



The Hunt Controversy: A Shadow Report.

Erin Gibbons

The Hunt Controversy: A Shadow Report.

**Erin Gibbons,
Letterard,
Cashel,
Co. Galway,
Ireland.**

For the Simon Wiesenthal Center, Paris, France.

**© Copyright Erin Gibbons, 2008
All rights reserved.**

**Printed by Standard Printers, Galway.
Tel.: 091 755373**

CURRICULUM VITAE

Erin Gibbons has a Bachelor of Arts degree in History and Archaeology, a Higher Diploma in Education and a Diploma in Irish Heritage Management. A professional archaeologist, she has directed archaeological excavations throughout Ireland. Also an experienced museum consultant and researcher on archives and collections and advisor to county museums, local authorities and private museums. She co-authored a feasibility study for Galway County Council on the establishment of a county museum service. Ms. Gibbons directed a national award winning oral history project and has undertaken survey work on behalf of the Irish Landmark Trust and other organisations.

Erin Gibbons has been a long-standing member of the panel of experts of the 'Heritage in Schools Scheme', an initiative of the Irish National Teachers Organisation and the Heritage Council. She has taught the History of Landscape module for the Diploma in European Conservation Management (University College, Dublin) and has lectured extensively. Editor of the volume *Conamara Faoi Cheilt: Hidden Conamara*, Letterfrack, 1991, her published articles and reviews relate mainly to her archaeological work. Erin Gibbons lives in Letterard, Cashel, Connemara, Co. Galway.



Erin Gibbons presents *The Hunt Controversy: A Shadow Report* to Dr. Shimon Samuels, Paris 2008.

Contents

Preface	7
Introduction	14
The Barrington Review Group	23
The Hunt Museum Evaluation Group	27
The Nicholas Commentary	33
Irish Military Archive File on John and Gertrude Hunt	36
Correspondence from Count Alexander von Frey to John and Gertrude Hunt	44
Arthur Goldschmidt and his circle	56
Herr Buhl and his associates in Lucerne	63
‘Galitzine’s’, London	78
Felix Harbord	82
Connections between the Hunts and Dr. Adolf Mahr, Director of the National Museum of Ireland and Head of the Nazi Party in Ireland	87
The Hunts, the Pitt Rivers Collection and Captain George Pitt Rivers	93
The Hunts, Séan P. Ó Ríordáin and the Lough Gur excavations	105
John Hunt’s origins and background	116
Alexander von Frey’s correspondence with the Hunts in seeking to establish himself in Ireland	121
Fakes and forgeries	123

A triptych from the Fritz Mannheimer Collection returned by John Hunt to Mrs Mannheimer	130
Phillip and Anna Markus	134
Provenance research issues	137
Conclusions and recommendations	142
Endnotes	151

PREFACE

The Hunt Museum Limerick contains a collection, much of it lacking provenance, assembled by the late John and Gertrude Hunt. In January 2004, shortly after the Hunt Museum was presented with the Museum of the Year Award 2003, the Wiesenthal Centre called on the Irish authorities to establish an independent investigation into allegations of Nazi associations of John and Gertrude Hunt – particularly in the context of their alleged relations with dealers in looted art.

A State-funded enquiry called the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group was appointed in May 2005 by the Royal Irish Academy to investigate the allegations. Operating within very narrow terms of reference, the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group did not address the allegations, delivering, instead, an evaluation of the Hunt Museum holdings. It is our view that the narrow terms of reference under which the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group operated contributed in no small measure to four years of hyperbole, and often gratuitous acrimony, in much of the Irish press,

Following criticism of the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Final Report by the Wiesenthal Centre, and others, the eminent American scholar of Nazi-looted art, Dr Lynn Nicholas was requested to analyze the methodology of the Evaluation Group, respond to the criticisms of the Wiesenthal Centre, and suggest further action. Dr. Nicholas' "Report on the Final Report to the Royal Irish Academy by the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group, June, 2006", was submitted on 8 August 2007.

We are gratified by the position taken by Dr. Nicholas in the "Conclusions and Recommendations" of her report. Therein, Dr Nicholas

vindicates the Wiesenthal Centre's call for a full enquiry into the activities of John and Gertrude Hunt, stating:

"An examination of the Hunt Museum Collection was certainly justified both by its lack of provenance records and by the discovery of the Hunts' relationship with a dealer who is known to have trafficked in confiscated art."

Therefore, our concerns were, indeed, legitimate and were correctly brought to the attention of Irish President Mary McAleese, following her prestigious award to the Hunt Museum in 2003.

We also agree with Dr. Nicholas that the investigation conducted by the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group was incomplete and that much research remains to be undertaken before the matter is resolved.

Though lack of provenance was only part of the Wiesenthal Centre's concern, our intervention resulted in the compilation of an online database of the Hunt Collection and an online archive of the Museum's documentation.

Although we are grateful for the compilation of the online archive and database, we consider that the State-funded enquiry missed the opportunity to provide historical context for the Collection, by avoiding investigation into the dealing activities of the Hunts.

As the Wiesenthal Centre was excluded from playing an active role in the investigation that its own appeal had launched, and as we considered the terms of reference to be inappropriately restrictive, the Centre could not

endorse the limited parameters of the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group investigation. We therefore held our data as a control factor to gauge the exhaustiveness of the official research process.

We are grateful to Museum Consultant and Archaeologist Erin Gibbons for authoring this 165 page Shadow Report. Her detailed analysis of the Irish Military Archive file demonstrates the importance of the Hunts' associations with art traffickers such as Alexander von Frey, Arthur Goldschmidt and the mysterious Herr Buhl (possibly Emil Bührle). Further investigation is warranted into the Hunt's relationship with these dealers and into the activities of another Hunt associate, Felix Harbord, who may have been involved in the removal of looted art from Germany. Further investigation is also warranted into the wider circle of dealers around von Frey, Goldschmidt and Herr Buhl, some of whom (Paul Lindpaintner and Hans Bossard) are referred to by name in von Frey's letters to the Hunts. Other associates of von Frey and Goldschmidt, such as Hans Wendland and the Galerie Fischer are known from British and American intelligence reports to have been involved in trafficking Nazi looted art.

Ms. Gibbons has brought to light the possibility that von Frey and the Hunts were associated with the British based pro-Nazi, Prince Turka Galitzine, a member of the notorious anti-Semitic Right Club founded by Captain Archibald Ramsay.

The Shadow Report documents aspects of the Hunts' association with the British Nazi collaborator, Captain George Pitt Rivers, and produces new evidence of the probable involvement of the Hunts with dealer John

Hewett in the dispersal of the Pitt Rivers Farnham Museum collections, reportedly contrary to a tax agreement with the British Authorities.

Ms. Gibbons provides documentary evidence of alleged connections between the Hunts and Adolf Mahr, Head of the Nazi Party in Ireland and Director of the National Museum of Ireland, and shows how Mahr and his network may have been of crucial importance to the Hunts in establishing themselves in Ireland. Further research into the relationship between the Hunts and Adolf Mahr and his associates is warranted. Although not a central issue in the report, Ms. Gibbons raises important questions as to the influence that Mahr's ideological stance may have had on subsequent Irish scholarship.

It is understood that all Hunt family documentation relating to the Hunt collection was to be given to the Hunt Museum under a tax arrangement with the Irish authorities and transparency in relation to this matter should be assured, especially in the light of Nicholas' finding that 'the private and professional lives of free-lance dealers such as the Hunts cannot really be separated.' Likewise, the Shadow Report raises the need for full access to documentation in the possession of the Hunt family. This is essential in order to assess the Hunts' motives and involvement with the German Jewish Aid Committee as relating to the dealers, Phillip and Anna Markus and Adolf Beckhardt (especially in view of the partial correspondence provided by the late John Hunt Jr. as evidence that his father may have assisted Jewish refugees).

Further investigation is required to throw light on the manner in which John Hunt came into possession of a valuable triptych from the collection of the deceased German Jewish banker Fritz Mannheimer.

Further investigation is needed to establish the reasons and circumstances by which John Hunt obtained Irish citizenship and an Irish passport, especially in the light of unconfirmed suspicions of espionage activities by the Hunts.

The question of whether or not, and at what period, the Hunts were involved as interior decorators at the trans-Atlantic flying-boat station at Foynes, Co. Limerick needs to be clarified.

Finally, due to my own part in the investigation of Dutch German SS member and art collector, Pieter Menten, for the 1970s transfer of looted Jewish art to his home in County Waterford, I was concerned that Ireland - like other neutral countries - could have been abused for illicit art traffic. In light of the Hunts' possible connections, who could reasonably object to such an investigation?

This Shadow Report demonstrates that the work of the Evaluation Group was incomplete and that the Nicholas Report was erroneously interpreted by some Irish media as giving "a clean bill of health" to John and Gertrude Hunt.

On the contrary, the Shadow Report indicates that concerns about their activities are reasonably grounded and warrant proper and exhaustive investigation.

For that reason, this Shadow Report has been addressed to Irish Prime Minister, Brian Cowen, calling upon him to reopen the Hunt Museum

enquiry, and to broaden its terms of reference, so that justice may not only be done, but may be seen to be done.

Dr. Shimon Samuels
Director for International Relations
Simon Wiesenthal Centre, Paris
December 2008 (Centenary month of Simon
Wiesenthal's birth)

P.S.:

We wish to acknowledge the Interim Report of the Hunt Museum Provenance Research Project, sent to us in late November by the Museum's Director, Mrs Virginia Teehan, just as we were going to press.

We welcome this initiative. Just like the online database placed on the Museum's website, so too this provenance research of the past year vindicates the Simon Wiesenthal Centre's campaign.

While the provenance report engaged the highly respected research consultant, Marina Mixon, its direction follows the same limited terms of reference as interpreted by the Evaluation Group.

Mrs Teehan's proposed next steps, in connection with auction houses – if pre-War sales are also included – could be more promising.

Appendix 2 of the Provenance Research Project, "Royal Irish Academy Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Terms of Reference", notes – in response to the Wiesenthal Centre initiative – the decision to "require the Hunt Museum to seek a meeting with a representative or representatives of the Wiesenthal Centre..."

In fact, we were excluded throughout the process.

The Centre would be happy to cooperate with the further research plans outlined in the Provenance Research Project, if these were also to address the matters raised in this Shadow Report.

On 1 January, the Czech Republic assumes the Presidency of the European Union. During 2009, a major international conference will be held in Prague on World War Two loot and restitution. This will register an evaluation of successes and failures over the last decade of moral initiatives and efforts to achieve historical transparency.

We believe it would be fitting for what began at the inception of the Irish Presidency in 2004 to be presented, as exhaustively as possible, at the Czech Presidency conference. With goodwill, this would mark an important step toward closure for all parties to this controversy.

The Simon Wiesenthal Centre is ready to work with the Hunt Museum researchers to that end.

Introduction

On 15 November 2003, at a ceremony in the Bank of Ireland, College Green, Dublin, the Heritage Council and the Northern Ireland Museums Council awarded the 'Museum of the Year Award 2003' to the Hunt Museum, Limerick. Virginia Teehan, Director of the Hunt Museum, accepted the award from Mrs. Mary McAleese, President of Ireland. A joint statement issued later on behalf of the Heritage Council and the Northern Ireland Museums Council, said:

'The Museum of the Year Awards have become a very important fixture in the Irish museum calendar. The museum sector is developing and expanding rapidly and it is important to recognise the very valuable contribution to society that is made by the dedicated staff in museums throughout Ireland. It is also important to raise the profile of museums and encourage the public to go and experience the wonderful riches and treasures held in our museums.

The Museum of the Year Award 2003 was awarded to the Hunt Museum in Limerick for its consistent good practice including its ongoing inventive education programme, its quality exhibitions, its website, published guide and the maintenance of its historic collection and building.'¹

In respect of the 'ongoing inventive education programme, its quality exhibitions, its website, ... and the maintenance of its historic collection and building,' this was, indeed, the case. However, the Hunt Museum seemed not to have prioritised research into the provenance of its collection. Provenance research was not mentioned in a document drafted

in December 2002 entitled ‘Hunt Museum – Director. Briefing Document to Candidates.’²

The need for research into the provenance of the Hunt collection was noted in an article that reviewed the ‘published guide’³ referred to in the joint statement by the Heritage Council and the Northern Ireland Museums Council. Reviewing the Hunt Museum Essential Guide in the Irish Arts Review, Museum Consultant and Archaeologist Erin Gibbons wrote:

‘This is a useful and welcome publication describing one hundred and fifty of the 2000 or so objects in the collection of the Hunt Museum, Limerick. In the foreword the chairman of the Hunt Museum, George Stacpoole, describes the collection as an eclectic mix, based on a knowledge of art that was legendary. The various categories of objects, time-span, diversity and expertise represented in the collection succeed in making this publication a significant contribution to our knowledge of the collection.’⁴

However the review article continued:

‘What is most lacking in this and previous Hunt Museum catalogues is information on the provenance of the objects described. What generally distinguishes museum collections from the bric- a-brac of an antique dealer’s store (no matter how impressive the store contents) is the issue of provenance. Museum objects are not just evaluated in terms of their monetary or art historical value. Each object has a place and a purpose in time and space, and knowledge

of the details of this enhances our overall understanding of the culture and society from which the object derives.’⁵

Some specific concerns were flagged in the article that highlighted the need for provenance research including the Hunts involvement in the dispersal of the Pitt Rivers collection, their alleged Nazi associations, the friendship of John Hunt (senior) with the collector and arms dealer John Ball, and with ‘the much discredited Peter Wilson of Sotheby’s.’⁶

The Hunt Museum made no reply to the review, nor did it apparently raise its priority for provenance research. A 2003 newspaper announcement of the appointment of Virginia Teehan as Director of the Hunt Museum indicated the main priorities of the Hunt Museum’s board:

‘One of the new director’s first tasks will be to develop creative and commercial strategies for the Hunt Collection which will bring it to the attention of a wider audience.’⁷

Over the weekend of the 21st - 23rd February 2003, the Irish Museums Association held its Annual Conference in Coleraine, Co. Derry, where, under the umbrella theme of ‘Museums and Nationality’, the conference examined Collections and Collective Identities in 21st Century Ireland. Among the speakers was Mr Ciarán MacGonigal, former Director of the Hunt Museum, Limerick. In a paper published in the association’s journal in 2003, MacGonigal made reference to the unprovenanced nature of the Hunt Museum Collection and also alleged that John and Gertrud Hunt had Nazi and Fascist connections.⁸ MacGonigal claimed that:

‘There was no scientific examination of the material or its archives before the Hunt collection was accepted as part of a gift/donation/bequest.’⁹

MacGonigal went on to speak of the:

‘many problems when moving from private ownership basis to that of public ownership, particularly as public subvention requires a different level of transparency and accountability.’

MacGonigal informed his audience that he:

‘commenced a catalogue which is now published in the form of a visitor’s guide, (although I’m dismayed at the lack of rigour in the unsigned introduction and the persistence of incorrect information).’¹⁰

The Hunt Collection is relatively small, comprising some two thousand objects, of which about one half are without provenance, though apparently collected in the period 1933-1945. Given allegations that the Hunts may have had Nazi connections, the thorny issue of provenance would seem to have required an urgent response.

Best practice in relation to such material is already well established and the American Association of Museums published guidelines in November 1999, amended, April 2001. Among the general principles outlined in the guidelines are the following:

‘When faced with the possibility that an object in a museum's custody might have been unlawfully appropriated as part of the abhorrent practices of the Nazi regime, the museum's responsibility to practice ethical stewardship is paramount. Museums should develop and implement policies and practices that address this issue in accordance with these guidelines.

These guidelines are intended to assist museums in addressing issues relating to objects that may have been unlawfully appropriated during the Nazi era (1933-1945) as a result of actions in furtherance of the Holocaust or that were taken by the Nazis or their collaborators. For the purposes of these guidelines, objects that were acquired through theft, confiscation, coercive transfer, or other methods of wrongful expropriation may be considered to have been unlawfully appropriated, depending on the specific circumstances.

In order to aid in the identification and discovery of unlawfully appropriated objects that may be in the custody of museums, the PCHA, AAMD, and AAM have agreed that museums should strive to: (1) identify all objects in their collections that were created before 1946 and acquired by the museum after 1932, that underwent a change of ownership between 1932 and 1946, and that were or might reasonably be thought to have been in continental Europe between those dates (hereafter, "covered objects"); (2) make currently available object and provenance (history of ownership) information on those objects accessible; and (3) give priority to continuing provenance research as resources allow. AAM, AAMD, and PCHA also agreed that the initial focus of research should be European paintings and Judaica.

Because of the Internet's global accessibility, museums are encouraged to expand online access to collection information that

could aid in the discovery of objects unlawfully appropriated during the Nazi era without subsequent restitution.

AAM and AAM/ICOM acknowledge that during World War II and the years following the end of the war, much of the information needed to establish provenance and prove ownership was dispersed or lost. In determining whether an object may have been unlawfully appropriated without restitution, reasonable consideration should be given to gaps or ambiguities in provenance in light of the passage of time and the circumstances of the Holocaust era. AAM and AAM/ICOM support efforts to make archives and other resources more accessible and to establish databases that help track and organize information.’¹¹

If the Hunt Museum had apparently failed in its application of principles in the crucial area of provenance research, the point appears not to have been raised by the judging panel of the "Museum of the Year Award".

That panel for the 2003 Award and the officials of the Heritage Council and Museums Council of Northern Ireland may have been unaware of the concerns expressed by Erin Gibbons in her review of the Hunt Museum Essential Guide. However, while attending the Annual Conference of the Irish Museums Association held in Coleraine from 21st - 23rd February 2003, they had the opportunity to hear similar concerns expressed by former Hunt Museum Director Ciarán MacGonigal.

The apparent endorsement by the Heritage Council, the Northern Ireland Museums Council (and, by implication, the President of Ireland) of a museum that had arguably not given highest priority to the best practise of identifying provenance, convinced the Wiesenthal Center that it must

write to Mrs. McAleese outlining its objections to what had transpired and requesting that certain actions be taken by the Irish authorities.

Mrs. Mary McAleese, President of Ireland,
Áras an Uachtaráin,
Phoenix Park,
Dublin 8, Republic of Ireland.

Paris 26th January 2004

“Dear Madame President,

The Simon Wiesenthal Centre is an international Jewish human rights organization with a worldwide membership of 440,000. Established in 1977, with headquarters in Los Angeles, it draws the lessons of the Holocaust to the analysis of contemporary issues of prejudice and discrimination. The Centre is an NGO in Consultative Status to ECOSOC, UNESCO and the Council of Europe.

Tomorrow, 27 January, most European Union member states will mark Holocaust Commemoration Day (the date of the liberation of the Auschwitz Birkenau extermination camp). At this inception of Ireland’s EU Presidency, I wish to draw your attention to an Irish-related Holocaust-era issue.

Madame President, only last month you were quoted in eloquent praise of the “Irish Museum of the Year Award” being bestowed upon the Hunt Museum in Limerick. The Irish Arts Review has alluded to the extensive pre-war Nazi connections of John Hunt and Gertrude, his German-born wife. Further sources point to:

- the Hunts' precipitate 1940 flight from London to neutral Ireland one step ahead of British suspicions of their alleged espionage activity
- their close personal ties to Adolf Mahr, the then Director of the Irish National Museum and head of the Nazi Party (NSDP-AO) in Ireland
- above all their intimate business relationships with notorious dealers in art looted by the Nazis.

The "Hunt Museum Essential Guide" describes only 150 of the over 2000 objects in the Museum's collection and, notably, without providing information on their provenance - data that all museums are now required to provide in accordance with international procedure. The Wiesenthal Centre therefore urges Ireland to see placed on the Internet the entire Hunt Museum holdings, as also all items sold by the Hunts to other collections, i.e. The National Museum of Ireland's Art and Industrial Division, The National Gallery of Ireland and the Lord Gort Trust Collection in Bunratty Castle. Thus may eventual claimants scrutinize these objects in the manner of suspect art held by museums world wide. Indeed, Hunt material in British and American museums has already been made accessible on the World Wide Web.

The character of neutrality during World War Two has been closely examined in the cases of Portugal, Sweden, Spain, Switzerland and even Turkey - especially the degree of these countries' place in the network of Nazi looted art. It is appropriate that Ireland's E.U. Presidency enunciate a new transparency in regard to its own wartime neutrality by sponsoring a full and independent investigation into the role of John and Gertrude Hunt.

We therefore request that you announce forthwith the suspension of the “Irish Museum of the Year Award”, conferred upon the Hunt Collection, until the satisfactory conclusion of this inquiry. To do otherwise would impugn the good name of this prestigious award and deny justice, after sixty years, to eventual Holocaust survivor heirs, before it is too late.

Most respectfully,
Dr. Shimon Samuels,
Director of International Liaison.

Cc: Mr Simon Wiesenthal, Vienna
Rabbi Marvin Hier, Dean and Founder,
Rabbi Abraham Cooper, Associate Dean, Simon Wiesenthal Center,
Los Angeles”

President McAleese replied three days later saying she was ‘precluded from comment under the constitution.’¹² She referred the Wiesenthal Centre letter to the Irish Prime Minister, Bertie Ahern T.D., who, in turn forwarded it for the attention of the Minister for Arts, Sport and Tourism, Mr. John O’Donoghue. Before making any decision on how to respond to the Wiesenthal Center letter Minister O’Donoghue requested the views of the Hunt Museum Board. On 14th February 2004 the Irish Times reported:

‘The museum board held a special meeting yesterday after the Minister for Arts, Mr. O’Donoghue, asked it to take action about the allegations “insofar as they relate to the collection.”

The Barrington Review Group

The Irish Times report of 14th February, 2004 revealed that a retired senior judge was to be asked to lead an investigation into the Wiesenthal Center allegations. A senior academic and a museum professional from outside Ireland would assist the judge.

In the same newspaper report Erin Gibbons responded to the announcement, by offering the view that it was inappropriate to have the judge report to the Hunt Museum. She suggested instead that:

‘The Government should establish an independent investigation immediately.’¹³

Dr. Shimon Samuels welcomed the fact that progress was being made; however he expressed a desire for a nominee from the Wiesenthal Centre to be allowed join the investigation.¹⁴

On 18th February 2004 Dr. Samuels was once more reported as seeking a role for the Wiesenthal Center in the investigative process. Calling for:

‘the establishment of a satisfactorily independent investigative instrument,’ he stated: ‘I would like a tamper-proof independent enquiry, possibly by the Heritage Council, possibly by the Minister for Arts, which would include a representative of putative claimants.’¹⁵

On 21st February, 2004 the three members of the ‘review group’ were named as retired Supreme Court judge Donal Barrington; Anne Webber, chairwoman, European Commission for looted art; and Hugh Tait, former curator at the British Museum.¹⁶ The group reported no progress however and by August the Irish Times reported:

‘No detailed investigations have been carried out by the review group in the six months since its appointment because the question of who will fund its work has not yet been resolved.’¹⁷

Later in 2004, further correspondence from the Wiesenthal Center to the Irish authorities, urging progress, met with no success, and in January 2005 the review group members submitted their resignations to the Hunt Museum, citing the belief that their investigation would not be seen to be independent if it was funded by the Hunt Museum. In February 2005 this was referred to in a long report in the Sunday Times, excerpts of which are quoted:

“It was very important that a proper investigation be done, but the only people who would fund it were the Hunt Museum,” said Barrington. “We could not be seen as being independent in that situation. There was no other source of finance, and we had no resources, so we resigned.”

“It’s a very important investigation, and we needed skilled professionals, but we had no means of paying anybody. There was talk of the Royal Irish Academy funding our work but that arrangement has gone.”

The Simon Wiesenthal Centre in Paris, which demanded the investigation over a year ago, yesterday accused the Irish authorities of a “betrayal”.

“I congratulate Justice Barrington and his two colleagues for showing integrity to their responsibilities by resigning,” said Shimon Samuels, the centre’s director for international liaison.

“I see this as a cover-up and a betrayal of a national commitment. I repeat my request that the Irish Museum of the year award given to the Hunt in 2003 be removed.”

Samuels is against an investigation led by the Royal Irish Academy because he says there is an overlap between its board and the Hunt’s. The academy has been in discussion with the museum about organising a fresh, independent inquiry and a decision is expected to be announced within a few weeks.

Virginia Teehan, the museum’s director, said the resignation of the Barrington commission did not mean the inquiry had been discontinued. “Justice Barrington and the commission felt strongly that this process must be objective and independent, and should report to an agency other than the museum. We agree with that,” she said. “Achieving transparency and international best practice has required discussion with various individuals and agencies. Those discussions are ongoing, but we hope to conclude them in a month.”

Teehan said progress had been made in establishing a new inquiry and in finding funding. Public money would be involved. The Hunt director said some thought that they would be justified in not examining the Wiesenthal allegations because they were not specific, but best practice demanded that claims about the provenance of artefacts had to be researched.

Michael Ryan, the president of the Royal Irish Academy, confirmed that the institute was helping to set up a new inquiry. “We have had discussions with all the stakeholders and looked at it internally,” he said. “We think we can assist in having the museum’s artefacts properly evaluated and having the process made public.”

The academy was asked to assist by the department of the Arts, which provides funding to the Hunt Museum but does not want to supervise the inquiry.

John O’Donoghue’s department had no comment.’¹⁸

The Hunt Museum Evaluation Group

The Hunt Museum Evaluation Group was appointed in May 2005 by the Royal Irish Academy

‘to facilitate an exhaustive and internationally bench-marked investigation of the provenance of the objects in the Hunt Museum in the light of the accusations levelled against that institution by the Simon Wiesenthal Centre in Paris.’

‘It was established by the Academy in agreement with the Department of Arts, Sport and Tourism to provide an independent oversight of the process.’

