

“Due to Artistic Value under Military Protection!”

Esther Rahel Heyer

1. Catalogue Introduction to a “Fictitious Complete Fonds”

Among the most striking examples of art protection carried out by the German military in occupied France are the warning signs issued by the *Militärbefehlshaber* (military commander in France, henceforth MBF), some of which are now collected in the *Nachlass* (documents from a deceased person, sometimes also referred to as personal papers) of Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich (1893–1978)¹ and in the French Archives nationales. Part of a quote from one of these posters—“(…) due to artistic value under military protection!”—sums up the core topic of the inventory: the central archival holdings of the private *Nachlass* of Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich (NL FGWM), as well as a variety of supplementary sources that deal with the *Kunstschutz* (an art protection division within the *Wehrmacht*) during the Second World War, with a particular focus on its work in France.

This introduction to the archival inventory summarises the current state of research, describes what have so far been the predominant sources, and discusses ongoing research projects. Alongside a historical contextualisation of the German military *Kunstschutz*, it also includes a brief biography of Wolff Metternich and an explanation of the tradition within which he was situated, as well as a description and characterisation of the sources in the NL FGWM and the *Gegenüberlieferung* (supplementary sources). From this, the documents can be categorised according to their file creator (institutions and correspondents) and classified by document type. In addition, an attempt is made to reconstruct the transmission history of the sources² by comparing these holdings with relevant filing plans. This comparison sheds light on which files were kept by the *Kunstschutz* and which were carefully selected by Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich and his closest colleague, Bernhard von Tieschowitz (1902–1968), to be transferred to the *Denkmalpflegeamt der Rheinischen Provinzialverwaltung* (Rhineland Provincial Administration’s monument preservation office) in Bonn³ in the months and weeks before the German troops left Paris in August 1944, while also revealing some obvious gaps and raising further questions. It is hoped that this

¹ Vereinigte Adelsarchive im Rheinland e. V., Ehreshoven, family archive of the Grafen Wolff Metternich zur Gracht, *Nachlass* of Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich (hereafter NL FGWM), no. 74.

² See footnote in the German version of the introduction.

³ NL FGWM, no. 251.

source-based approach to the question of what the Kunstschutz's scope of activity was and how it functioned will inspire future analytical research initiatives.⁴

This inventory is intended to make it easier to find sources relating to specific topics and to aid provenance research by making sources accessible. In terms of methodology, the inventory is a foundational research project in the auxiliary or ancillary sciences of history, specifically archival science. Other relevant disciplines include biographical research, network analysis, the history of science, research regarding cultural policy, the history of the occupation, and approaches to Kulturguttransfer (the transfer of cultural assets) and reception history. Elements from each of these fields have been borrowed to provide an academic basis for the inventory and to suggest additional ways in which the sources in the holdings could be used.⁵

The translation into English and French of the research introduction will ensure it reaches the widest possible international research community. Improved access to sources in predominantly German and French archives, the networking of current research at a specialist conference, and the publication of research projects and results represent only a small portion of what, in the best case scenario, will be an ongoing project that is cooperative, international, and transdisciplinary. The opening up and cataloguing of other sources and private Nachlässe would be particularly welcome, as would further academic collaboration enabling comparison and dialogue between different national, institutional, or biographical perspectives—essentially an *histoire croisée*.

2. Current State of Research

Previous and ongoing research into the Kunstschutz can be grouped into several distinct categories. Our focus here is on the following: the historical development of the institution during the First World War along with subsequent publications on the experiences of its key figures during that time; the re-establishment of the institution during the Second World War; biographies and memoirs; the preservation of historical monuments in the Rhineland; reappraisals during the postwar period; research into art looting and protection dating from

4 There are numerous content-related questions that can be touched on only briefly here. Some are discussed in more detail in this volume in the section on research approaches, or in the articles in the conference publication for “Kulturgutschutz in Europa und im Rheinland—Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich und der Kunstschutz im Zweiten Weltkrieg” (Conference held in the Landschaftsverband Rheinland cultural center in Brauweiler Abbey, 19–21 September 2019). See Hans-Werner Langbrandtner/Esther Heyer/Florence de Peyronnet-Dryden (eds.), *Kulturgutschutz in Europa und im Rheinland. Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich und der Kunstschutz im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Brüche und Kontinuitäten. Forschungen zu Kunst und Kunstgeschichte im Nationalsozialismus 5), Cologne/Vienna/Weimar 2021.

5 See footnote in the German version of the introduction.

the 1980s to the 2010s; exhibition catalogues and monographs about institutional history; and Festschriften. A distinction should be made between primary and secondary literature; the personal accounts published by Kunstschutz personnel in various countries are of particular interest for source research. This volume also contains a selected thematic bibliography to complement the research overview.

Apart from his own research and publications, a Festschrift published in honour of his eightieth birthday,⁶ and an essay in the collection *100 Jahre Bibliotheca Hertziana*,⁷ information about Wolff Metternich is limited. Although he is mentioned in numerous publications about art looting and protection, there is still no complete account of his role that incorporates this newly discovered body of source material.⁸ Contemporary publications, for example, monument inventories and registers of artworks of national significance, form the foundation of previous work on the preservation of historical monuments in France and the Rhineland as well as of the present-day analysis.⁹ The yearbooks of the *Denkmalpflege* (preservation of historical monuments) provide insight into its day-to-day operation and development during the Nazi era.¹⁰ Its reappraisals of its own activities in writings about the war and monument preservation are useful for studies of the Kunstschutz during both the First and Second World War.¹¹ Festschriften and papers in honour of deeds and accomplishments shed more light on reception history and can be used to analyse the (self-)representation of Kunstschutz personnel. The study of the *Bodendenkmalpflege* (preservation of archaeological monuments) in the Rhineland and the cultural policy of the Rhineland during the Nazi era is facilitated by publications and conference proceedings.¹² Also worth noting here are both the involvement of the University of Bonn and the ramifications of personal networks.¹³ Jan Schleusener is currently working on a comparative study of historical monument preservation in Bavaria, Thuringia, and the Rhineland.¹⁴

Following the 1998 Washington Declaration¹⁵ and the joint declaration between the German Federal Government and the Länder in 1999,¹⁶ there was a proliferation of research into Nazi-confiscated cultural assets, provenance research, issues of restitution and *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (the process of coming to terms with the past), and the mechanisms and agents of art looting and cultural policy during the Nazi era. References to the Kunstschutz are

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid.

9 Ibid.

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid.

12 Ibid.

13 Ibid.

14 Ibid.

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.

found especially in studies of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (Reichsleiter Rosenberg Taskforce, henceforth ERR), studies of art market participants, and the history of individual museums or collectors.¹⁷ In terms of academic relationships, cultural heritage, and translocation, this rapidly developing and extremely diverse research field, which can only be sketched in brief here, promises to facilitate future connections to the equally dynamic field of research into Kunstschutz and wartime art protection.¹⁸

Research into the Kunstschutz in the First World War, and particularly its work in Belgium and France, has made significant progress in the last two decades, largely thanks to Christina Kott.¹⁹ She has described the restriction of the term “Kunstschutz” to the activities of a specific group of people or an administrative department during the Second World War as “not adequately assessed”, especially because the definition of that group is itself imprecise and subjective due to postwar (self-)representations. An accurate, multifaceted reappraisal and historicisation of Kunstschutz as a concept and field of activity has yet to appear.²⁰ This self-representation took place partly in publications about wartime activity and partly in final activity reports; while some of these are available in libraries, significantly more can be found in the institutional archives of museums and universities, the archival holdings of the military administration, and in private Nachlässe. Some of these apologias have only been published in revised form. Because of the scarcity of other sources, they have strongly influenced public perception of the Kunstschutz and its agents.²¹ Even Margot Günther-Hornig’s attempt at a multi-country reappraisal on behalf of the Institut für Besatzungsfragen (Institute for Occupation Affairs) at the end of the 1950s is based on scant sources and sometimes solely on personal statements from those who had been involved; her request to consult Wolff Metternich’s documents was refused.²²

Personal accounts by former Kunstschutz officers do contain information about its activities, but they are often dominated by diary-like narratives of events.²³ Further information can also be found in the descriptions of the relocations from or to institutions in which the objects themselves receive more attention than the organisational interdependencies.²⁴ Also indispensable for an understanding of the Kunstschutz are the related Archivschutz (archive protection) and Bibliotheksschutz (library protection) divisions, as well as personal accounts and academic publications about them.²⁵ Later publications that seem relevant because of

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid.

their titles, like that of Günther Haase, are ultimately less informative because they lack proper sources.²⁶

The Kunstschutz has also been studied more intensively in recent years as part of the boom in studies of the history of science, provenance research, and research into the transfer of cultural assets.²⁷ The American officers of the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives (MFA&A) programme have received much attention since the release of the film “Monuments Men”, based on the book by Robert Edsel, and the subsequent media coverage and surge of research into these individuals.²⁸ The activity of the French spy heroine and Kunstschutz officer Rose Valland (1898–1980) in occupied postwar Germany is another example of this branch of research.²⁹

It is very gratifying to see the vitality of current research into the Kunstschutz and other far-reaching questions of cultural asset protection and translocation. Adding to that research is the aim of this inventory, with its accompanying database, print publication, and conference proceedings, some of the researchers from which have contributed articles. A general overview of the Kunstschutz construct would still be desirable. Christina Kott has already published several essays on this topic, and the results of her forthcoming habilitation thesis are sure to provide new insights.³⁰ Christian Fuhrmeister has written numerous articles about the Kunstschutz in Italy. In his recently published habilitation thesis, he places it in the context of art history, politics, and propaganda, and analyses ruptures and continuities beyond the war years.³¹ The Kunstschutz in Greece has been and is currently being studied from two separate perspectives: Alexandra Kankleit addressed the topic as part of a project on the reappraisal of the Nazi history of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens, while Raik Stolzenberg looked at the relationship between the Kunstschutz and the Ahnenerbe in his doctoral thesis.³² The Kunstschutz in Serbia has also received attention, with Andreas Roth recently publishing a book about Johann Albrecht Freiherr von Reischwitz (1899–1962).³³ A recent volume on art looting and rescue in Russian museums during the Second World War deals with “underestimated participants” in Russia.³⁴ In her doctoral thesis, Emily Löffler looks at “art protection in occupied Germany” and restitution policies in the French and American occupation zones, and describes the relationships between the Allies and their entanglements with German

