of the Schenker papers that goods purchased in Paris through the normal channels took an interminable time to reach the Fatherland. The activities of Lindpaintner are interesting but not completely clear. As early as the 13th January 1941 a letter from Otto Pössenbacher in Munich to Schenker's Paris office explained that he had asked "Herr Rittmeister Paul Lindpaintner" to look after his interests in Paris. Thereafter no dealers names appear in the Pössenbacher papers: the stuff is sent to Munich as from Lindpaintner.

A letter dated the 7th Dec: 1943 from Lindpaintner to Schenker states "The goods are intended in the first instance for high-placed authorities (oberste Behörden) and German museums." While there seems no evidence in the Schenker material that Lindpaintner supplied any firm in Germany other than Pössenbacher, a most interesting statement in a letter of the 31st March 1944 from Schenker to Lindpaintner says "The cases marked "FL 1-2-3-4-4" Iran were despatched in van A.L. 309.127 on the 21st March 1944 to Iran and remain at your disposal with the firm of Bignera Kusche y Martin at Iran". A further statement was to the effect that these cases contained furniture.

In addition to 1,798,000 francs, spent on pictures on behalf of Pössenbacher some 2,777,245 francs appear to have been spent on furniture etc.

Paintings sent by Lindpaintner to Pössenbacher were the following:

<u>Artist.</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Dimensions.</u>	<u>Price Paid.</u>
Soucher (style of)	(2 oval pictures)	60 x 50	35,000 fr.
Pruegel the Younger	Peasants paying their rent (copper)		235,000 fr.
Pruegel (attributed to)			600,000 fr
Händecoetter			(with the Händecoetter and the van Eckhout)
(attributed to)			85,000 fr.
Janinsco	Landscape		
Marieschi (attributed to)	Wash drawing "View of Venice"	37 x 24	7,500 fr.
Pruegel (attributed to)	Landscape		60,000 fr.
Pruegel (attributed to)	Mythological Scene (canvas)	87 x 63	52,000 fr.
van Eckhout			(See Pruegel)
van Loo	French portrait		180,000 fr.

Other pictures purchased on behalf of Pössenbacher were a c.19 view of the Berlin Schloss (60,000 fr.), a c.16 copy of a portrait of Philip the Bold (78,000fr) a c.15 picture on wood of the Assumption, 53 x 48 (100,000Fr.) and an English-school gouache, "Empire period" of a horseman 22 x 16. (5,500 fr.)

REICHSSANSENMINISTER

Ribbentrop bought a painting in 1941 (summer). It was described as representing three women and a dog, and the name of the artist, price paid etc. was not specified.

SCHWARZINGER, Karl (Nussdorferstr.1, Vienna)

Furniture to the value of 228,350 francs was bought from Comoglio, Andrey and Jiguet in March 1942 on behalf of this man.

SPEER, Professor (Generalbauinspektor: Berlin)

Twenty-five cases at least of miscellaneous furniture, sculpture and knick-knacks were sent to Speer -- apparently between October 1941 and August 1942. No details concerning prices emerged but the following were the firms in question:- Kalebajian, Buvelot, Rudier, Petitot, de Lodere, Middegaeis, Jansen, Fabre.

STIASSNY, Hans (Riemergasse 13, Vienna)

In August-November 1941 86,650 francs worth of goods (mainly picture-frames) were sent to Stiassny in Vienna.

Galerie WELZ (Salzburg) & Galerie FELLNER (Linz)

These two firms, being both Austrian, are often treated together in the Schenker dossiers, as goods for both were despatched by the same transport. It seems that Friedrich Welz was commissioned by the Gauleiter und Reichsstatthalter of Salzburg to buy furniture etc in Paris with which to equip Schloss Klessheim, near Salzburg -- this being a personal project from Hitler, the aim being apparently, to found a "Landesgalerie". The descriptions of the pictures bought by Welz are tantalisingly brief, no prices or subjects being specified. The artists, however, were the following:- Bloemaert, Chaudin, Cheret, Claude, Clouet, Coello, Corot (3), Courbet (7), Dati (2), Daumier, Delacroix, Feuerbach, Goltzius, Goya, Fraesbeck, Heinsius, Heusch, Lepine, Monet, Monticelli (2), Pissarro, Poussin, Rodin, Romeyn, Rubens, Santo di Tito, Scorel, Scurat, Signac, Sonje, Vallin, Van der Velde, Van Dyck, Vouvermanns Wunde.

Dealers supplying these paintings were the following:- Galerie des Beaux-Arts Bary, Holzappel, Leguay, Frank, Josephine, Hotel de Chevreuse.

Furniture, sculpture etc. was also bought in considerable quantities, but, as in the case of the paintings, very few details were supplied.

4. Letter from Dr. Sabine Röder, curator at the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* to Chiew-Lee Khut, May 12, 1999.



Kaiser Wilhelm Museum
Museum Haus Lange
Museum Haus Esters

Kunstmuseen der Stadt Krefeld • Karlsplatz 35 • D 47 798 Krefeld

Chiew-Lee Khut
Barr Smith Library (Inter-Library Loans)
The University of Adelaide
North Terrace
Adelaide 5005
South Australia

Administration
Karlsplatz 35
D 47798 Krefeld

Telefon (02151) 77 00 44
Telefax (02151) 77 03 68

Dear Sir/Madam,

the correspondence of the museum during the nazi-period still exists and is open to research. Because of the lack of personal resource we can't do a profound study in the archive for you in respect of your questions.

But from a first view at the documents I can insure you, that there isn't the slightest indication that „Impressionist paintings“ were regarded as „degenerated“ or that anybody would see a problem in buying them - at least not here in the region. In fact they seemed to have a position kind of „in-between“.