‘Its members are Mr Seán Cromien, former Secretary General of the Department of Finance (Chairman); Dr Michael Ryan, MRIA, past President of the Royal Irish Academy and Director of the Chester Beatty Library (Secretary); Dr Anne Kelly, School of Art History and Cultural Policy, University College, Dublin, and Ms Helen Wechsler of the American Association of Museums.’

‘As required under the terms of reference, an internationally reputable expert in the area of art provenance, Ms Nancy Yeide of the National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, was appointed to support the group in the conduct of its business.’¹⁹

Apparently, provenance research and the investigation into the background of the collection were to be left in the hands of the Hunt Museum.

The main focus of the Evaluation Group seemed to be concentrated on the preparation by the Hunt Museum of a computer database of the collection. Given the terms of reference, effective investigation would be limited largely to provenance research into the collection, despite the paucity of primary documentation available in respect of unprovenanced material from the crucial period 1933-45. The Evaluation Group and the Royal Irish Academy may have been aware of this when the terms of reference were determined, as the defectiveness of the Hunt Museum archive as a potential source of information about the collection had been made public by Ciarán MacGonigal in a newspaper report published 10th March, 2004.

‘A former director of the Hunt Museum in Limerick has claimed that the museum archive is “virtually useless” as an academic record of the collection’s provenance.

Mr Ciaran MacGonigal, who headed the museum from 1998 to 2001, said yesterday that the provenance of significant parts of the collection “simply could not be proved” from material in the archive.’²⁰

The Evaluation Group also undertook to arrange for an independent examination of documentation in the possession of the Hunt family

‘which has a bearing on the provenance of objects in the Hunt Museum collection’²¹

In response to this requirement the Evaluation Group:

‘consulted Ms Trudy Hunt and Mrs Patricia Hunt and have received assurances that all documentation relevant to the collection in their possession or formerly possessed by their parents has been handed over to the Hunt Museum and all that is retained by the family is personal material.’²²

This approach would create the impression that the Hunt family was left to decide what documentation was relevant to the investigation and what should be made available for examination.

The Evaluation Group reportedly decided not to address claims made by Erin Gibbons, Ciarán MacGonigal and Shimon Samuels that John and Gertrude Hunt had Nazi associations. Nor would claims made by Gibbons and Samuels that the Hunts may have had business and social links with dealers in Nazi loot be looked into. This decision was explained by the Evaluation Group in the following terms.

‘In the course of the letter to President McAleese of 26 January 2004 from the Wiesenthal Centre, certain allegations were made in regard to John and Gertrude Hunt. During their work the Group discussed how these allegations should be considered. A reading of the terms of reference showed that they were outside the Group’s remit.’²³

This approach was justified further by the Evaluation Group, which stated:

‘However, questions of the particular affiliation of two individuals, no matter how prominent, would appear after this lapse of time to be matters for the biographer or the historian rather than a State-funded enquiry such as this.’²⁴

By deciding not to investigate the associations and activities of John and Gertrude Hunt, the approach to be taken by the Evaluation Group fell short of what had been requested by the Wiesenthal Center. It appeared that the Evaluation Group would not be engaging in a wide-ranging investigation; instead there would be an ‘evaluation’ of the Hunt collection, to be conducted to some degree by the Hunt Museum itself, under the overall supervision of the Evaluation Group. The Evaluation Group met on three occasions only (all before an Interim Report was published in February 2006) and had a consultation by e-mail in May 2006, to complete the work and agree upon a Final Report.²⁵

Under the terms of reference, unless information related specifically to the provenance of an object currently in the Hunt Museum collection, the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group could exclude it from consideration. However, the lack of documentation in the Hunt Museum archive and the fact that the collection was a decorative arts one containing objects that were non-unique²⁶ would make claims extremely difficult.

Without developing an investigative trail, starting with the Hunt family archive and other primary documents pertaining to the activities of John and Gertrude Hunt, it was unlikely that a context for the collection could ever be established. Without seeking information on the dealing activities of the Hunts, few clues were likely to emerge as to the origin of objects in the collection.

In the circumstances, neither the Wiesenthal Center nor Erin Gibbons would agree to cooperate with the Evaluation Group, because information they might provide could be set aside as being outside the terms of reference.

The Hunt Museum Evaluation Group produced an Interim Report that was published in February 2006 and a final report that was presented before an invited audience at a seminar held in the Royal Irish Academy on 19th June 2006.²⁷ No invitation to attend was issued to the Wiesenthal Center or to Erin Gibbons. The press were prepared in advance for what was the main conclusion of the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report:

‘Most of the objects in the Hunt Museum with gaps in their provenance are unlikely to have problematic pasts.’²⁸

However, this conclusion is not backed up with evidence; it appears to be merely the opinion of the authors of the Evaluation Group report.

In the discussion that followed the presentation of the report by Virginia Teehan, Eamonn P. Kelly, Keeper of Irish Antiquities at the National Museum of Ireland²⁹ questioned the methodology and terms of reference of the Evaluation Group, asking in particular why the Hunt family archive had not been scrutinised independently and why links between the Hunts and dealers in looted Nazi Art identified in a file in the Irish Military Archive had not been taken into account and revealed. Kelly offered the opinion that the investigation was inadequate and incomplete and he called on Professor James A. Slevin, President of the Academy, not to

accept the report in its present form. In response Professor Slevin stated that he would be accepting the report.

The Wiesenthal Center issued a press statement³⁰ alleging deficiencies in the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report, such as the failure to reference the information in the Irish Military Archive, which renewed press interest in the origins of the Hunt collection.³¹ In response, it appears that the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group decided to have the final report assessed by a third party, who could also assess the importance of the information contained in the Irish Military Archive, pertaining to the Hunts.

The Nicholas Commentary

On 8th August, 2007 Lynn H. Nicholas, a well-known writer on Nazi wartime art looting, produced a document entitled *Report on the Final Report to the Royal Irish Academy by the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group*, June 2006.

Lynn Nicholas explains her role in relation to the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group as follows:

‘Dr Michael Ryan, Secretary of the Evaluation Group, in October, 2006, requested that I analyze the methodology of the Group, respond to the criticisms of the Wiesenthal Centre, and suggest further action.’³²

In line with the request from Dr. Ryan, Lynn Nicholas produced an account of the controversy; however some of her findings are open to challenge. For example Nicholas criticised the Wiesenthal Center for not engaging in consultation or sharing information with the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group. However, the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group shared no information with the Wiesenthal Center. Nor was the Wiesenthal Center provided with a copy of her own report for comment, prior to its publication, which would have allowed for any differences to have been addressed.

Nicholas indicates that the approach of the Evaluation Group was found wanting in a number of respects, but does not follow the concern of the Wiesenthal Center that its cooperation with the Evaluation Group might

have been interpreted as endorsing an investigative process to which it was not party and which it believed to be wanting.

Nicholas confirmed that the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group's investigative process was incomplete. Despite this and despite Nicholas' finding that an investigation into the Hunts and their collection was warranted, sections of the Irish media interpreted the Nicholas commentary as having cleared the Hunts of any wrong-doing, and that concerns about the provenance of the collection were without foundation. Typical of this was the Irish Times headline that proclaimed:

‘Report clears Hunts of dealing in Nazi Art’.³³

A later report in the Irish Times Weekend supplement³⁴ took the same line but was somewhat offensive in tone and content. The report quoted Brian O’Connell, director of Shannon Heritage, as attacking the credentials and expertise of the Wiesenthal Center and accusing it of ulterior motives in raising the issues relating to the Hunts and their collection. According to the report:

‘The way O’Connell sees it, the [Wiesenthal] centre already had “form” on Ireland, having clashed with Mary Robinson during her tenure as UN human rights supreme as well as attacking Ireland’s role on the UN Security Council, both in relation to Israel. “The allegation given to them about the Hunt Museum would have been manna in their campaign against Ireland.”’³⁵

Both Mr O’Connell and Shannon Heritage have, reportedly, given generous support to the Hunt reputation.³⁶

In January 2008 President Mary McAleese visited the Hunt Museum, to which she had presented the Museum of the Year Award for 2003. During the course of her visit she made a speech attacking the Wiesenthal Center. It was an extraordinary intervention by the Head of State, given that she had responded initially to the concerns addressed to her by the Wiesenthal Center by stating that she was precluded from comment under the constitution. In her Hunt Museum speech the President dismissed the concerns of the Wiesenthal Center as ‘base and unfounded allegations’ and ‘a tissue of lies’.³⁷ Mrs McAleese also accused the Wiesenthal Center of having ‘diminished’ the name of Simon Wiesenthal.³⁸ She endorsed the view that the Hunts had no case to answer stating:

‘People like the Hunts were entitled to so much better [but] their generosity [was] met with mean-spiritedness based on unfounded allegations.’³⁹

In the aftermath of President McAleese's statement, sections of the media followed up with articles critical of the Wiesenthal Center.⁴⁰ The Wiesenthal Center also received a number of anti-Semitic e-mails from Ireland.⁴¹

This present document will attempt to set the record straight by presenting a clear statement of the motives and actions of Erin Gibbons and the Wiesenthal Center. It is intended also to deal with points raised in the Nicholas Commentary and the Final Evaluation Group report and to present information that was not addressed in these two reports.

Irish Military Archive file on John and Gertrude Hunt

The Irish Military Archive in Cathal Brugha Barracks, Dublin 6 is a well-known archive utilised by researchers on modern Irish history. Of particular value to the study of the World War II period are files compiled at the time by Irish Military Intelligence on various individuals.

Such a file was compiled on John and Gertrude Hunt and contains indications of their alleged links with dealers engaged in the Nazi-looted art trade and their possible relations within the milieu of Nazi sympathisers.⁴² Although the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group, apparently, had knowledge of the existence of the file and its contents, the file is not mentioned in the final report of the group. Subsequently Lynn Nicholas was engaged by the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group to view the Irish Military Archive file in order to

‘examine its contents in detail and to put them in context.’⁴³

Nicholas mentions that the Hunt file is a mere 30 pages in length, by contrast with a file on the German Jew, Kurt Tischer, which ‘contains hundreds of pages tracking his business transactions’.⁴⁴ This might be taken as inferring that the Irish Intelligence Service had little interest in the Hunts, however, the evidence from the Military Archive file examined by Nicholas shows that file G2/4371 is not the full extent of the documentation on the Hunts compiled originally by the Irish Intelligence Services. The first piece of evidence to this effect comes in the form of a hand written note that reads:

‘Registry/

There are other references to Hunt and letters for certain. Keep an eye out for them.

[Signed] 2.1.41.’

The second handwritten note, seemingly written in 1943 is as follows:

‘Capt Coren [?]

A wife [?]

See English [?] is this man identical with people in Molesworth Street who were interested in old furniture. It received attention at one time if so why no records

[Signature]’

Lynn Nicholas states that

‘The Wiesenthal Center, in the June 21, 2006 press release, correctly points out that no dealer’s records were examined [by the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group]. The question is which dealers to investigate.’⁴⁵

Elsewhere she says of Shimon Samuels:

‘He suggested that dealer’s records should have been searched but did not specify which dealers’.⁴⁶

It should have been clear from the Wiesenthal Center press release that Samuels was referring to the dealers named in the Irish Military Archive file.

Nicholas, at the same time, notes that:

‘It is clear that a number of individuals with connections to the [Hunt] Museum and the investigation were, by the time of the Interim Report, aware of the existence and perhaps of the contents of the Military Archive file, but for reasons that are attributable to intra-Irish politics, did not reveal this knowledge.’⁴⁷

It is not clear from the report quite what Lynn Nicholas is referring to in her remark about ‘reasons that are attributable to intra-Irish politics’.

In light of Mr. Justice Barrington’s resignation statement that he and his commission felt strongly that the investigatives process must be

‘objective and independent’,⁴⁸

together with the Wiesenthal Center call for

‘the establishment of a satisfactorily independent investigative instrument’⁴⁹

Why did the Department of Arts, Sport and Tourism not address the concerns of the Wiesenthal Center and others regarding possible overlapping of institutional and organisational affiliations among members of the Evaluation Group? Much of the investigative work of the

Hunt Museum Evaluation Group was carried out by Virginia Teehan, Director of the Hunt Museum. In her report Lynn Nicholas seems to suggest that Ms. Teehan was not suitably qualified for the role, on the basis that she was

‘a trained archivist, but not an expert on Nazism, refugees, espionage or looted art.’⁵⁰

Dr. Michael Ryan, Secretary of the Evaluation Group had preceded Virginia Teehan as a member of the Heritage Council and as Chairman of the Museums and Archives Committee of the Heritage Council. It was the making of a prestigious award to the Hunt Museum by the Heritage Council and Northern Ireland Museums Council that precipitated the controversy. Dr. Ryan is also a former Keeper of Irish Antiquities at the National Museum of Ireland, whose Director Patrick Wallace, was a Director of the Hunt Museums Trust while Sean Cromien, the Chairman of the Evaluation Group and Dr. Anne Kelly, also a member of the Evaluation Group, are former members of the Caretaker Board of the National Museum of Ireland. The Royal Irish Academy, which appointed the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group, reportedly had members who were or had been Directors of the Hunt Museums Trust.

Given the clear need for transparency in the investigative process, it is likely that, had the Department of Arts, Sport and Tourism heeded the request from Dr Samuels that they come up with a process that was both independent and ‘tamper-free’,⁵¹ the unspecified ‘intra-Irish politics’ that Lynn Nicholas attributed as the reason for the lack of attention to the Military Archive files, may never have arisen.

If such information as the Military Archive file was so excluded for the reasons alluded to by Lynn Nicholas, (and due to the limited terms of reference), then questions may be raised as to whether other sources were also excluded on the same grounds?

The Irish Military Archive file provides the names of dealers in looted art with whom the Hunts were engaged in business dealings or who formed part of the circle of dealers who may have been known to the Hunts. Despite this:

‘The Evaluation Group, once aware of the file, seems to have decided that it could be ignored for purposes of the Final report as not being relevant to the objects in the museum, but only to the Hunt’s personal histories, which they declared to be a separate issue.’⁵²

The Evaluation Group's conclusion would have meant, in fact, that the dealers who were named in the file would be excluded from the investigation into whether objects in the Hunt Museum (or objects acquired by the Hunts and disposed of elsewhere) had been obtained from the dealers in question.

Lynn Nicholas concludes that the Evaluation Group:

‘was certainly misguided in its decision not to include the contents of the Military File in its formal report, as the private and professional lives of free-lance dealers such as the Hunts cannot really be separated.’⁵³

Lynn Nicholas' finding implies a critique of the Evaluation Group's terms of reference, as she advocates an approach that is both biographical and historical; an approach that the terms of reference eschewed. Nicholas' recommendation also underlines the need for proper independent access to the Hunt Family Archive.

Although Nicholas established that the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group was:

‘aware of the existence and perhaps of the contents of the Military Archive file’⁵⁴

she goes on to draw conclusions that appear to be at odds with that finding. She states:

‘The fact that, inexplicably, the Wiesenthal Center continued to conceal the existence of the file, certainly encouraged this mistaken point of view’⁵⁵ [i.e. exclusion of the file by the Evaluation Group].’

However, it is difficult to see how the Wiesenthal Center can be accused of concealing from the Evaluation Group something of which they were already fully aware. Therefore, there seems no logical way in which the Wiesenthal Centre can be held responsible for the decision of the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group not to report the existence and contents of the file. It seems more reasonable to agree with Nicholas' ambiguous structural attribution to ‘intra-Irish politics’.

During the period that the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group was carrying out its work, the Wiesenthal Center was aware that Erin Gibbons had, in

April 2003, openly discussed the Military Archive file, and the general nature of its contents, with Dr. Patrick Wallace, a Director of the Hunt Museums Trust. The Wiesenthal Center was also convinced that the Military Archive file had, logically, been accessed by persons acting on behalf of the Hunt Museum. This was the basis for Dr. Shimon Samuels' statement, quoted by Lynn Nicholas

“if the findings of the committee [Hunt Museum Evaluation Group] include any findings that we already have then that will show that there has been indeed transparency. If the findings do not include ours then in that case that will point to some type of inefficiency or lack of transparency on the part of the documents given to the review board.”⁵⁶

In the circumstances, Lynn Nicholas' conclusion that the approach taken by the Wiesenthal Center constituted an attempt to 'blackmail' the Irish authorities seems lacking in moderation and does not appear sustainable.

Dr. Samuels had challenged the Hunt Museum to make a statement as to whether any agents, representatives or persons acting on behalf of the Hunt family or Hunt Museum had ever had access to the Irish military archives.

Nicholas refers to this in her commentary, however she makes no comment on the failure of the Hunt Museum to respond to Dr. Samuels question; rather, she observes:

‘The archives are open to the public. As is proper, the archivists do not, without permission of the individual, reveal to any researcher

who else has seen a particular file. It would, therefore, not be appropriate to publish a list of those who had seen it.’⁵⁷

Correspondence from Count Alexander von Frey to John and Gertrude Hunt

The Irish Military Archive file contains transcriptions of three letters sent to John and Gertrude Hunt, from Switzerland, by Count Alexander von Frey during and after World War II. The correspondence seems to illustrate that the Hunts were friends and business associates of von Frey and, during the war, on behalf of the Hunts; von Frey sent coffee to Gertrude Hunt's mother in Germany. British and American intelligence sources reveal that von Frey was an associate of known Nazis and was one of a group of Swiss-based dealers who traded with the Nazis to acquire looted art works.

Sq. Ldr. Douglas Cooper, who investigated the role of Swiss-based art dealers in the trade in Nazi looted art, documented the activities of von Frey.⁵⁸

In one exchange with the Nazis, von Frey gave 'Mill in Saxony' by Karl Blechen and 'Study of Figures' by Hans Makart in exchange for 'Portrait of a Girl' by Renoir, 'Apple' by Picasso and 'Country Road' by Pissarro. An assessment of the value of the three paintings received by von Frey, (made for British investigators by Professor Bertrand), came to an aggregate figure of Fr. Frs. 80,000. The paintings were looted from collections owned by Alfred Lindon, Paul Rosenberg and the Bernheim-Juene Gallery, Paris.⁵⁹

According to Attachment A of Cooper's report:

‘The contract for this exchange (document available) was drawn up on 14/5/42 personally by VON BEHR, head of Amt. Westen. It appears that von FREY was anxious to avoid mention of ERR. The two pictures by Blechen and Mackart were acquired on behalf of Goering: he subsequently presented the Blechen to HITLER. Hofer personally approved the exchange and von FREY personally selected his pictures in Paris from the A.W. depot.

FREY is a Hungarian national resident in Lucerne. (Your A.646 of 14th May, 1945, from Zurich Consulate General refers, and is hereby disproved). It has not yet been ascertained how FREY imported these pictures into Switzerland. The whereabouts of Nos: 1 and 3 are still unknown and must be discovered. Goering acquired all three French pictures on 14/5/1942.’⁶⁰

The Amt. Westen was the Western Office of the ERR, the abbreviation for Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg of which von Behr was the deputy Director. Between 1940–1944 the ERR confiscated artworks and cultural artefacts from Jews and others deemed by the Nazis to have lost their property rights. Walter Andreas Hofer was Goering's art curator.⁶¹

Attachment F of Cooper’s report provides the following assessment of von Frey, who had an address at the Hotel Eden, Lucerne.

‘Hungarian national since 1925, formerly German.
Acquired three pictures, Nos. 58, 59 and 60, by exchange with ERR (contract available). Was in contact with Habersstock and Wuester. Picture No. 57 was delivered

to von Frey. Was in Paris several times during the war and engaged in selling works of art to the German authorities.’⁶²

Karl Haberstock was Hitler’s art agent while Adolf Wuester was an art agent who acted for the Nazi Foreign Minister, Joachim von Ribbentrop.⁶³

Paintings 58, 59 and 60 are the Renoir, Picasso and Pissarro referred to earlier that were obtained by von Frey from the ERR in Paris. However, von Frey found other means to obtain painting no. 57, a work by Picasso, ‘Woman at the Races’ looted from the Lindon collection, Paris.⁶⁴

In Appendix B of Cooper’s report, it is stated that this painting was:

‘Offered for sale by Alexander von Frey of Lucerne. Sold by Junod of Lausanne to Herr Emil Bührle.’

(Herr Bührle will feature in further discussion below).

The OSS⁶⁵ files provide further information about von Frey, his associates and methods of operation. Referred to as:

‘Count Alexander von Frey formerly in Paris, France, but now in Switzerland.’⁶⁶

Von Frey alleged to the Americans that the Germans stole art objects from his Paris collection.⁶⁷

Additional information is obtainable for the entry on von Frey in the ALIU Final Report.

‘von Frey, Count Alexander

Lucerne, Hotel Eden

Art dealer of German birth and Hungarian citizenship; married originally to the daughter of a Hungarian industrialist. Divorced in 19[?]6 and remarried to a German. In art dealing since about 1920. Involved in several important looted art transactions in France and Switzerland and, although he did not do a great deal of business, is perhaps second only to WENDLAND in the Swiss art trade in the strength of his official German contacts. Closely connected with WENDLAND, LOHSE, ROCHLITZ and other key looting figures. Believed to have brought works of art illegally into Switzerland through Rumanian diplomatic channels. Participated in an exchange of loot with the ERR. Professes strong pro-Allied sentiments. Has had possession of #57, #58, #59 and #60 of the Allied List. Has maintained contacts throughout the war with the New York art trade. See CIR #1.’⁶⁸

Of German nationality and an art dealer by profession, von Frey’s associate Dr. Bruno Lohse joined the Nazi party in 1937 and in 1941 he was made the Deputy Chief of the ERR in Paris where he worked closely with Herman Goering. After the war Lohse was jailed by the French authorities.⁶⁹

Von Frey’s other named associate Gustav Rochlitz was also a major player in the trade in looted art. According to the OSS he was an:

‘Art Dealer, active in France prior to and during World War II in the interests of the Third Reich. Chief participant in exchanges of paintings confiscated by the ERR. and important recipient of loot.’⁷⁰

After the war Rochlitz was jailed by the French authorities.⁷¹

Von Frey is also linked with the dealer Paul Lindpaintner,

‘of Lucerne, Switzerland’⁷²

who is described as:

‘Former German cavalry officer and amateur art dealer, with broad official and aristocratic connections throughout Europe. He was the Paris, France agent of Fritz Pössenbacher, (art and antique dealer of Munich, Germany), and travelled extensively during the war from Germany to France, Switzerland, Spain and Portugal.’⁷³

Lindpaintner and von Frey are both linked to Erich van Kreibig, described as:

‘a Nazi who deals in pictures for Germans (including Goering).’ Kreibig is a ‘German national; considered a strong Nazi and possibly implicated in looting transactions. Had contacts with Lindpaintner, Frey, and Fischer.’⁷⁴

Erich van Kreibitz resided in Ascona, the Swiss town from which von Frey wrote to the Hunts on 7th January 1944, and where he and his wife were staying:

‘with good friends.’⁷⁵

As a Hungarian national, whose country was allied to Germany during the war, (and being German-born), von Frey would have had greater ease of movement in Nazi occupied lands than might otherwise have been the case. Information contained in the correspondence in the Irish Military Archives (not referred to by Nicholas) shows that during the war von Frey retained an apartment in Paris, staffed by a Swiss servant and his family.

In a letter to the Hunts dated, 7th January, 1945 von Frey reports the following:

‘From P. [Paris] I had very bad news. My servant and his family have been expelled from our home in the rue Cervance [?]. He is Swiss, as you probably will remember and his wife and children are friends but nevermind he had to leave from one moment to the other and even the protests of the Swiss legation did not help yet. The fellow who took everything is called Bollak and I do not know him at all. He has probably arranged this coup with the help of the police after he persuaded the concierge without to have any right to do as there are still two other apartments in the house still free. I took a good lawyer and I am trying now to get him out with the help of my american [sic] friends. The situation in P. [Paris] is – as people coming from there tell me – not at all bright and it shows that black

spots are everywhere. It would be very hard for me, to loose all the pretty things I have collected for over twenty years, my pictures, books, silver, furniture etc. as a consequence of my confidence in the French and having done all I could for french [sic] friends since 1939 having paid as well my taxes and rents all this time in spite of the germand [sic] occupation not allowing me to live there.⁷⁶

From von Frey's statement to the Hunts concerning his servant,

‘He is Swiss, as you probably will remember,’

it seems possible that the Hunts had met the servant, presumably during a pre-war visit to von Frey in Paris. It seems also that von Frey's description of Paris as a ‘black spot’ is not focussed exclusively on his own problems relating to the occupation of his apartment but on experiences related to him by

‘other people coming from there’.

Unfortunately the correspondence provided no clue as to the identity of the persons referred to by von Frey or their reasons for regarding liberated Paris as a ‘black spot’.

In describing to the Hunts the nature of a proposed new business he hopes to open in Lucerne after the war, von Frey gives a clear insight into the nature of his Paris business:

‘exactly the same as in Paris, not a business open to everybody but chiefly dealing with firms and museums.’⁷⁷

It seems from his reference to ‘American friends’⁷⁸ whom he could call upon to assist him in his efforts to recover his Paris apartment, that von Frey was well connected – sufficiently well connected, at that, to have obtained a visa for the United States despite opposition from American OSS officer James Plaut.

‘Von Frey was interrogated by American OSS officer James Plaut on January 5, 1946. During the interrogation he expressed the desire to procure a visa to the United States “in order to reopen business connections with the New York art trade.” Plaut recommended strongly that no visa be granted. Despite this, von Frey managed to get to the US in 1948 where he remained until his death in 1951.’⁷⁹

Alexander von Frey also had connections in ‘quarters’ that even the influential ‘Herr Buhl’⁸⁰ might respect:

‘If he goes absolutely too far I could go to quarters for which he has the most respect and where we are in good standing and reveal the reason of his attitude.’⁸¹

In the same letter von Frey refers to another influential friend.