26 Ibid.

27 Ibid.

28 Ibid.

29 Ibid.

30 Ibid.

31 Ibid.

32 Ibid.

33 Ibid.

34 Ibid.

actors.³⁵ The forerunners of the US art protection services are also currently being studied in a dissertation by Laura Nicolaiciuc.³⁶

Finally, the way the Kunstschutz has been depicted in the media is also relevant, particularly for reception history. A white paper planned by Kunstschutz personnel and Wolff Metternich never materialised.³⁷ Several exhibitions in museums or storage facilities have dealt or are dealing with the question of art protection in wartime.³⁸ The Kunstschutz's activity in occupied Paris also forms a central plotline in the Russian director Alexander Sokurov's film "Francofonia".³⁹

3. Sources

Research into the Kunstschutz is hampered by fragmentary sources. Either there has never been a complete, systematic archive of everything relating to the Kunstschutz's work in the Oberkommando des Heeres (Army High Command, henceforth OKH) and the departments of the military administrations of the occupied zones, or that archive has not been preserved. Anja Heuß remarked in 2000 that the files of the Kunstschutz in France are generally thought to have been lost.⁴⁰ According to Christian Fuhrmeister, sources relating to the Kunstschutz in Italy are fragmentary. In his view it would be necessary to compare several incomplete holdings that differ widely in terms of how much has been preserved: archives and Nachlässe belonging to individual institutions and people who were involved in the Kunstschutz; government archives where the papers of the military administration Kunstschutz office have ended up; or indeed anywhere there are records of investigations into the subject, including in other countries.⁴¹ The only way to overcome the obstacle of having to reconstruct the disparate sources before even starting work is to adopt an *histoire croisée* approach and to call on a transnational network of contacts in order to prevent a one-sided representation. Just like the activities and actors of the Kunstschutz, this research must proceed on several levels: both with official materials in government or private records and private documents within government and institutional records and private archives.⁴²

35 Ibid.

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.

38 Ibid.

39 Ibid.

40 Ibid.

41 Ibid.

42 Ibid.

This disparate source material forms the basis of the comparison between the sources in the NL FGWM and the supplementary sources, which will be briefly described below. They include the publications of the French Archives nationales (supported by the German Historical Institute Paris) and of the military section of the Bundesarchiv (German Federal Archive) in Freiburg. These publications organise the surviving holdings of the military administration in France in mutually complementary instruments, which makes access significantly easier.⁴³ Other records relating to the Nazi organisations involved can be found in the Bundesarchiv in Berlin and in the holdings of the Treuhandverwaltung von Kulturgut (Trusteeship for the Administration of Cultural Assets, henceforth TvK) and the Institut für Besatzungsfragen in the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz.⁴⁴ Cultural policy aspects are documented in the political archives of the Auswärtiges Amt (German Federal Foreign Office), which also contain the personnel files of Wolff Metternich and von Tieschowitz from their time at the Auswärtiges Amt in Bonn.⁴⁵ Wolff Metternich's long-standing role as provincial conservator is recorded in the Archiv des Landschaftsverbandes Rheinland (Archive of the Rhineland Regional Council, henceforth ALVR), in which its overlap with the field of art protection in terms of activities and personnel becomes clear.⁴⁶ Archival items relating to the people and institutions involved can also be found in university archives, museum archives, or private Nachlässe.⁴⁷ Following this principle, research was also carried out in government records, institutional archives, and private Nachlässe in France, Belgium, the Netherlands, the USA, and England.⁴⁸

Access to this material was and is facilitated by finding aids that were developed or updated when the holdings were catalogued. Frequently consulted holdings have been partially digitised and made available in databases.⁴⁹ It should not be forgotten in this context that, in line with the Washington Principles and the Joint Declaration between the German Federal Government and the Länder, archives are obliged to make sources available and accessible for provenance research.⁵⁰

43 Ibid.

44 Ibid.

45 Ibid.

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid.

48 Ibid.

49 Finding aids connect the holdings of an archive to the individual file level. They are registries of archival items that facilitate the search for relevant items. A physical registry is often referred to as a catalogue. It comprises a breakdown of the holdings, an introduction to the history of the holdings and the Nachlass creators, and, in the main body, a list of archival items with details about the form and content of the descriptive units. Many institutions also offer online finding aids, or descriptive databases, which can be searched using various functions.

50 See footnote in the German version of the introduction.

Making the NL FGWM available to the public has filled another gap in the records. For years, it has been no secret that Wolff Metternich and his colleagues brought files back to Germany from France. This fact is clear not just from inquiries among colleagues about where the material was located or Margot Günther-Hornig's request for information for her research in the 1950s, but also from communication between researchers and the family.⁵¹

4. Historical Context

The establishment of the Kunstschutz as the Wehrmacht began the invasion of France and the Low Countries in the spring of 1940 was modelled on the measures taken to protect cultural assets during the First World War. A military unit responsible for preventing war damage to cultural assets, historically significant buildings, and monuments was created in part as a form of propaganda to rehabilitate Germany's image, that had suffered after its armed forces became the perpetrators of internationally condemned destruction, particularly in Belgium.⁵² However the suitability of the term "Schutz" as a description for wartime activities needs to be questioned fundamentally. It is important to note that these units did not have much authority and that they were hampered by limited opportunities for action and a shortage of equipment. It is equally hard to dispute the fact that the establishment of the Kunstschutz was largely a propaganda tool intended to demonstrate that Germany had the best interests of the cultural wealth of humankind at heart; the actual goal was to repatriate works of art "stolen" by Napoleon. The protective measures were retrospectively glorified, and chauvinistic seizures were eclipsed by inventories and photographic documentation.⁵³ Paul Clemen (1866–1947), professor of art history at the University of Bonn and Kunstschutz officer during the First World War, published a two-volume book shortly after the end of WWI presenting his ideas and standards for the altruistic concept of "Kunstschutz"; he had a long-lasting impact on this narrative.⁵⁴

During the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71, long before the idea of establishing a dedicated military "Kunstschutz" within an occupying army, the most important national art collections in French museums had been systematically inventoried and placed in specially selected storage facilities. The resulting empirical data and classification systems were then used as references during subsequent conflicts.⁵⁵ Also relevant in this context is the tradition of registering nationally significant cultural assets in the course of the

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

nationalisation process during the late nineteenth century.⁵⁶ The questions this practice raises about cultural identity, the history of inventories, and nationalistic strategies are especially interesting given that this registry was used as a guide to facilitate the targeted recapture of cultural assets during war.⁵⁷

The protection of cultural assets in armed conflicts was internationally accepted and codified in the Hague Convention of 1907; nevertheless, art protection was subordinated to military needs.⁵⁸

Wolff Metternich's appointment and work in the *Kunstschutz* during the Second World War developed naturally out of his commitment, which he felt as a personal obligation, to conserving the cultural heritage of humankind and the previous achievements of his university teacher and predecessor in office, Paul Clemen. The fact that the *Kunstschutz* has been highly regarded for such a long time must also to be understood in the context of these widely admired figures, with their commitment to protecting artistic monuments and their international networks.

In May 1940, the Reichministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung (Reich Ministry of Science, Education, and Culture, henceforth REM) appointed Wolff Metternich to be the authoritative representative of the *Kunstschutz* at the OKH in the occupied zones. The different forms of administration in the occupied countries meant, however, that establishing a consistent procedure was a challenge right from the beginning. The problem was not just that protective measures could only be implemented behind the frontline rather than preventatively, but also that the establishment of *Kunstschutz* offices within each military administration depended on coordination between the military administration staffs of the various army groups. The difficulties became clear during the Battle of France: the troops advanced rapidly; the OKH's jurisdiction over the Netherlands was withdrawn; a military administration was established in Belgium and Northern France; and, finally, in June 1940, General Walther von Brauchitsch (1881–1948), who was already Oberbefehlshaber des Heeres (commander-in-chief of the army), was appointed MBF. The OKH's headquarters were installed in Fontainebleau, while those of the MBF were in the Hôtel Majestic on Avenue Kléber in Paris. Several factors limited the *Kunstschutz*'s opportunities for action. Chief among them, besides various personnel changes and restructurings caused by conflicts of interest as well as the ongoing war, were the *Kunstschutz*'s disputes with the ERR and with Otto Abetz (1903–1958) at the German Embassy in Paris over who was responsible for “safeguarding” private, mainly Jewish, art collections. General Otto von Stülpnagel (1878–1948) took over as military commander from October 1940 until February 1942, followed by Carl-Heinrich von Stülpnagel (1886–1944) until July 1944. But the military commander had no authority over the troops. The administrative structure, with

56 Ibid.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid.

five districts (Northeast France, Northwest France, Southwest France, Bordeaux, and Paris), had been unchanged since the armistice: each prefecture had a Feldkommandantur (military administration headquarters), and each sub-prefecture had a Kreiskommandantur (area headquarters). The eastern campaigns in the spring of 1941 led to a loosening of the command structure and a general reduction in staff numbers, which also affected the Kunstschutz. Wolff Metternich's powers as Kunstschutz authoritative representative were restricted, not least because of the OKH's loss of sole control and authority over the occupied zones. The Kunstschutz's competitors and opponents in France were now not just the Luftwaffe and the Kriegsmarine, but also various ministries, agencies, party bureaus, and civil institutions.⁵⁹

The military administration's Kommandostab (command staff) had authority over the German occupying troops, while the Verwaltungsstab (administrative staff) oversaw the French administration with the aim of ensuring smooth operation and a rapid return to normal life. The director of the administration department was Werner Best (1903–1989), with Alexander Langsdorff (1898–1946) as his deputy.⁶⁰

Under the military administration, the Kunstschutz, Archivschutz, and Bibliothekschutz offices were grouped into the Culture and Art Administration Department (previously Education and Culture Group V 14, later Group V 1/2). The Archivschutz group was established on the orders of the OKH on 17 July 1940, and was put into practise on 1 August 1940. Ernst Zipfel (1891–1966) was appointed Kommissar for the protection of archives in the western theatre of operations; George Schnath (1898–1989) was the leader of the Archivschutz department in France, with Georg Winter (1895–1961) as his deputy; in Belgium and Northern France, Georg Sante (1896–1984) was charged with this assignment; and, at the Reichskommissar of the occupied Netherlands, it was headed by Bernhard Vollmer (1886–1958). The principal tasks of the Archivschutz were to inventory war damages, to protect relocated holdings against looting and destruction, and to draft repatriation lists. It faced particular difficulties where its work conflicted with that of ideologically driven party institutions that confiscated archival holdings for the purposes of Nazi research and legitimization of the party's (genocidal) expansionist policies. Its powers were liable to be withdrawn at any time and it was obliged to cooperate with the Chef der Heeresarchive (Head of the Army Archives), the Sonderkommando Künsberg (Special Unit Künsberg), or the ERR. Especially for the repatriation lists, this led to academic disagreements about whether they should be based on the provenance or pertinence principle; in other words, whether to only repatriate files originating in Germany or to extend the acquisition criteria to include files relating to Germany obtained from foreign sources. The Archivschutz branch was, however, greatly diminished in 1942, after which point it had almost no authority in what later became occupied Southern France.⁶¹