Several museum directors from the Rhineland and even Nazi-politicians of the city objected to the „Aktion entartete Kunst“ and even tried to get back the paintings being confiscated - without success of course. The more they were fascinated by the sudden possibility to purchase at least 19. and early 20. century-french art for their robbed collections. It's strange enough to see that it didn't come into their minds that those purchases made possible by the German occupation might not be okay. Probably you know the book of Hector Feliciano, who describes the history of the purchases and robbery of art in Paris quite well.

Back to your question regarding the Impressionists in the broadest sense of the word in our collection: I send to you some copies of letters, where they are mentioned. They were transported together with other works of art by diverse companies and even by the military. They were not treated different to any older work of art, which had been bought at the same time.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Sabine Röder
curator

5. Letter addressed to Dr. Muthmann signed by Hermann Lange's Secretary, dated 21 July 1942. A photocopy of the original letter from the museum's archives was provided to me courtesy of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum, Krefeld Museum*, by the museum's curator, Dr. Sabine Röder.

HERMANN LANGE

TELEGRAMME : VERSEIDAG, LANGE, KREFELD
FERNANRUF NR. 258 81

KREFELD, den 21.7.42
GARTENSTR. 52

Herrn Dr. M u t h m a n n

K r e f e l d .
- - - - -

Sehr geehrter Herr Doktor !

Herr Hermann Lange, der auf der Reise wieder erkrankt ist und deshalb einige Tage das Bett hüten musste, hätte Ihnen gerne persönlich geantwortet, ist aber dazu nicht imstande. Er bittet mich deshalb, Ihnen Folgendes mitzuteilen:

Das Bild von Sebastiano Piombo hat er in München besichtigt, es ist für den Reichsmarschall reserviert, überdies wird ein unerschwinglicher Preis verlangt (über Mk.300.000.-).

Herr Lange hat nun den Gedanken, dass die Verseida ein schönes Kunstwerk des 19.Jahrhunderts stiftet. Zunächst hat er sich erkundigt, ob die Gruppe von Maillol (3 Grazien) noch im Handel ist (sie soll in Frankreich sein). Dann hält er vielleicht des von Ihnen erwähnte Pastellbild von Degas für geeignet, ferner käme ein schöner Utrillo (Kathedrale oder Strassenbild) aus der Zeit 1910-1913/14 in Frage. Ob und zu welchen Preisen zu haben ist ein Manet, ein van Gogh, ein Cézanne nur in bester Qualität, kann er nicht beurteilen, möchte aber sehr gerne dauernd von Ihnen über den Pariser und Amsterdamer Markt unterrichtet sein.-

Heil Hitler

6. Certificate issued by the Commander of the Armed Forces in France, dated 27 May 1942. . A copy of the original letter was supplied from the archives of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* by the museum's curator, Dr. Sabine Röder.

Der Militärbefehlshaber in Frankreich

Verwaltungsstab ~~Abt. Verw. N. V. / 7 Kunst~~

Paris, den 27. Mai 1942

Hotel Majestic, Avenue Kleber 19
Fernsprecher : Kle 6800/09

B e s c h e i n i g u n g

Herr Museumsdirektor Dr. Fritz M u t h m a n n

hat für das Kaiser-Wilhelm-Museum der Stadt Krefeld ein Gemälde von Eugène Boudin, "Hafen von Antwerpen" erworben.

Die Ausfuhr aus Frankreich ist seitens des "Kunstschutzes" beim Militärbefehlshaber in Frankreich genehmigt. Die Einfuhr ist, da das genannte Kunstwerk für das Museum der Stadt Krefeld bestimmt ist und mithin in den öffentlichen Räumen des Museums gemeinnützigen Lehr- und Anschauungszwecken dient, sowohl zoll- wie umsatzausgleichssteuerfrei.

Für den Militärbefehlshaber
Der Chef des Verwaltungsstabes

~~Am~~ Auftrage



Oberkriegsverwaltungsrat

7. Letter to a Dr. Köhn in the *Folkwang Museum in Essen* from a regional administrative office in Düsseldorf, dated 21 May 1942. A copy of the original letter was supplied from the archives of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* by the museum's curator, Dr. Sabine Röder.

**Der Oberpräsident der Rheinprovinz, Düsseldorf, Landeshaus
(Verwaltung des Provinzialverbandes)**

SA-Oberführer
Landesrat Dr. Apffelstaedt

Der Oberpräsident der Rheinprovinz
(Verwaltung des Provinzialverbandes) Düsseldorf, Landeshaus
Postfach 111

Drahtwort: Landeshaus Düsseldorf Fernsprecher: 102 19
Fernschreiber: 035 58

Herrn
Dr. Köhn,
Essen,
Folkwang-Museum

K

21. Mai 1942.

Abt. _____ Tagebuch-Nr. _____
(bei Antwortschreiben unbedingt anzugeben.)

Düsseldorf,
Landeshaus

Lieber Herr Dr. Köhn,

in der Anlage sende ich Ihnen das Photo einer wundervollen, großen Pastellzeichnung von Degas, das bei Bignou steht und 75 000 RM = 1 ½ Millionen Franken kostet. Die Stadt Krefeld ist bereit, das Bild in Paris zu kaufen und zu bezahlen unter der Voraussetzung, daß die Stadt Essen bereit ist, den überschießenden Betrag von 25 000.- RM -- 50 000.- RM soll ja der von Ihnen abgegebene Euro kosten -- direkt an die Stadt Krefeld zu bezahlen. Es erscheint mir das außerordentlich günstig und praktisch, da sie dadurch keinerlei Transfer-Angelegenheiten zu behandeln haben. Entscheiden Sie bitte sofort, da das Bild bei Herrn Bignou nur bis zum 30. 6. reserviert ist. Telegrafieren Sie jedenfalls zusagend oder absagend rechtzeitig an Herrn Wüster, mit dem ich bei meinem nächsten Aufenthalt in Paris ab 31. Mai die Angelegenheit abschließend besprechen kann.