‘I had a visit from a friend of my youthful days who occupies one of the highest positions in the S.J.’⁸² and came directly from the Vatican he takes a very gloomy view of the future of Europe, at least for Spain and – Ireland.’⁸³

The value of having well-placed friends in the Vatican is also suggested in connection with von Frey's associate Hans Wendland, as revealed in the report of Wendland's interrogation on 18th September, 1946.

‘On 1 April 1946 he left Switzerland on an exit permit from the Canton of Geneva and went to Rome, where he remained past the expiration date, 1 June 1946, of his permit until his arrest on 25 July. He offers various confused and conflicting reasons for his flight to Italy, among them the desire to become a Catholic and effect a proposed exchange of certain works of art of religious significance between Switzerland and the Vatican.’⁸⁴

Von Frey was, apparently, a secretive dealer as shown by his reluctance to be documented in the ERR records. If he engaged in looted art transactions with other dealers while on visits to Paris there may have been little or no documentation kept.

Apparently, the level at which von Frey was operating, the nature of his documented transaction with the ERR and the fact that he personally selected his pictures in the Paris depot of the ERR fully justifies his identification as a ‘red flag dealer’. Having examined the Irish Military Archive, Lynn Nicholas reached the same conclusion:

‘the discovery of a “red flag” dealer’s name [Alexander von Frey] associated with an art collection [Hunt] is certainly a valid reason for an inquiry.’⁸⁵

Further research into the nature of von Frey's 'business connections with the New York art trade' may prove rewarding especially in the context (discussed below) that some of his close associates appear to have been engaged in importing looted art into the USA. It is reported of von Frey that

'Throughout the war [he] maintained contact with the New York art trade.'⁸⁶

This contact may have been in the form of business deals as, in his letter of 7th January 1945, von Frey informs the Hunts

'I have still a few thousand pounds in U.S.A.'⁸⁷

It appears that von Frey may have acted as an agent for the Hunts in Lucerne. This is suggested by the letter of 11th April 1944, in which von Frey reveals he was on the lookout in Switzerland for suitable Irish silver that the Hunts might wish to acquire.

'I will watch a bit if there is some Irish silver in Switzerland but I do not think so. Must it be XVIIIth or XVIIth century?'⁸⁸

Furthermore, on Hunt's behalf von Frey pursued a debtor (Herr Buhl) for money owed to Hunt from the sale of a crucifix.⁸⁹

According to Nicholas:

‘In the 1946 letter, the war being over, discussion of possible future business becomes more detailed as von Frey clearly is hoping to get out of Switzerland, where he cannot work legally.’⁹⁰

The British and American investigators portray Von Frey as working illegally in Switzerland during the war and as being an important figure in the trade in looted art. Indeed, few dealers throughout Europe had greater access than he to the upper echelons of the Nazi art-looting apparatus. The Irish Military Archive file indicates that he also appears to have been a close personal friend and business associate of the Hunts, with whom he discussed ‘possible future business’ after the war. From its knowledge of the Irish Military Archive file on the Hunts, it is surprising that the Evaluation Group did not conclude that further research into von Frey was warranted and that his association with the Hunts should be reported publicly. Indeed, the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group might have recognised the possibility that von Frey may have been a source of objects acquired by the Hunts.

Lynn Nicholas did however recognise the need for further research to be conducted into von Frey:

‘Obviously von Frey’s records would be of interest, if they can be located. As noted above, von Frey and his wife emigrated to the United States in 1948. Several American museums mention him in their provenances, which would indicate that he continued to do business there. None of the provenances I have seen contain links to the Hunts, however this could be explored further. After his wife’s death in 1987, a sale of the von Frey collection was held on December 8th, 1988 at Sotheby’s, London. That auction house might

be able to supply some information as to the whereabouts of any Frey archive.’⁹¹

Arthur Goldschmidt and his circle

The von Frey letter to the Hunts of 11th April, 1944 refers to an art dealer named Arthur Goldschmidt, who, like von Frey had dealings with the Nazis. The Goldschmidt reference in the letter comes immediately after a discussion by von Frey of the relative merits of Ireland as a refuge over Spain or Portugal, and his train of thought may have been suggested by the fact that Goldschmidt had left France for Portugal before moving to Cuba. The transcript of the von Frey letter reads as follows:

‘I am very sorry for you, that you lost so much in the Goldschmidt bankrupt [sic]. My losses will be about £300. Arthur Goldschmidt is in U.S.A. and is doing very well, as I heard. Perhaps one can get something out of him later on.’⁹²

Concerning Arthur Goldschmidt, Lynn Nicholas accepts that

‘Goldschmidt sold at least two paintings to Haberstock [Hitler’s art agent], who was on a buying trip in France’.⁹³

However, Goldschmidt’s involvement in the web of looted art extended far beyond his transactions with Haberstock. Goldschmidt had a business relationship with Paul Graupe, a Berlin auctioneer through whose hands a number of forced sales of Jewish-owned art passed during the 1930s. Goldschmidt profited from these sales. For example, in 1935 he acquired a Rueben’s at the liquidation sale of the Galerie van Diemen, Berlin organised by Graupe. The painting in question, *Allegory of Eternity*, ended up in the San Diego Museum of Art where it later became the

subject of a restitution claim and settlement with the Galerie van Diemen.⁹⁴

Graupe and Goldschmidt are also suspected of having gained from the looting by the ERR of the Wacker-Bondy warehouse in Paris, containing the art collection of Friedrich Gutmann and his wife, Louise, both murdered by the Nazis in the concentration camps in 1943. The paintings were consigned to Hans Wendland, a German associate of both Graupe and Goldschmidt, based in Switzerland, and a major figure in the trade in looted art.⁹⁵

Goldschmidt is also referred to in the interrogation report of the dealer Hans Wendland, in 1946.⁹⁶ On page 8 of the document it is stated that Arthur Goldschmidt gave a painting by the artist Altdorfer,

‘together with several other paintings belonging to the same dealer [his partner Paul Graupe]’

to Wendland, who in turn stated that

‘the Altdorfer was sent to Carl BUEMING of Darmstadt,⁹⁷ who was to transmit it to Switzerland.’

According to the interrogation report, Wendland was German by birth but moved to Switzerland in 1920, the same year that he met Theodore Fischer, a prominent Lucerne art dealer. In 1939 Fischer sold, on behalf of the Nazis, 126 paintings and sculptures that were deemed to be ‘degenerate’ and had been de-accessioned by the Nazis from German museums and galleries.

During the war, Wendland was the Swiss-based agent of Walter Hofer, who in turn acted for Goering, and the Galerie Fischer in Lucerne played a key role in the exchanges. Peter Harclerode and Brendan Pittaway indicate the scale of what took place and the importance of Lucerne in the following terms:

‘During the war Wendland’s main business was acquiring looted works of art and importing them into Switzerland. In November 1942 he took delivery of a large consignment which arrived from Paris in a railway wagon which it filled completely. This had been cleared for import by a Lausanne-based firm of freight forwarding handlers called Lavanchy. When he moved from Lucerne to Geneva in 1944, Wendland took two van-loads from Lucerne and one from Basle, all of which were reported as having contained works of art which had arrived from Italy in early November of the previous year.’⁹⁸

The consignment of art from Paris contained the looted contents of the Wacker-Bondy warehouse - the paintings of the murdered art collectors Friedrich and Louise Gutmann.⁹⁹ As will be seen, Wendland turns up again in connection with a proposed business venture involving Arthur Goldschmidt.

Goldschmidt’s name continues to be associated with suspect artworks that have found their way into museum and gallery collections. For example, drawings and watercolours by the artists Delacroix, Fragonard, Goya and Guardi, acquired by the Courtauld Institute, which passed through Goldschmidt’s hands, are lacking provenance for the Holocaust Era.¹⁰⁰ Four paintings acquired by the Courtauld Institute that were

handled by Goldschmidt also fall into the same category, including works by Degas, 'Lady with a parasol', Pittoni 'The Holy Family' and Rubens 'The Assumption of the Virgin' and 'The Annunciation of the Virgin's Death'.¹⁰¹

Lynn Nicholas accepts as fact that the Von Frey correspondence in the Military Archive

'does describe specific pre-war Hunt dealings with Goldschmidt in which Hunt has lost money, but the objects involved are not identified.'¹⁰²

Nicholas also states:

'As von Frey recounts, Goldschmidt fled to Portugal in 1940 and then on to Cuba in 1941.'¹⁰³

Whereas it is true that Goldschmidt fled to Portugal and then on to Cuba this is not stated by von Frey who reports only that:

'Arthur Goldschmidt is in U.S.A.'¹⁰⁴.

In her report, Nicholas is cautious in her assessment of Goldschmidt, stating:

'Thus the position of individuals like Goldschmidt is not entirely clear, and the great complexity of the wartime situation requires careful analysis of individual cases.'¹⁰⁵

However Nicholas also offers the opinion:

‘The relationships between all the dealers mentioned should be viewed in their historical context.’¹⁰⁶

Ms. Nicholas’ own published work provides just such historical context that may, moreover, provide a possible important insight into Goldschmidt’s move to Cuba in 1941.

The United States provided an important market for dealers selling looted art from Europe.

‘When entry to the United States proved difficult many dealers opened branches in Buenos Aires, Mexico City and Havana.’¹⁰⁷

‘With the entry of the United States into the war this trade became increasingly lively and complicated.’¹⁰⁸

Nicholas goes on to make specific reference to the role played by Arthur Goldschmidt and his associates in the trade in looted art.

‘So Byzantine were these international trading arrangements that even the normally unflappable agents of the U.S. Treasury, who had presumably been privy to more than one convoluted deal, were sometimes at a loss to explain them, and in their reports resorted to such descriptive phrases as “a long letter filled with confused accounts of business deals, shares of profits, ownerships, disputes, etc....and various juggling of citizenships as occasions suggest.” This was a reference to the intricate proposed dealings between a German dealer named Paul Graupe who lived in New York; Arthur

Goldschmidt, his onetime partner, whom we last saw in contact with Haberstock and Wildenstein in the south of France, and who eventually escaped to Cuba; Theodore Fischer, he of the Lucerne “degenerate” art auction; Hans Wendland, a German lawyer, possibly Jewish, who was a Swiss resident: Haberstock himself: and a whole series of French dealers – a combination, according to the Treasury, “lending itself to any trickery”.¹⁰⁹

Given the connections and activities of Arthur Goldschmidt and his apparent business dealings with the Hunts, why had the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group made no mention of him in its report? Nor had Lynn Nicholas made any recommendation that further research be conducted into Goldschmidt’s business dealings with the Hunts.

It seems that two of the distinguished speakers who were invited to give talks on related art-theft issues at the Royal Irish Academy seminar¹¹⁰ (at which the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Final Report was launched), would have been in a position to discuss the possible significance of Arthur Goldschmidt.

American lawyer Thomas Kline, who spoke on the subject of ‘The Importance of Museum Policy,’¹¹¹ is the lawyer who represented the heirs of the murdered collectors Friedrich and Louise Gutmann in their efforts to have the looted works restored to them. Arthur Goldschmidt is suspected to have played a role in the ERR’s acquisition of the Gutman collection. Stephen Kern, from the San Diego Art Museum, spoke about the settlement reached with the Galerie van Diemen, concerning a Rubens painting that had passed through the hands of Arthur Goldschmidt.¹¹²

Apparently, the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group did not share with the speakers the possibility of a relationship between Goldschmidt and the Hunts. Had Thomas Kline and Stephen Kern been asked to comment upon possible Goldschmidt business dealings with the Hunts, they may have been well placed to offer useful comments, insights and advice. Bringing such top scholars in looted art to Ireland seems to have amounted to a wasted opportunity, in that their contribution to the seminar had little or nothing to do with the Hunts or their collection.

Herr Buhl and his associates in Lucerne

Another person based in Switzerland is identified in the von Frey correspondence as possibly having a business relationship with the Hunts. The man is recorded on the Irish Military Archive file by the name 'Herr Buhl'. For reasons that will be detailed below, it is believed that this person may be identified as a wealthy collector named Emil Bührle, named in a Wiesenthal Center press statement released in June 2006.

Emil Georg Bührle was born in Pforzheim, Germany in 1890 and died in Zurich, Switzerland, in 1956. He studied art history in Freiburg and Munich, and, in 1924, Bührle was transferred from Magdeburg to Zurich by his employer to reorganise the ailing Swiss Machine Tool Factory Oerlikon. He assumed sole ownership of the company in 1936, and obtained Swiss citizenship; at the same time he began with his first purchases of pictures through Swiss dealers.¹¹³

Bührle transformed the fortunes of the company and trading as Oerlikon-Bührle it became an important armaments manufacturer, a role it continues to play to the present day. The company has not been without controversy and in 1971 Dietrich Bührle, son of the founder, and Chairman of the company, was in the Swiss Supreme Court, admitting responsibility for Oerlikon's illegal arms sales.¹¹⁴

Despite the fact that she cannot herself positively identify the Herr Buhl referred to by von Frey in his letter to the Hunts, Lynn Nicholas nevertheless asserts:

‘The claim (by the Wiesenthal Center) that the Military file proves a connection between the Hunts and Emil Bührle is mistaken.’

Although Nicholas appears to have no positive proof, one way or the other, as to the identity of Herr Buhl, she did not leave the matter open. Having dismissed Bührle as the Herr Buhl of the von Frey letter Nicholas suggests an alternative possibility.

‘It is possible that the Buhl in the letter was a dealer in antiquities at Freiburg who was suspected by the SS of smuggling works of art from German occupied Alsace into Germany. Buhl does not appear on the Allied lists.’¹¹⁵

However, as Nicholas points out, the Freiburg dealer’s area of activity was Alsace and Germany and she demonstrates no connection between him and Lucerne, the place with which the Herr Buhl of the von Frey correspondence is associated.

From her examination of the Military file, Nicholas characterises Herr Buhl as

‘an unreliable dealer who sells forgeries’¹¹⁶

However, this is quite misleading. The von Frey letter of 13th November 1946 contains the following details:

‘Now for something very different. I am trying to get permission here to open up a business and set myself up as an expert. Who do you think is working hard against me? Herr Buhl. And at the same

time he is fawningly friendly to my face. He looks me up to show me things etc. The reason of course is that being vindictive he is annoyed with me because, as he never paid for your crucifix, I wont [sic] after him for the money on your behalf and he still did not want to pay. He is certainly no prompt payer in money matters and is unreliable as well, but such a person can always do you an injury. I would ask you now that when you see him you will say nothing to him about this, but only say that you would be very sorry if I remained in Switzerland and manouvre [sic] him to express a favourable opinion about me, which you could then report to me. With that I could put a stop to his activity. Otherwise the fellow will keep raising trouble. Once, at the beginning of the war, he sold a number of forgeries to Lindpainter [sic] and guaranteed him that they came from West Switzerland, from an old family, whereas they all came from Lucerne and from Bossard's workshop at that, ordered directly from Bossard's by Buhl. I suspected them immediately but allowed myself to be shut up by Buhl's persuasive talk. That I found out the business and B. was compelled to refund the money to Pauly annoyed him also of course, but I cannot allow any forgeries to pass as genuine. This is all very confidential however because I don't want a rupture with him, on the contrary I want to have his approval when I establish myself here, of course exactly the same as in Paris, not a business open to everybody but chiefly dealing with firms and museums.

Buhl is at the moment in London and if you could do something for me in the way of convincing him that I can be useful to him, or even that I can injure him through my connections, I would be much obliged.

If he goes absolutely too far I could go to quarters for which he has the most respect and where we are in good standing and reveal the reason of his attitude. But I hope that wont [sic] be necessary. So, if the opportunity presents itself, I leave it to your diplomatic skill.'

The fact that Hunt sold a crucifix to Buhl raises the question as to whether there may have been a more extensive business relationship between Hunt and Buhl, especially in the context that they were to meet in London.

From the von Frey letter one can also conclude that Buhl consulted von Frey for advice on artwork and they appear to have met on a reasonably frequent basis. As Buhl appears to have gone to von Frey, these meetings seemingly took place in Lucerne, where von Frey was based. Buhl also did business in Lucerne with Bossard's workshop, from whom he had commissioned forgeries, and with Paul Lindpaintner, who had an office in Lucerne.

It can also be demonstrated that Emil Bührle had connections with Lucerne. Lynn Nicholas wrote extensively about Emil Bührle in her book *The Rape of Europa*¹¹⁷ and she showed that he was a visitor to Lucerne where he acquired looted paintings from Walter Hofer and Hans Wendland via the Fischer Gallery.

Herr Buhl was clearly an associate of von Frey and connected with Lindpaintner; and he had other connections in Lucerne as well. Sq. Ldr. Douglas Cooper appears to have conducted his investigation into the trafficking of looted art into Switzerland with great thoroughness; exposing and documenting the activities of Hofer, Wendland, Bührle, von

Frey and the Fischer Gallery, amongst many others. Likewise the OSS investigation into the Swiss-based dealers in looted art was thorough and revealing. In these circumstances one would have considered it strange had neither Cooper nor the OSS officers made any mention of a dealer named Herr Buhl, in connection with von Frey and Lindpaintner. However, this apparent omission could be explained easily were it the case that 'Herr Buhl' might, in fact, be a mistransliteration for Emil Bührle, who is well-documented in all the relevant intelligence reports.

When von Frey wrote to the Hunts on 13th November 1946 he reported that Buhl was in London and he was of the belief that Hunt would meet with him there. It seems more plausible to conclude that the owner of an armaments industry that sold weapons to the allies during the war would be more likely to be in London in November 1946 than 'an unreliable dealer' from Freiburg who might risk detention in England. Moreover, it is possible that John Hunt could have come in contact with an arms manufacturer such as Emil Bührle through his earlier connections with the arms dealer John Ball, part of whose collection he acquired.¹¹⁸

The 'Herr Buhl' referred to by von Frey was a powerful and influential figure whose good will von Frey sought to cultivate, in order to obtain official permission to set up as a *bona fide* dealer in Switzerland. This clearly fits the profile of Emil Bührle. In her book *The Rape of Europa*, Lynn Nicholas shows how Dr. Vodoz of the Swiss Federal Department of the Interior assisted Bührle, initially:

‘with customs difficulties related to the undocumented importation of the [looted] pictures he had bought in Paris.’

Dr. Vodoz again proved helpful to Bührle at the end of the war when looted pictures were found to be in his possession and were the subject of restitution claims by the collector Paul Rosenberg.¹¹⁹

In turn Bührle was prepared to use his contacts to help his friends. The interrogation report on Hans Wendland states:

‘Wendland admits that he was a close friend of Bührle, the Oerlikon arms manufacturer, who used his influence to assist Wendland in his difficulties with the Swiss.’¹²⁰

For someone like von Frey, who was seeking official permission to set up as an art dealer in Switzerland, a man such as Bührle, who had a powerful friend in the Swiss Federal Department of the Interior, was more likely to be someone to be feared and cultivated than was:

‘an unreliable dealer who sells forgeries’¹²¹

Another possible link between von Frey and Bührle is the fact that like Bührle, von Frey acquired from the ERR artwork stolen from the collector Paul Rosenberg. Similarly, a Picasso painting looted from the Lindon collection acquired by Bührle from Junod of Lausanne, had earlier been acquired by von Frey from the Nazis.

Ms Nicholas states

‘the individual described [Herr Buhl], an unreliable dealer who sells forgeries, certainly bears no resemblance to the extremely rich collector and armaments manufacturer Emil Bührle.’¹²²

This is a curious assessment.

Bührle was an arms manufacturer who sold weapons to both the Allies and the Nazis during the war. He was also a man who purchased looted art from the Nazis and smuggled it into Switzerland with the help of a corrupt official. These are not credentials that would lead one to consider him incapable of commissioning forgeries for sale to Lindpaintner.

It has been shown that Alexander von Frey was a very well-connected person and based on this observation it would appear that only a person such as Emil Bührle would be of sufficient standing for von Frey to be seeking to elicit his support and approval. A small-time dealer in forgeries certainly does not seem to fit the profile.

While there is evidence to suggest that ‘Herr Buhl’ is in fact Emil Bührle, there is the obvious difficulty that the form of the name apparently used by von Frey is Buhl, not Bührle. However this may not have been the case. Nicholas simply refers to the fact that the name Buhl, not Bührle, is used four times in one letter, but she appears not to have delved further into the matter. She may not have taken account of the fact that the document in the Irish Military Archive is not the original letter written by von Frey; it is a translated transcript compiled for Irish Military Intelligence officers. The information on the file shows that the letter was intercepted by the police and forwarded 31st December 1946 by Chief Superintendent Carroll to Col. Dan Bryan, Head of Irish Military Intelligence:

‘Dear Bryan:

I should be thankful for an English translation of the enclosed communication. It is requested that the matter be treated as urgent.

Yours sincerely,

P. Carroll,

Chief Superintendent.’¹²³

Col Bryan replied to Chief Superintendent Carroll on 7th January 1947.

‘SECRET

Dear Carroll, herewith original English translation as requested. I regret delay, but Colt. Butler was away and I had to get it done elsewhere.

Yours sincerely,

(signature illegible).

Colonel

Director of Intelligence.’

As revealed in Col Bryan’s note, the person who normally undertook the work did not undertake the translation and transcription of the letter from Von Frey.

Furthermore, the significance of the fact that one is dealing with a transcribed translation, rather than the original letter, is that a copy may contain errors. As any palaeographer can testify, once made, an error in transcription can be repeated *ad nauseam* throughout a document. Apparently, Lynn Nicholas did not consider this possibility as providing an explanation for the discrepancy between ‘Buhl’ and ‘Bührle’. Nor did

her report note that the name Lindpaintner is also misspelled in the same transcription.¹²⁴

Another possibility that may account for the misspelling of the name Bührle (and Lindpaintner) is contained at the end of the von Frey letter, and once more Lynn Nicholas appears not to have considered its possible implications. Von Frey signs off with the following statement:

‘I have supped too much cognac which explains all the errors in typing.’

Von Frey may have misspelled the name simply because he was drunk when he wrote to the Hunts.

Emil Bührle continued to be a controversial figure in the post war years. In 1990 the National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC jointly organised with the Foundation Emil G. Bührle Collection a controversial exhibition entitled "The Passionate Eye: Impressionist and Other Master Paintings From the E. G. Bührle Collection." In addition to being displayed in Washington, the exhibition toured a number of centres including the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, the Yokohama Museum of Art in Japan and the Royal Academy of Arts in London.

The National Gallery of Art was criticised by Michael Kimmelman in an article entitled ‘Was This Exhibition Necessary?’ published by the New York Times on 20th May 1990. Kimmelman wrote,

‘What is nowhere mentioned in the catalogue is that Bührle-made arms were distributed to the Nazis as well as to the Allies. Nor is

anything said about Dieter Buhrle - the collector's son and the present chairman of Oerlikon-Buhrle, who owns many of the works in this exhibition - except that he continued to buy art for the family firm after his father's death. A reader will search in vain for news about Dieter Buhrle's conviction in 1970 in Switzerland for illegal arms sales.

Nor does the catalogue point out that the Martin Marietta Corporation, the sponsor in Washington of "The Passionate Eye," has a contract with Oerlikon-Buhrle to manufacture "Adats," or anti-aircraft weapons. And only the most scrupulous reader of the small print at the back of the catalogue will notice curious bits of information like the provenance of Renoir's "Portrait of Mademoiselle Irene Cahen d'Anvers," which traces the painting to the collection of Hermann Goring.'

In a comment that applies equally to all collections – including the Hunt Museum - Kimmelman states:

‘Museums must never be mistaken for public relations agencies, and if they organize an exhibition that has a specific collector as its subject, it is reasonable for the public to assume that they apply to that collector the same standards of scholarly inquiry that they apply to the description of specific works of art.’

Kimmelman concluded by stating:

‘Pleasurable though it is to see so many fine paintings that otherwise can be seen only in Zurich, "The Passionate Eye" can in no way be justified as a necessary exhibition for the museum to have

undertaken. From an art-historical perspective, and perhaps from a moral perspective, too, it does no honor to the National Gallery.’

The National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, employed Ms Nancy Yeide, appointed to assist the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group in its investigation,¹²⁵ and Lynn Nicholas is a former employee of the institution.¹²⁶ Given the controversy surrounding the Bührle Washington exhibition and the Wiesenthal Center statement identifying Herr Buhl as Emil Bührle, both Nancy Yeide and Lynn Nicholas were well placed to understand the importance of resolving the identity of the person referred to in the von Frey correspondence. However, the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group did not address the matter as the contents of the Military Archive file was ignored. It may be that Lynn Nicholas undertook a meticulous and detailed examination of the information in the von Frey correspondence relating to ‘Herr Buhl’, however she presented no detailed analysis of any such investigation in her report.

While the evidence supporting the proposal that ‘Buhl’ and ‘Bührle’ are the same person is not conclusive, there are facts that support that view and nothing that is known currently precludes the validity of such a conclusion. No stronger candidate has come to light and Lynn Nicholas’ alternative proposal as to the identity of Herr Buhl would not seem to carry greater validity. Indeed, it can be argued that further investigation into possible links between John Hunt and Emil Bührle appears to provide a more promising line of research.

Herr Buhl is linked to the Lucerne based ‘red flag’ dealers von Frey and Lindpaintner and the von Frey correspondence also reveals that John Hunt traded with Buhl on at least one occasion, and that he may have met

him in London in 1946. At the time of the proposed meeting John Hunt was aware from the von Frey letter that Buhl engaged in selling forgeries commissioned from Bossard's workshop. Hans Bossard, the man in whose workshop the forgeries sold to Lindpaintner were made, was a right-wing extremist and Nazi supporter who favoured Swiss participation in the Nazi war against the Soviet Union. A police dossier in the Swiss Bundesarchiv documents his pro-Nazi activities.¹²⁷

Lindpaintner, the victim of Bossard's and Herr Buhl's deception, appears to have been a friend of von Frey and they were both associates of the Nazi Erich van Kreibitz, as discussed earlier. The U.S. National Archives Military Agency Records contains additional information concerning Lindpaintner whom von Frey refers to in his correspondence with the Hunts.