59 Ibid.

60 Ibid.

61 Ibid.

On 2 July 1940, Hugo Andres Krüss (1879–1945), the director general of the Preußische Staatsbibliothek (Prussian State Library), was appointed Kommissar for the protection of libraries in the western theatre of operations. The Bibliotheksschutz department in France was led by Ernst Wermke (1893–1987) until 1942, and then by his deputy Hermann Fuchs (1896–1970) until its dissolution. Likewise, its purpose was to safeguard and protect French libraries, and, above all, to inventory German library materials in France and to draw up repatriation lists based on this inventory. The department's staff numbers were also dramatically reduced in 1942 following the completion of the lists.⁶²

The Referat für Vorgeschichte und Archäologie (office for prehistory and archaeology) was established in the autumn of 1940 on the initiative of Martin Schede (1883–1947), director of the Archäologisches Institut des Deutschen Reiches (Archaeological Institute of the German Reich); Eduard Neuffer (1900–1954) was appointed as its director in December 1940, and it existed until July 1942. Here too, the focus was on providing unrestricted access to research, objects, and documents in the occupied zones, as well as planning the repatriation of objects appropriated from Germany. Its responsibilities also included “protection” as well as the documentation and thus the supplementation of the fields of art, archives, and libraries.⁶³

In contrast to the looting groups, these departments were not specifically instructed to confiscate items. Nevertheless, their documentation and inventorying work, their reclamation lists, and their research projects all laid the groundwork for further acquisitions, ambiguous “safeguarding” operations, and the repatriation of objects to the German Reich. While the Archivschutz and Bibliotheksschutz offices in each zone were under the authority of the respective military commanders and the corresponding Kommissar in the German Reich, Wolff Metternich was part of the OKH and as such was responsible for the entire occupied zone (under military administration). He also saw himself as being in charge of Kunstschutz matters within German territory.

Wolff Metternich was appointed to the OKH by order of the commander-in-chief of the army on 13 May 1940 with the task of protecting cultural assets in the theatre of operations. He initially assisted Army Groups A and B as a technical staff officer reporting to each group's deputy chief of the general staff (chief of administration). After the establishment of the military administrations in Belgium and France, Kunstschutz specialists were assigned to each military commander. Wolff Metternich remained at the OKH, first in the Brussels office and then in Paris. On 19 July 1940, the commander-in-chief of the army issued a command establishing the administrative structures of the Kunstschutz branches in each military administration zone. Wolff Metternich's powers were extended when the OKH was relocated to Germany and he was appointed as head of the military administration department. In April 1941, he joined the military administration's *Verwaltungsstab* while retaining his position as representative at the OKH. He was appointed director of the newly

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

created Administration Group V 14 “Kunstschutz and Archaeology”, and in the autumn was appointed director of the culture department under the military commander in France. When he was given leave in June 1942 and returned to his work of monument preservation and art protection in Bonn, his deputy Bernhard von Tieschowitz was named his successor.⁶⁴

Wolff Metternich had influence over the recruitment of staff for the Kunstschutz in France, and for this he turned to his colleagues from the Rhineland. Felix Kuetgens (1890–1976) was appointed director of the Kunstschutz office in Paris on 1 August 1940. Subordinated to him were Hans Hörmann (1894–1985), who was based in St Germain and responsible for Northern France; Josef Busley (1888–1969), based in Angers and responsible for Western France; Walther Zimmermann (1902–1961), based in Dijon and responsible for Eastern France; and later Hans Möbius (1895–1977), based in Lyon and responsible for Southern France, and Hermann Bunjes (1911–1945) in the office for the metropolitan area of Paris. Kuetgens’s staff in Paris were Carlheinz Pfitzner (1908–1944) and Wend Graf von Kalnein (1914–2007). The Culture Group also comprised the departments for education (Reiprich; first name, birth and death dates unknown), Bibliotheksschutz (Hermann Fuchs), Archivschutz (Georg Schnath), and archaeology (Eduard Neuffer).⁶⁵

In Belgium, Heinz Rudolf Rosemann (1900–1977) was director of the Kunstschutz office. His staff were Henry Koehn (1892–1963), Wolfgang Kroenig (1904–1992), and Joachim Wolfgang von Moltke (1909–2002). The office for prehistory and archaeology, established in 1941, was headed by Joachim Werner (1909–1994). In Serbia, Johann Albrecht von Reiszitz (1899–1962) was responsible for a group for Kunstschutz, archaeology, and prehistory from the summer of 1941. In Greece, Hans Ulrich von Schoenebeck (1904–1944) was appointed director of the Kunstschutz group in February 1941; Wilhelm Kraiker (1899–1987) acted as its expert advisor from October 1941 (he became its director in July 1942); and Ernst Kirsten (1911–1987) and Ulf Jantzen (1909–2000) were temporary research assistants. When the Kunstschutz department in Italy was established in 1943, Alexander Langsdorff was appointed its director and Hans Gerhard Evers (1900–1993) its expert advisor. Gustav André (1900–1989), Hans Adalbert von Stockhausen (1874–1942), and Richard Hamann-Mac Lean (1908–2000) formed the art historical research group for photographic campaigns, joined occasionally by Reinhold Strenger (1903–after 1966) and Günther Schiedlausky (1907–2003), who was also involved in the ERR.

The duties of the Kunstschutz officers differed in each occupied zone, partly depending on their own research interests, but also as a result of the varying degrees of influence exercised by other local Nazi institutions. According to Wolff Metternich’s understanding of art

64 NL FGWM no. 53, “Abschließender Bericht über die Arbeit des Kunstschutzbeauftragten in der Zeit von Mai 1940–September 1944”.

65 NL FGWM no. 240, documents concerning the establishment of the Kunstschutz, including correspondence between Robert Hiecke and Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich. See also NL FGWM no. 48, letter from Wolff Metternich to Paul Clemen of 22 July 1940 concerning the organisation and staffing of the Kunstschutz and the intended selection of additional personnel.

protection, which was based on previous Kunstschutz work during the First World War, the provisions of the Hague Convention, and his own experience of monument preservation in the Rhineland, the principal duties of the Kunstschutz were as follows:

- to protect architectural monuments and historical residences,
- to supervise static artworks,
- to protect museums and public collections,
- to protect movable artworks,
- to monitor artistic life, and
- to carry out academic research.

More specifically, this included protecting the storage facilities of state museums, preventing billeting, overseeing depots and providing them with staff and equipment, and working with the French authorities and monument preservation office, for example equipping and authorising staff. The Kunstschutz's day-to-day work also involved issuing quartering prohibitions for historically significant buildings and educating troops about valuable furnishings and how to use them appropriately without damaging them. Responsibility for the protection of privately owned art became a point of contention with the ERR, and it was removed from the Kunstschutz's jurisdiction very early on. The Kunstschutz was also in charge of reconstruction work and the return to normal life (including the reopening of the Louvre), which was undertaken in large part for propaganda purposes. The occupiers also made the most of new opportunities for research and access to previously inaccessible material. An "Art History Taskforce" was created within the OKH, comprising Richard Hamann (1879–1961) at the University of Marburg and Alfred Stange (1894–1968) at the University of Bonn, and with financial and material support from the REM. Its activities included photographic documentation, lectures, publications, and excursions in the occupied zones. This was a precursor to the establishment of the Kunsthistorische Forschungsstätte (Research Institute for Art History, henceforth KHF) in Paris at the beginning of 1942.

At the department's peak at the beginning of 1942, the Kunstschutz's staff included twenty-eight military administration officials and a driver (Josef Bauch, birth and death dates unknown), as well as a dedicated typist within the military administration and another within the OKH: Gisela Günther (known as Gigü, birth and death dates unknown) and Margarethe Schmidt (known as Schmidt'chen, birth and death dates unknown). There were also twenty-four officers and non-commissioned officers assigned to the Kunstschutz for special missions. In total, therefore, there were up to fifty-four people working for the Kunstschutz in the occupied zones, not including civilian support staff and e.g. the various French specialists who were sporadically involved in the missions. Significant reductions were implemented later on due to the amount of work already completed, a desire for smoother processes, and the overall cutback on staff levels during the eastern campaigns. However, this reduction in staff numbers in 1942 caused increasing difficulties following the expansion of the Kunstschutz's jurisdiction to include Southern France and because of Allied and French

Résistance attacks. The addition of Italy to its responsibilities in 1943 only exacerbated the problem. As the troops retreated, the Kunstschutz officers remaining in France stressed the growing urgency of the situation on the one hand, and the fact that the protective measures were untenable on the other.⁶⁶

Wolff Metternich's freedom to organise "his" staff within the military administrations as he wished, which he did primarily by turning to his existing professional relationships in the Rhineland, shows once again how important it is to look more closely at these actors—individually and as a collective—in order to understand the larger processes and connections at work. For that reason, the network of individuals mentioned in this volume is illustrated by brief biographies and institutional descriptions.⁶⁷

The relationships between teachers and students are also interesting, as are the parallels between the First and Second World Wars in terms of the continuity of people and activities among groups of colleagues from Berlin and the Rhineland. One obvious example is the way Wolff Metternich succeeded his teacher Paul Clemen as Kunstschutz representative. Josef Busley has also been a student and assistant of Clemen and worked with the Kunstschutz in occupied France from the autumn of 1940. Richard Hamann had participated in photographic campaigns in the occupied zones during the First World War and coordinated them during the Second World War. Some of his students, including Bernhard von Tieschowitz, also worked with the Kunstschutz or on the photographic campaigns. This student-teacher filiation can be seen in numerous cases and can be explained in part by the natural process of seniority and occupational career succession. It does, however, also raise questions about the degree of mutual influence and academic emulation that was involved, as well as to what extent relationships unravelled as a result of new opportunities or students turning away from former role models.⁶⁸ Although Kunstschutz personnel were not bound to the Kunstschutz representative by military command, previous connections that existed due to studies or work mostly resulted in loyalty towards their former teachers and colleagues, not least out of gratitude that their work with the Kunstschutz meant they avoided being sent to the front.