Mit besten Grüßen und

Heil Hitler !

Ihr

Q.

++

++

++

Abschrift übersende ich zur gefl. Kenntnis.

8. Letter to the director of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum from Provinzial-Feuerversicherungs-Anstalt*, dated 17 April 1942. A copy of the original letter was supplied from the archives of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* by the museum's curator, Dr. Sabine Röder.

Der Generaldirektor

der
Provinzial-Feuerversicherungsanstalt
der Rheinprovinz

Düsseldorf, den 17. April 1942.
Friedrichstraße 70-74, Postfach

Fernsprecher: Sammelnummer 10441 · Drahtname:
Provinzialfeuer · Postcheckkonto: Köln Nr. 2630

Bankkonten: Rhein. Girozentrale und Provinzialbank — Deutsche Bank,
Filiale Düsseldorf, Depositen-Kasse Bilk — Commerz- und Privat-Bank,
Aktiengesellschaft, sämtlich in Düsseldorf

Geschäftszeichen Transport 25.4.

Bitte im Antwortschreiben zu wiederholen

Herrn

Museumsdirektor Dr. Muthmann
Kaiser-Wilhelm-Museum

K r e f ä l d .

Westwall.

Betr.: Museumsversicherung T.Rh. 2491.

Auf Ihren heutigen telef. Anruf bezugnehmend bestätige ich Ihr hiermit der Ordnung halber, davon Vormerkung genommen zu haben, daß der Transport der Neuerwerbungen ab Paris nicht am 15.4., sondern 25. 4. 42 per verschlossenen plombierten Wehrmachtswaggon erfolgt. Ich bitte Sie um umgehende Mitteilung, ob in diesem Waggon ausschließlich Ihre und die Kunstgegenstände der Stadt Düsseldorf verladen werden und welche Personen den Transport begleiten. Sodann bitte noch Angabe, bis zu welcher Station in Deutschland der Waggon läuft und wie von dort die Weiterbeförderung der Kunstgegenstände vorgenommen wird.

Ich habe heute versucht, Herrn Dr. Hupp telef. zu bekommen, was mir leider nicht möglich war.

Heil Hitler !

/Im Auftrage :

National Archives at College Park



8601 Adelphi Road College Park, Maryland 20740-6001

March 12, 1996

Chiew-Lee Khut

South Australia 5031
AUSTRALIA

Dear Mr. Khut:

We can furnish electrostatic (paper) reproductions of "Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1, Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France," "Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2, The Goering Collection," and "Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 4, Linz: Hitler's Museum and Library," Records of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, Record Group 239, for \$299.40 (this includes foreign airmail delivery). We can furnish a microfiche copy of OSS R and A report 1708, "German Publicity on Measures for the Protection of Art in Italy," M1221, General Records of the Department of State, Record Group 59, for \$1.25 (\$6 minimum). We can furnish electrostatic (paper) reproductions of a folder of documents relating to looted art in the records of the R and A Branch, Records of the Office of Strategic Services for \$28 (including foreign airmail delivery). It could take at least 6-8 weeks after we receive your payment to complete your order.

The price quoted on the enclosed form is only an estimate; we will determine the actual cost at the time of copying. If your payment does not sufficiently cover the cost of copying we will request additional funds before releasing the reproductions. If your payment exceeds the amount required, we will refund the balance.

If you wish to order by international money order or a check drawn in United States dollars on a bank in the United States (payable to "NATF-NNR2-M96-2991-WM"), send it with the enclosed order form to the National Archives Trust Fund Board, P.O. Box 100793, Atlanta, GA 30384. If instead you wish to pay by using a MasterCard or VISA credit card, you should return the enclosed form (annotated with type of credit card, account number, expiration date, and your signature) to the Cashier (NAJC), National Archives at College Park, 8601 Adelphi Road, College

Park, MD 20740-6001. We have a minimum of \$6.00 (U.S.) for all mail orders.

Sincerely,

WILBERT MAHONEY^U
Archives II
Textual Reference Branch

Enclosure

National Archives at College Park



8601 Adelphi Road College Park, Maryland 20740-6001

December 23, 1996

Chiew-Lee Khut

South Australia 5031
AUSTRALIA

Dear Ms. Khut:

This is in reply to your December 10, 1996, request for a copy of a Detailed Interrogation Report (DIR).

We interpret your citation to Record Group 239/84 to mean box 84 within that record group. Unfortunately, that box contains several DIRs and without knowing precisely which one in which you are interested, we cannot provide you with an estimate for reproduction. To help you in your research, we enclosed a list of DIRs in box 84. Please select the report(s) in which you are interested and let us know. At that time we can provide you with a price quote to reproduce the report(s).

Sincerely, //

KENNETH HEGER
Archivist
Archives II Reference Branch

Schilling Dossier

Scholz, Robert

Box 82 Spain

Sweden

Swiss Reports

Looting, Switzerland

Voss, Hermann

Wendland, Hans

" , "

Western Hemisphere Study

Wildenstein & Cie.

Wilkinson, Tudor

Adolf Wuester

Box 83 Art Looting Investigation Unit - Final Report (4 Copies)

Box 84 D.I.R. #1 - Heinrich Hoffmann ✓

" #2 - Ernst Bucher ✓

" #3 - Robert Scholz ✓

" #4 - Gustav Rochlitz ✓

" #5 - Gunther Schiedlausky ✓

" #6 - Bruno Lohse ✓

" #7 - Gisela Limberger ✓

" #9 - Walter Andreas Hofer ✓

" #10 - Karl Kress ✓

" #11 - Walter Bornheim

" #12 - Hermann Voss ✓

" #13 - Karl Haberstock ✓

National Archives at College Park



8601 Adelphi Road College Park, Maryland 20740-6001

November 13, 1997

C. Khut

South Australia
AUSTRALIA

Dear Mr. Khut:

This is in reply to your October 31, 1997, request for copies of three documents from the Roberts Commission (RG 239).