'9018 Safehaven report on antique furniture held in Spain for a German, Rittmeister Paul Lindpainter [sic] of Berlin, Germany. 1 p. April 1945; see also XL 19026 Information concerning Erich von Kreibitz, Alexander von Frey and Lindpaintner, reported to be connected with looted art traffic. Lindpaintner has office space in Lucerne, Switzerland 1 p. September 1945'.

In his letter to the Hunts, Von Frey's uses the familiar form 'Pauly';¹²⁸ instead of the formal name 'Paul', which suggests that the Hunts may have been familiar with Paul Lindpaintner. Lynn Nicholas undertook research into possible links between the Hunts and Lindpaintner, concluding:

‘Archival sources examined do not show any link between Lindpaintner and the Hunts’¹²⁹

However she provides no details as to the identity of these ‘archival sources’, the direction of her research, nor the focus that future research might take.

Perhaps based upon their familiarity with the von Frey correspondence with the Hunts, the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group appeared to have recognised the need to scrutinise Swiss dealers involved in trade in looted art with the Nazis. The Evaluation Group report refers to Sq. Ldr. Cooper’s report¹³⁰ as one of the sources it consulted. The Evaluation Group would thus have been aware from the Cooper report that von Frey had been engaged in trading in looted art. Their scrutiny of the Irish Military Archive file should have made the Group aware that von Frey was a friend and business associate of the Hunts, with whom he corresponded during the war. Yet there is no mention of von Frey in the Evaluation Group report, although several of von Frey’s associates are, indeed, named in their report, where their possible connection with the Hunts is examined and discounted.

The Evaluation Group also record in their final report that they examined the interrogation records on Wendland and Fisher. Despite von Frey’s connection with the Hunts, there is no mention of the latter’s interrogation record ever having being consulted. Nor is there mention made by the Evaluation Group of Arthur Goldschmidt, who did business with the Hunts, and who is referred to by name both in the von Frey correspondence with Hunt and in the Wendland interrogation record, which the Evaluation Group references among sources it consulted.¹³¹

The Evaluation Group also record the following:

‘The records of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War areas (or Roberts Commission) contain a series of index card files on looted art works, collections and individuals suspected of involvement in art-looting activities. The ‘Card File on Repositories, Collections and Collectors Suspected of Receiving or Storing Looted Art Objects, 1943-46’ was consulted and no references to the Hunts were found. Other reports contained within the Roberts Commission files which were consulted, included files on the Galerie Fischer and a Report prepared by *The Foreign Economic Administration* on looted art, August 1945. Files from the Schenker shipping firm were consulted as were files on Hans Wendland and reports on art related activities in Switzerland.’¹³²

Given von Frey’s prominence in the Swiss art-looting network, it seems a remarkable oversight that such documents as those cited would not have alerted the Evaluation Group to his role. Yet it is his associates, rather than von Frey, who are mentioned in the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report. This would strengthen the argument of the Wiesenthal Center that the incomplete nature of the research requires a reopened enquiry.

Galerie Fischer was known to sell objects of a type that were of interest to John Hunt. For example a notice that referred to the infamous ‘degenerate’ art auction scheduled for 30th June 1939, also referred to a series of auctions by Fischer of arms, armour and religious relics.¹³³ There is nothing in the Evaluation Group report to indicate whether they

considered checking Fisher sales catalogues to see if any matches with Hunt material could be established or whether they considered such a course of action to be desirable or feasible.

‘Galitzine’s’, London

There is yet another piece of potentially important information provided by the von Frey letters that was, apparently, not considered by either the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group or by Lynn Nicholas. Writing to the Hunts on 13th November 1946, von Frey enquired

‘When are you going to London? I will apply for a visa at the same time. I will stay at Galitzine’s and would be hugely delighted to have a chat with you.’

Did Lynn Nicholas consider that an effort should be made to identify the person or place to which the term ‘Galitzine’s’ might apply? Especially as the von Frey letter implies that the Hunts were familiar with ‘Galitzine’s’.

Galitzine is not a British name and was therefore unlikely to have been common in London. It appears in a British Home Office file summarised by Richard Griffiths.

*‘Prince Turka Galitzine was a scion of that great Russian family. Little is known of him, apart from the fact that, as early as October 1939 (i.e. long before the discovery of the Red Book), Home Office files listed ‘Prince Eurhe [sic] Galitzine, together with Lord Ronald Graham and Richard Findlay, as being among the principle active members of the Right Club in the first months of the war.’*¹³⁴

‘The Red Book is the membership list of the Right Club, a secret organisation founded in May 1939 by Captain Archibald Ramsay MP. Unlike the populist British Union of Fascists lead by the charismatic Sir Oswald Mosley, the Right Club was exclusive.

Its members were aristocrats and Members of Parliament, academics, civil servants, clerics and rich dilettantes. Some of the men had distinguished themselves in the 1914-18 war and saw themselves as patriots. But they were also virulent racists who supported Hitler's treatment of Germany's Jewish population. Many were Nazi sympathisers.’¹³⁵

The Red Book is now housed in the Wiener Library, 4 Devonshire Street, London W1W 5BH, and among the list of Right Club members is Prince Turka Galitzine.

‘Running my finger down the list, written with a fountain pen in Ramsay's hand, the names still resonate: Arthur Wellesley the 5th Duke of Wellington, the Second Baron Redesdale, The Earl of Galloway, Lord Ronald Graham, Princess Blucher, Sir Ernest Bennett, Prince Turka Galitzine and Britain's most notorious Second World War traitor, William Joyce, later known as Lord Haw-Haw as he broadcast propaganda from Germany. The book also lists donations. Sir Alexander Walker, then the head of the Johnnie Walker whisky dynasty, is shown to have donated the princely sum of £100.’

‘Another well known, anti-Semite member was A K Chesterton, a First World War military hero. Commander E H Cole was the Chancellor of the White Knights, a British version of the Ku Klux

Klan. MPs included Sir James Edmondson, Colonel Charles I Kerr and John M'Kie.'

'Many of those of those who appear in the Right Club list were also members of other extreme right-wing groups. Fifty four were in the Nordic League, which, like the Nazis, believed in an Aryan master race.'¹³⁶

George Pitt Rivers, part of whose collection is now in the Hunt Museum, and of whom there will be more discussion later, was a prominent member of the Nordic League, however it seems he was not invited to join the Right Club, being apparently regarded as a 'loose cannon'.¹³⁷

While the von Frey letters provide no evidence that von Frey was an anti-Semite, his anti-communist views are outlined in a manner that suggests he shared at least some of the political sympathies of Prince Galitzine. Furthermore the fact that von Frey was a Count would possibly have provided him with access to Prince Galitzine's social circle. In the letter from von Frey dated 11th April 1944, it is clearly indicated that the Hunts share von Frey's view of 'the bolshies'.

'About the general situation I have, or better, we have the same feelings as you

"Timer danaos et dans ferenter" ['Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes'] or I am 'afraid of the bolshies' even if they pretend to fight for democracy and I know them better than they do in England.'¹³⁸

Extract from a letter from von Frey 7th January 1945.

‘if you Anglo-Saxons will be able to stop the daily growing expansion of Russian ideas over the ruined areas and their beggars in central Europe. This is a great danger and you cannot stop it with planes and bombs.’

There is some additional evidence that supports the view that von Frey had connections with Russian émigrés. This is in the form of a sale he made in October 1938 from his Paris base to the Detroit Museum of Art. The sale involved two pictures; one by German artist Karl Blechen, named *The Waterfall*, for which no provenance was provided; and a second painting, this one a seventeenth century example by the Dutch ‘School of Hercules Seghers’ of which it is stated:

‘From a Russian private collection (according to the dealer) A.C. von Frey’.¹³⁹

At the very least, there is a case for suggesting that Prince Turka Galitzine knew both Von Frey and the Hunts. It would be valuable if Lynn Nicholas were to comment on the potential importance of the reference to ‘Galitzine’s’ in the Frey correspondence and its possible significance for future lines of research.

Felix Harbord

Another person with whom John Hunt had dealings is named in the Irish Military Archives, and he is the subject of comment by Lynn Nicholas'

'The Hunt Military File also contains a letter, dated November 4, 1940/1? from John Hunt to R.A. Masters, Esq, which refers to business dealings with Felix Harbord, a decorator and dealer who worked both in England and Ireland before and after the war. Harbord, for a short time (May-Oct 1945), was posted as a Monuments and Fine Arts Officer at the British Collecting Point at Schloss Celle near Hannover. Some time after he left that post it was discovered that many of the hundreds of cases of recovered art objects stored in the Collecting Point had been rifled. The thefts were the subject of an investigation by the British authorities. As Dr. Samuels suggests, the records of this investigation and the records of the Collecting Point should be examined to see if any of the missing objects could be matched to those in the [Hunt] Museum. Dr. Samuels' allegations that Felix Harbord took objects from the Collecting Point and sold them should also be documented.'¹⁴⁰

Based on Nicholas' recommendations, in 2008 the Hunt Museum undertook an investigation into the thefts at Schloss Celle following which they reported that no evidence linked Felix Harbord to the thefts and that no objects in the Hunt Museum holdings corresponded to items stolen from Schloss Celle.¹⁴¹ This report is to be welcomed. However it must be pointed out that Dr. Samuels never made any reference to the

Schloss Celle thefts nor did he make any allegations that Felix Harbord was involved in them.

Dr. Samuel's reference to Felix Harbord is contained in a press release issued by the Wiesenthal Center, Paris on 21st June 2006, which reads as follows:

‘It is also clear from separate correspondence in the Hunt file that, in late 1940, the Hunts were trading from Ireland with a British based dealer named Felix Harbord. From a separate source, we have learned that, at the end of the war, Harbord was involved with the British army in tracing looted and stolen art, which position he used to expropriate ‘displaced’ objects for sale to former clients in Britain’,¹⁴²

Felix Harbord was a designer and decorator with a list of important and well-connected clients in Britain and Ireland. Among his famous English clients was the photographer Cecil Beaton for whom he designed a multi-columned drawing room at Reddish House, which was completed in the 1950's. Harbord enjoyed the patronage of members of the Guinness family and some of his best-known interior design work was undertaken at Luttrellstown Castle, Co. Dublin on behalf of Aileen Plunket, who acquired the castle in 1927 as a wedding present from her father Ernest Guinness. The relationship between Harbord and Aileen Plunket was soured by a law case following Harbord's sale of paintings that Aileen Plunket insisted she only wanted to have valued. Plunket won the law case against Harbord.¹⁴³ Harbord also worked for Aileen Plunket's younger sister Maureen, Marchioness of Dufferin and Ava.¹⁴⁴

One of Harbord's Scottish clients also had an Irish connection. Augusta Crichton-Stuart, Marchioness of Bute was the daughter of Sir Alan Henry Bellingham, of Castlebellingham, Co. Louth. She died in 1947 and Bute House, her residence at no. 6, Charlotte Square, Edinburgh, is now the official residence of the First Minister of Scotland.

According to the Bute House Guidebook ¹⁴⁵ one of the main attractions in the Drawing Room is a continental glass chandelier, which is:

‘one of the three spectacular Bute family pieces.’

The guidebook further informs the reader:

‘The chandelier has a fascinating history: during the war, Felix Harbord, the interior decorator who helped lady Bute with the arrangement [sic] her family homes, was serving in the Forces and was charged with repatriating works of art. One day he came upon this chandelier abandoned in one of the streets of Cleves and had it packed in empty munitions boxes, which he addressed to No. 6 Charlotte Square. With the help of Edinburgh antiques dealers, Lady Bute traced suitable replacements for the missing pieces of glass and successfully assembled and installed the light fitting in the Drawing Room of Bute House. She always ensured, however, that the Drawing Room curtains were left open at night, so that passers-by could share her enjoyment in the chandelier's unexpected arrival.’¹⁴⁶

A number of matters arise from the chandelier affair. In this instance, Harbord had established a means of removing, from Germany, an

unprovenanced artwork by placing it in an empty munitions box and addressing it to a client in Scotland.

Provenance researchers will undoubtedly be interested to establish whether the chandelier is the only object that Harbord removed from Germany in this way, or whether there were others. Further research is required to try to establish the origins of the chandelier in question. It may be an object looted from the British Collecting Point at Schloss Celle, or it may be an object looted from legitimate German ownership.

During and after the British invasion of Germany, extensive looting took place by members of the British armed forces at a time when Harbord was serving there as an officer.¹⁴⁷

Harbord's action in sending the chandelier to Bute House clearly indicates that he had an excellent relationship with Lady Bute. Lady Bute was the wife of John Crichton-Stuart, 4th Marquess of Bute, whose brother Lord Ninian Crichton-Stuart was killed during the First World War. Lord Ninian's widow, Ismay, later married Captain Archibald Ramsay, the founder of the Right Club of which Prince Turka Galitzine was a prominent member. Ramsay was conservative MP for South Midlothian and Peebles since 1931. He was arrested on 22nd May 1940 under Regulation 18B and detained at Brixton prison.¹⁴⁸

Lord Calum Crichton-Stuart, younger brother of the 4th Marquess was a supporter of Ramsay and also engaged in extreme right-wing politics. He is described as follows by Richard Griffiths:

‘Lord Calum Crichton-Stuart (Warden), the younger brother of the 4th Marquess of Bute, was brother-in-law to Mrs Ramsay (whose first husband had been Lord Ninian Crichton-Stuart, killed in the war). The Unionist MP for Northwich since 1922, Crichton-Stuart, too, had served with the Scots Guards in the war. A Roman Catholic, he shared many of Ramsay’s views about the anti-Christian dangers of the Communist threat, and was prepared to join questionable bodies, as is shown by his association with the Earl of Glasgow in the Christian Defence Movement.’¹⁴⁹

A connection with the Crichton-Stuart family is to be found in the archives of the Hunt Museum. This is in the form of a letter written by Lord Gort on 17th December 1956 in which he informs John Hunt, Senior, that he has arranged the purchase from the executors of

‘Lord Ninian Stewart [of] 90 acres of cut off timber land adjoining our park for £700.’

The letter is contained in the Bunratty Castle, Co. Clare file¹⁵⁰ but may relate to land purchased elsewhere.¹⁵¹ At the time of the sale Ninian Stewart’s widow Ismay was still living although her second husband Captain Ramsay was by then deceased. John Hunt assisted Lord Gort to renovate Bunratty Castle, near Limerick, during the 1950s.¹⁵²

Connections between the Hunts and Dr. Adolf Mahr, Director of the National Museum of Ireland and Head of the Nazi Party in Ireland

Dr Adolf Mahr, an Austrian, came to Ireland in 1927 to work as Keeper of Irish Antiquities in the National Museum of Ireland. In 1934 he was promoted to Director of the museum. He was also the head of the Nazi Party in Ireland, and was dubbed ‘Dublin Nazi No. 1’. Under pressure from Irish and British military intelligence, he left for Germany shortly before the outbreak of war in 1939, never to return. During the war, he became director of Irland-Redaktion, the German propaganda radio service that broadcast into neutral Ireland. At the end of the war he was arrested, and upon his release tried to return to Ireland, but to no avail.

Lynn Nicholas asserts that

‘ties [by the Hunts] to the Irish Nazi Party leader [Mahr] have not been established’¹⁵³

Nicholas also states that the research conducted by the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group, *inter alia*, failed to discover evidence of ‘Nazi party membership’ by the Hunts and also failed:

‘to uncover any documentation of wartime contact with Adolf Mahr, who left Ireland permanently in 1939, before the Hunts settled there.’¹⁵⁴

Lynn Nicholas seems to imply here that because Mahr left Ireland before the Hunts moved there, it was not possible for them to have had contact prior to the war. However, such a conclusion would run contrary to the available documentary and published evidence. According to Mary Cahill of the National Museum of Ireland:

‘During the period 1936-1939 John Hunt was active in the London antiquities market and was in touch with Dr. Adolf Mahr on several occasions.’¹⁵⁵

Evidence for contact between the Hunts and Adolf Mahr is to be found in the files of the Irish Antiquities Division, National Museum of Ireland, to which Erin Gibbons was provided access.¹⁵⁶

The Irish Antiquities Division files provide important information relating to Mahr and the Hunts. On 28th January 1947 Joseph Raftery, Irish Antiquities Division, National Museum of Ireland wrote a briefing memo concerning a collection of ancient Irish gold objects that were available for purchase. Raftery referred to a recent conversation with John Hunt in which Hunt revealed that he had offered the pieces for sale to Dr. Adolf Mahr some years earlier:

‘(about 1935, he thinks)’¹⁵⁷

When first offered for sale by John Hunt the objects were part of the holdings of the Pitt Rivers Museum at Farnham, England. The offer made in writing by Hunt to Mahr is contained in a letter dated 24th January 1936 written by Hunt to Mahr from his address at Bury Street, London.

Hunt sent a further letter to Mahr on 19th February seeking a response to the offer.

Mahr was unable to obtain sufficient funds to acquire the gold and the objects were sold to Randolph Hearst, an American newspaper owner. In 1938 Hearst decided to dispose of the objects, which were then offered for sale through Sotheby's, London. Once again Mahr failed to secure the funds necessary to acquire the gold objects. However, on 12th July 1939 John Hunt wrote to Adolf Mahr in the following terms.

‘My Dear Dr. Mahr,

You will remember that some years ago I showed you some important Irish Gold Ornaments, which I had for disposal, from the Pitt-Rivers Collection. These, as you no doubt know, have recently come up for sale at Sothebys, as the property of Mr. Randolph Hearst. They were not sold at the sale, and I now have an opportunity of buying them at an advantageous price. The price they were bought in for at the sale-rooms was £680, and the reserve price placed upon them was £800.

I am in direct touch with Mr. Hearst's Agent, who is a friend of mine, and if you are interested in these pieces I should be happy to negotiate for you, as I am sure you would be able to obtain better terms in that way than would otherwise be the case.

If you are in London during the Art

Historians' Congress at the end of the month, I hope
I shall have the pleasure of seeing you.

With kindest regards from my wife and
myself.

Yours very sincerely

John Hunt.¹⁵⁸

The manner in which John Hunt signs off with a greeting that included his wife suggests that both John and Gertrude Hunt were on familiar terms with Adolf Mahr.

Mahr replied to Hunt on 14th July 1939 expressing his interest in acquiring the gold objects. He added:

‘I regret to say I will not be at the London Congress,
but I hope to see you at another stay of mine in London
which I hope to manage later in the Autumn.’¹⁵⁹

On that same day, 14th July 1939, Mahr wrote a memo to the Secretary [General], Department of Education seeking funds to acquire the gold objects. He also advised the Secretary that:

‘Mr. Hunt is not our regular agent in London, but he is
trustworthy, and I beg to submit also the carbon of my letter
to him.’¹⁶⁰

Mahr's confidence in recommending Hunt to the Secretary of the Department of Education as being 'trustworthy' seems to have been based on something more than casual acquaintance with the dealer. It is perhaps even surprising given that, in a separate transaction that took place during the previous year, Hunt had attempted to sell Mahr an object of somewhat doubtful authenticity.

It would appear that Hunt visited Mahr at the National Museum of Ireland in 1938 where he may have been given a tour of the collections by Mahr, to whom he offered a seal matrix of Odo O'Neill for sale.¹⁶¹ Mahr subsequently wrote to Hunt but the letter has not come to light. In reply, on 16th May 1938 Hunt wrote to Mahr in the following terms.

'Very many thanks for your kind letter. I enjoyed my visit to Ireland immensely particularly for the opportunity it gave me for seeing the wonderful things you have in your museum. I am amazed at the number of things you have added lately.

I have now heard again from the owner of the seal and have some more details.'¹⁶²

This excerpt suggests that Hunt's visit to the museum was not his first such visit; otherwise he was unlikely to be in a position to comment on:

'the number of things you have added lately.'

Hunt concludes his letter as follows:

'I hope you will come and see me when you are

next in London.

With kindest regards from my wife and myself.

Very sincerely yours,

John Hunt.'

Mahr had the seal matrix evaluated by an expert, Charles McNeill, who wrote to him on 20th May 1938 expressing doubts about the object.

'There is a document extant where this Odo (by the hand, no doubt, of a Norman clerk) styles himself "Odo Onel, Rex Keneleon", spelling his name not so correctly as on the seal.'¹⁶³

From the correspondence quoted above, Adolf Mahr and John Hunt were corresponding and holding meetings between January 1936 and July 1939. Moreover, Mahr was of close enough acquaintance with John Hunt to have provided him with a business reference to Mahr's own superiors in the Department of Education. However, these connections were not documented by either the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group or Lynn Nicholas.

The Hunts, the Pitt Rivers Collection and Captain George Pitt Rivers

The Mahr correspondence quoted earlier shows that John Hunt was involved in the sale of objects from the Pitt Rivers Museum in Farnham. Neither the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report nor the Nicholas commentary refer to the 1936 sale and, although the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group refers to the fact that the Hunt Museum contains items from the Pitt Rivers collection, much information about the objects is absent from the report.

The Pitt Rivers collection at Farnham was assembled by Lieutenant-General Augustus Henry Lane Fox Pitt Rivers a noted Victorian antiquarian. In time, a grandson, Captain George Pitt Rivers, obtained the ownership of the collection.

Material in the Hunt Museum from the Pitt Rivers collection is introduced in the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report as follows:

‘APPENDIX 3

Sources consulted for research into objects contained in the Hunt Collection

Report by Ms Virginia Teehan

"SECONDARY SOURCE MATERIALS

Cambridge University Library: Catalogues relating to the Pitt Rivers Collection.

General Augustus Pitt Rivers was a 19th Century collector and archaeologist. His first collection forms the basis for the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford. These illustrated catalogues record his second collection, collected between 1880 and 1900, and form the basis for the museum which he set up, in Farnham, Dorset, near his home at Rushmore Lodge. The collection remained at Farnham until the 1960s when it was dispersed after the death of his grandson, George Pitt Rivers.’

Contrary to what is stated in the Evaluation Group report, the dispersal of the Pitt Rivers Farnham collection began long before the death of George Pitt Rivers when John Hunt sold Irish gold objects from the collection to Randolph Hearst around 1936.

The dispersal of the rest of the collection took place after World War II and it appears that John and Gertrude Hunt played key roles in this. This is not reported by Virginia Teehan on behalf of the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group nor commented on by Lynn Nicholas.

Captain George Pitt Rivers was a prominent fascist, anti-Semite and promoter of eugenics and race theory during the thirties and forties. A writer and polemicist, he was closely associated with all of the leading pro-Nazi leaders and organisations in Britain at that period. There is extensive literature on and by Pitt Rivers about whom much relevant detail is to be found in Richard Griffiths’ 1998 book.¹⁶⁴ Pitt Rivers was arrested and interned by the British Authorities during World War II.

As George Pitt Rivers espoused Fascist political views and was active in the promotion of this ideology, establishing the nature of the connection

between him and the Hunts is clearly relevant. So too are allegations of the role played by the Hunts in the dispersal of the Pitt Rivers collection.

According to Nicholas Shakespeare:

‘In 1927, Captain George [Pitt Rivers] had reached an important agreement with the Inland Revenue: death duties would be exempted so long as the Farnham museum remained intact.’¹⁶⁵

This would suggest that the sale in 1936 by John Hunt of gold objects from the Pitt Rivers collection was in contravention of the revenue agreement. The existence of the revenue agreement meant that the disposal of the Farnham collection after the war required a cautious approach. A group of dealers consisting of John Hewett, Peter Wilson, and John and Gertrude Hunt agreed to dispose of the collection.

‘Jack Hunt and his wife Putzel were two other members of the circle. Because of their political affiliations – conservative in the tradition of Captain George – the couple had to live in Ireland, where they dealt in medieval works of art.’¹⁶⁶

‘Duplicates of the objects to be sold were arranged so that the pretence could be maintained that they were still in the museum. ‘Hewett’s partner, Sandy Martin, confirms that Putzel Hunt (Hewett’s third partner based in Ireland) had a Benin mask copied at this time.’¹⁶⁷

The copying and dispersal of the collection began during the lifetime of George Pitt Rivers,¹⁶⁸ with the assistance of his common law wife Stella, and continued apace after Pitt Rivers' death on 16th June 1966.

‘The best pieces were diverted out of England through an offshore company based in Ireland, and reshipped to the continent to avoid exchange control.’¹⁶⁹

In his article in the Irish Museum's Journal, Ciarán MacGonigal also refers to the involvement of John and Gertrude Hunt in the disposal of the Pitt Rivers collection, as reported by Nicholas Shakespeare.¹⁷⁰

Although Lynn Nicholas references MacGonigal's article, she makes no comment on the politics of George Pitt Rivers or the allegation that the Hunts shared his political views, nor does Nicholas comment on the involvement of the Hunts in the questionable dispersal of the Pitt Rivers collection.¹⁷¹

There is independent documentary evidence that supports Shakespeare's account of the dispersal of the Pitt Rivers collection. This is to be found in files in the National Museum of Ireland¹⁷² that were available to the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group for consultation. The files document the museum's acquisition in **1979** of the residue of the Pitt Rivers Irish collection from the Farnham Museum, as well as other relevant information. One might reasonably assume that the Evaluation Group had knowledge of the existence of the National Museum's Pitt Rivers files, as a document on file IA/128/1970 shows that Dr. Michael Ryan, Secretary of the Evaluation Group, submitted a valuation of the Pitt Rivers collection to Breandán Ó Ríordáin, Keeper of Irish Antiquities on

the 7th July, 1978, as part of the process of acquiring the collection. At that time Dr. Ryan was Assistant Keeper in the Irish Antiquities Division, National Museum of Ireland.