The historical development of monument preservation is relevant to the Kunstschutz not just because of the network of individuals involved, but also their intertwining spheres of activity. Paul Clemen coined the term "Kriegsdenkmalpflege" (wartime monument preservation), and his successors Edmund Renard (1871–1932) and Wolff Metternich were also renowned figures in monument preservation. They often occupied multiple leadership positions simultaneously and were very influential. It is also important not to underestimate the impact of Nazi ideology, with its intense interest in nationally significant cultural assets and Heimatpflege (the preservation and promotion of national and regional values and traditions), on the development of monument preservation in the Rhineland and throughout

66 See footnote in the German version of the introduction.

67 See short biographies and information about institutions in this volume.

68 See footnote in the German version of the introduction.

Germany. Wartime monument preservation and Kunstschutz can be seen as two mutually stimulating fields, with significant wartime advances in practical monument preservation techniques, such as protective measures and relocations. These developments sparked the creation of monument preservation institutions modelled on prior Kunstschutz measures in some of the occupied countries.⁶⁹

Until the middle of the 1990s, the individuals and activities of the Kunstschutz were discussed in rather hagiographic terms. Dazzling personalities like Clemen and Wolff Metternich were seen as flawless heroes who dedicated themselves selflessly to cultural heritage. Since then, however, attitudes towards the Kunstschutz have become more critical. Recent studies of the organisation's relationship to propaganda and "Westforschung", a study by German scholars of the areas to the country's immediate west which sought to scientifically prove German cultural superiority, have questioned the self-representation of those involved as having a purely academic calling or being engaged in altruistic work far removed from ideology.⁷⁰ The extent to which this portrayal was fuelled by the deliberate destruction or concealment of files and documents remains an open question at this point.

5. Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich (1893–1978)⁷¹

Franziskus (Franz) Graf Wolff Metternich was born on 31 December 1893 in Haus Beck, Westphalia. He was the tenth child and fourth and youngest son of Ferdinand Graf Wolff Metternich zur Gracht (1845–1938) and Flaminia, Princess of Salm-Salm (1853–1913). He spent his childhood in Schloss Gracht, Cologne, and was deeply influenced by his family's Catholicism. He joined the Rhenish-Westphalian Genossenschaft der Malteserritter (Association of the Knights of Malta) as a knight of the order in 1915, and was appointed to the board in 1931, a role he retained until the 1960s. As a consequence, he naturally developed close ties to the highest-ranking clergy of the Rhineland.

After graduating from the secondary school in Brühl, he went to the University of Bonn to study art history under Paul Clemen. When the First World War broke out, he was drafted into the Bonn Hussar Regiment and underwent intensive military training. He was severely wounded in the neck by shrapnel, but his military service did not end until September 1919.

After finishing his military service, he returned to his art history studies in Bonn. During his time as an undergraduate and then PhD student, he travelled throughout Europe and spent several months conducting research in Rome. He completed his doctorate at the University of Bonn in 1923 with a thesis on the emergence of the Renaissance style in Rhenish architecture: "Die spätgotische Loggia zu Binsfeld, eine stilkritische Studie zur niederrheinischen

69 Ibid.

70 Ibid.

71 Ibid.

Profanarchitektur im letzten Viertel des 15. und im ersten Viertel des 16. Jahrhunderts” (The late Gothic loggia in Binsfeld: a critical study of the secular architectural style of the Lower Rhine in the last quarter of the fifteenth and the first quarter of the sixteenth century). In 1925, he married Alix Freiin von Fürstenberg (1900–1991). They had four children: Johann Adolf, known as Hanno (1926–1995), Winfried (1928–2017), Theresia (born in 1930), and Antonius (born in 1933).

In 1926, Wolff Metternich joined the Rhineland Provincial Administration as an academic assistant to the provincial conservator, Edmund Renard. In 1928, thanks to the influential advocacy of the Rhineland clergy, he was appointed as provincial conservator and continued in that role until 1950. The University of Bonn gave him a teaching position in 1933 and an honorary professorship in monument preservation and Rhenish art in 1940. On 1 May 1933, after consulting with clerical circles, he joined the Nazi Party.

He maintained a lifelong connection to his academic and professional mentor Paul Clemen, the first provincial conservator of the Rhineland Province from 1893 to 1911. This was reflected in their frequent correspondence, particularly on the topic of wartime monument preservation and art protection: Clemen had worked in the Kunstschutz during the First World War, and Wolff Metternich was inspired by his commitment to (wartime) monument preservation. Wolff Metternich was briefly conscripted at the start of the Second World War, but was shortly afterwards released from active duty by the Prussian state conservator, Robert Hiecke (1876–1952), who worked at the REM, so that he could help rescue and protect movable artworks in the Rhineland. On Hiecke’s initiative, he was appointed as Kunstschutz representative and given responsibility for preventing war damage to artistically and historically significant buildings, monuments, and movable artworks in the occupied zones and was sent to German-occupied Brussels in May 1940. In the summer of that year he moved to Paris. To that end, he drafted the “Verordnung über die Erhaltung von Kunstschatzen im besetzten Gebiet Frankreich vom 15. Juli 1940” (Ordinance of 15 July 1940, concerning the preservation of artistic treasures in the occupied territories of France), which was published in the “Verordnungsblatt für die besetzten französischen Gebiete” (Ordinance Gazette for the Occupied Territories of France). While writing it, he drew on Clemen’s earlier work and on the 1907 Hague Convention’s provisions regarding the protection of cultural assets in armed conflicts. He was determined to act solely as a protector of state art collections, which he saw as part of the cultural heritage of humankind. His consistent opposition to the haphazard looting of state museums, his *clearly Francophile tendencies that are not in keeping with the interests of the Reich*⁷² (fostered not least by his personal connections to French nobles, leading Catholics, and the Knights of Malta), and his insufficiently ambitious efforts to reclaim German art stolen by Napoleon quickly brought him into conflict with agencies and individuals engaged in the systematic looting of art: the Reichsleiter Rosenberg

72 NL FGWM, no. 153, Sicherheitspolizei and Sicherheitsdienst report on Wolff Metternich of 20 April 1943.

Taskforce; the German ambassador in Paris, Otto Abetz; and Reichsmarschall Hermann Göring (1893–1946). Wolff Metternich was able to work within the restrictive framework of the OKH and with the help of an efficient network of loyal staff in each of the military administrations for two years, after which point the Kunstschutz was increasingly depleted. He was put on leave of absence in June 1942 and finally discharged in October 1943. Back in the Rhineland, he turned himself to the task of protecting the art of the region. He continued to offer advice to his like-minded deputy and successor in Paris, Bernhard von Tieschowitz, who kept him informed about the activities and evolution of the Kunstschutz in the occupied zones.

Wolff Metternich was director of the Amt für Denkmalpflege in the Rhineland from 1928. The first part of his tenure was characterised by contradiction: financial troubles during the difficult crisis years were followed by the Nazi period, with its job creation scheme, increased funding, and growing interest in nationally significant cultural assets and creating a national canon of “Germanic” values and traditions. The first steps to evacuate and protect artworks in the Rhineland were taken in 1939. In Wolff Metternich’s absence, his duties were carried out by the district conservators and especially by his deputy, the provincial buildings officer Theodor Wildeman (1885–1962). The Archivberatungsstelle der Rheinprovinz (Rhineland archival advisory board) under Wilhelm Kisky (1881–1953) also played an important role in coordinating storage sites and relocations. As bombing raids grew more frequent, however, Wolff Metternich’s presence was urgently required. In summer 1942, he returned to Bonn and resumed his work there while maintaining close contact with the Kunstschutz in the occupied zones via von Tieschowitz.

Thanks in part to his service in the Kunstschutz and his international renown, but especially his professional expertise and the urgent need to repatriate relocated works of art, Wolff Metternich was quickly exonerated after the war and was able to resume his work as provincial conservator (later conservator of the German Federal State North-Rhine Westphalia). The director of the French Musées nationaux, Jacques Jaujard, had already vouched for him in 1945. He also maintained what were sometimes lifelong connections to several art protection officers from the Allied MFA&A programme, which was set up to search for art that had been stolen by the Nazis. Because of his Nazi Party membership, it was not until April 1948 that he completed the final stage of his denazification and was officially placed in category V, “persons exonerated”.

His position and his academic and professional networks made him suited for assuming a diplomatic role in isolated postwar Germany. From December 1950 until the end of 1952, he was the director of the science office in the culture department of the Auswärtiges Amt. The Bibliotheca Hertziana in Rome was officially reopened in October 1953 as the Max Planck Institute for Art History, with Wolff Metternich as its director. He continued his research into St Peter’s Basilica in Rome until 1968, well after his retirement in 1962. During this period, he was a member of the Institute’s board of trustees. On 2 January 1964, two days after his seventieth birthday, Wolff Metternich was awarded the Légion d’Honneur (Legion

of Honour) on behalf of French President Charles de Gaulle (1890–1970) in recognition of his service to art protection. In 1968, he returned with his family to the Rhineland, where he spent his time cultivating his contacts there and continued to act as an expert advisor on matters of monument preservation. Together with his former colleagues, he spent several decades pushing for the production of a white paper about the Kunstschutz. Wolff Metternich died at the age of eighty-four on 25 May 1978.

His professional status, his relationship to the church, his connections to the nobility, his own self-perception, and the way he portrayed the Kunstschutz as a service on behalf of the overriding cultural heritage of humankind, all contributed to the rather hagiographical way he has been perceived until now. This afterlife persists to some extent in current research; the newly available sources in NL FGWM are sure to provide novel insights.

6. Core Holdings of the FGWM Nachlass

The Nachlass of Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich is part of the family archives of the Grafen Wolff Metternich zur Gracht. The holdings contain Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich's private, professional, and academic documents.