We can provide you with paper copies of the files for "Looting Switzerland" and "Hans Wendland" for \$75. If you wish to order by check or money order (payable to "NABT-NWDT2"), and send it with the enclosed order form to the National Archives Trust Fund Board, P.O. Box 100793, Atlanta, GA 30384. If instead you wish to pay by using a MasterCard or VISA credit card, you should return the enclosed form (annotated with type of credit card, account number, expiration date, and your signature) to the Cashier (NAJC), National Archives at College Park, 8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, MD 20740-6001. I enclosed an ordering instruction sheet for your convenience.

I did not locate a copy of "Report No. 3: German Methods of Acquisition" in Box 83 as you suggested.

Sincerely,

KENNETH HEGER
Archivist
Archives II Reference Branch

National Archives at College Park



8601 Adelphi Road College Park, Maryland 20740-6001

June 15, 1999

Mr. Chiew-Lee Khut
The Barr Smith Library
The University of Adelaide, North Terrace
Adelaide 5005
AUSTRALIA

Dear Mr. Chiew-Lee Khut:

This is in response to your letter of March 31, 1999 to Dr. Heger, who is no longer with this office. We apologize for the delay in responding.

Enclosed is a courtesy copy of the document you requested from Record Group 239, Records of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas (the "Roberts Commission"). It is London Despatch No. 19284, dated November 17, 1944, enclosing Embassy Report No. 478 re: 'Objets d'Art,' found in Box 39 of RG 239.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. WALSH, Ph.D.
Archivist, Civilian Records
Textual Archives Services Division

Enclosure

FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF DOCUMENTS



Imperial War Museum
Lambeth Road
London SE1 6HZ

Telephone 0171-416 5226
Fax 0171-416 5374
Email SWalton@iwm.org.uk

Ms Chiew-Lee Khut

Switzerland

SWW/DOC3

9 June 1999

Dear Ms Khut

Thank you for your letter of 27 May.

I have identified the *Einsatzstab Rosenberg* file you refer to among the Nuremberg Tribunal documents, and enclose a photocopy order form detailing the relevant costs. The annex to the main report contains lists of personnel and their positions within the organisation, which you may not require and which I have therefore treated separately. I would be grateful for payment in the form of a Eurocheque or other draft in £ sterling, together with the signed form.

There is, of course, further documentation in the IMT Nuremberg papers concerning the looting of artworks by the Nazis, with particular reference to Rosenberg and Goering. However, a thorough investigation of this material would require a personal visit to the archives. With regard to the work of the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Branch of the CCG, we have one collection of personal papers which is described on the enclosed extract from our catalogues. These diaries, which are handwritten, might well contain information of use to you, although having them copied would be a lengthy and expensive process as they are quite substantial. The official records of the MFA Branch are in the Public Record Office, Ruskin Avenue, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU, together with the rest of the CCG files.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Walton
Archivist



Chiew-Lee Khut

Switzerland

14th June 1999

Dear Chiew-Lee Khut,

Thank you for your letter of 1st June concerning access to the "Entarte Kunst" typescript. This has been microfilmed by us, and is available to see in this medium. A photocopy of the microfilm is also available. Please let me know if some reason you need to see the original typescript; permission to see this can only be granted by the Chief Librarian.

James Bettley, Head of Collection Development, has a good knowledge of the typescript and its acquisition, and you can speak to him when you come in.

The Library is open Tuesday - Saturday 10.00 - 5.00. You should note that we are closed for stocktake from 28th August - 20th September inclusive. I would be grateful if you could let me know which days you intend to come in so I can arrange a time for your meeting with James Bettley.

Yours sincerely,

Barney Perkins
Special Collections
National Art Library

Tel:

Fax:

E-mail: l. . . .



**Öffentliche Kunstsammlung
Basel**

Post-Adresse:
Öffentliche Kunstsammlung
CH-4010 Basel, Postfach

Telefon (061) 2066262
Telefax (061) 2066252

**Kunstmuseum
St. Alban-Graben 16**

**Museum für Gegenwartskunst
St. Alban-Rheinweg 60**

Mr.
Chiew-Lee Khut

8355 Aadorf

Basel, June 22, 1999

Your letter of May 29, 1999

Dear Sir

Thank you for your letter of May 29, 1999, which had my full attention.

I am sorry to say, that unfortunately we do not have an accessible archive. However, I am happy to inform you, that the history of the paintings you are interested in have been published in the following book by

Prof. Georg Kreis
"Entartete" Kunst für Basel,
Wiese Verlag 1990

You may order it through our gallery book shop (Tel. 0041-61-206.62.82/Fax 0041-61-206.62.84) for Sfr. 49.-- and delivery costs ca. Sfr. 15.--.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Katharina Schmidt
Director

BIBLIOGRAPHY**The National Archives, (Washington D.C.).**

Cooper, Douglas. "Looted Works of Art in Switzerland: German Methods of Acquisition, January 21, 1945", record group 239, box 82.

_____. "Report on S/Ldr. Cooper's Visit to Switzerland", record group 239, box 82.

Heger, Kenneth, Archives Reference Branch, letter addressed to Chiew-Lee Khut regarding purchase of *Detailed Interrogation Reports* dated December 23 1996.

_____. Letter addressed to Chiew-Lee Khut regarding purchase of Swiss Reports dated November 13 1997.

Faison, Lane S. "Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 4, Linz - Hitler's Museum and Library, December 15, 1945.", record group 239, box 75.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation Report no. 12: Hermann Voss, September 15, 1945", record group 239, box 84.