The National Museum of Ireland had been advised by Professor Charles Thomas, Leicester University, on 23rd September 1970, that it might be possible for it to acquire the Irish collection of antiquities in the Pitt Rivers Museum in Farnham and following lengthy negotiations a large part of the Irish material that had formerly been exhibited in Farnham was purchased in 1979.

Among the items acquired by the National Museum of Ireland were replicas of eight gold objects from the Farnham Museum.¹⁷³ These were replicas of the gold objects that John Hunt first offered for sale to Adolf Mahr in 1936. Around 1949 the objects were placed with the New York agents Berry Hill and a letter written at the direction of the Irish Minister for External Affairs on 9th July 1949 informed the Secretary of the Royal Irish Academy that the agents, Berry Hill,

‘state that their instructions are to break up the collection and sell the pieces separately..¹⁷⁴

The existence of the replicas of the gold objects among the Pitt Rivers material acquired by the National Museum of Ireland would suggest that replication of objects in the Farnham Museum collection, presumably to facilitate the sale of the originals, had commenced as early as the mid 1930s. A letter in the National Museum file written by Peter Saunders, Curator of the Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum on 15th February 1979 is also of interest.

‘It is now three years since I had access to the Museum at Farnham. As I expect you are aware this museum acquired the material from Wessex, together with the Agricultural Collection, and I was able to enter the Museum in order to organise its removal here. Certainly at that time there was a quantity of Irish material still in the museum, although it did appear that certain items had either been removed or in some cases, were electrotypes [i.e. replicas].’¹⁷⁵

An indication of what may have happened to the missing objects is also to be found in the files of the National Museum of Ireland. On 19th February 1972 a letter written by David Brown, Assistant Keeper at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, was published in *The Times*. In the letter Brown states that he was studying archaeological objects in the ‘private collection of a London dealer.’ He identified some of the objects as having

‘once formed a part of the of the collections in the Pitt-Rivers Museum, including such important pieces as the two prehistoric bronze cauldrons from Ballyscullion and Cape Castle Bog, Armoy, Co. Antrim.’¹⁷⁶

On 21st December 1972, Brown’s letter was brought to the attention of the National Museum of Ireland by Ms. Beatrice de Cardi, Secretary of the Council for British Archaeology.¹⁷⁷ On the following day Joseph Raftery wrote to Professor Charles Thomas in the following terms:

‘I was visited recently by John Hunt, the high-class Dublin dealer, who is some sort of representative of Sothebys. He is toying with the

idea of reconstructing a castle in Clare to house his collection as a private museum open to tourists and he mentioned that he had access to two Irish bronze swords and two Irish bronze cauldrons. It is, I suggest not unreasonable to believe that the two cauldrons which he is contemplating acquiring are those mentioned by David Brown. Hunt said that these objects are now in Germany. If I am correct in assuming that the two German cauldrons which he proposes to acquire came from Pitt-Rivers through a dealer in England to a client in Germany there is clearly a serious situation where important Irish and British material is being scattered in such a way that will make it unavailable for scholarship in the future.¹⁷⁸

On 3rd January 1973, Raftery wrote to David Brown asking him to identify the London dealer in whose collection he had seen the Pitt Rivers material. Brown replied on 8th January 1973 identifying the dealer.

‘He is John Hewett, of 45 Evelyn Gardens, London S.W.7.

I mentioned the cauldrons, because they were the only pieces (prehistoric pieces) which was showed me which I could afterwards identify (I was more particularly interested in his Anglo Saxon and later pieces which I recorded fully – but I do remember that he also had a bronze shield (I think from Wiltshire) and other things. Whether or not they were also from Pitt Rivers, I don’t know.¹⁷⁹

From a hand written note on the file it appears that Raftery telephoned John Hunt on 15th January 1973, or spoke with him in person. Hunt identified the objects in which he had an interest as a cauldron from Ballyscullion, Co. Antrim, a situla (or bucket) from Cape Castle Bog and a bronze shield from Toome Bar (Co. Antrim) – this is probably the

shield which Brown saw in the possession of Hewett. Raftery noted Hunts remarks about the objects and he quotes him as having stated that the objects were

‘Handled by a man in Germany’

and that

‘This man must have got them from the Robinson Collection.’¹⁸⁰

On the same day Raftery telephoned John Hewett and the following is his handwritten record of the conversation:

‘Telephoned Mr. John Hewett at London 3730353. He said that the only Pitt River’s material that he had ever had was a brooch which, as it was found in the Six Counties, he had sold to Belfast museum. I asked if he had a cauldron or two and he said no, but that as they were also from the Six Counties, “the museum [Pitt Rivers] if selling, would probably sell to Belfast.” However, Mr. Hewett promised to let us know if any other material of 26-county Irish interest came his way, or he “would let Mr. Hunt know.”’¹⁸¹

On 7th May 1974 David Brown wrote to Raftery enquiring about the cauldrons he had seen in the possession of John Hewett. He added that

‘I have noticed that some of Hewett’s Anglo Saxon objects (including pieces from Farnham) have begun to appear openly on the London Market. I haven’t seen any sign of the cauldrons – but, do

you know, is there still a need to look out for them, or have they found another destination elsewhere.’¹⁸²

Raftery replied on 2nd July 1974 informing Brown of what Hewett had told him. He went on to state:

‘I spoke with John Hunt who intimated that he was negotiating with a German dealer for the cauldron from Ballyscullion and the Cape Castle situla and that he wanted to put them in a new small, semi-private museum he is building near Shannon Airport. Evans Ancient Bronze Implements, says that these two items came from the collection of a Mr. T.W. Robinson. Mr. Hunt said to me that the German dealer must have got them from the Robinson collection!’¹⁸³

Raftery’s use of an exclamation mark indicates that he was sceptical about Hunt’s account. The Robinson Collection from which Hunt suggested the alleged German dealer must have got the cauldrons was sold in the lifetime of General Augustus Pitt Rivers and was one of three major collections on which the Pitt Rivers Irish collection was based.¹⁸⁴

The identification by Brown of the bronze vessels he saw in Hewett’s possession as the Ballyscullion and Cape Castle objects from the Pitt Rivers Museum, Farnham, together with the inconsistencies in Hewett’s and Hunt’s accounts, provided good grounds for Raftery’s scepticism. It seems more plausible to conclude that Hewett’s denial that he had been in possession of the Ballyscullion and Cape Castle objects may not be relied upon and that the unnamed German dealer referred to by Hunt was an invention of Hunt’s designed to place some distance between himself and Hewett. Hewett’s statement to Raftery that he ‘would let Mr. Hunt know’ should objects from the Irish republic come his way suggest a business

relationship between them, which would add support to Nicholas Shakespeare's account of the involvement of the Hunts with John Hewett in the dispersal and sale of the Pitt Rivers Farnham collection.

Further support for this interpretation and for Nicholas Shakespeare's account of the relationship between the Hunts, Peter Wilson and John Hewett, is published by Robert Lacey.

'Wilson had first met Hewett through Jack and Putzl Hunt, an erudite couple of dealers whom he had known since the thirties and whose personal collecting had amassed a treasure trove of ancient and curious works of art. Wilson and the Hunts would go antiquing together and they had "discovered" Hewett selling antiques from a barrow in a Chelsea street. So this became the nucleus of Peter Wilson's off-duty family, the bearded Hewett and the scholarly Hunts, friends in thrall to the romantic power of beautiful objects, swapping tips on the telephone, weekending in Mersham – and wheeling, dealing, all the time.'¹⁸⁵

The Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Final Report identifies more than a dozen objects in the Hunt Collection that come from the Pitt Rivers collection, including the Ballyscullion cauldron, Cape Castle situla and Antrim shield.¹⁸⁶ However, no mention is made of John Hewett's possible role in channelling some of these items to the Hunts nor is any reference made to the National Museum files relating to the Pitt Rivers collection, which refer to John Hunt's acquisition of the Ballyscullion cauldron, Cape Castle situla and Antrim shield. The Hunt Museum archival records of these three objects, which may be found through the Hunt Museum Online Catalogue, makes no reference to the objects as having once

formed part of the Pitt Rivers Museum collection and the only reference to Pitt Rivers in connection with these objects is to be found in the archival record of the Ballyscullion cauldron which refers to an

‘article from ‘Country Life’ magazine (7 September 2000) which treats of a garden set out by the Pitt Rivers family’.¹⁸⁷

On 21st December 1972, Ms. Beatrice de Cardi also referred Joseph Raftery to an article in *The Times* under the headline ‘Break-up of Pitt-Rivers collection sends African art treasures to sale room.’¹⁸⁸ In the article, journalist Peter Hopkirk interviewed Mr. Kenelm Digby-Jones, who is described as

‘one of the advisors to the present owner, Mrs Stella Maumen [George Pitt Rivers’ widow].’

In the course of the interview Mr. Digby-Jones stated that the sale of parts of the collection was commenced ‘in the early 1950s’ by Captain Pitt Rivers. From this statement, and from Shakespeare’s account provided earlier, the assertion of the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group¹⁸⁹ that the dispersal of the Farnham collection began only after the death of George Pitt Rivers, would appear to be incorrect. It would appear that the Hunts were known to George Pitt Rivers whom the evidence suggests they assisted in the disposal of material from the Farnham Museum, beginning in the mid thirties and again after the war, acting in collaboration with John Hewett and Peter Wilson.

The fact that George Pitt Rivers espoused pro-Nazi politics together with Nicholas Shakespeare’s allegation that the Hunts were associated with

him and shared his political outlook, gives credence to allegations that the Hunts had Nazi associations. These are matters that should not have been overlooked by the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group and by Lynn Nicholas.

The Hunts, Seán P. Ó Ríordáin and the Lough Gur excavations

Adolf Mahr was aware of the Pitt Rivers collection in the Farnham Museum from at least 1932 when he had the collection photographed and card indexed by his protégée Seán P. Ó Ríordáin, then working as an Assistant in the Irish Antiquities Division of the National Museum of Ireland.¹⁹⁰ Mahr was Ó Ríordáin's mentor and the extraordinary degree to which Mahr influenced Ó Ríordáin's career has been published by Dr. Patrick Wallace.¹⁹¹ Wallace maintains however that Mahr's influence on Ó Ríordáin was in relation to archaeology only and that it did not extend to political matters. Wallace states:

‘Mahr, apparently encouraged his trainees to stay aloof from the political developments of the day, particularly on the continent.’¹⁹²

However the only evidence he produces to support this assertion is that Mahr warned Ó Ríordáin:

‘not to engage in political discussions with Bersu’.¹⁹³

This was not surprising advice from a Nazi like Mahr as Gerhard Bersu was a distinguished archaeologist and scholar of Jewish extraction who was removed from his post as Director of the Romisch-Germanische Kommission, Frankfurt, and forced to leave Germany by the Nazi's.¹⁹⁴ Although interned as a German national by the British during World War II, Bersu spent the war on the Isle of Man, conducting archaeological

excavations. After the war he was appointed Professor of Archaeology by the Royal Irish Academy in 1947.¹⁹⁵

In the article quoted, Wallace makes no mention of Bersu's persecution by the Nazi's, however he does lament the fact that Bersu campaigned to prevent Mahr's return to Ireland after the war.¹⁹⁶

In a recent essay on Mahr, Wallace provided a slightly different version, stating that Mahr advised Ó Ríordáin not to discuss politics with Bersu's friend Raymond Lantier. Speaking of Mahr, after his release from prison, Wallace states:

‘He was convinced his old adversary, Gerhard Bersu, was actively working against his interests. His long-time enmity towards Bersu went back to at least 1933, when in a letter to then travelling student Seán P. Ó Ríordáin, Mahr warned, ‘be careful with Lantier and do not speak about political developments in Germany because he is a great friend of Bersu,’¹⁹⁷

Wallace provides no information about the origins or nature of the alleged ‘enmity’ between the two men and Bersu's persecution by the Nazi's is ignored once more.

Shortly after their arrival in Ireland, having initially taken up residence at 21, Molesworth Street, Dublin, (in immediate proximity to the National Museum of Ireland)¹⁹⁸, the Hunts moved to Lough Gur, Co. Limerick (where they may have owned a farmhouse since as early as 1938)¹⁹⁹. This was where Séan P. Ó Ríordáin was engaged since 1934 in archaeological excavations²⁰⁰. Initially Ó Ríordáin worked under Mahr's direct

instructions, and Mahr continued to have a role after 1936²⁰¹ when Ó Ríordáin was appointed Professor of Archaeology in University College, Cork. No sooner had the Hunts moved to Lough Gur than they were working alongside Ó Ríordáin in the archaeological investigation of the area.

Is it possible that Mahr's protégée Ó Ríordáin, or even Mahr himself, influenced the Hunts decision to move to Lough Gur in the first instance?

Information in yet another National Museum file appears to suggest that as early as 1932, Seán P. Ó Ríordáin was influenced by Mahr's political views and that he may have subscribed to them.

On 26th November 1932, Domhnall Úa Ríoghghardáin, Maree, Oranmore, Co. Galway, wrote a letter to Adolf Mahr in which he seems to refer to a visit by Ó Ríordáin to collect recent archaeological discoveries.

‘Please remember us to Mr. S. P. O Riordan who taught us a very nice German song and “Heil Hitler”!’²⁰²

That Ó Ríordáin may have come under Mahr's political influence would be consistent with the assessment of Col. Dan Bryan, Head of Military Intelligence, who wrote:

‘Mahr while resident in Ireland was an open and blatant Nazi and made every effort to convert Irish graduates, and other persons with whom he had associations, to Nazi doctrines and beliefs.’²⁰³

The Lough Gur excavations were initiated by Adolf Mahr²⁰⁴ and, according to Wallace, were but a part of his wider connections with the Limerick area.

‘Mahr’s interest in localities and building up a ‘local school’ led him to supporting regional and provincial archaeological societies, notably the Thomond or North Munster Society in Limerick, which seems to have been founded (or, more properly, revived) because of his friendship with local antiquarians who, in turn, coaxed Mahr to write for the first issues of their new journal, which were later reissued as a combined offprint.’²⁰⁵

The manner in which the Hunts were able to assimilate themselves into Mahr’s network in the Thomond Society,²⁰⁶ and their connections with Mahr’s protégés and friends, for example, Sean P. Ó Ríordáin and Joseph Raftery, were of crucial importance to them in establishing their credentials in Ireland, and as a means of convincing the authorities of their *bona fides*. Mahr’s role was pivotal in all of this, as it was through him that these contacts had been established. It should not be forgotten either that Mahr had written a reference for John Hunt for the head of the Department of Education in Dublin and, though absent in Germany during the war, Mahr continued as Director of the Museum, a fact that his staff no doubt took into account.

This overall view is borne out by a confidential informant’s report in the Military Archive file.

‘Mr. Hunt is supposed to be “one of the Limerick Hunts.” My informant though he was a Catholic “who didn’t bother much.” I was

told that his wife – a German – is “Alt-Katholich.” [Old-Catholic, German] H. was an art-dealer in London. His house in Molesworth Street contains many objets d’art. He knows a good deal about medieval art, and has displayed his knowledge to Liam Gogan of the Nat. Museum, who thinks highly of him. Leask, of the Board of Works, inspector of nat. monuments is also numbered among his friends, also Sèan O’Riordain of U.C.C. Hunt helped in the excavations at Loch Gur in 1940, and has been selected to carry out a “dig” in Co. Cavan in 1941. He is well-in with a no. of the archaeologists, who have accepted him. Raftery of the Nat. Mus. is a particular friend of his, & visits his flat.^{’207}

Throughout the war, a police watch was kept on the Hunts and Nicholas acknowledges this:

‘Two documents indicate that the Irish police kept careful track of Mrs. Hunt during the war. They were aware that John Hunt was engaged in archeological (sic) work at Lough Gur.’²⁰⁸

Lough Gur is in the same county as the village of Foynes, from which an intercontinental flying boat service operated throughout World War II.

According to Guy Warner:

‘most passengers were top level Allied military and diplomatic personnel with the necessary high priority status required for transatlantic flights. Many were on active duty and traveling under false passports. At first the airlines were very circumspect about the identity of many of these passengers but, as the war progressed,

more American military uniforms were seen. There is no doubt that, with the tacit approval of the Irish government, the flying boat base was a very important link in the Allied war effort.'²⁰⁹

In March 1944 a request was made to employ the Hunts as interior decorators in a restaurant in Foynes,²¹⁰ however the police authorities, refused to allow either of the Hunts to be employed in Foynes.²¹¹ The request to employ the Hunts at Foynes was made in the following terms.

Foynes

16th March '44.

C.S.O. G2.

Parkgate,

DUBLIN.

Sir,

Mr. & Mrs. John Hunt

Sent you at Col. Maher's request. Mr. O'Regan, who is the manager of the I & C restaurant here, wishes to enlist the temporary help of the above, as they are experts in interior decoration. Mrs Hunt however is a German National, and before asking her to come to Foynes, your views on the matter are solicited.

They have a very elaborate house at Lough Gurr, Co. Limerick, and are apparently very interested in Irish Folk Lore.

If you could let him have your observations with a minimum of delay, the Colonel will be very much obliged.

Respectfully,
N. Hewitt (Capt)

The response to Capt. Hewitt is noted in blue ink as follows:

File X/0379

CSO phones Capt. Hewitt 21/3/44 saying they are not to be brought to Foynes.

[Signature illegible, dated:] 21/8/44 or 21/3/44

This was curious given that John Hunt had an Irish passport, so it seems that the police may have entertained suspicions about both John and Gertrude Hunt. The filed note refusing permission for the Hunts to work at Foynes is given the reference number X/0379. According to the Military Archive staff, the use of the letter X as a prefix normally indicates suspicion of espionage.

Yet, there is no hard evidence to prove that the Hunts were engaged in espionage. According to Yvonne Hackenbrock, a contemporary and friend of the Hunts who was resident in London at the time of the Hunts' departure for Ireland, it was widely believed among their circle that fears of arrest on charges of espionage lay behind the flight to Ireland. According to Ms. Hackenbrock, suspicions centred on Hunt's ownership of a radio transmitter and possession of certain maps. Ms. Hackenbrock stated that the departure of the Hunts for Ireland was 'sudden', however,

she did not subscribe to the belief that the Hunts were engaged in spying.²¹²

The Evaluation Group had little to say about the Hunts decision to live at Lough Gur other than stating twice:

‘The Hunts came to Ireland about 1940 when they lived at Lough Gur, Co, Limerick. Here they were involved in excavations around the area undertaken by Professor Seán P Ó Riordáin.’²¹³

It was during the period that the Hunts were living at Lough Gur that John Hunt undertook the reconstruction of a Neolithic house, based on a type excavated at Lough Gur by Ó Riordáin. This undertaking was an example of the continental ‘open-air museum’ that had been developed first in Sweden during the 1890s²¹⁴ Adolf Mahr was a great admirer of open-air museums, and it was his wish that such a museum would be developed by the National Museum of Ireland in the Phoenix Park, Dublin.²¹⁵ However Mahr left Ireland forever without realising his goal and it was left to John Hunt to become the first to introduce the open-air museum concept to Ireland.

Subsequently Hunt collaborated with Lord and Lady Gort, Brendan O’Regan and architect Percy Le Clerc in the conservation and re-furnishing of Bunratty Castle, Co. Clare and the construction and furnishing of an adjacent folk village.²¹⁶

In the mid-seventies Hunt completed a further project in the form of a complex of archaeological reconstructions, built at Craggaunowen, Co.

Clare, the centrepiece of which was an ancient Irish lake dwelling, or crannóg.²¹⁷

Inspiration for the reconstructed crannóg at Craggaunowen apparently came from reconstructions of Neolithic and Bronze Age pile dwellings in the open-air museum Pfahlbaumuseum, Unteruhldingen, on Lake Constance, on the border between Germany, Switzerland and Austria.²¹⁸ The Pfahlbaumuseum buildings are idealized reconstructions erected between 1922 and 1941, of which the designs were based on sites on the Wasserburg Buchau at Federsee excavated by Hans Reinerth. During the 1930s the Nazis embraced the open-air museum concept as a means of spreading Nazi ideology, in particular the propagating of ideas concerning Germanic (Teutonic) power in ancient prehistory. Under the Nazis, the Pfahlbaumuseum was expanded and developed.

Hunt's friend Sean P. Ó Ríordáin may have sowed the germ of the idea for the Craggaunowen project years earlier. During Ó Ríordáin's period of training on the continent in the early 1930s, Adolf Mahr arranged for him to visit the excavations directed by Karl Keller-Tarnuzzer on the Insel Werd, Lake Constance.²¹⁹ The Lake Constance excavations were of key importance to National Socialist theorists²²⁰ and Keller-Tarnuzzer was an academic collaborator of Hans Reinerth, who was responsible for the Pfahlbaumuseum reconstructions.

Reinerth was also the leading archaeologist of Amt Rosenberg, an organisation of Nazi archaeologists founded by the National Socialist ideologue and race theorist Alfred Rosenberg. Amt Rosenberg was dedicated to finding archeological evidence of the superiority of Germanic culture and conducting ethnic, cultural and racial research that

would later help shape the Nazi policy on the Final Solution. Alfred Rosenberg would later found the Nazi art looting organisation Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (ERR) in 1940.

In 1934 Rosenberg appointed Hans Reinerth to the position of Reich Deputy of German Prehistory, which made him the spokesman for the ‘purification’ and Germanisation of the German prehistory. Reinerth used his position to lead and direct an Amt Rosenberg ‘witch hunt’ against Gerhardt Bersu, who was dismissed from office. Bersu opposed the imposition of Nazi theory on German archaeology, however the official reason for his persecution was Bersu’s Jewish heritage.²²¹ Bersu returned to his career in Germany after the war. Although debarred from returning to his university post, Hans Reinerth remained working in archaeology and after 1945 he became Director of the Pfahlbaumuseum, Unteruhldingen.

As early as 1932, Adolf Mahr was of the belief that the Irish crannogs were derived from the central European lake dwellings and he believed that the crannógs held the key to understanding some of the most important aspects of Irish prehistory.²²² Within a year of his arrival in Ireland, he excavated a crannóg in Lough Feenagh, Co. Sligo.²²³ When, in 1932, the Harvard University Archaeological Mission to Ireland began to excavate sites that were recommended by Mahr, the first to be excavated was a crannóg at Ballinderry, Co. Westmeath.²²⁴ The Harvard archaeologists went on to excavate a second crannóg at Ballinderry (1933) as well as Lagore crannóg, Co. Meath (1934-1936). In 1937 Mahr arranged for Joseph Raftery to excavate a crannóg at Knocknalappa, Co. Clare that produced Late Bronze Age finds.²²⁵

Supported by the results from Knocknalappa and Ballinderry II, Mahr proposed that there was an invasion of Ireland about 900BC, which introduced the Celts.

‘It was the conquest, by the Indogermanic world, of a very important stronghold of the pre-Aryans.’²²⁶

The views Mahr expressed in his 1937 Presidential Address to the prehistoric Society were very much in keeping with those of Gustav Kossinna.

‘Kossinna proposed cultural diffusion as a process whereby influences, ideas and models were passed on by more advanced peoples to the less advanced with which they came into contact. This concept, wedded to Kossinna’s *Kulturkreis* theory, the identification of geographical regions with specific ethnic groups on the basis of material culture, lent theoretical support to the expansionist policies of the Nazis.’²²⁷

Ó Ríordáin’s misinterpretation of an Early Medieval site at Cush, Co. Limerick, as dating to the Bronze Age may have been influenced by Mahr’s ideological stance. Mahr’s ideological approach must surely undermine claims about his prowess as a scientific archaeologist, for the evidence shows that he engaged in the same pseudo-science as that practiced by Gustav Kossinna, Hans Reinerth, Oswald Menghin and the other Nazi archaeologists.²²⁸

This was the milieu that John Hunt stepped into when he began excavating with Ó Ríordáin at Lough Gur in 1940.

John Hunt's origins and background

In the Hunt Museum Essential Guide published in 2002 it is stated that

‘John Hunt was born in England in 1900, of Irish parentage from counties Limerick and Clare.’²²⁹

This description is at odds with information obtained from official British records, published two years earlier by the then Hunt Museum Director Ciarán MacGonigal in the introduction to the catalogue of the John Hunt Centenary Exhibition.²³⁰

MacGonigal stated correctly

‘John Hunt was born in London, on 28th May 1900 into a family of Architects, both his father and his grandfather were prominent architects with a substantial London practice. His mother was Effie Jane Sherry.’²³¹

In footnote 4²³² MacGonigal documents that neither of Hunt's mother's parents were born in Ireland, her father coming from Wales and her mother a British subject born in France.

The information about John Hunt's origins and ancestry published in the Hunt Museum Essential Guide two years later, just after MacGonigal's departure as Director, was therefore mistaken.

According to the Irish Military Archive file, on 15th April 1943, Military Intelligence, G.2 Branch, Department of Defence, Parkgate Street, Dublin wrote to Chief Supt. P. Carroll, Garda Síochána Headquarters, Dublin with the following request marked SECRET:

‘Dear Carroll,

I am informed that there is a gentleman named Hunt engaged on archaeological work near Lough Gur, Co. Limerick, who is married to a German wife. In order to prevent confusion in our aliens records, I should be much obliged if you could find out for me whether this lady is identical with Mrs. Helene Adele Hunt, née Humbert, French national (Regd. No. G.S.1606), who came here on 9.9.1939, and also let me know who the husband is, when he came here, and if he is not of Irish origin, and under whose auspices he is doing this archaeological work and what other alien members of his family are residing with him, if any, we have record of an Odette Hunt who would appear to be a daughter.