The holdings contain more than five hundred reference numbers organised in approximately one hundred and fifty boxes. Almost two hundred of these descriptive units are of exclusively private provenance. These include documents, letters, and family photograph albums, mostly belonging to his parents and parents-in-law as well as to his wife and children. Almost one hundred other units are of exclusively professional provenance, comprising assorted documents from Wolff Metternich's career with no relation to his activities during the Second World War. Around two hundred files in the Nachlass are of interest for research into the Kunstschutz during the Second World War. Half originate directly in the activities of the Kunstschutz and its members; the other half are related to Wolff Metternich and Bernhard von Tieschowitz's private and professional affairs or to the reception of the Kunstschutz's activities. The archival items that relate to the Kunstschutz include service files and personal reference files for staff members, private correspondence, and images. There is also a significant section of Wolff Metternich's academic library.

When the Nachlass was catalogued, it was divided into five sub-holdings defined by file creator and thematic focus. The description of the holdings that follows is based on these categories:

- I. Family, personal, property
- II. Military Kunstschutz
- III. Files from Wolff Metternich's deputy and successor in the Kunstschutz, Bernhard von Tieschowitz
- IV. Reception of the Kunstschutz concept
- V. Kunstschutz research carried out by Wolff Metternich's sons.

I. Family, personal, property

The largest sub-holding, containing files relating to the family, the family's home and other properties, personal events, correspondence, and photograph albums, is grouped with dossiers relating to his parents' generation and family finances and arranged chronologically following Wolff Metternich's life stages. The sources in this sub-holding are almost exclusively private in nature and include many documents relating to Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich's parents and his wife, Alix Freiin von Fürstenberg, as well as to the family's asset management. These documents offer insight into the noble family's ties, its property, and the lively exchanges between family members. They reveal Wolff Metternich's noble upbringing, Catholic influences, Francophile tendencies, and early inclination towards art and culture, as well as his academic ambition and professional dedication.

Among the documents relating to Wolff Metternich's career, his private and academic correspondence is a particularly interesting peripheral area that supplements the Kunstschutz's institutional files. It clearly shows the overlap between his work as Kunstschutz representative and as provincial conservator, and, even more so, the letters, photographs, and notes demonstrate just how blurred the boundary between his private and professional lives was. His journals, pocket diaries, and Wehrpass (military identity card) are particularly valuable sources for reconstructing the Kunstschutz's chronological development and personal networks. There are also fascinating complementary sources in the form of his correspondence with professional and academic colleagues from after the Nazi period and the Second World War, especially on the subjects of denazification and the reception of the Kunstschutz. These documents, particularly certificates of exoneration and character references, paint an extremely one-sided and flattering picture. They emphasise the positive aspects of the protection of cultural assets while making a clear distinction between it and Nazi art looting.

II. Military Kunstschutz

The military Kunstschutz files in NL FGWM are of official and mixed private/official origin. Wolff Metternich and his colleagues created reference files containing additional details to supplement the information in the service files. These reference files include private correspondence, duplicates, publications, and newspaper articles. The files are divided into sub-groups corresponding to areas of responsibility, defined either by content or location (state or district). There is, however, some overlap in the content of descriptive units, which are also supplemented by letters in the personal records of Wolff Metternich and von Tieschowitz.

Sub-holding II contains seventy-eight files from the institutional context of the Kunstschutz. They were assembled by Bernhard von Tieschowitz and Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich and sent to Bonn before August 1944. The configuration of the sub-holding reflects the administrative structure of the respective occupied countries, as well as the

jurisdiction and structure of the Kunstschutz. These files represent the core of the archival inventory, with a focus on France.

Letters, reports, and commands from the military authorities are part of the holdings relating to the Kunstschutz in France, but they also cover a wider range of topics, such as French legislation and the administration of the occupied zones.⁷³ Of particular interest are the letters, regulations, and commands issued by the *Verwaltungsstab* of the military commander in occupied France regarding the organisation, staffing, equipment, and legal aspects of the administration, as well as discussions and situation reports from the various *Verwaltungsstab* groups. There are also files documenting the use of French prisoners of war for cultural activities and the Kunstschutz.

The legal frameworks include guidelines and ordinances for the protection of artistic monuments and valuable buildings, as well as letters and orders concerning the export of high-value art objects; these are an important source of information on the Kunstschutz's areas of responsibility and procedures.

The organisational documents are particularly helpful for understanding the Kunstschutz in France, especially several letters about the establishment of the organisation in May/June 1940 and a report by Wolff Metternich on its structure and bureaus. The start of the Kunstschutz in France is documented in letters discussing the authority and involvement of the *Feldkommandatur*s, personnel issues, group photographs, information on preparation and equipment procurement for photographic campaigns, travel authorisation requests, activity reports, and correspondence between the Kunstschutz and the French monument preservation service. A summary of the Kunstschutz's activities as understood by Wolff Metternich and his colleagues can be found in Wolff Metternich's final report on his work as Kunstschutz representative from May 1940 to September 1944, preserved in both draft and finalised versions, and his report on his work as OKH representative for the protection of fine art (1940–1942), and the attachments to those reports.

Propaganda material, lectures, specialist works in the form of various publications and lecture transcripts, letters, press articles, and reports are all evidence of the Kunstschutz's "PR work" and its use for both academic and propaganda purposes.

The files relating to Belgium and the Netherlands include texts, photographs, and plans for reconstruction and urban planning in Belgium and France; travel reports and letters about the Netherlands and the Kunstschutz in Belgium, including an activity report on the "Glockenaktion" ("the church bell operation") of 1944,⁷⁴ and relocation lists of paintings from the Museum of Fine Arts in Ghent (1940), etc. These files demonstrate the overlap between the different Kunstschutz branches and their records in the *Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich Nachlass*.

⁷³ See footnote in the German version of the introduction.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

The dossier relating to France contains forty-four files and thus represents the focal point of the Kunstschutz sources in NL FGWM. It is subdivided into four categories:

- 6.1 General letters, orders, and maps
- 6.2 General reports (travel reports, situation reports, and summary reports)
- 6.3 Artistic monuments and historically significant buildings
- 6.4 Movable art objects, archival and library holdings, and their storage locations.

These wide-ranging documents reveal the filing structure and so the range of activities of the Kunstschutz in France. Alongside general organisational documents and internal correspondence, they are mainly activity and travel reports. Documents concerning artistic monuments and historically significant buildings are systematically ordered by military administration district, mainly District A. They include inspection reports and assessments by local French specialists, as well as some photographs and letters from private individuals asking the Kunstschutz to protect their castles and collections. Castles and buildings deemed worthy of protection are marked on the maps and were fitted with warning signs, some of which are also contained in this dossier, declaring a partial or full prohibition against billeting troops there. There is also evidence of cooperation with the French authorities, for example in the shared desire to protect the storage facilities of French state museums and to review holdings on the basis of inventory lists.

The Kunstschutz's shared interests and cooperation with the Archivschutz and Bibliotheksschutz divisions can also be identified. Less common are documents relating to the "safeguarding" of movable art objects, such as the "Geheimakte Bunjes" (Bunjes secret file).

The individual reports and letters, organised by military district (A/B/C) and département, comprise twenty-four files, including reports, images, maps, and letters discussing the condition, contents, and troop-billeting prohibitions of buildings, monuments, and castles worthy of protection in the military administration districts, all arranged alphabetically by city. There are documents on the following districts and letters:

- District A: letters A, B, Ca–Ce, F, G, H, J, L, Ma, Me, Mo, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, Va–Vers, Vert–Vo, W, Y
- District B: letters A, B, T–Z
- District C: letters M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V
- District Bordeaux: letters Ch–E.

The Southern France dossier, which begins in 1942, contains documents relating to the establishment of the Kunstschutz in previously unoccupied Southern France. It includes travel reports, and lists of museums and artistic monuments in the newly occupied zones ordered by French départements, and later individual reports and letters about monuments and castles in Southern France, arranged alphabetically by city (letters I–Z). There are also a few documents concerning the inventorying of art objects that were previously the property of Jewish French citizens. The dossier's papers document the expansion of the French

Kunstschutz branch into Southern France at the end of 1942, thanks in part to the planning and travels of Bernhard von Tieschowitz. Letters and reports about castles and monuments provide information about the subsequent day-to-day operation of the Kunstschutz.

The Italy dossier includes documents about Wolff Metternich's and von Tieschowitz's study trip to Italy, including their plans, travel expenses, and Wolff Metternich's travel report. It contains details of journeys undertaken by Kunstschutz personnel, revealing the connections between Kunstschutz activities and academic research.

The descriptive units in the Greece dossier contain reports and letters about the Kunstschutz in Greece, including those of Bernhard von Tieschowitz and Hans-Ulrich von Schoenebeck, as well as documents relating to publications and printed "Merkblätter für den deutschen Soldaten an den geschichtlichen Stätten Griechenlands" (Numbers 1–20; Information booklets about Greece's historical sites for the German soldier). These booklets convey both the relationship between the Kunstschutz in Greece and the Kunstschutz representative and his deputy and successor, and the Kunstschutz's educational duties.

Serbia, the Baltic, Russia, and Egypt feature in files relating to Kunstschutz branches in other occupied countries as well as planned projects. The letters and reports about Kunstschutz measures in the Baltic include Richard Hamann's final report on the photographic inventory of Baltic-German monuments, carried out in 1940. The files relating to the Kunstschutz in Russia and the Baltic include Reinhold Strenger's reports on the condition of monuments, as well as relocation lists and city maps, correspondence with academics, and museum catalogues. There are also Wolff Metternich's and von Tieschowitz's letters with Johann Albrecht von Reischwitz regarding the establishment of a Kunstschutz branch in Serbia, as well as documents concerning a planned Kunstschutz branch in Egypt and in the "Orient".

There is one file of reports and correspondence relating to the prehistory and archaeology office under the military commander in France. It also contains activity reports, mostly written by Eduard Neuffer, including the group's final evaluation report for the period from 1940 to 1944.

There are letters, lists, photographs, and press reports regarding the repatriation of German art, archival material, and library items that had been taken to Paris by Napoleon. These include transcripts and documents relating to the appointment of the art historian Otto Kummel (1874–1952) as the person responsible for systematically listing artworks stolen by Napoleon and repatriating them to Germany. This work was carried out with the cooperation of the Kunstschutz office in the military administration in France, especially in the early stages of the process in 1940/1941. Communication between the Kunstschutz office and German museums about the repatriated artworks was largely the responsibility of the archaeologist Hans Möbius (1895–1977).