Gould, Cecil. "The Schenker Papers: Part 1, Accession to German Museums and Galleries during the Occupation of France; Part 2, Purchases of Works of Art in France during the Occupation by and on Behalf of German Dealers and Officials, April 5, 1945", record group 239, box 81.

Mahoney, Wilbert, Textual Reference Branch, letter addressed to Chiew-Lee Khut regarding purchase of *Consolidated Interrogation Reports* dated March 12 1996.

Plaut, James S. "Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 1, Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, August 15, 1945", record group 239, box 75.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation Report no. 3: Robert Scholz, August 15, 1945", record group 239, box 84.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation Report no. 5: Günther Schiedlausky, August 15, 1945", record group 239, box 84.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation Report no. 4: Gustav Rochlitz, August 15, 1945", record group 239, box 84.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation report no. 6: Bruno Lohse, August 15, 1945," record group 239, box 84.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation Report no. 10: Karl Kress, August 15, 1945", record group 239, box 84.

_____. "Safehaven Report, Looted Art in Switzerland, January 15, 1946", record group 239, box 82.

Rousseau, Theodore. Consolidated Interrogation Report no. 2, "The Göring Collection", September 15, 1945, record group 239, box 75.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation Report no. 1: Heinrich Hoffmann, July 1, 1945, record group 239, box 84.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation Report no. 2: Ernst Buchner, July 31, 1945, record group 239, box 84.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation Report no. 7: Gisela Limberger, September 15, 1945, record group 239, box 84.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation Report no. 9: Walter Andreas Hofer." September 15, 1945, record group 239, box 84.

_____. "Detailed Interrogation Report no. 13: Karl Haberstock." May 1, 1946, record group 239, box 84.

Walsh, William, Archivist, letter addressed to Chiew-Lee Khut regarding purchase of records of *The American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Historic Monuments in War Areas* dated June 15 1999.

The National Art Library of the Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

"Entartete Kunst": Typescript Inventory (Germany. *Institut für Deutsche Kultur-und Wirtschafts-propaganda*, 1942).

Information sheets produced by the *Victoria and Albert Museum's Press Office* about the museum's acquisition of the inventory.

Barney Perkins, Special Collections, letter addressed to Chiew-Lee Khut regarding access to "*Degenerate Art*" Inventory dated 14 June 1999.

The Imperial War Museum, Lambeth Road, London.

"The *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg: An Analysis of the Captured Letter-Register of the ERR, October 29, 1940, through March 1941*", Foreign Office 645, box 349.

Stephen Walton, Archivist letter addressed to Chiew-Lee Khut regarding the museum's archival material on the *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg* dated 9 June 1999.

The Kaiser Wilhelm Museum, Krefeld.

Der Kunstverein in Bremen: Kunsthalle Bremen (KulturStiftung der Länder, 1992).

Dr. Sabine Röder, Curator of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* in Krefeld, letter addressed to Chiew-Lee Khut dated 12 May 1999.

Letter from the *Provinzial-Feuerversicherungs-Anstalt* to the Director of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Museum* dated 17 April 1942.

Letter from a Regional Office in Düsseldorf to Dr. Köln in the *Folkwang Museum* in Essen dated 20 May 1942.

Certificate Issued by the Commander of the Armed Forces in France dated 27 May 1943.

Letter Signed by Herman Lange's Secretary to a Dr. Muthmann Lange, Dated 21 July 1942.

The *Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zurich.*

Scholz, Robert. "Zur Wiedereröffnung des Berliner Kronprinzenpalais", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 19 December 1933.

_____. "Hausse in Verfallkunst", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 16 March 1934.

Rosenberg, Alfred. "Revolution in der bildenden Kunst", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 15 July 1933.

_____. "Revolutionäre an Sich", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 15 July 1933.

_____. "Kultur, Organisation und Politik", *Völkischer Beobachter*, 11 December 1933.

Öffentliche Kunstsammlung Basel, Basel.

Katharina Schmidt, Director of the *Öffentliche Kunstsammlung*, letter addressed to Chiew-Lee Khut about the history of the museum's purchase of "degenerate art" dated June 22, 1999.

Books

- Adam, Peter, *The Arts of the Third Reich*, (London: Thames & Hudson, 1992).
- _____. *Art of the Third Reich* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1995).
- Akinsha, Konstantin & Kozlov, Grigorii. *Stolen Treasures: The Hunt for the World's Lost Masterpieces*, (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1995).
- Backes, Klaus. "Adolf Hitler's Einfluß auf die Kulturpolitik des Dritten Reiches", (PhD. Diss. Ruprecht-Universität, Heidelberg, 1984).
- Avraham Barkai, *Nazi Economics: Ideology, Theory and Policy*, (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1990).
- Barron, Stephanie. ed. *'Degenerate Art': The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*, (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991).
- Botting, Douglas & Sayer, Ian. *America's Secret Army*, (New York: Watts, 1989).
- Botting, Douglas. *Nazi Gold*, (New York: Congdon & Weed, 1984).
- _____, *In the Ruins of the Reich*, (London; Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1985).
- Bower, Tom. *Blood Money: The Swiss, the Nazis and the Looted Billions*, (London: Macmillan, 1997).
- Broszat, Martin. *The Hitler State: The Foundation and Development of the Internal Structure of the Third Reich*, (London: Longman, 1981).
- Buomberger, Thomas. *Raubkunst Kunstraub: Die Schweiz und der Handel mit gestohlenen Kulturgütern zur Zeit des Zweiten Weltkriegs*, (Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1998).
- Chamberlain, E. R. *Loot!: The Heritage Of Plunder*, (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1983).
- Chipp, Herschell. ed. *Theories of Modern Art: A Sourcebook by Artists and Critics*, (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1996).
- Cuomo, Glen R. ed. *National Socialist Cultural Policy*, (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995).
- Dunlop, Ian. *The Shock of the New: Seven Historic Exhibitions of Modern Art*, (New York: American Heritage Press, 1972).
- Eberle, Matthias. *World War I and the Weimar Artists: Dix, Grosz, Beckmann, Schlemmer*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
- Elderfield, John. *European Master Paintings from Swiss Collections: Post-Impressionism to World War II*, (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1976).
- Eisner, Lotte Henriette. *The Haunted Screen: Expressionism in the German Cinema and the Influence of Max Reinhardt*, (London: Secker & Warburg, 1973, c1969).