Yours sincerely, [signature]²³³

The Irish police were prompt to reply and a response was sent on 17th April 1943 from the Crime Branch, Section 3, Office of the Commissioner, Garda Síochána, Dublin

‘I am directed by the Commissioner to refer to your communication (G.2/4371) of 15th instant concerning a man named Hunt engaged on archaeological work near Lough Gur, Co. Limerick, and to inform you that this man was born at Watford, England, on 28th June 1900. His father was Irish and a member of the well-known Hunt family of Friarstown, Croom, Co. Limerick. He came to Dublin in July, 1940

and is the holder of an Irish passport. His wife, Charlotte Paula Durell Hunt, née Hartman, is a native of Germany and is the holder of a British passport. She was born at Mannheim on 6th February 1903.

Mr. Hunt is an archaeologist and art expert and has spent some time on excavations at Lough Gur. He is employed in an unpaid capacity by the National Museum and does not appear to be interested in any political organisation. When in Dublin he resided at 21, Molesworth Street.

The Mrs. Helene Adele Hunt referred to in your communication is a French national and has no connection with the lady referred to above. She is a divorcée and the Odette Hunt referred to is her daughter.

[Signature illegible]

Ard Cheannphort.

Mol.²³⁴

This correspondence raises a number of interesting questions. John Hunt's birth certificate shows that his date of birth is 28th May 1900, rather than 28th June 1900, which is the date provided in the letter sent to Military Intelligence by the Irish police on 17th April 1943. It is probable that John Hunt himself provided the information on record with the Gardaí. It is reasonable to question whether incorrect information was provided deliberately by the Hunts to the Irish authorities. A possible reason for deliberately providing a slightly incorrect birth date is that, should the deception be uncovered and challenged, it might be explained

away as a minor mistake. However such a discrepancy would certainly have made checking John Hunt's details more difficult, especially in wartime conditions.

The statement in the military file that Hunt's father was Irish, from Croom, Friarstown, Co. Limerick is certainly incorrect, however it looks as if whoever provided the Irish authorities with the details may have taken careful steps to make such a claim appear plausible. There is a record of the death on 29/3/1898 of John Thomas Urquhart Hunt, Friarstown House who appears to have died without family.²³⁵ No head of household bearing the name Hunt resided at Friarstown at the time of the 1911 census.²³⁶

Did John Hunt use information pertaining to an unrelated family named Hunt in order to construct an Irish identity for himself? Such an interpretation is certainly consistent with the known facts of the matter. If this is what transpired, it proved successful, for as the Garda letter states, Hunt was provided with an Irish passport to which, in the absence of Irish parents or grandparents, he would not have been entitled.

As the wife of an Irish passport-holder, Gertrude Hunt also later obtained an Irish passport, a matter that is recorded by Military intelligence in the form of a press cutting from the Irish Independent 19/2/1947 stating that one of the new Irish citizens to whom certificates of Irish nationality was granted was named as Gertrude Francisca Charlotte Paula Hunt, Lough Gur, Holy Cross, Kilmallock. Lynn Nicholas refers to the fact that Hunt family papers confirm that Gertrude Hunt received Irish citizenship in 1947,²³⁷ however her report does not address the validity or otherwise of this, or of the Irish citizenship obtained by John Hunt.

As a British citizen, and with his wife Gertrude in possession of a British passport, the Hunts would have been entitled to be resident in Ireland during the war, without fear of facing internment. Why would Hunt have taken an unnecessary risk in applying for an Irish passport, based on, apparently, false information? Had such a deception been uncovered, he could have faced deportation to Britain where his wife would have faced internment.²³⁸

Alexander von Frey's correspondence with the Hunts in seeking to establish himself in Ireland.

The manner in which the Hunts appear to have falsely obtained Irish citizenship should be viewed as providing a context for the repeatedly published misinformation about John Hunt's spurious Irish origins. It also provides a context for the correspondence between Alexander von Frey and the Hunts in which von Frey sought their advice about obtaining papers to settle in Ireland.

Letter of 7th January 1944.

‘We however hope that it will be possible to get visas this year for another country where I will be able to work. If there is any possibility to come to Eire please write me how to manage it.’²³⁹

Letter of 11th April 1944.

‘Therefore I asked you if it would be possible for Hungarian citizens to get visas for Eire and if you could help us. One must prepare this before everybody wants to go away and this will certainly come if the German armies will be beaten definitely. I say if, because it is not sure yet. Eire seems to me much better as a refuge than Spain or Portugal. I have Spanish friends in Lausanne and they are entirely of my opinion. Please do enquire about the visa chances.’²⁴⁰

The Irish police took note of this information in the following terms:

[Handwritten note in blue ink]

‘C.S.O.

Sir/

To see letter below, phone.

Some of Hunt’s friends (or relatives) apparently Hungarian nationals, are preparing to flit. Letter is dated “april 1944” and bears postmark Lucerne, Switzerland.

[Signature illegible]²⁴¹

Von Frey letter to the Hunts dated 13th November 1946.

‘How long does it take to get an Irish passport? I consider this a very wise move for a great many reasons. It will prove good in results perhaps sooner than you realise now.’²⁴²

As things transpired, von Frey and his wife obtained papers to travel to America after the war. However, numerous Nazis, fellow travellers and collaborators found sanctuary in Ireland, especially those who came from a Catholic background and had friends in the Church.²⁴³

Fakes and forgeries

The Hunt Museum possesses a Benin leopard mask that the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group concluded was part of the Pitt Rivers collection, based on the similarity of the mask with one described and illustrated by General Pitt Rivers in a catalogue written in 1900.

The mask is not recorded in the catalogues relating to the Pitt Rivers collection held in the Cambridge University Library, however it is suggested that the mask being kept in George Pitt Rivers' home, rather than in the museum might explain this discrepancy.²⁴⁴

The omission of the mask from the catalogues held by Cambridge University Library might suggest another explanation.

Based on the allegation in Shakespeare's book that Gertrude Hunt arranged for the copying of a Benin mask, *The Phoenix* magazine posed the question as to whether the Pitt Rivers mask in the Hunt collection is an original or a copy.²⁴⁵ In the face of these concerns it would be prudent if the mask could be evaluated by an expert to establish the authenticity of the piece. This would seem relevant in the context of overall provenance and, in any case, is a probable provision in the evaluation of the Hunt Museum's holdings for tax relief.²⁴⁶

Based on the article in *The Phoenix*,²⁴⁷ and given the probability that Shakespeare's allegations are contained in the Hunt Museum archive (see endnote 170); was the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group aware that there were specific allegations that Gertrude Hunt had a Benin mask in the Pitt Rivers collection copied and that the Hunts had, allegedly, planned to

copy and sell the Farnham Museum collection? Such allegations that the Hunts might have been engaged in commissioning forgeries do not seem to have been addressed by the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group.

The activities of John and Gertrude Hunt in disposing of the Pitt Rivers collection is by no means their only transaction that may be questionable. The correspondence below may create the impression that they, indeed, traded in fakes.

It is generally acknowledged that all dealers run the risk of innocently acquiring faked or replicated material that they may later, in good faith, offer for sale to collectors. The seal of Odo O'Neil offered by John Hunt to Adolf Mahr in 1938 may well fall into this category. So also may an inscribed book cover in the Hunt collection purporting to be of 9th – 10th century date, but shown by British Museum experts to be a 'scholarly fake', possibly of 19th century date.²⁴⁸ A bronze candelabrum purported to be of 15th century date was likewise exposed by a British Museum expert to be of more recent origin.²⁴⁹

There are other cases, where the Hunts' activity is more open to question. On February 26th, 1954 James J. Rorimer, Director of the Cloisters, Curator of Medieval Art wrote to John and Putzel Hunt, seeking information about two Early Medieval Irish 'hand pins' that had originated in the John Ball collection and had been acquired separately by the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. He enclosed a report by Irwin Scollar

'who is working with us on the department's Migration material.'²⁵⁰

On 3rd May 1954, Rorimer wrote to Hugh O'Neill Hencken, Peabody Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

‘My old friend, John Hunt, whom I have visited since then, has not thrown any light on the Ball fabrications. Among the pieces I think I can trace to John Hunt are the two [hand pins] of which we send you photographs herewith.’²⁵¹

The Metropolitan Museum of Art file on the pins contains a letter, dated September 11 (no year), written by Irwin Scollar from an address at 4, Grand Place, Brussels. It provides the following details

‘Concerning the Hunt things: All the Irish stuff we have comes from him indirectly. They were sold at Sotheby’s in the forties and O’Connor must have bought them then or from some intermediary. Therefore we can add the Ball collection to the provenance of all the 49.125s, since Hunt bought the Ball collection wholesale. He still has a large part of it. Furthermore, I have the provenance for most of the pieces, as well as for the Bronze floral crown and some other stuff which we got later, I’ll send a detailed report when I get a typewriter on which I can make a clean copy. The hand pins over which such a fuss was made are as genuine as a three dollar bill. I looked at over thirty examples in the Dublin museum and if type means anything at all, ours have no relation to any of the existing variet(ies). Moreover they are much larger and more elaborate than any of the others, a feature which is in itself suspicious. Further, Ball was, according to Hunt, extremely interested in metalwork and had a very well equipped workshop where he used to make rather dubious restorations etc.’²⁵²

Information on John Ball's Irish collection and John Hunt's role in relation to it are published in a detailed article written by Mary Cahill of the National Museum of Ireland.²⁵³ John Ball was involved in arms dealings during the 1920's and 1930's. However, at an earlier stage in his career he was responsible for fabricating a collection of miniature gold axes that became known as the Strangford Lough Hoard. The hoard was acquired as genuine by the National Museum of Ireland in 1914 but the objects were later exposed as fakes. The wealth that John Ball accrued from his arms dealings enabled him to assemble an extensive collection of antiquities, many of which had Irish origins. When John Ball died his Irish collection was acquired by John Hunt who offered it for sale to the National Museum of Ireland in 1940.

A confidential informant's report in the Irish Military Archive refers to the matter.

'Hunt has been in negotiation with the Dept. of Education for the sale of a collection of Irish antiquities, gold torqs, bronze axes etc (about 250-350 pieces) – one of the best collections in existence in private hands. He wants £900 for it – the Dept. of Educ. offered £600. This collection belonged to a Captain Ball (of Co. Limerick?) who (my informant says) was "in the British Intelligence in Ireland." Ball was a very close friend of Hunt, & left him his collection.'²⁵⁴

However the Acting Director of the museum, Dr. Quane raised doubts about the possible genuineness of objects in the Ball collection, describing Ball as:

‘the fabricator of the Strangford Lough Hoard and other impudent forgeries.’²⁵⁵

The Department of Education proved reluctant to commit funds to purchase the entire Ball collection from Hunt, however Joseph Raftery was given permission to negotiate with Hunt to acquire part of it.²⁵⁶

Raftery was another friend and protégé of Adolf Mahr, who had studied in Germany and had a German wife. John Hunt appears to have cultivated Raftery, who (as the confidential informant quoted earlier reported)

‘is a particular friend of his, & visits his flat.’

Raftery and his wife Lotte visited the Hunts at Lough Gur, where they appear to have been well received. In a letter dated 28th August, 1940 Raftery wrote to Hunt as follows:

‘Please give my kindest regards to Mrs Hunt and accept sincerest thanks from both of us for the grand part you played in helping to make our stay at Lough Gur as enjoyable as it was.’²⁵⁷

However Hunt adopted an ‘all or nothing’ attitude to the disposal of the Ball collection and no deal was made.

Given that he later confided in Irwin Scollar that Ball had a workshop

‘where he used to make rather dubious restorations etc.’,

Hunt seemed untroubled by any doubts about the authenticity of the gold objects in the Ball collection, when it came to offering them for sale, as genuine, to the National Museum of Ireland.

Sean P Ó Ríordáin referred to a conversation he had with Hunt in October 1951 in which Hunt told him that the only gold fabricated by Ball was the ‘Strangford Hoard’, however Ó Ríordáin harboured doubts about other gold objects in Hunt’s possession.²⁵⁸

Most of John’s Ball’s Irish collection is now in the Hunt Museum, including five gold earrings of debatable authenticity²⁵⁹. Other gold objects that were formerly a part of the Ball collection were sold by John Hunt; one to the Barber Institute, Birmingham, three gold objects to the collector Kurt Ticher²⁶⁰ (now in the Ulster Museum) while other gold objects sold by Hunt to Randolph Hearst have ended up in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Detroit Museum of Fine Arts. There have, apparently, been questions as to those objects’ authenticity, with the possible exception of the object in the Barber Institute.²⁶¹

The Irish Military Archive demonstrates that John Hunt did business with ‘Herr Buhl’ who commissioned forgeries from Hans Bossard’s workshop in Lucerne (although, as far as is known, not on behalf of Hunt). The archive also demonstrates that he had business dealings with the English decorator and designer Felix Harbord, who is known to have produced ‘stylish fakes’ of antique furniture. Mitchell Owens refers to a white Regency-style table and four matching chairs, formerly in Lady Dufferin’s [Maureen Guinness] cottage in Kent.

‘But only three of the chairs date from the early 1800’s; to complete the set, the fourth was made in 1957, as was the table, and the catalogue says, Harbord apparently made more copies of the chairs for a South American client.’²⁶²

Was the question of fakes and forgeries considered to be beyond the terms of reference of the Evaluation Group? Though controversial, the allegations raised that the Hunts had engaged in such activities, require attention in a further enquiry.

A triptych from the Fritz Mannheimer Collection returned by John Hunt to Mrs Mannheimer.

An unpublished essay by Judith Hill²⁶³ refers to an object that came into John Hunt's possession, which had originated earlier in the Fritz Mannheimer collection:

‘at another time the Campion Hall Triptych, a rare enamelled fourteenth-century miniature gold triptych, passed into his hand in exchange for a suite of eighteenth century furniture.’²⁶⁴

Hill provided a bibliographical reference to an article in which Hunt's acquisition of the triptych is referred to in greater detail. Written by Cristina Ruiz, the article is entitled ‘The legacy of the ever elusive John Hunt’ and it was published in the Art Newspaper on 1st September 1997. According to Ruiz:

‘Some outstanding items made their way into Hunt's possession in circumstances that are less than clear. The Campion Hall Triptych, an exceptionally rare enamelled fourteenth-century miniature gold triptych, thought to have belonged to Mary, Queen of Scots is first recorded in the collection of the Wittelsbachs, the ruling house of Bavaria, in an inventory compiled in 1617. It remained there until the 1930s when it passed through the hands of several dealers into the collection of Dutch collector and banker Fritz Mannheimer. By the time of his death and bankruptcy in 1939, the triptych and

several other items from his collection had been placed in a London bank vault to escape creditors in Holland.

During the war, the bank was bombed, but the triptych miraculously survived and was looted from the site. It is said to have changed hands over a couple of pints in an Irish pub, then to have been sold to a furniture dealer in Dublin who gave it to his wife. Hunt persuaded the dealer to exchange the triptych for a suite of eighteenth century furniture. This aroused some animosity, as it was felt that Hunt knew it was stolen. It was eventually returned to its legal owner, Mrs Mannheimer.²⁶⁵

In fact, Fritz Mannheimer was a German Jewish banker who had of necessity become a Dutch resident in 1936. Mannheimer assembled a huge art collection, however, when he died suddenly in 1939, his estate was bankrupt. The Dutch authorities seized part of the art collection, and Mannheimer's widow removed other parts of it to France and London. Following the invasion of Holland and France, parts of the Mannheimer collection ended up in the hands of the Nazis. Lynn Nicholas wrote at some length about the complicated Mannheimer collection in her 1995 book.²⁶⁶

However, in their reports, neither the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group nor Lynn Nicholas make any reference to this important object from the Mannheimer collection. Is it possible that the Evaluation Group excluded it from consideration on the basis that it did not form part of the present holdings of the Hunt Museum? Why, however, did Lynn Nicholas not address it in her Report, given the fact that she devoted much time to the Hill essay, which is quoted extensively, and even the differences between the three versions of that essay provided to her, are also noted? Nicholas

does address Hill's claims that the press inappropriately quoted her essay, quoting Hill's letter to the Limerick Leader newspaper, published in April 2004.

“two separate paragraphs of my essay were put together and quoted to give a misleading impression of my account of the Hunt's activities”²⁶⁷

Nicholas quotes Hill's letter as protesting that:

“the misleading impression that I was focusing on the Hunts as dealers in looted European art, whereas I only included the reference to looted art as background to the European art market in which they operated at the time.”²⁶⁸

At no point does Lynn Nicholas assert that Erin Gibbons or the Wiesenthal Center misused the Hill essay in any way.

Nicholas, informs us that the Hill essay, which was revised a number of times, was rejected for publication by the Museum:

‘on grounds of inaccuracy and length.’²⁶⁹

Lynn Nicholas showed merit-worthy concern that the press might unfairly report parts of the Hill essay in a manner detrimental to the Hunt Museum. Yet, she has not considered the most important issue raised in the essay: the Campion Hall Triptych from the Mannheimer collection.

It would appear from Cristina Ruiz's article that all we have to go on to explain the means by which the triptych came into John Hunt's possession, is Hunt's own account of the matter. If, as stated by Ruiz, the triptych was eventually returned to Mrs Mannheimer there must surely have been documentation, perhaps including legal documentation, relating to the matter.

Efforts should be made to find and examine all documentation relating to the return to Mrs Mannheimer of the Campion Hall triptych, in order to see what light this might throw on the means whereby John Hunt came into possession of the object, (which might also throw new light on his collecting activities). The possibility thus exists that there may be objects in the Hunt Museum currently that were acquired by similar means.

Phillip and Anna Markus

Following extensive TV news coverage on the evening of 5th March 2004, (coinciding with the start of the Irish Museums Association annual conference), there was a further development on the morning of Saturday 6th March 2004 in the form of a newspaper article. The article in question, written by Karl Hanlon, appeared in the Irish Times under the headline

‘Hunts aided Jewish families escape the Nazis, says son’.

The article stated

‘Mr. John Hunt produced letters yesterday showing his parents dealing with a body called the German Jewish Aid Committee.

The letters, which have been translated from German by the Goethe Institute in Dublin, date from 1938 and 1939 and refer to apparent efforts by John and Gertrude Hunt to help a couple, Phillip and Anna Markus, flee Germany for a new life in England.’²⁷⁰

The article also claimed

‘In further correspondence, reference is made to the apparent effort made by the Hunts to help others leave Germany for new lives abroad.’²⁷¹

Edited extracts from four letters, written by Anna and Phillip Markus to the Hunts between December 1938 and June 1939, accompanied the article, in which the delight of the Markus’ at the prospect of leaving Germany is obvious.

On the face of it, the newspaper article, and the accompanying letter extracts, may suggest that the Hunts had acted with commendable humanitarianism. However the matter is not as clear-cut as that. Many individuals, including the Nazis themselves, profited by assisting Jews to leave Germany, usually in return for their money and cultural assets.

Based on the existing evidence, it is by no means clear what interpretation might be placed on the actions of the Hunts. An extract from a letter written in February 1939 by John Hunt to Phillip Marcus is ambiguous.

‘Beckhardt from Frankfurt is also here²⁷²and he got permission to take almost everything out after he sold a few things to some museums. The more you can bring, the better it will be, mainly smaller things like watches, etc. If you wish to bring your furniture we can give you two rooms.

I think it very important that as much as possible is in Anna’s name and, as she is non-Jewish, it can only be of advantage.’²⁷³

What the letters clearly demonstrate is that the Hunt Family Archive contains relevant correspondence covering the pre-war era, including correspondence in German.

The full correspondence between the Hunts and Phillip and Anna Markus should be made available for evaluation, as well as the documentation, which, it is claimed, supports the assertion that the Hunts assisted other Jews to leave Germany. It is not clear whether the Hunts assisted Adolf Beckhardt to leave Germany and any documentation on the matter should be made available for examination. It would be important to seek to

establish if any of the objects in the Hunt collection were acquired as a result of their involvement with German Jewish refugees. Indeed, documentary transparency may give credence to the Hunts' long hidden acts of humanitarianism.

Neither the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group nor Lynn Nicholas make any mention of the Markus correspondence, despite the fact that the Hunt's activities at the time may indicate a possible entry route for objects into the Hunt collection; objects, on the other hand, which, putatively, may have come under the category of 'forced sales.'

Referring to Anna and Phillip Markus, the Irish Times article states

'However, it remains unclear whether they managed to flee Nazi Germany.'²⁷⁴

There is a record of a man named Philipp Markus, born 17th April 1877 who was arrested on 3rd October 1942 and died in Theresienstadt concentration camp in March 1944,²⁷⁵ however it is not known whether this record relates to the person with whom the Hunts were corresponding.

Provenance research issues.

It is important to stress that an investigation into the activities and associations of the Hunts is not a separate issue from that of providing provenance information about the collection, and Lynn Nicholas supports this view:

"The private and professional lives of free-lance dealers such as the Hunts cannot really be separated."²⁷⁶

It is to be regretted that the terms of reference limited the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group to an investigation into the collection while considering the activities of the Hunts as extraneous.

The Hunt Museum Evaluation Group acted on the basis that investigation into claims that the Hunts had business and social links with dealers in Nazi loot, lay outside the Group's remit under the terms of reference.²⁷⁷ The Group dismissed the need to investigate such claims, expressing the view that such considerations were:

‘after this lapse of time to be matters for the biographer or the historian rather than a State-funded enquiry such as this.’²⁷⁸

However, Lynn Nicholas' finding that

‘the private and professional lives of free-lance dealers such as the Hunts cannot really be separated’²⁷⁹

would, apparently, deem the approach taken by the Evaluation Group as inappropriate.

According to the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report:

‘The two main obligations on the Hunt Museum under the terms of reference have been

(i)

to prepare for the publication on the web of a detailed computer database of the collection under its care and control, together with images of the objects contained in it.

(ii)

to carry out detailed provenance research on the objects held by it, this research to incorporate all relevant data from documentation held by the Museum and other bodies or individuals. Particular attention was to be paid to material acquired during the period 1933 to 1945.’²⁸⁰

It would appear from the briefing document produced on behalf of the board of the Hunt Museum in December 2002²⁸¹ that provenance research has not been a priority at that time. According to Nicholas this was due mainly to resource problems.

‘given the constraints of a tiny staff and little funding, no serious provenance research seems to have been undertaken’ [by the Hunt Museum].²⁸²

Why then were provenance issues a matter of insufficient resources? The nearby Jim Kemmy Municipal Museum²⁸³ possesses a far larger

collection and even fewer resources than the Hunt Museum; nevertheless, it managed to place its entire holdings online by 2003²⁸⁴. Unlike the Hunt Museum, the Jim Kemmy Municipal Museum received no additional resources to compile its online database.

The Hunt Museum benefited considerably by having a valuable database of its collection designed and input at public expense. The database could be used to promote the museum and its collection.

The Hunt Museum archive was noted in the press to be of little use for provenance research.²⁸⁵ The Hunt Family files that were made available to the Hunt Museum appear to have consisted exclusively of material relating to English collectors,²⁸⁶ however no Hunt family archival material appears to have been made available relating to European dealers with whom it is known the Hunts had connections before, during and after the war. Nor seemingly was any archival material made available relating to the Hunts possession of the triptych from the Mannheimer collection; the Markus correspondence; or the alleged work undertaken by the Hunts to assist Jews to leave Germany.

The report of the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group mentions ‘exhaustive’ research undertaken into numerous archival sources.

The Evaluation Group report states, for example, that

‘The Report written by Douglas Cooper, entitled “Report of Mission to Switzerland” was consulted’.²⁸⁷

However Cooper's identification of Alexander von Frey as a dealer who traded with the Nazis for looted art was not addressed by the Evaluation Group nor was the fact that von Frey was a friend and business associate of the Hunts. The Evaluation Group's report also states that the interrogation report of von Frey's associate Hans Wendland was examined;²⁸⁸ however, it makes no mention of the revelations in the interrogation report concerning the activities of Wendland's associate Arthur Goldschmidt. Nor is mention made of Goldschmidt's connection with the Hunts.

As there were allegations that the Hunts may have had Nazi connections, why did the Evaluation Group report, dealing with the Pitt Rivers material in the Hunt Collection, make no mention of the Nazi politics of Captain George Pitt Rivers or of the fact that John Hunt had dealings with him from as early as 1936? It would be helpful for the Hunt Museum to clarify whether a document in their archive is, in fact, an excerpt from Nicholas Shakespeare's biography of Bruce Chatwin, (which contains allegations that the Hunts shared George Pitt Rivers extreme right-wing political views; that Gertrude Hunt commissioned a fake and that the Hunts were key players in the illegal dispersal of the Farnham Museum collection). If the Hunt Museum can confirm that Shakespeare's allegations are in its own archive, then this document should have been made available to the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group and to Lynn Nicholas.

The above-mentioned points, together with the lack of attention to the information in the Military Archive file, would perhaps question the claim that the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group had conducted

‘an exhaustive and internationally bench-marked investigation’²⁸⁹

The American Association of Museum Guidelines, which the Evaluation Group expressed the desire to emulate, would seem to require a more rigorous and holistic investigative approach.

‘In undertaking provenance research, museums should search their own records thoroughly and, when necessary, contact established archives, databases, art dealers, auction houses, donors, scholars, and researchers who may be able to provide Nazi-era provenance information.’²⁹⁰

Conclusions and recommendations

The Wiesenthal Center's concern about the lack of provenance of the Hunt collection can only be regarded as responsible and their request that the Hunt Museum holdings and archives be placed on the Internet has not only been acknowledged, but also acted upon. The main focus of the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group was concentrated on the preparation by the Hunt Museum of a detailed computer database of the collection and archive.