III. Files from Wolff Metternich's Deputy and Successor in the Kunstschutz, Bernhard von Tieschowitz

Wolff Metternich's deputy and then successor was the graduated art historian Bernhard von Tieschowitz. He had previously worked in the Bildarchiv Foto Marburg (photographic department of the University of Marburg's Institute for Art History, an image library), first as a photographer and assistant and then from 1929 as director of the photography department, succeeding Richard Hamann. In 1936, he changed roles to become academic assistant to the provincial conservator, Wolff Metternich. The two men developed a close and trusting relationship that became a lifelong friendship. Sub-holding III contains files from von Tieschowitz's personal papers. The documents were presumably sent to Wolff Metternich by his widow, Lisl von Tieschowitz (1903–1982), after his death. They are mostly documents relating to von Tieschowitz's time in the Kunstschutz during the Second World War, the period immediately after the war and his denazification, and his work with the Auswärtiges Amt (1950–1952). They are divided into three dossiers:

1. Personal (denazification)
2. Kunstschutz
3. Auswärtiges Amt.

Bernhard von Tieschowitz's personal documents are extremely important sources of information about the Kunstschutz, particularly in France and Italy, and specifically in relation to the rescue of cultural assets at Monte Cassino (1943) and the impact and portrayal of the destruction of the monastery. As well as letters, denazification documents, and documents relating to the reception of the Kunstschutz from his time at the Auswärtiges Amt, von Tieschowitz's pocket diaries from 1940 to 1944 are especially informative about the Kunstschutz's chronological development and personal networks. Invitations to exhibitions in Parisian galleries and museums provide useful background information about the cultural networks of occupied Paris. His personal working documents from his time in the culture department at the Auswärtiges Amt demonstrate his commitment to ensuring German cultural institutes in Italy could reopen and operate autonomously. These files also contain documents about the establishment and management of the Auswärtiges Amt's TvK, a special department responsible for handling the objects at the allied Central Collecting Points on a fiduciary basis. This concerned mostly cultural assets confiscated as a result of Nazi persecution or objects previously owned by the regime.

IV. Reception of the Kunstschutz Concept

This sub-holding comprises twelve files containing documents from the postwar period relating to the Kunstschutz. It also contains correspondence between former Kunstschutz

personnel discussing the reception of the Kunstschutz's activities in the formerly occupied zones and opinions about a planned reappraisal of those activities in the form of a white paper.

In the decades after the war, Wolff Metternich and, after his death in 1978, his sons continued to work on the Kunstschutz files he had brought home with him, and added more recent newspaper articles and letters. Even in his private archive, Wolff Metternich always maintained the meticulous file management system he had adopted during his service: he noted when letters had been received and when and how they were answered. He also instructed his secretary to either create a new file for each letter or to add it "to the Kunstschutz files."

This sub-holding is divided into three dossiers:

1. The Kunstschutz concept
2. Correspondence with the Monuments Men and other colleagues (private/official)
3. Search for and restitution of looted art.

Of particular interest are the letters and opinions exchanged between the former Kunstschutz personnel and their international counterparts.

Assorted press articles and publications about the Kunstschutz during the Second World War and letters, statements, and reports by former Kunstschutz personnel once again demonstrate how positively the Kunstschutz concept was received or represented. Critical opinions were analysed intensively in letters between former Kunstschutz personnel, while the Kunstschutz's positive and honourable aspects were praised. Calls for a planned white paper on the Kunstschutz (in Italy) grew louder throughout the 1950s and 1960s, and there was increasing international discussion about the whereabouts of Kunstschutz files that could serve as sources for the paper. The dossier also contains minutes of UNESCO conferences on the protection of historical and art historical sites, as well as extensive correspondence between Wolff Metternich and Paul Clemen on the subject of Kunstschutz, monument preservation, and reconstruction. Various documents, including letters from art protection officers at the MFA&A, notes about honours awarded to Wolff Metternich for his work, and letters from French agencies expressing congratulations at his reinstatement as provincial conservator after the war clearly show how Wolff Metternich's work as a Kunstschutz officer was staged and perceived.

The files concerning restitution and looted art principally comprise letters and press articles, as well as minutes of meetings, transcripts, publications, and statements regarding restitution demands and art looting in the occupied zones. Particularly interesting in this context are both the long-term impact of the Kunstschutz and the fact that Wolff Metternich was asked to act as a mediator or expert in international negotiations.

V. Kunstschutz Research Conducted by Wolff Metternich's Sons

Wolff Metternich's eldest son, Johann Adolf Graf Wolff Metternich, became trustee of the Nachlass in 1978. After his death in 1995, the trusteeship passed to Winfried Graf Wolff Metternich, who moved his father's Nachlass from Gut Fronhof in Junkersdorf, Cologne, where it had been stored for many years, to his own home in Bonn. There was a standing obligation to ensure other family members could access the Nachlass. Like Johann Adolf before him, Winfried had a keen interest in his father's work and achievements. He began to meticulously examine and sort the folders and bundles of files, some of which were still tied with their original string. Most of the files were arranged in chronological order. In 2012, research into the NL FGWM was conducted by the "Franconia" film crew in Berlin, during which the files were scanned over the course of several weeks, which resulted in disarray and the reorganisation of the archive. The making of this film ultimately led to the opening up of the NL FGWM. Winfried added copies of documents from other archives to the Nachlass through his own research, mostly with no information regarding provenance.

Sub-holding V comprises fourteen files containing assorted material relating to the reappraisal and analysis of Wolff Metternich's work. Most of the documents come from Johann Adolf's and Winfried's research into family history and the debate surrounding Wolff Metternich's service to the Kunstschutz, but there are also some of their own personal documents. Extensive material relating to the Kunstschutz, including copies from the NL FGWM or the Bundesarchiv and scans from the National Archives in the USA, particularly of sources from the holdings of the American Allied art protection officers, was also collected.

Partial Holding: Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich's Library

The partial holding "library" comprises books from Franziskus Graf Wolff Metternich's professional and academic career, predominantly on the topics of art history, art protection, history, archaeology, monument preservation, and other subjects of personal interest to him or his family members. Wolff Metternich's extensive academic library was originally located in the family home in Junkersdorf. When it was divided up after his death, some of it ended up in his grandson Paul's library in Bonn, from where the project collaborators were able to select items for the NL FGWM. The books added to the NL FGWM from the fragmented family library were chosen based on Wolff Metternich's academic and professional interests and activities. They fill forty-six archive boxes. The books selected were used in Wolff Metternich's work and demonstrate his primary interests and his connections to colleagues. Kunstschutz-related works include publications by his colleagues on the protection of cultural assets, as well as works from the postwar period on the reception and reappraisal of wartime art protection. These are supplemented by publications on war propaganda and special

editions of wartime lectures given at the University of Bonn. The monument preservation, history, and archaeology categories mostly comprise specialist publications, including many of Wolff Metternich's own publications, and special editions.⁷⁵

When, how, and why the Kunstschutz files came to be a part of Wolff Metternich's Nachlass can to some extent be reconstructed on the basis of information within the files themselves. The service files date mostly from 1940–1942/1943. Bernhard von Tieschowitz's pocket diaries document Wolff Metternich's visits to Paris, including after his suspension in 1942 and his discharge in 1943. Some entries refer to their collaborative effort to sort the files, as well as to the destruction of documents.⁷⁶ With Paris increasingly under threat and the German troops in retreat, it is presumably the service files deemed most useful for the purpose of documentation (Wolff Metternich added his pocket diaries and wartime correspondence in the awareness and hope that his role would subsequently be studied⁷⁷) that were sent to safety, while files still needed for the Kunstschutz's ongoing operation were kept in Paris. The Kunstschutz's service and reference files were thus sent to Wolff Metternich's and von Tieschowitz's offices in Bonn. There are several pieces of corroborating evidence showing that the files were stored in the Bonn monument preservation office.⁷⁸

In September 1944, Josef Busley was instructed to write a final report on the activities of the Kunstschutz in Southwest France from July 1940 to August 1944, "specifically on the basis of the files he himself had rescued and taken to Bonn".⁷⁹ Wolff Metternich was also ordered by the military administration in France, which was by then operating out of Germany, to write a final report on the Kunstschutz's activities. He used the files collected in Bonn as the basis of this report.⁸⁰

Since the monument preservation office was destroyed by heavy bombing in 1944/1945, the files from Paris, along with the monument preservation office's archives, must have already been stored in the cellar of Wolff Metternich's private residence on Blücherstraße. Otherwise they, too, could not have been preserved for posterity.⁸¹

The upcoming transfer of the files from the Denkmalpflegeamt to Wolff Metternich and von Tieschowitz is alluded to in letters contained in the Nachlass. For example, *bundles of war files* were sent from Bonn to von Tieschowitz. In October 1961, the *Paris war files* were sent to Hanno Graf Wolff Metternich. In November and December of the same year, von Tieschowitz inquired whether the files from Paris were still in the monument preservation

75 Ibid.

76 Ibid.

77 Ibid.

78 Ibid.

79 Ibid.

80 Ibid.

81 Ibid.

office, writing to the institution's expert consultant officer Hans Kisky (1920–1965) and Wolff Metternich. Kisky responded that Wolff Metternich had taken all the files with the intention of donating them to the Bundesarchiv. The Bundesarchiv was interested in the records as an exchange of letters shows; whether the archives of the Auswärtiges Amt would be a better *fit* for the files was also discussed. Wolff Metternich decided to keep the files in the interim as he was intending to contribute to a planned work on the Kunstschutz's activities during the war *conducted by authorities*.⁸²

Bernhard von Tieschowitz's pocket diaries, Kunstschutz files, and denazification documents seem to have been sent after his death to Wolff Metternich by his widow, Lisl von Tischowitz, as suggested by correspondence between the latter two. A comment on one of the letters states that Wolff Metternich returned several documents that she did not want to part from.⁸³

A few notes handwritten by von Tieschowitz provide information about the structure and history of the files: for example, his comment on the Italian documents *Italy 1943–1944 (Files found in the cellar of the monument preservation office in Bonn on 9 July 1947)*.⁸⁴ He also drew up a list on 29 July 1943 of the file bundles transferred, entitled *Files of the Kunstschutz representative at the OKH* and numbered from one to sixteen, presumably following a filing plan. An undated (probably subsequent) *overview of the Kunstschutz files in Bonn* has a similar structure, with eight subject areas.⁸⁵ The NL FGWM does not contain filing plans for the OKH or the military administration in France; it only has an overview of the files relating to Southern France.⁸⁶ More information could be obtained from the supplementary sources and from a structural and thematic classification of the files.