- Esterow, Milton. *The Art Stealers* (New York: Macmillan, 1973).
- Faith, Nicholas. *Safety in Numbers: The Mysterious World of Swiss Banking*, (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1982).
- Feliciano, Hector. *The Lost Museum: The Nazi Conspiracy to Steal the World's Greatest Works of Art*, (New York: Basic Books, 1997).
- Friedländer, Henry & Milton, Sybil (eds). *The Holocaust: Ideology, Bureaucracy and Genocide*, (New York: Kraus-International Publications, 1980).
- Friedländer, Saul. *Reflections of Nazism: An Essay on Kitsch and Death*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993).
- Giles, Geoffrey J. *Students and National Socialism in Germany*, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1985).
- Gordon, Donald E. *Expressionism: Art and Idea*, (London: Yale University Press, 1987).
- Grosshans, Henry. *Hitler and the Artists*, (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983).
- Haffner, Sebastian. *The Meaning of Hitler*, (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1979).
- Haftmann, Werner. *Banned and Persecuted: Dictatorship of Art Under Hitler*, (Cologne: DuMont Buchverlag, 1986).
- _____, *Emil Nolde: Unpainted Pictures*, (New York: Praeger, 1965).
- Hardy, Alexander. *Hitler's Secret Weapon: The Managed Press and Propaganda Machine in Nazi Germany*, (New York: Vantage, 1967).
- Hewitt, Andrew. *Fascist Modernism: Aesthetics, Politics and the Avant-Garde*, (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1993).
- Hiden, John. *Explaining Hitler's Germany: Historians and the Third Reich*, (Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble, 1983).
- Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971).
- Hinz, Berthold. *Art in the Third Reich*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1979).
- Hirschfield, Gerhard, & Patrick Marsh, eds. *Collaboration in France: Politics and Culture during the Nazi Occupation, 1940-1944*, (New York, 1989).
- Holborn, Hajo. ed. *From Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1972).
- Howe, Thomas C. *Salt Mines and Castles: The Discovery and Restitution of Looted European Art*, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1946).
- Hull, David S. *Film in the Third Reich: A Study of the German Cinema 1933-1945*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969).

- Jaeger, Charles de. *The Linz File: Hitler's Plunder of Europe's Art*, (Exeter, England: Webb & Bower, 1981).
- Joachimides, Christos M.; Rosenthal, Norman; & Schmied, Wieland (eds). *German Art in the 20th Century: Painting and Sculpture 1905-1985*, (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1985).
- Kater, Michael H. *Different Drummers: Jazz in the Culture of Nazi Germany*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- Kershaw, Ian. *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation*, (London: Edward Arnold, 1989).
- Krauskopf, Robert W. & O'Neill, James. eds. *World War II: An Account of its Documents*, (Washington: Howard University Press, 1976).
- Kreis, Georg. "Entartete" Kunst für Basel. *Die Herausforderung von 1939*, (Basel: Wiese Verlag, 1990).
- Kurtz, Michael. *Nazi Contraband: American Policy on European Cultural Treasures 1945-1955*, (New York: Garland, 1985).
- Laqueur, Walter & Mosse, George. *Left-Wing Intellectuals between the Wars, 1919-1939*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).
- Lane, Barbara Miller. *Architecture and Politics in Germany 1918-1945*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1985).
- Lehmann-Haupt, Hellmut. *Art Under a Dictatorship*, (New York: Octagon Books, 1973).
- John Henry Merryman, *Law, Ethics, and the Visual Arts*, (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987).
- Mosse, George L. *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*, (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964).
- _____, *Nazi Culture: Intellectual, Cultural, and Social Life in the Third Reich*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1981).
- Norvold, James E. "Time, Space, and Dimension: Adolf Hitler and his Relation to Art", (M.A. thesis, California State University, Dominguez Hills, 1990).
- Nicholas, Lynn H. *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War*, (New York: Knopf, 1994).
- Peterson, Edward N. *The Limits of Hitler's Power*, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969).
- Petropoulos, Jonathan. "Art as Politics: The Nazi Elite's Quest for the Political and Material Control of Art", (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1990).
- _____. *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*, (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