The amount of work involved in preparing the Hunt Museum Online Catalogue and Archive was demanding and a great deal was achieved in a relatively short period of time.²⁹¹ Yet, the potential usefulness of the Online Catalogue and Archive was limited by the lack of primary documentation available in the Hunt Museum archive in respect of the crucial period 1933-45. The weakness of the Hunt Museum archive, as a potential source of information about the collection, had been made public by Ciarán MacGonigal in a newspaper report published 10th March, 2004²⁹² - a fact that should have been known to the Evaluation Group and the Royal Irish Academy when the terms of reference were drawn up.

The Hunt Museum Evaluation Group also undertook wider research seeking to obtain information on the provenance of objects in the Hunt Collection and

‘Most, if not all, of the continuing research seems, once again, to have been carried out by Museum Director Teehan’²⁹³

Some information that was established by the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group, and which is present in the report, does not appear to have been included in the online databases.²⁹⁴ As noted earlier, no reference would indicate that the Ballyscullion cauldron, Cape Castle situla and Antrim shield once formed part of the Pitt Rivers Museum collection at Farnham.²⁹⁵

Due to the nature of the collection and the apparent paucity of documentation relating to it in the possession of the Hunt Museum, were one reliant solely on the Online Catalogue and Archive, it would be extremely difficult to establish which, if any, object in the museum was from a looted source.

As little information relating to the dealing activities of the Hunts appears to have been looked into, few clues emerged as to the likely origin of objects in the collection and no real context for the collection was established. Apparently, up to half of the Hunt Museum collection is still without provenance for the period 1933-45.

Lynn Nicholas observes that Virginia Teehan

‘should certainly have been provided with more help and it is clear that the small Museum staff cannot undertake extensive future research alone. It has been suggested that all the entities involved join forces to fund a special provenance internship. This would be good training for researchers and any information gathered could be shared with the many agencies working in the field of restitution. It is, of course, possible that further provenance

research may reveal that objects in the collection are from confiscated collections, in which case it has been promised that they would be returned.’²⁹⁶

What might be the feasibility and merits of this proposal?

The Hunt Museum Evaluation Group undertook

‘to facilitate an exhaustive and internationally bench-marked investigation of the provenance of the objects in the Hunt Museum in the light of the accusations levelled against that institution by the Simon Wiesenthal Centre in Paris.’²⁹⁷

However, consideration of the ‘accusations’ referred to was excluded by the terms of reference, and these were simply not addressed. Furthermore, information that was available from the Irish Military Archive, that would have assisted the Evaluation Group in addressing the issues raised by the Wiesenthal Center, was not taken into consideration.

Throughout her report, Lynn Nicholas expresses criticism of the Wiesenthal Center, much of which has been assessed in the present report. However, in her *Conclusions and Recommendations*, Nicholas addressed the central nub of the controversy when she vindicated the call made by the Wiesenthal Centre for an enquiry into the activities of John and Gertrude Hunt.

‘An examination of the Hunt Museum Collection was certainly justified both by its lack of provenance records and by the discovery

of the Hunt's relationship with a dealer who is known to have trafficked in confiscated art.'²⁹⁸

It has been noted that the investigative process, put in place by the Irish authorities, did not address the specific concerns raised by the Wiesenthal Center; concerns related to the Nazi connections and associations of the Hunts, their relationship with Adolf Mahr and in particular

‘their intimate business relationships with notorious dealers in art looted by the Nazis.’²⁹⁹

Indeed, the Irish Military Archive file on the Hunts points to such contacts. Moreover, the terms of reference of the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group would seem to have been able to include the Irish Military file based on Nicholas's judgment that

‘the private and professional lives of free-lance dealers such as the Hunts cannot really be separated.’³⁰⁰

In order to obtain information about the dealing activities of the Hunts; the dealers with whom they traded, and their wider business associations, it would have been methodologically sound to have developed an investigative trail that started with the Hunt family archive and other primary documents such as those to be found in the Irish Military Archive.

Nicholas's finding that there was no association between the Hunts and Adolf Mahr, as was alleged by the Wiesenthal Center, appears to be contrary to the available documentary evidence and one might wonder

whether she knew the relevant documentary sources. Mahr and his network have been shown in this report to have been of crucial importance to the Hunts in establishing themselves in Ireland. Further research into the relationship between the Hunts and Adolf Mahr and his associates is warranted.

The Hunts also had pre-war and post-war dealings with the anti-Semite George Pitt Rivers, who was an important British collaborator with the Nazis, and they may also have had an association with the pro-Nazi Prince Turka Galitzine. These are matters that warrant further research. The possibility that the mask that seemingly originated in the Pitt Rivers collection is a fake should be investigated and the possibility that unidentified fakes are present in the collection should be considered.

The alleged involvement of the Hunts with Peter Wilson and John Hewett in the dispersal of the Pitt Rivers Farnham Museum collection warrants further investigation. Efforts should be made to identify the Irish-based company allegedly used to avoid exchange control by sending Pitt Rivers pieces to it from England for reshipping to the continent.³⁰¹ If they could be located, the records of the company could prove a useful source for provenance researchers.

The Wiesenthal Center referred to the Hunts' precipitate 1940 flight from London one step ahead of British suspicions of their alleged espionage activity. Though no evidence of spying by the Hunts has been found, it has been shown that suspicions did in fact exist, both among their London circle of friends and with Irish Military Intelligence. The apparent nature of John Hunt's acquisition of Irish citizenship and his settling in Ireland

close to the strategically important trans-Atlantic airport at Foynes, may buttress those suspicions.

A further concern outlined by the Wiesenthal Center related to the possibility that Ireland may have been used as a base for the disposal of Nazi looted art. The use of neutral countries like Portugal, Sweden, Spain, Switzerland and Turkey in the illicit trade have all been closely examined, however, no such investigation has been undertaken in respect of Ireland. That such an investigation be carried out seems reasonable, for it is known that looted art flowed to the United States during the course of the war and the Flying Boat station at Foynes was one of the few transatlantic flying links that operated at that time. It is a matter of fact that the Hunt's had connections with dealers in Nazi looted art and it is also the case that many Nazis found refuge in Ireland after the war, including the Dutch Nazi art collector Pieter Menten, a former SS member, who lived in Co. Waterford from 1962 until his conviction by a Dutch court in 1976.³⁰²

In the light of all the evidence raised in this Shadow Report, the concerns of the Wiesenthal Center appear legitimate and measured, and Dr. Shimon Samuels acted responsibly when he brought them to the attention of the President of Ireland. It should be recalled that, at the time, President McAleese had but recently made a prestigious award to the Hunt Museum.

On close examination, Lynn Nicholas' characterisation of the Wiesenthal Center as having engaged in a form of blackmail of the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group, and of acting unprofessionally, appears to be without foundation. The Wiesenthal Center made it abundantly clear that it

supported an independent enquiry; indeed it was they who pressed the Irish authorities into establishing an investigation into its claims. It should also be noted that the Wiesenthal Center was rebuffed in its efforts to play an active role in the investigation into the Hunts. As a result, the Wiesenthal Center did not cooperate with the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group because it formed the view that to do so would endorse a process that it considered to be wanting. In fact, Lynn Nicholas herself accepts that the investigative process was, in a number of respects, wanting.

The high standing that the Hunt Museum enjoyed in social, political and business circles appeared to have encouraged some persons, especially media commentators, to hyperbole in relation to the controversy.

Academics and provenance research experts have had the benefit of the investigations carried out by Sq. Ldr. Cooper and the OSS investigators, who compiled detailed reports of their findings, together with lists of suspect works, dealers, collectors, interrogation reports etc. As no comparable investigation was carried out into the actions of the Hunts this makes scrutiny of the contents of the Hunt family archive all the more important.

It is questionable whether the Evaluation Group achieved its commitment to subject all documentation in the possession of the Hunt family to an independent examination.

Lynn Nicholas states:

‘I have examined both the documents at the museum and in the personal holdings of the Hunt family. For most of the objects, there

are no dates of acquisition, receipts, or invoices. There are no stock books or insurance records which enumerate the Hunt holdings. (According to the family solicitor, the Hunts never bought insurance for their collections.) What records there are, consist mainly of receipts from Sotheby's, loan documents, and excerpts from scholarly texts.³⁰³

Nicholas made no reference to having been shown the Markus correspondence. It therefore remains unclear precisely what Hunt family papers Lynn Nicholas examined and whether they represented the totality of the archive held by the Hunt family. Consistent with the approach advocated by Nicholas, all of the archival material remaining in the possession of the Hunt family must be made available for independent scrutiny. The relevant information contained therein must be made available to facilitate investigation into the collecting activities of the Hunts.

The papers relating to the Hunts involvement with the German Jewish Aid Committee, seemingly in the possession of the Hunt Family, should be made available for scrutiny, as should any documentary information relating to the dealers Phillip and Anna Markus and Adolf Beckhardt.

Any documentation, relating to John Hunt's acquisition of the Campion Hall Triptych from the Fritz Mannheimer Collection, should be made available for scrutiny, as should any documentation relating to its return to Mrs Mannheimer.

Based on her reading of the Irish Military Archive file on John and Gertrude Hunt, Lynn Nicholas concluded that the work of the Hunt

Museum Evaluation Group was incomplete and that further research was needed into the Hunts' connections with Alexander von Frey and Felix Harbord and into the activities of von Frey and Harbord. This appears to have been accepted fully by the Hunt Museum, which has undertaken further research into Harbord and have given an undertaking to engage in further research into von Frey.³⁰⁴

However, the analysis of the Irish Military Archive file, undertaken in this report, shows that further research is also warranted into persons such as Arthur Goldschmidt and Herr Buhl (Emil Bührle?) with whom the Hunts had business dealings, as also with Paul Lindpaintner, Hans Bossard and Galerie Fischer who appear to have formed part of a wider circle of dealers known to the Hunts. The Hunt Museum Evaluation Group who considered it appropriate to look into records relating to Galerie Fischer and the dealer Hans Wendland has already tacitly acknowledged this need.

The contents of the Nicholas Report cannot be interpreted as giving 'a clean bill of health' to John and Gertrude Hunt, or to the unprovenanced objects in the Hunt Museum collection. On the contrary, Lynn Nicholas expressed the view that the enquiry into the Hunts was justified, but that the work of investigation remains incomplete. That view is endorsed by the present report. Moreover, the totality of the evidence presented here shows that the concerns about the activities of John and Gertrude Hunt and about the possible origin of the unprovenanced objects in the Hunt Collection are reasonably grounded and warrant further investigation.

¹ "Accolades for Ireland's Leading Museums", Joint statement Michael Starett, Chief Executive, The Heritage Council and Chris Bailey, Director of the Northern Ireland Museums Council, 25 November 2003.

² Circulated by O'Malley & Associates, InterSearch, on behalf of the Hunt Museum. The responsibilities of the Director, under the Board, are listed as follows:

- Leadership and management of the Museum and for guiding and implementing artistic policy;
- Management of the Museum to the highest standards of curation on a tight budget while implementing realistic plans for exhibitions;
- Management and development of Museum Personnel and Voluntary Docents;
- Ensuring that best practice is observed in the management of the museums collection and in corporate governance;
- Nurturing and development of relations with the Museums extensive Friends organisation and key stakeholder groups;
- Leading the Museums fundraising activities.'

³ The Hunt Museum Essential Guide, ed. Helen Armitage, Scala Publishers in Association with The Hunt Museum, 2002, 176 pp. Reviewed in *Irish Arts Review*, Spring 2003, vol. 20, no 1.

⁴ *Irish Arts Review*, Spring 2003, vol. 20, no 1. (The review article is alluded to in the *Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Final Report to the Royal Irish Academy*, but it is not referenced).

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Among the allegations made against Wilson is that he arranged fake telephone bids to force up prices and that, while chairman of Sotheby's, in association with the dealers John and Gertrude Hunt and John Hewett, he conducted lucrative private deals outside Sotheby's. (Nicholas Shakespeare, *Bruce Chatwin*, The Harvill Press, London, 1999, 185). Wilson is also alleged to have conducted personal sales through Sotheby's and of having used his position to ensure that the reserve prices on items he offered for sale were informed by his inside knowledge of pre-auction bids. (Robert Lacey, *Sotheby's – Bidding for Class*, Time Warner Paperbacks, 2002, 162-3).

⁷ *Irish Examiner*, 3rd April 2003.

⁸ 'John Hunt was English but his wife was German, and they had to leave wartime England or be interned. This was not just because she was German but also because of their membership of the English Fascist party. Gertrud Hunt's first husband had also been a noted Nazi and art collector.' Ciarán MacGonigal, "Big Brothers and Country Cousins; Relations between Regional and National Museums" *Museum Ireland*, vol. 13, 2003, 13. Although MacGonigal provided no evidence to support these allegations, the fact that they were made by a former Director of the Hunt Museum should have further underscored the need to resolve the problems surrounding the provenance of the Hunt collection.

⁹ *Ibid*, 13.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, 15.

¹¹ *The American Association of Museums Guidelines Concerning the Unlawful Appropriation of Objects During the Nazi Era*. Approved, November 1999, amended, April 2001.

¹² *Irish Times*, 7th February 2004.

¹³ *Irish Times*, 14th February 2004.

¹⁴ *Irish Times*, 14th February 2004.

¹⁵ *Irish Times*, 18th February 2004.

¹⁶ *Irish Times*, 21st February 2004.

¹⁷ *Irish Times*, 17th August 2004.

¹⁸ *Sunday Times*, 13th February 2005.

¹⁹ *Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Final Report to the Royal Irish Academy*, June 2006, 2.

²⁰ 'Doubt cast on value of archive to Hunt inquiry', *Irish Times*, 10th March 2004.

²¹ *Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Final Report to the Royal Irish Academy*, June 2006, 19.

²² *Ibid*, 13.

²³ *Ibid*, 12.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 12.

²⁵ *Ibid*, 2.

²⁶ 'Furthermore, researching decorative arts collections is complicated as, by their nature, decorative arts objects, unlike many fine art objects, are non-unique.' *Ibid*, 41.

²⁷ The seminar was entitled 'Contested Cultural Property and Museums: the case of the Hunt Museum.' There were a number of talks by distinguished persons on a range of topics not related directly to the Hunt Museum. In the final session Virginia Teehan presented the Evaluation Group report in a talk entitled 'The Hunt Museum Case: Accusations, Research, Response.'

²⁸ *Evaluation Group Final Report*, 11. (See *Irish Times*, June 17th, 2006, 'Hunt Museum items unlikely to have 'problematic past' p. 1, & 'Experts find no provenance records for most Hunt items', p. 5.

²⁹ Kelly, who has worked with police forces in Ireland and abroad to recover stolen art, is a former member of the Council for the Prevention of Art Theft.

³⁰ 21st June 2006.

³¹ For example *Sunday Times*, 25th June 2006; *Irish Examiner*, 12th August 2006.

³² Lynn H. Nicholas, *Report on the Final Report to the Royal Irish Academy by the Hunt Museum Evaluation Group, June 2006*, Washington, DC, August 8, 2007, 11.

³³ *Irish Times*, 28th September 2007. (A similar approach was taken by the *Irish Independent*, 29th September, 14).

³⁴ *Irish Times Weekend*, 6th October 2007, 4.

³⁵ *Ibid*

³⁶ Shannon Heritage is a wholly owned subsidiary of Shannon Development, an organisation that part-funds the Hunt Museum. In November 2007 a bust of John Hunt was unveiled in Bunratty Castle, near Limerick, commissioned by Shannon Heritage and the Bunratty Furniture Trustees. John Hunt played a major role in sourcing and collecting much of the art and furniture on display in the castle, which is a major tourism venue in the region. Mr. O'Connell is quoted as saying 'We thought this piece of art

dedicated to a man so involved in the art world would be the most appropriate tribute.’ *Irish Times*, 12th November 2007, 2.

³⁷ *Irish Times Weekend Review*, 26th January 2008.

³⁸ *Sunday Times*, 27th January 2008.

³⁹ *Sunday Times*, 27th January 2008.

⁴⁰ ‘Standing with Israel but stepping on all other toes. The Simon Wiesenthal Centre has a unique concept of human rights says Colum Kenny’, *Sunday Independent*, 27th January 2008. The rights and wrongs of the Simon Wiesenthal Center’, *Sunday Times*, 27th January 2008.

⁴¹ ‘E-mail abuse of Nazi hunter’, *Sunday Times*, 27th January 2008.

⁴² Irish Military Archive file no. [G2/4371](#).

⁴³ Nicholas, 2007, 12.

⁴⁴ Nicholas, 2007, 13.

⁴⁵ Nicholas, 2007, 19.

⁴⁶ Nicholas, 2007, 10.

⁴⁷ Nicholas, 2007, 9.

⁴⁸ *Sunday Times*, 13th February, 2005.

⁴⁹ *Irish Times*, 18th February 2004.

⁵⁰ Nicholas points out however that ‘Ms. Teehan did consult experts on these issues at the National Archives in Washington, DC, ... and at the Public Record Office in London. She made inquiries of many other art world and government sources’ (Nicholas, 2007, 9). Nicholas also compliments Virginia Teehan, ‘for her truly extraordinary accomplishment in setting up the website and document listing in so short a time, and for keeping the Museum going while simultaneously doing research in several countries.’ (Nicholas, 2007, 18).

⁵¹ *Irish Times*, 18th February 2004.

⁵² Nicholas, 2007, 9.

⁵³ Nicholas, 2007, 12.

⁵⁴ Nicholas, 2007, 9.

⁵⁵ Nicholas, 2007, 9.

⁵⁶ RTE Radio I, 22/02/04.

⁵⁷ Nicholas, 2007, 12.

⁵⁸ Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland*, 10th December 1945. (Cooper was later promoted to the rank of Wing Commander).

⁵⁹ Listed as ‘Exchange no: 5 Dr. Alexander von Frey of Lucerne with ERR (Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg - the Nazi art-looting organisation).’ Attachment ‘A’ Looted Works of Art in Switzerland. German Methods of looting’, Douglas Cooper, *Report of Mission to Switzerland*, 10th December 1945.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Office of Strategic Services, Art Looting Investigative Unit, APO 413, U.S. Army, *Consolidated Report No. 1, 15 August 1945, Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France*, J.S. Plaut, Lieutenant, USNR, Director.

⁶² Attachment F, 'Memorandum to Federal Political Department in Connection with the Questioning of Certain Persons known to have Dealt in Looted Works of Art', (Report of 10th Dec. 1945 by Wg Cdr Douglas Cooper, MFA&A Branch, Control Commission for Germany (British Element), *Report of Mission to Switzerland*.

⁶³ Art Looting Investigation Unit (ALIU) Detailed Interrogation Report of Hans Wendland, 18th September 1946. (Strategic Services Unit, Art Looting Investigation Unit, Washington, and Office of the Military Government for Germany (U.S.), Economics Division, Restitution Branch, Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Section, Otto Wittman, Jr. for SSU; Bernard Taper, for MFA&A). IV Traffic in Confiscated Art, p. 13. See also Post-War Reports: Activity of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg in France CIR 1, 15 August 1945, Office of Strategic Services, Art Looting Investigation Unit, APO 413, U.S. Army, Consolidated Interrogation Report NO. 1, 15 August 1945, Activity of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg in France, J. S. Plaut, Lieutenant, USNR, Director, p. 25. See also Harclerode and Pittaway, 1988, 41-42, 132-133, 141, 190.

⁶⁴ Nicholas appears to minimize the importance of von Frey in the looted art trade and she provided details of only one exchange in which he was involved to obtain looted works from the Nazis. 'Post war Allied records show that von Frey was indeed in contact with many other dealers who traded with the Nazis and was involved in at least one Nazi exchange with the ERR in which three paintings looted from Jewish collections were transferred to and fed into the Swiss art trade. (The paintings were recovered after the war.)' Nicholas, 2007, 15.

⁶⁵ The Office of Strategic Services (OSS) was the wartime intelligence agency that was predecessor to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).

⁶⁶ The National Archives, 'Military Agency Records, Interallied and Interservice Military Agencies Records, Records of the Office of Strategic Services (RG 226) Records of the Research and Analysis Branch,' file 134935.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, (file 134935).

⁶⁸ Art Looting Investigation Unit, Final Report, War Department, Office of the Assistant Secretary of War, Strategic Services Unit, Washington D.C., 1 May 1946, p. 131

⁶⁹ *Ibid*, p. 53.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, p. 67.

⁷¹ *Ibid*, p. 67.

⁷² The National Archives, 'Military Agency Records, Interallied and Interservice Military Agencies Records, Records of the Office of Strategic Services (RG 226) Records of the Research and Analysis Branch,' file 134935.

⁷³ *Ibid*, (Note 116).

⁷⁴ *Ibid*, (file134935; note 115).

⁷⁵ Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371. The address on the letter is 'Casa Rossa, Ascona.' The von Freys may have been staying with German writer Herman Hesse, who moved to the 'Casa Rossa, Ascona' in 1931, following its construction for him by Hans C. Bodmer.

-
- ⁷⁶ Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.
- ⁷⁷ Letter 13th Nov. 1946, Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371
- ⁷⁸ von Frey letter, 7th January 1945. Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.
- ⁷⁹ Nicholas, 2007, 15.
- ⁸⁰ Referred to in the letter of 13th November 1946, Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.
- ⁸¹ Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.
- ⁸² Society of Jesus – Jesuit Order.
- ⁸³ Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.
- ⁸⁴ Art Looting Investigation Unit (ALIU) Detailed Interrogation Report of Hans Wendland, 18th September 1946. (Strategic Services Unit, Art Looting Investigation Unit, Washington, and Office of the Military Government for Germany (U.S.), Economics Division, Restitution Branch, Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Section, Otto Wittman, Jr. for SSU; Bernard Taper, for MFA&A).
- ⁸⁵ Nicholas, 2007, 12.
- ⁸⁶ The National Archives, 'Military Agency Records, Interallied and Interservice Military Agencies Records, Records of the Office of Strategic Services (RG 226) Records of the Research and Analysis Branch,' file 134935, note 117.
- ⁸⁷ Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid*
- ⁸⁹ Letter of 13th November 1946.
- ⁹⁰ Nicholas, 2007, 14.
- ⁹¹ Nicholas, 2007, 19.
- ⁹² von Frey letter of 11th April 1944.
- ⁹³ Nicholas, 2007, 15.
- ⁹⁴ San Diego Museum of Art, Provenance Research (Online).
- ⁹⁵ 'Hunt for a looted legacy. The Profits of Plunder - Art ownership under review', Peter Watson, ABC News, Museum Security Mailinglist Reports.
- ⁹⁶ Art Looting Investigation Unit (ALIU) Detailed Interrogation Report of Hans Wendland, 18th September 1946. (Strategic Services Unit, Art Looting Investigation Unit, Washington, and Office of the Military Government for Germany (U.S.), Economics Division, Restitution Branch, Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Section, Otto Wittman, Jr. for SSU; Bernard Taper, for MFA&A).
- ⁹⁷ 'Karl W. Bruemming was a bookseller and antique dealer in Darmstadt, Germany. He was chief representative in Germany for Fischer and was an important intermediary in Hofer-Fischer exchanges, as well as many of Dr. Wolffhardt's (SS Hauptsturmfuehrer) transactions for the Linz Library. He traveled frequently to Switzerland during the war and was a key figure in movement of looted works of art between Germany and Switzerland.' The National Archives, Holocaust-Era Assets, Military Agency Records, Interallied and Interservice Military Agencies Records, Records of the Office of Strategic Services (RG 226), Records of the Research and Analysis Branch, Note 127.

-
- ⁹⁸ Peter Harclerode & Brendan Pittaway, *The Lost Masters. The Looting of Europe's Treasurehouses*, Orion, London, 2000, 130-131.
- ⁹⁹ 'Hunt for a looted legacy. The Profits of Plunder - Art ownership under review', Peter Watson, ABC News, Museum Security Mailinglist Reports.
- ¹⁰⁰ Lists of works with incomplete provenances during the period 1933-1945, The Courtauld Institute of Art Gallery, Drawings (Princes Gate Collection).
- ¹⁰¹ Lists of works with incomplete provenances during the period 1933-1945, The Courtauld Institute of Art Gallery, Paintings.
- ¹⁰² Nicholas, 2007, 15.
- ¹⁰³ Nicholas, 2007, 16.
- ¹⁰⁴ Letter of 11th April 1944, file no. G2/4371.
- ¹⁰⁵ Nicholas, 2007, 16.
- ¹⁰⁶ Nicholas, 2007, 16.
- ¹⁰⁷ Lynn Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa*, London, 1995, 164.
- ¹⁰⁸ Ibid, 164.
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid, 165.
- ¹¹⁰ 'Contested Cultural Property and Museums: the case of the Hunt Museum', hosted by the Royal Irish Academy, 19th June 2006, with the assistance of the Heritage Council and the Department of Arts, Sport and Tourism.
- ¹¹¹ 'The Importance of Museum Policy,' Mr. Thomas Kline, Curator of European Art, Managing Partner of AndrewsKurth, Washington DC, Seminar programme, 'Contested Cultural Property and Museums: the case of the Hunt Museum', hosted by the Royal Irish Academy, 19th June 2006.
- ¹¹² 'Restitution Settlement Between the San Diego museum of Art and the Galerie van Diemen, Berlin', Stephen Kern, Curator of European Art, San Diego Museum of Art, Seminar programme, 'Contested Cultural Property and Museums: the case of the Hunt Museum', hosted by the Royal Irish Academy, 19th June 2006.
- ¹¹³ Website <http://www.buehrle.ch>, 'The Collector'. *Foundation E.G. Bührle Collection*.
- ¹¹⁴ 'Merchants of Death Conference', Richard Sanders, *Peace Magazine*, December 1989- January 1990, 8. It was revealed that '21 million worth of arms had been illegally exported by Oerlikon-Buehrle', Anthony Sampson, *The Arms Bazaar*, 1977, 340.
- ¹¹⁵ Nicholas, 2007, 17.
- ¹¹⁶ Nicholas, 2007, 16.
- ¹¹⁷ Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa*, London, 1995, see pages 162, 168, 169, 417-420, 427.
- ¹¹⁸ These items are now in the Hunt Museum.
- ¹¹⁹ Nicholas, 1995, 418-9.
- ¹²⁰ Art Looting Investigation Unit (ALIU) Detailed Interrogation Report of Hans Wendland, 18th September 1946. (Strategic Services Unit, Art Looting Investigation Unit, Washington, and Office of

the Military Government for Germany (U.S.), Economics Division, Restitution Branch, Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Section, Otto Wittman, Jr. for SSU; Bernard Taper, for MFA&A), p. 10.