7. Supplementary Sources

During the research project, it became apparent that the supplementary sources to the Kunstschutz files in the Wolff Metternich Nachlass could be divided into the following categories.

FILES DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE KUNSTSCHUTZ, which were created either at the OKH or in the Kunstschutz departments of the military administration districts, can be found (other than in the NL FGWM) particularly in holding AJ 40 of the French Archives nationales, which contains files from the military administration in France with a focus on Greater Paris and Hermann Bunjes. Other individual sources of Kunstschutz

82 Ibid.

83 Ibid.

84 Ibid.

85 Ibid.

86 Ibid.

provenance⁸⁷ can also be found in the archives of the French départements, which contain documents concerning Kunstschutz measures taken by the various Feldkommandaturen. There are also a few Kunstschutz reference files focusing on District C (Dijon) and Walther Zimmermann in the archives of the LVR, in the holding for the culture department of the provincial administration. The Kunstschutz's direct output also includes images from the photographic campaigns which are held at the Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, and publications and reports by Kunstschutz personnel in various libraries.

THE FILES OF THE GERMAN MILITARY ADMINISTRATION are also relevant to the overall administration context. Besides the aforementioned holding AJ 40 in the French Archives nationales, these can also be found in the Freiburg military archives. Of interest here are the files of the military administrations in France and in Northern France and Belgium, as well as the files kept by the army and the Feldkommandanturen. These are in turn supplemented by holdings in the archives of the French départements.

Another source of information is the files of French government agencies that document the COOPERATION BETWEEN THE KUNSTSCHUTZ AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES. These are found above all in the archive holdings relating to the Musées nationaux in the French Archives nationales (AN 20144792). As well as information about the art protection measures taken by the directors of the French national museums themselves, they also contain information about art protection through joint operations like warehouse protection measures and related correspondence. The Médiathèque de l'architecture et du patrimoine (MAP) contains the archival holdings of the French artistic heritage relating to the administration of monument preservation as well as of La Demeure historique, an association of private owners of historical buildings, which corresponded with the Kunstschutz about the protection of architectural monuments and the prohibition against billeting troops in historically significant buildings. There is also evidence of cooperation between German and foreign agencies regarding the protection of art and cultural heritage in Belgium, specifically in the Archives générales du Royaume (National Archives of Belgium), the Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique (Royal Institute for Cultural Heritage), and the Centre d'Études et de Documentation Guerre et Société contemporaine (Center for Historical Research and Documentation on War and Contemporary Society). The Nationaal Archief of the Netherlands also contains files relating to the "Glockenaktion" and Kunstbescherming (art protection), although these files differ in terms of structure and content because the Netherlands was not under military administration.

The archival sources are also supplemented by the RECORDS OF THE KUNSTSCHUTZ'S PARTNER INSTITUTIONS, including the files of the Archivschutz in France, which are held in the Freiburg military archives, although the holding is of limited use because of severe water damage. There are also documents relating to the Bibliotheksschutz in the same location.

87 The provenance principle (from Latin "provenire", to come from) is a method of ordering and analysing archival material according to document origin, file creator, and original context.

References to the Kunsthistorische Forschungsstätte in Paris can be found in Hermann Bunjes's files in the French Archives nationales as well as in Alfred Stange's correspondence in the archives of the University of Bonn and the archives of the Kunsthistorisches Institut (art history institute) in Bonn. Files relating to the photographic campaigns in the occupied zones can be found in the institutional archives of the Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, though they are not sufficiently labeled yet.

The FILES OF NAZI BODIES AND INSTITUTIONS supplement Kunstschutz research by shedding light on how the Kunstschutz differed from art looting, as well as on the overlap and cooperation in terms of work and personnel between the Kunstschutz and other Nazi institutions. The political archives of the Auswärtiges Amt contain the records of the German embassy in Paris and of the Sonderkommando Künsberg. The Bundesarchiv in Berlin have holdings relating to the Rosenberg office (NS 8), the ERR (NS 30), the Nazi party membership card index, and the upper administrative levels of the Reich Ministry of Science, Education, and Culture.

The RECORDS OF THE MONUMENT PRESERVATION OFFICE AND THE REGIONAL KUNSTSCHUTZ ACTIVITIES dating from Wolff Metternich's time are also relevant to his work and wartime art protection. These are principally located in the archives of the LVR and consist of the holdings of the monument preservation office and provincial administration of the Rhineland. They include documents relating to rescue operations, air-raid and art protection; personnel files; and the register of archive consultants who worked with the Archivschutz during the Second World War. Other peripherally related files include the records of the administration of the Province of Prussia in the Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (Prussian Secret State Archives).

VARIOUS CULTURAL INSTITUTIONAL ARCHIVES document Wolff Metternich's and the Kunstschutz's connections to museums. Relevant items in these archives include Wolff Metternich's articles and publications on monument preservation, art air-raid protection, while academic connections can be seen clearly in correspondence about research in the occupied zones, which includes research inquiries or requests for material, e. g. images, to be used in research. Jointly organised research projects are also documented in the holdings of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Association) in the Bundesarchiv in Berlin. The purchase of art in occupied France and its export to the German Reich took place with the authorisation of the Kunstschutz, and evidence of this can be found in, for example, the Rheinisches Landesmuseum Bonn (Museum of the Rhineland Bonn) holdings in the archives of the LVR, the Nationalgalerie (national gallery) holdings in the central archives of the Staatliche Museen (state museums) in Berlin, and the institutional archives of the current Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum (art museum) in Aachen. Information about the Kunstschutz's involvement in the purchase and export of art from France can also be found in the archives of art dealers, for example the Hildebrand Gurlitt (1895–1956) Nachlass in the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz.

THE PRIVATE AND PROFESSIONAL NACHLÄSSE OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS of the Kunstschutz and related groups supplement the subjective personal accounts of those individuals and, like the NL FGWM, contain some reference files concerning their activity during the war. They are mainly stored in the archives of institutions to which the individuals concerned were connected, archives devoted to Nachlässe, or family archives. Two Nachlässe held in the Rhineland department of the North-Rhine Westphalia Landesarchiv (archive of the state NRW) in Duisburg are worth mentioning in this context: the Nachlass of Alois Becker, senior civil servant under the Oberpräsident (supreme representative of the Prussian province) of the Rhineland, and the Nachlass of Josef Busley, a Kunstschutz officer who was director of the culture and monument preservation department under the Landeshauptmann (governor) of the Rhineland from 1927 until his dismissal in 1933, then did work in Bonn inventorying the monuments, and after the war rejoined the Kultusministerium (Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs) in Düsseldorf. Some parts of the Josef Busley Nachlass are also held in the Rheinisches Archiv für Künstlernachlässe (Rhine Archive of Artists' Personal Papers) in Bonn. Also stored there is part of the Nachlass of the Kunstschutz officer Carlheinz Pfitzner. Partial or full Nachlässe of various colleagues, as well as the Bonn professors Paul Clemen and Alfred Stange, are held in the artists' archive at the Germanisches Nationalmuseum (Germanic National Museum) in Nuremberg. Part of the Clemen Nachlass (correspondence 1904–1948) is stored in the documentation department of the LVR-office for monument preservation in the Rhineland, in Pulheim-Brauweiler. The Ernst Zipfel Nachlass in the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz provides further information about the connection between the Kunstschutz and the Archivschutz. The Richard Hamann Nachlass in the Universitätsbibliothek (library of the University) in Marburg contains additional information about the photographic campaigns. The Johann Albrecht von Rechwitz Nachlass, some of which is held in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (Bavarian State Library) and some in the Archiv der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (archives of the LMU) in Munich (as well as some still kept by the family), offers further opportunities for research into the Kunstschutz in Serbia. The private family archives of the Kunstschutz officers Hans Gerhard Evers and Wend Graf von Kalnein contain additional information in personal records.

The Kunstschutz is also mentioned in the documents of various international institutions dealing with the INVESTIGATION INTO ART LOOTING AND RESTITUTION at the end of the war and the in postwar period. In German archives, these documents include files relating to restitution from the culture department and the TvK at the Auswärtiges Amt, which are held in the political archive of the Auswärtiges Amt. The Bundesarchiv in Koblenz also contains files from the TvK at the Oberfinanzdirektion (regional finance office) Munich and the holdings of the Institut für Besatzungsfragen. There are isolated references to the Kunstschutz in the investigation files from the Nuremberg trial, which are held in the Staatsarchiv Nürnberg (Nuremberg State Archive). The French Archives nationales hold files related to the postwar restitution and compensation process. The Archives diplomatiques (Diplomatic Archives) contain documents from the Commission de récupération artistique

(Artistic Recovery Commission), including extensive material relating to art looting and the repatriation of looted French cultural assets. In the USA, documents from the MFA&A units are held in the US National Archives. In particular, these include reports on institutions and actors—e. g. the Art Looting Intelligence Unit (ALIU) Reports 1945–1946 and ALIU Red Flag Names List and Index—connected with art looting in Italy and France, but also documents that shed light on American military art protection measures. The private Nachlässe of art protection officers are stored in various institutional archives. The UK National Archives also contain documents concerning cultural issues during the postwar period in the British occupation zone, which included parts of the Rhineland.

As for documents relating to WOLFF METTERNICH HIMSELF, in addition to the extensive NL FGWM, the aforementioned records relating to monument preservation in the archives of the LVR, and the files relating to his university connections in the archives of the University of Bonn and the archives of the Kunsthistorisches Institut, as well as in the political archive of the Auswärtiges Amt, there are also some interesting personnel files with information about Wolff Metternich's actions and professional posts in the archives of the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft (Max Planck Society) in Berlin and the archives of the Bibliotheca Hertziana in Rome.

From the postwar period, information about Kunstschutz activities comes particularly in the form of documents relating to the DENAZIFICATION OF FORMER KUNSTSCHUTZ PERSONNEL. The denazification files from the British occupation zone, including those of Wolff Metternich, von Tieschowitz, and Kuetgens, are held in the Rhineland section of the North-Rhine Westphalia Landesarchiv in Duisburg. They are supplemented by Kunstschutz officers' personnel files in various institutional archives. The apologias and statements of mutual exoneration, or indeed accusation, contain subjective information and shed light on networks. Yet, these documents must be considered in context and with a healthy amount of scepticism.