- _____. *The Faustian Bargain: The Art World in Nazi Germany*, (London: Penguin, 2000).
- Rao, Barbara L. "The Development of the German National Socialist Point of View on Art and Art Criticism as Seen in the 'Volkischer Beobachter' 1920-1937", (M.A. thesis, California State University, Long Beach, 1985).
- Reichel, Peter. *Der schöne Schein des Dritten Reiches: Faszination und Gewalt der Faschismus*, (Munich: Hanser, 1991).
- Report of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1946).
- Roper, Hugh Trevor. *The Last Days of Hitler*, (London: Pan Books, 1968).
- Alfred Rosenberg, *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts: Eine Wertung der seelischgeistigen Gestaltenkämpfe* (Munich: Hoheneichen, 1939), published in English as *The Myth of the Twentieth Century: An Evaluation of the Spiritual-Intellectual Confrontations of Our Age*, (California: Noontide, 1982).
- Rothfeder, Herbert. "A Study of Alfred Rosenberg's Organisation for National Socialist Ideology", (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1963).
- Roxan, David & Wanstall, Kenneth. *The Jackdaw of Linz: The Story of Hitler's Art Thefts*, (London: Cassell, 1964).
- Schoenberner, Gerhard. *Artists Against Hitler: Persecution, Exile, Resistance* (Bonn: Inter Nationales, 1984).
- Scholz, Robert. *Architektur und bildenden Kunst, 1933-1945*, (Preußisch Oldendorf Schütz, 1974).
- Simpson, Elizabeth ed. *The Spoils of War: World War II and its Aftermath: The Loss, Reappearance, and Recovery of Cultural Property*, (New York: Harry N. Abrams, in association with The Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, 1997).
- Smith, Arthur Lee. *Hitler's Gold: The Story of the Nazi War Loot* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989).
- Smyth, Craig Hugh. *Repatriation of Art from the Collecting Point in Munich After World War II: Background and Beginnings, with Reference Especially to the Netherlands*, (Maarssen, the Netherlands: Gary Schwartz, 1988).
- Speer, Albert. *Inside the Third Reich*, (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1970).
- Stachura, Peter. ed. *The Nazi Machtergreifung: The Reich Chamber of Music, Theater and Visual Arts*, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983).
- Steinweis, Alan E. *Art, Ideology and Economics in Nazi Germany*, (University of North Carolina Press, 1993).

Treue, Wilhelm. *Art Plunder: The Fate of Works of Art in War and Unrest*, (New York: John Day, 1961).

Willett, John. *The New Sobriety 1917-1933: Art and Politics in the Weimar Period*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978).

_____. *The Weimar Years: A Culture Cut Short*, (Thames and Hudson, 1984).

Wulf, Joseph. *Presse und Funk im Dritten Reich: Eine Dokumentation*, (Gütersloh: Sigbert Mohn Verlag, 1964).

Uhr, Horst. *Masterpieces of German Expressionism at the Detroit Institute of Arts* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1982).

Articles

Arntz, Wilhelm. "Bildersturm in Deutschland: Das Schicksal der Bilder", *Das Schönste*, vol. 8, no. 6.

Ascherson, Neal. "The Führer's Freak Show", (Hitler's choice of heroic realism as the official art of the Third Reich ensured the future of Modernist painters such as Otto Dix)," *Independent on Sunday* (Review Supplement), March 1, 1992, pp. 12-13.

Bailey, Martin. "Revealed: What Happened to "Degenerate" Art in Germany's Museums from G to Z" *The Art Newspaper*, May 1997, no. 70.

Appleyard, Brian. "Portrait of a Nazi?", *The Independent*, September 28, 1994. p. 15.

Barr, Alfred Hamilton. "Art in the Third Reich - Preview 1933", *The Magazine of Art*, October 1945, pp. 211-30.

Bradscher, Greg. "Searching for Documents on Nazi Gold", *The Record*, May 1997.

Braun, Emily. "Return of the Repressed, ('Degenerate Art': The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany: Los Angeles County Museum of Art; travelling exhibit)", *Art in America*, October 1991, pp. 116-23.

Breitenbach, Edgar. "Historical Survey of the Intelligence Department. MFAA Section, in OMGB, 1946-1949", *College Art Journal* 2, Winter 1949-50.

Burnham, Bonnie & Ketchum, Linda E. "World War II Art Losses Still Surfacing"; *Stolen Art Alert*, October 1984, p. 1.

Buruma, Ian. "Melancholy Victory", *Spectator*, December 15, 1990, pp. 41-3.

Causton, Bernard. "Art in Germany Under the Nazis", *The London Studio* 12, November 1936, pp. 235-46.

Cork, Richard. "Crushed by the Jackboot", *Times Supplement*, March 13, 1992, p. 3.

Coumo, Glenn R. "Purging an 'Art Bolshevist': The Persecution of Gottfried Benn in the Years 1933-1938", *German Studies Review*, vol. 9, 1986, pp. 85-105.

D'Arcy, David. "Christie's Gets Mission Impossible (Christie's to auction 900 works of art looted from Vienna's Jewish community by the Nazis)", *The Art Newspaper*, vol. 7, January 1996, p. 27.

Decker, Andrew. "Nazi Art Returns to Germany (from the United States)", *ARTnews*, November 1984, p. 143.

_____, "A Legacy of Shame", *ARTnews*, December 1984. pp. 54-76.

_____, "Austria Will Auction 'Heirless' Art", *ARTnews*, February 1985, p. 96.

_____, "A Promise of Justice", *ARTnews*, March 1985, p. 90.

_____, "Austria to List Art Confiscated by Nazis", *New York Times*, July 26, 1985, p.13.

Decker, Andrew. "Austria Accepts New Claims for Looted Art", *ARTnews*, February 1986, p. 113.

_____, "Austria Reviews Claims on Looted Art (under the Nazi régime)", *ARTnews*, February 1987, pp. 37-8.

_____, "Vienna: A Slow Process, (the claims proceedings for Austrian-held artworks confiscated under the Nazi régime are nearly at the end of the first stage of review)", *ARTnews*, October 1987, pp. 71-2.

_____, "An Untapped, if Forbidden, Source", *ARTnews*, vol. 91, May 1992, p. 47-8.

Dewey, Fred. "Fascinating Facism", *New Statesman and Society*, May 10, 1991, pp. 30-2.

Dornberg, John. "Revenge of the Degenerates (strong sales at German auctions by modern artists, particularly the German Expressionists, branded degenerate by the Nazis)", *ARTnews*, October 1988, p. 28.

_____, "The Mounting Embarrassment of Germany's Nazi Treasures", *ARTnews*, September 1988, pp. 130-41.

Fergusson, Lee & Bonshek, Anna. "'Degenerate Art'; Censorship in Nazi Germany", *New Art Examiner*, vol. 20, November 1992, p. 35.