¹²¹ Nicholas, 2007, 16. When one considers how well connected von Frey was, it seems untenable that he would be seeking support and approval from ‘an unreliable dealer who sells forgeries.’

¹²² Nicholas, 2007, 16.

¹²³ Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.

¹²⁴ It is spelled ‘Lindpainter’ rather than ‘Lindpaintner’ in the transcript of the von Frey letter.

¹²⁵ *Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report*, 2.

¹²⁶ ‘On the Trail of Lost Art: A Conversation with Lynn H. Nicholas’, (Interviewed by William R. Ferris), *Humanities*, September/October 2000, vol. 22, no. 3.

¹²⁷ Bundesarchive Bundespolizei-Dossier C.2.5711. See also ‘Aber doch nicht der Stutz’, Hans Stutz, *Die WochenZeitung*, 10th May, 1996.

¹²⁸ von Frey letter of 13th November 1946, file no. G2/4371.

¹²⁹ Nicholas, 2007, 17.

¹³⁰ The Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report states: ‘The Report written by Douglas Cooper, entitled “Report of Mission to Switzerland” was consulted.’ p. 33.

¹³¹ ‘Other records in relation to the ALIU trip to Switzerland were consulted, in particular the interrogation interviews with Nazi-connected art dealers, Hans Wendland and Theodor Fischer.’ Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report, p. 33.

¹³² Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report, p. 33-34.

¹³³ Art News, 29th April, 1939

¹³⁴ Richard Griffiths, *Patriotism Perverted. Captain Ramsay, The Right Club and British Anti-Semitism 1939-1940*, 1998, 156, 237; PRO HO 144/22454/83.

¹³⁵ Paul Lashmar, ‘The Who's Who of British Nazis. Exposed: the establishment figures who wanted to turn the UK into a fascist dictatorship’, *The Independent*, 9th January 2000.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

¹³⁷ Griffiths, 1998, 221.

¹³⁸ *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, (I fear the Greeks even when they make offerings [to the gods]). Words attributed to the Trojan high priest Laocoon by Virgil in his *Aeneid*, II, 49. Origin of the modern expression ‘Beware of Greeks bearing gifts’.

¹³⁹ Detroit Institute of Arts, provenance research (Online).

¹⁴⁰ Nicholas, 2007, 17. Account of events in Celle and reference to the investigation in Friemuth see, Cay Die geraubte Kunst, Braunschweig, 1989, 165. “H.L. Parry, PSO III. Special Enquiry Bureau, Public Safety Branch, HQ Land Niedersachsen: Enquiry on Losses at Schloss Celle, 27 April 1948. FO 1046/155 Proceedings of Schloss Celle administrative committee, 1948-9.

¹⁴¹ V.Teehan, *The Hunt Museum Provenance Research Project. Interim Report*, September 15 2008.

¹⁴² The reference to "a separate source" in the press release related to the research of Erin Gibbons.

¹⁴³ Aileen Plunket; Obituary, *The Times*, 6th April 1999, 21.

¹⁴⁴ Maureen Marchioness of Dufferin and Ava; Obituary, *The Times*, 4th May 1998, 23.

¹⁴⁵ *Bute House Guidebook*, The Scottish Government Publications, January 2003.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁷ Sean Longden, chapter 12, 'Operation Plunder', *To the Victor the Spoils. Soldiers lives from D-Day to VE Day*, Robinson, London, 2007, 323-352. If it can be established for certain that Harbord was involved in trading looted art, then his family connections may also prove to be of interest. His brother Charles Robert Harbord owned hotels in Portugal, a country that played an important role in the trade in looted art, both during and after the war. Portugal is where Arthur Goldschmidt was based prior to his departure to Cuba.

¹⁴⁸ HO 045/25696/E

¹⁴⁹ Griffiths, 1998, 150.

¹⁵⁰ The Hunt Museum Limerick, The Online Archives, file HM/ARCH/B1a/00001. Section Name: Hunt Family Files - Projects - Bunratty Castle, county Clare, c. 1952-71.

¹⁵¹ Possibly around Lord Gort's Lough Cutra estate. The author was refused permission to consult the files of the Hunt Museum and has had to rely on the museum's Online Archive, which provides a listing of the contents of the archive.

¹⁵² The Crichton-Stuarts may have had a distant family connection with Bunratty. The first stone castle at Bunratty was built in 1277 by Thomas de Clare, a grandson of Edward I, and a nephew of Joan, (daughter of King Edward I), who was married to Gilbert de Clare, Lord of Cardiff. Through the marriage of John, 1st Marquess of Butte to Charlotte Jane Windsor this title passed to the Crichton-Stuart family when, in 1776, John, 1st Marquess of Butte, was created Baron Cardiff. 'The Lords of Cardiff', *Cardiff Records*: vol. 2 (1900), pp. 42-55.

¹⁵³ Nicholas, 2007, 2.

¹⁵⁴ Nicholas, 2007, 9.

¹⁵⁵ Mary Cahill, 'The strange case of the Strangford Lough hoard,' *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, vol. 135, 2005, 83.

¹⁵⁶ Correspondence between Hunt and Mahr in the Irish Antiquities Division Archive (file IA/72/78) was first examined by Erin Gibbons in 1997 when she was compiling an inventory of archaeological objects in the National Museum of Ireland for Clare County Museum, Ennis, Co. Clare. A later request by Gibbons to access the Museum's Directorial files on Mahr was turned down on the basis that the Director, Dr. Patrick Wallace, was engaged in researching the files in question.

¹⁵⁷ NMI file IA/237/47.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁶¹ This transaction is referred to by Gerry Mullins in his biography of Mahr. However Mullins was unaware that there was more extensive contact between Mahr and Hunt. (Mullins, 2007, 220-221).

¹⁶² Irish Antiquities Division, National Museum of Ireland, file IA/72/78.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁴ Richard Griffiths' *Patriotism Perverted. Captain Ramsay, The Right Club and British Anti-Semitism 1939-1940*, (Constable, London, 1998).

¹⁶⁵ Nicholas Shakespeare, *Bruce Chatwin*, The Harvill Press, London, 1999, 181-182.

¹⁶⁶ Shakespeare, 185.

¹⁶⁷ Shakespeare, 183.

¹⁶⁸ Shakespeare, 182.

¹⁶⁹ Shakespeare, 185.

¹⁷⁰ 'Both came from the world of the antique dealer and many of the aspects of their collecting are well set out in a number of books, of which the most recent is probably the biography of Bruce Chatwin by Nicholas Shakespeare. It outlines their work as advisors to Sothebys and various collectors as well as their role, *an unfortunate role at best*, in the dismembering of the Pitt Rivers Museum.' MacGonigal, 2003, 13.

¹⁷¹ It appears that a copy of the part of Shakespeare's book dealing with the Hunts is in the Hunt Museum archive. According to the Online Archives description there is a 'photocopy of extract from unidentified publication (date unspecified) by Bruce Chatwin relating to Pitt Rivers which mentions John Hunt, Senior, and Gertrude Hunt' Hunt Museum Pitt-Rivers file HM/ARCH/B4d/00001. This appears to refer to Shakespeare's biography of Chatwin rather than a publication by Chatwin.

¹⁷² IA/237/1947, IA/128/1970 & IA/77/1978

¹⁷³ File IA/77/1978

¹⁷⁴ File IA/237/1947

¹⁷⁵ Letter to Ragnall Ó Floinn, Irish Antiquities Division, National Museum of Ireland, file IA/77/1978

¹⁷⁶ Press cutting, National Museum of Ireland file IA/128/1970, (*The Times*, 19th February 1972).

¹⁷⁷ National Museum of Ireland file IA/128/1970.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁸² *Ibid.*

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁴ 'Most of the Pitt-Rivers Irish material seems to have come from the sales of the Bateman collection in 1893 (Sothebys), the B. Wright collection (1888) and the Robinson collection. Other objects were acquired from the Grey and Edkins collections.' Report written for the Keeper of Irish Antiquities by Ragnall Ó Floinn, Assistant Keeper, following a visit by him to the Pitt Rivers Museum, Farnham on 8th December 1978, to view the Irish material. File IA/77/1978.

-
- ¹⁸⁵ Robert Lacey, *Sotheby's – Bidding for Class*, Time Warner Paperbacks, 2002, 150.
- ¹⁸⁶ *Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Final Report to the Royal Irish Academy*, June 2006, 43.
- ¹⁸⁷ The Hunt Museum Limerick, The Online Archives.
- ¹⁸⁸ *The Times*, 15th December 1972.
- ¹⁸⁹ *Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Final Report to the Royal Irish Academy*, June 2006, 42.
- ¹⁹⁰ Patrick Wallace, 'Adolf Mahr and the making of Seán P. Ó Ríordáin', *From Megaliths to Metals. Essays in Honour of George Eogan*, eds. H. Roche, E. Grogan, J. Bradley, J. Coles & B. Raftery, Oxbow Books, Oxford, 2004, 256.
- ¹⁹¹ *Ibid*, 254-263.
- ¹⁹² *Ibid*, 263.
- ¹⁹³ *Ibid*, 263.
- ¹⁹⁴ Gerry Mullins, *Dublin Nazi No.1. The Life of Adolf Mahr*, Liberties Press, Dublin, 2007, 196.
- ¹⁹⁵ 'Royal Irish Academy Minutes of Proceedings, Session 1946-47, Monday, 24th February, 1947', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. 51, C, 1945-1948, 4.
- ¹⁹⁶ Wallace, 2004, 263.
- ¹⁹⁷ Patrick F. Wallace, 'An Error of Judgement, Rescuing Adolf Mahr's Contribution to the National Museum of Ireland', *Speaking ill of the Dead*, ed. Myles Dungan, New Island, Dublin, 2007, 176.
- ¹⁹⁸ No. 21, Molesworth Street is less than fifty metres from the museum entrance.
- ¹⁹⁹ Richard Marks, *Burrell. A Portrait of a Collector, Sir William Burrell, 1861-1958*, Richard Drew Publishing, Glasgow, 1988, 173.
- ²⁰⁰ Wallace, 2004, 261. Ó Ríordáin's first excavation in the area was at Cush, to the south east of Lough Gur (excavated 1934-35). (Adolf Mahr, 'New Aspects and Problems in Irish Prehistory. Presidential Address for 1937', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 1937, 280).
- ²⁰¹ The excavations were undertaken under a State-funded Relief for Unemployment scheme, begun in 1934, under the supervision and inspection of Mahr, who selected most of the sites to be investigated (Mahr, 1937, 268-270). Mahr also appears to have been responsible for the financial accounts of the scheme (Wallace, 2007, 184).
- ²⁰² Irish Antiquities Division, National Museum of Ireland, topographical file, 1933:1275, Carrowmore, Co. Galway. Wallace interprets the comment as being made by Úa Ríoghghardáin in an attempt to impress Mahr (Wallace, 2007, 171).
- ²⁰³ Unsigned report, 19th December 1945. Irish Military Archives, file MA, G2/130. Quoted in Mullins, 2007, 176.
- ²⁰⁴ Annika Stephan & Paul Gosling, 'Adolf Mahr (1887-1951): his contribution to archaeological research and practice in Austria and Ireland', *Connections and Identities: Austria, Ireland and Switzerland / Österreich, Irland und die Schweiz beziehungen und identitäten*, Series: Wechselwirkungen Österreichische Literatur im Internationalen Kontext, vol. 6, Peter Lang, Bern, 2004.

²⁰⁵ Wallace, 2007, 210.

²⁰⁶ The Thomond Archaeological Society published a memorial volume in memory of John Hunt. *Studia in Memoriam John Hunt*, *North Munster Antiquarian Journal*, Vol. 20, 1978. Mary Geary, Former President, Thomond Archaeological Society, wrote a letter to the Irish Times, (26th February, 2004), expressing support for John and Gertrude Hunt.

²⁰⁷ Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.

²⁰⁸ Nicholas, 2007, 13.

²⁰⁹ Guy Warner, 'The Flying Boats of Foynes', *Inland Waterways News*, vol. 28, no. 4, Winter 2001, 1-6. (p. 4).

²¹⁰ The request came from Brendan O'Regan, the Catering Comptroller at Foynes. O'Regan was Chairman of Shannon Development from 1959-1978 and also later served as a member of the Hunt Museum Trust. (*Empowering the People, The Career and Achievements of Dr. Brendan O'Regan*, Clare Museum Exhibition, Spring, 2007). See also, Bernard Share, *Bunratty. Rebirth of a Castle*, Brandon Books, Dingle, Co. Kerry, 1995, 95-96.

²¹¹ According to Lynn Nicholas, Gertrude Hunt was engaged to advise on the décor of the Foynes terminal. (Nicholas, 2007, 13). Nicholas provides no source for her statement and it remains unclear whether the Hunts were allowed to visit Foynes before the end of the war. While the Hunt Museum archives contain documents made available from the Hunt family archive regarding interior decorating work done by the Hunts in the Old Ground hotel, Ennis, (owned by Brendan O'Regan's father), there appears to be nothing in the museum archive relating to work undertaken at Foynes.

²¹² Interviewed by Erin Gibbons, 23rd April 2002.

²¹³ Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Final Report, 9-10, repeated on p. 40.

²¹⁴ A comprehensive history of the open air museum as idea and institution can be found in the Swedish museologist Sten Rentzhog's *Open air museums. The history and future of a visionary idea*, Jamtli Förlag & Carlsson Bokförlag, Kristianstad, Sweden, 2007.

²¹⁵ Wallace, 2007, 196-200. The need for a folklore museum was also advocated by Séamus Ó Duilearga whose views were formed during a study trip to northern Europe in 1928 (*The Irish Folklore Commission 1935-1970. History, Ideology, Methodology*, *Studia Fennica, Folkloristica* 17, Mícheál Briody, Helsinki, 2007, 88-91). Ó Duilearga appears to have been close to Adolf Mahr (Briody, 2007, 62) who was appointed to the Irish Folklore Commission (of which Ó Duilearga was Director) in 1935 (Wallace, 2007, 200). Ó Duilearga appears, at best, to have been ambivalent about the Nazis. In 1937 he made a controversial lecture tour of Nazi Germany. This led to return visits to Ireland by Nazi scholars who became the subject of interest by Irish Military Intelligence (Briody, 2007, 62-63).

²¹⁶ It appears there were tensions over Hunt taking inordinate credit for his role and for 'monopolising of the limelight.' (Share, 1995, 92). Problems also arose because Hunt undertook excavations in the basement, without having obtained an excavation license. Apparently, this was granted subsequently. However, there appears to have been no record kept of the findings. (Share, 1995, 101).

²¹⁷ Share, 1995, 91.

²¹⁸ Interviewed by Erin Gibbons in April 2002, Eamonn P. Kelly recalled a conversation he had in 1973 with Barry Raftery when they travelled to Craggaunowen, where Raftery had a pre-arranged project meeting with John Hunt. Raftery was Hunt's consultant on the Craggaunowen project. According to Kelly, Raftery told him that John Hunt was inspired to build the Craggaunowen crannóg by the Lake Constance reconstructions.

²¹⁹ Wallace, 2004, 259.

²²⁰ For the Nazis and Lake Constance see: *Living on the Lake in Prehistoric Europe: 150 Years of Lake-Dwelling Research*, ed. Francesco Menotti, Routledge, Abingdon and New York, 2004, p. 239; Bettina Arnold, 'The Past as Propaganda: totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany', *Antiquity*, vol. 64, 1990, 464- 478; 'The past as propaganda', how Hitler's archaeologists distorted European prehistory to justify racist and territorial goals', *Archaeology*, vol. 45, July - August, 1992, 30-37. See also Martin Schmidt, 'Reconstruction as ideology: the open air museum at Oerlinghausen, Germany', *The Constructed Past: Experimental Archaeology, Education, and the Public*, Philippe G. Planel & Peter G. Stone, Routledge, London, 1999, 146-155. The emphasis placed by the Nazis on the continental lake dwellings may partly explain Adolf Mahr's particular interest in the Irish examples. See Wallace, 2007, 180-181.

²²¹ 'The Past as Propaganda: totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany, Bettina Arnold, *Antiquity*, vol. 64, 1990, 472.

²²² Mahr, 1937, 387.

²²³ Wallace, 2007, 192. See also *Crannogs. A study of people's interaction with lakes, with particular reference to Lough Gara in the north-west of Ireland*, Christina Fredengren, Wordwell, Bray, 2002, 47.

²²⁴ Mahr, 1937, 268.

²²⁵ Mahr, 1937, 280. Raftery later excavated further crannógs in Lough Gara, Co. Sligo. Fredengren, 2002, 52-53.

²²⁶ Mahr, 1937, 402. Fredengren, 2002, 46-47, also discusses Mahr's ideological approach and the importance of the crannógs to his theories. She points out that Mahr also supported a study of the racial history of Ireland carried out by C.P. Martin to which one chapter is devoted to 'the people of the crannogs'. (See *Prehistoric man in Ireland*, C. P. Martin, London, 1935).

²²⁷ Arnold, 1990, 464.

²²⁸ Mahr's virulent Nazism was a source of friction with some of his scholarly contemporaries such as Daniel Binchy, with whom Mahr served on the Board of the Irish Folklore Commission, (Briody, 2007, 62), and Danish scientist Hagbard Jonassen, with whom Mahr worked on the Irish Quaternary Research Committee. Frank Mitchell, who also worked with the Irish Quaternary Research Committee, describes Jonassen's anger at what Mitchell describes as Mahr's 'fascist tirades'. Frank Mitchell, *The Way that I Followed, a Naturalist's Journey Around Ireland*, Country House, Dublin, 1990, 14.

²²⁹ The Hunt Museum Essential Guide, ed. Helen Armitage, Scala Publishers in Association with The Hunt Museum, 2002, 9.

²³⁰ *Irish Medieval Figure Sculpture 1200 to 1600 by John Hunt (1900-1976)*, Hunt Museum, 2000. (The catalogue pages are unnumbered).

²³¹ Ibid. MacGonigal's account is supported by the details recorded on John Hunt's birth certificate, which was consulted.

²³² Ibid.

²³³ Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.

²³⁴ Ibid.

²³⁵ The Limerick Chronicle, 5th April 1898.

²³⁶ Householders in County Limerick, *1911 Census - County Limerick*, Limerick City Council, Online.

²³⁷ Nicholas, 2007, 13.

²³⁸ John Hunt had, apparently, created his Irish identity while living in London in the 1930s. When interviewed in April 2002, Yvonne Hackenbrock, who knew the Hunts in London before the war and who visited them in Ireland subsequently, expressed the belief that John Hunt was Irish.

²³⁹ Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*

²⁴² *Ibid.*

²⁴³ Mullins, 2007, 196-201.

²⁴⁴ Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Final Report, 44.

²⁴⁵ *The Phoenix*, 27th February 2004, 14.

²⁴⁶ The collection was acquired under Relief for Donation of Heritage Items, Section 1003, Taxes Consolidation Act, 1997. The tax relief to be obtained is based on the value of the items donated.

²⁴⁷ *The Phoenix*, 27th February 2004, 14.

²⁴⁸ Hunt Museum archive, HM/ARCH/A1/00121 DG 038.

²⁴⁹ Hunt Museum archive, HM/ARCH/A1/0169 HCM 160.

²⁵⁰ Copy from the Metropolitan Museum of Art New York file is to be found in National Museum of Ireland file IA/141/1998.

²⁵¹ National Museum of Ireland file IA/141/1998.

²⁵² National Museum of Ireland, file IA/141/1998.

²⁵³ Mary Cahill, 'The strange case of the Strangford Lough hoard,' *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, vol. 135, 2005, 5-118.

²⁵⁴ Irish Military Archive file no. G2/4371.

²⁵⁵ Cahill, 2005, 71. Dr. Quane's remark is quoted in a memo written by A.W. Stelfox for Acting Director, 20th August 1940.

²⁵⁶ Note written by Joseph Raftery dated 21st August 1940 referring to instructions from Mr. F. O'Duffy, Asst. Sec., Department of Education. Cahill, 2005, 71.

²⁵⁷ Cahill, 2005, 72.

²⁵⁸ Letter to Rupert Bruce-Mitford, 3rd October 1951, in Cahill, 2005, 81-82.

²⁵⁹ They may be genuine antiquities though unlikely to be of Irish provenance.

²⁶⁰ There are copies of an exchange of telegrams between Ticher and the Hunts in the Irish Military Archive file G2/4371. Dated 20th October 1944, the telegrams relate to a meeting planned between the Hunts and Ticher.

²⁶¹ Cahill, 2005, 5-118.

²⁶² New York Times, 19th March 1999.

-
- ²⁶³ Judith Hill, *John and Gertrude Hunt: Virtuoso Collectors and Benefactors*, June 1998, 12pp.
- ²⁶⁴ *Ibid*
- ²⁶⁵ Cristina Ruiz, 'The legacy of the ever elusive John Hunt', *The Art Newspaper*, 1st September 1997.
- ²⁶⁶ Lynn Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa* (Papermac, London, 1995, 111-114, 174, 313, 409, 422-423).
- ²⁶⁷ Quoted in Nicholas, 2007, 5.
- ²⁶⁸ Nicholas, 2007, 5.
- ²⁶⁹ Nicholas, 2007, 3. (The Hill essay is twelve pages in length, including the bibliography).
- ²⁷⁰ *Irish Times*, 6th March 2004.
- ²⁷¹ *Irish Times*, 6th March 2004.
- ²⁷² This seems to refer to the art dealer Adolf Beckhardt.
- ²⁷³ *Irish Times*, 6th March 2004.
- ²⁷⁴ *Irish Times*, 6th March 2004.
- ²⁷⁵ Bund der Antifaschisten Köpenick e.V., Puchanstrasse 12, 12555, Berlin.
- ²⁷⁶ Nicholas, 2007, 12.
- ²⁷⁷ Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report, 12.
- ²⁷⁸ *Ibid*, 12.
- ²⁷⁹ Nicholas, 2007, 12.
- ²⁸⁰ Hunt Museum Evaluation Group report, p. 6.
- ²⁸¹ See endnote 2.
- ²⁸² Nicholas, 2007, 18.
- ²⁸³ Formerly Limerick City Museum.
- ²⁸⁴ *The Phoenix*, 27th February 2004, 14.
- ²⁸⁵ 'Doubt cast on value of archive to Hunt inquiry', *Irish Times*, 10th March 2004.
- ²⁸⁶ Phillip Nelson, Sir William Burrell, John Ball and General Pitt Rivers. There is also material relating to Lord Gort, on whose behalf John Hunt furnished the restored Bunratty Castle, photographs of the Hunt family and collection, and material relating to publications by John Hunt.
- ²⁸⁷ Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Report, 33.
- ²⁸⁸ Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Report, 33.
- ²⁸⁹ Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Report, 2.
- ²⁹⁰ *The American Association of Museum Guidelines Concerning the Unlawful Appropriation of Objects During the Nazi Era*. Approved, November 1999, Amended, April 2001. 3, c.

²⁹¹ Lynn Nicholas commends the work of Virginia Teehan, Director of the Museum ‘for her truly extraordinary accomplishment in setting up the website and document listing in so short a time’ Nicholas, 2007, 18

²⁹² The article, written by Arthur Beesley, Political Reporter, was entitled ‘Doubt cast on value of archive to Hunt inquiry’ (Irish Times, 10th March 2004). It contains the following statement ‘Mr. Ciaran MacGonigal, who headed the museum from 1998 to 2001, said yesterday that the provenance of significant parts of the collection “simply could not be proved” from material in the archive.’

²⁹³ Nicholas, 2007, 9.

²⁹⁴ Such oversights may have arisen as a result of the large volume of information that had to be placed on the databases.

²⁹⁵ The cauldron and situla are described as coming from the Pitt Rivers Farnham Museum in a publication published in 1981. (Patrick Doran, *The Hunt Museum*, The Craggaunowen Project, Limerick/Shannon 1981, 5-6). This publication is a slightly revised version of Dr. Doran’s article on “The Hunt Museum”, originally published in *Studia in Memoriam John Hunt: The North Munster Antiquarian Journal*, vol. xx (1978). It is noted that Doran makes no reference to a German dealer / collector as having any involvement in Hunt’s acquisition of objects. This casts further doubt on the version of events that Hunt provided to Joseph Raftery, National Museum of Ireland, concerning his acquisition of the pieces.

²⁹⁶ Nicholas, 2007, 18-19.

²⁹⁷ Hunt Museum Evaluation Group Report, 2.

²⁹⁸ Nicholas, 2007, 17.

²⁹⁹ Letter from Dr. Shimon Samuels to Mrs. Mary McAleese, President of Ireland, 26th January 2004.

³⁰⁰ Nicholas, 2007, 12.

³⁰¹ Shakespeare, 185.

³⁰² *Munster Express*, 6th May 2001.

³⁰³ Nicholas, 2007, 18.

³⁰⁴ V.Teehan, The Hunt Museum Provenance Research Project. Interim Report, September 15, 2008, placed online on November 12, 2008.