Frowein, Cordula. "The Exhibition of 20th Century German Art in London 1938: Eine Antwort auf die Ausstellung 'Entartete Kunst' in München 1937", *Exilforschung: Ein Internationales Jahrbuch* 2, 1984, pp. 212-37.

Gambrell, Jamey & Phillips, Christopher. "Red Wedge, Black Wedge: The Blockbuster Show 'Berlin-Moscow,' (examines the tumultuous artistic relations between the two cities from 1900 to 1950)", *Art in America*, December 1995, pp. 72-79.

Gambrell, Jamey. "Displaced Art: Hidden for Decades (paintings seized by the Soviet Army during World War II resurfaced in two recent exhibitions in Russia)", *Art in America*, September 1995, pp. 88-95.

_____, "Will Russia Return Spoils of War?", *Art in America*, March 1995, p. 29.

Gibson, Michael. "How a Timid Curator With a Deadpan Expression Outwitted the Nazis", *ARTnews*, vol. 80, June 1981, pp. 105-111.

Goggin, Mary-Margaret. "Decent Versus Degenerate Art; The National Socialist Case", *Art Journal*, vol. 50, Winter 1991, pp. 84-92.

Hochfield, Sylvia. "The Russians Renege (art looted from Nazi Germany regarded by Moscow as war reparations)", *ARTnews*, vol. 93, Summer 1994, p. 68.

Horovitz, David. "Lost Treasure of the Nazis' Victims", *Independent*, September 16, 1995, p. 13.

Hoelterhoff, Manuela. "Art of the Third Reich: Documents of Oppression", *Artforum*, no. 14, December 1975, pp. 55-62.

Jencks, Charles. "The Nazi's and the Avant-Garde", *Times Literary Supplement*, May 24 1991, pp. 16-17.

Kasher, Steven. "The Art of Hitler (Nazi visual culture and ways that it has surfaced)", *October*, no. 59, Winter 1992, pp. 48-85; Discussion, no. 63, Winter 1993, pp. 117-119.

Kaufmann, Jason Edward. "Nolde, the Rejected Nazi", *Art Newspaper*, vol. 6, February 1995, p. 16.

Kenner, Hugh. "Cleansing the temple, ('Degenerate Art': The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany: Los Angeles County Museum of Art; travelling exhibit)", *Art & Antiques*, vol. 8, February 1991, p. 104.

Kosinski, Dorothy M. "'Degenerate Art,' ('Degenerate Art': The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany: Los Angeles County Museum of Art; travelling exhibit)", *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 133, May 1991, pp. 346-347.

Kramer, Hilton. "Degenerate Art and the War Against Modernism ('Degenerate Art': The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany: Los Angeles County Museum of Art; travelling exhibit)", *The New Criterion*, vol. 10, October 1991, pp. 5-9.

Kuhn, Charles L. "German Paintings in the National Gallery: A Protest", *College Art Journal* 5, January 1946.

Kuspit, Donald Burton. "Diagnostic Malpractice: The Nazis on Modern Art", *Artforum*, vol. 25, November 1986, pp. 90-8.

Lee, David. "Supping With the Devil, (Emil Nolde was a supporter and victim of Nazism)", *Art Review*, vol. 47, December 1995/January 1996, p. 38-41.

Metzger, Gustav. "Art in Germany Under National Socialism", *Studio International*, March 1976, pp. 110-111.

Morley, Simon. "Nolde's Nationalism (reassessment of Emil Nolde's relationship with Nazi ideology)", *Art Monthly*, no. 192, December 1995/January 1996, p. 7-9.

Norman, Geraldine. "Survivor of the Third Reich", *Independent on Sunday*, November 12, 1995, pp. 88-89.

Overy, Richard. "Booty and the Beast", *Times Literary Supplement*, January 13, 1995, p. 25.

Plaut, James S. "Hitler's Capital: Loot for the Master Race", *The Atlantic Monthly*, October 1946, pp. 73-78.

Pois, Robert A. "Nature Devours History: National Socialism and the Death of Romanticism", *History of European Ideas*, no. 16 (1-3), January 1993, pp. 315-21.

_____, "The Cultural Despair of Emil Nolde", *German Life and Letters*, vol. 25, 1971-72, pp. 252-260.

_____, "German Expressionism in the Plastic Arts and Nazism: A Confrontation of Idealists", *German Life and Letters*, vol 21, 1968, pp. 206-213.

Rabinbach, Anson G. "The Aesthetics of Production in the Third Reich", *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 11, no. 4, October 1976, pp. 43-74.

Ritchie, A. "The Restitution of Art Loot", *Gallery Notes* (Albright Art Gallery, Buffalo, N.Y.) July 1946.

Selz, Peter Howard. "'Degenerate Art' Reconstructed, ('Entartete Kunst': Los Angeles County Museum of Art; travelling exhibit)", *Arts Magazine*, vol. 66, September 1991, pp. 58-60.

Steinweis, Alan E. "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The *Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur*", *Central European History*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 402-423.

Tumasonis, Elizabeth. "Bernhard Hoetger's Tree of Life: German Expressionism and Racial Ideology", *Art Journal*, vol. 51, Spring 1992, pp. 81-91.

Walton, Robert C. "The Holocaust: Conversion to Racism Through Scientific Materialism - The People Like Us Who Killed Jews", *History of European Ideas*, vol. 19, no. 4-6, July 1994, pp. 787-794.

Whitford, Frank. "The Courage to be German: Emil Nolde and 'Degenerate Art'", *Times Literary Supplement*, 24 May 1991, p. 16.

_____, "The Reich to Know", *Sunday Times*, August 15, 1993, section 9, pp. 8-9.