THE RECEPTION OF KUNSTSCHUTZ ACTIVITIES is also documented in archives, for example in letters in private Nachlässe or the institutional correspondence of former Kunstschutz personnel. Politically ambitious representations are recorded in the form of files relating to a planned white paper on the Kunstschutz in Italy, which are stored in the political archives of the Auswärtiges Amt. The personal accounts written by international art protection officers in various countries in the period directly after the war also contain information about their activities and networks. Newspaper articles from the war years and press coverage from the postwar period about the protection, destruction, looting, and restitution of artworks by or with the help of Kunstschutz personnel represent another source of information. Recent media such as children's books, novels, or films are also evidence of the Kunstschutz's international image and the public's perception of art protection in general.

This list can of course be expanded as needed, and is merely intended to identify the principal focal points. These holdings are discussed in more detail in the chapter dealing with archive and holding descriptions and the database.

8. Characteristics of the Records

The documents in the NL FGWM and the supplementary sources that relate directly to the Kunstschutz in France can be divided into several categories. For example, files that originated in the military administration districts can be separated from those that originated in the office of the Kunstschutz representative at the OKH. This facilitates document classification. The next step is to compare the structure of the filing plans with the records in the archives. Previously described fields of activity can thus be reconstructed, at least to some extent, based purely on the files. Above all, however, obvious gaps in the records can be identified and potential hypotheses can be formulated.

The classification roughly corresponds to the thematic categories discussed above:

1. Documents drafted at the OKH for and by Wolff Metternich or von Tieschowitz, especially reports from the military administration districts to the Kunstschutz representative at the OKH or documents about structuring and organisation;
2. Documents from the art/culture department at the military administration in Paris, mostly internal administrative files;
3. Documents from military administration districts A/B/C drafted by Kunstschutz personnel, especially inspection reports regarding the condition and security measures, etc., of monuments, cities, castles, warehouses;
4. Outgoing correspondence from the Kunstschutz to French agencies, etc.;
5. Personal notes, journals, and diaries of Kunstschutz personnel;
6. In the supplementary sources, correspondence of other Nazi institutions with the Kunstschutz;
7. In the French supplementary sources, correspondence of French agencies, particularly the *Musées nationaux*, with the Kunstschutz;
8. Documents from the postwar period relating to restitution that are relevant to the Kunstschutz; and
9. Documents from the postwar period relating to the denazification of Kunstschutz personnel.

The absence of ascription means it is not always clear which file donor the Kunstschutz's administrative and reference files should be assigned to. Nevertheless, file AJ 40/573 in the French Archives nationales contains undated but detailed filing plans for the Kunstschutz group at the military administration; there are two not-quite-identical versions, both with handwritten revisions, as well as an OKH filing plan.⁸⁸

The filing plan for the military administration area V 1/2 Kunstschutz is ordered by topic (Roman numerals), section (Arabic numerals), and name:

88 AN AJ 40/573, dossier 1, Kunstschutz (Groupe de protection des œuvres d'art) auprès de l'OKH. Plan de classement des documents du service.

- o* *Kunstschutz*
o-0 *General*
o-1 *Internal administration, office affairs*
o-2 *Ordinances*
o-3 *Activity of Group V 1/2 (Kunstschutz)*
o-4 *Castle protection (general provisions)*
I *Kunstschutz in the outer districts*
I-0 *District A correspondence and District A individual reports for letters A, B, C, D-G, H-L, M-Q, R-S, T-Z*
I-1 *District B correspondence and District B individual reports for letters A-C, D-Q, R-Z*
I-2 *District C correspondence and District C individual reports for letters A-L, M-Z*
I-3 *Paris correspondence and Paris individual reports*
I-4 *Belgium and Northern France*
II *Prehistory and archaeology*
III *Movable artworks*
III-0 *Storage facilities correspondence and storage facilities individual reports for letters A-C and D-Z, also storage facilities [illegible]*
III-1 *Messages related to the Ordinance of 15 July 1940*
III-2 *Repatriation*
III-2 a *ERR*
III-2 b *Devisenschutzkommando [Foreign Exchange Protection Commando]*
III-2 c *Safeguarding operations*
III-2 d *Military museum*
III-3 *Alsace—Lorraine*
III-4 *Art trade (alphabetical)*
III-5 *Art trade general*
III-6 *[?] museum*
IV *Victory and hate monuments*
V *Metal collection (general provisions, monuments, bells)*
VI *Passports, endorsements*
VI-0 *Passports*
VI-1 *Permit requests for letters A-D, E-M, N-Z*
VI-2 *Control sheets*
VI-3 *Prisoners of war*
VII *Academic publications*
VIII *Miscellaneous*
VIII-0 *Correspondence with Germany [lit. Heimat, homeland].*

The filing plan for the Kunstschutz at the OKH shows a higher-level structure:

- 1) *General*
 - 2) *Orders, ordinances*
 - 3) *Personnel*
 - 4) *Movable artworks*
 - 5) *Reports Belgium*
 - 6) *Belgium general*
 - 7 a) *Reports France A*
 - 7 b) *Reports France A*
 - 7 c) *Reports France B*
 - 7 d) *Reports France C*
 - 7 f) *Reports France (general situation and special reports)*
 - 8) *France general*
 - 9) *Holland*
 - 10) *Germany [lit. Heimat, homeland]*
 - 11) *Summary reports to OKH Gen. Qu.*
 - 12) *Archaeology*
 - 13) *Cars (including photographic campaigns)*
 - 14) *Southern France*
 - 15) *Italy*
 - 16) *Newspaper clippings*
 - 17) *Academic campaigns*
 - 19) *Kunsthistorisches Institut [art history institute]*
 - 20) *Southeast (Greece)*
 - 20 a) *Southeast (Egypt, Serbia)*
 - 21) *East (Russia)*
- Special files Group 7 (finalised).*

The file NL FGWM, no. 141, which contains correspondence, situation and travel reports on the Kunstschutz in Southern France and lists of storage facilities (December 1942–June 1944), is presumably part of the extant OKH files: no. 14) *Southern France*. It also contains a filing plan, according to which part of the file is categorised as follows:⁸⁹

- 1.) *General. Correspondence with German agencies and the French about general matters, including art trade.*
- 2.) *Orders (fundamental), organisation, internal operations.*
- 3.) *Reports. Activity, travel, and situation reports, general overviews, lists of exempted buildings.*
- 4.) *Storage facilities and museums.*

89 NL FGWM, no. 141, including filing plan, Kommandant des Heeresgebietes Südfrankreich Qu/Kult, August 1943.

- a.) *General correspondence,*
- b.) *Individual objects in alphabetical order.*
- 5.) *Individual objects (immovable and movable artistic monuments).*
 - a.) *General correspondence,*
 - b.) *Individual objects ordered by département.*
- 6.) *Italian occupied zone.*

The question raised by this filing plan is not so much which aspects can, unfortunately, not be covered in this inventory, but rather which sub-items are in fact documented. Judging by the nature of the files and the handwritten comments on the documents, it can at least be assumed that the documents in the NL FGWM are taken from the records of the Kunstschutz office at the OKH. This corroborates the theory that the files were selected by Wolff Metternich and von Tieschowitz and sent to Bonn. A list by von Tieschowitz of the file bundles sent, Nos. 1–16, entitled *Files of the Kunstschutz representative at the OKH* and dated 29 July 1943 provides further support for the idea that the files of the Kunstschutz office at the OKH were transferred to NL FGWM:⁹⁰

List of the file bundles sent from Paris to Bonn on 29 July 1943:

Files of the Kunstschutz representative at the OKH:

- 1) *General, orders and organisation, reports France (general situation reports France), District C*
 - 2) *Personnel*
 - 3) *Movable artworks*
 - 4) *Reports Belgium*
 - 5) *Reports general*
 - 6) *Reports France A–K*
 - 7) *Reports France L–Z*
 - 8) *Reports France Districts B and C*
 - 9) *France general and Holland*
 - 10) *Germany [lit. Heimat, homeland]*
 - 11) *Summary reports to OKH Gen. Qu.*
 - 12) *Archaeology, newspaper clippings*
 - 13) *Research trips*
 - 14) *Kunsthistorisches Institut, academic campaigns*
 - 15) *Southeast (Greece)*
 - 16) *Serbia, Egypt, East (Russia)*
- Photographic campaign files:*
- 1) *General*
 - 2) *Orders, personnel, reports (planning).*
- Signed Tieschowitz, MVR.*

⁹⁰ NL FGWM, no. 34.

A handwritten and undated list written by Wolff Metternich, which was typed and numbered in the addendum, also includes:

Overview of the Kunstschutz files in Bonn

- 1) *General orders from the military authorities.*
- 2) *General orders re: Kunstschutz, information booklets for troop commanders and troops re: protection of architectural and artistic monuments.*
- 3) *Movable artworks: protection and efforts to prevent abduction.*
- 4) *a) Travel reports from representatives arranged by district.*
b) Situation reports (general), monthly reports from the Kunstschutz representatives.
c) Likewise for Serbia, Near East.
- 5) *Reports on the destruction of artworks.*
- 6) *Protection of state storage facilities of French artworks.*
- 7) *Individual actions taken to protect architectural monuments (cathedrals pp.).*
- 8) *Repatriation of artworks stolen by the French 1795–1813. Excerpts from state archive files, correspondence. (Repatriation never started).*

Wolff Metternich and von Tieschowitz both stayed in Paris in July 1943 to select the files to be sent to Bonn. This is recorded in von Tieschowitz's pocket diary:

24/07/43, Paris, *afternoon with Mett. in the office, worked. Looking through the files.* 25/07/43, Paris/Versailles, *with Metternich and Fräulein Schmidt in Versailles, morning St Germain-des-prés. Notre Dame, afternoon with Mett. and Schmidchen in Versailles—delightful, dinner à trois in Paris Hotel Lotti, 10.30 Metternich left.*⁹¹

A later entry reveals that the files were taken to Bonn by the driver Josef Bauch: 28/07/43, Paris, *Bauch drives to Bonn with files.*

Wolff Metternich also mentioned the Kunstschutz files in his journal entry for his Paris trip of 12–25 July 1943: *The days were filled with numerous professional matters, organising the files and so on, and also managed to fit in several interesting visits (...).*⁹²

When one compares the OKH filing plan with von Tieschowitz's list of the files taken from Paris to Bonn and Wolff Metternich's list of the Kunstschutz files, it emerges that there are files in the NL FGWM corresponding to every subheading, although these subheadings have not been retained in the current archival configuration and vary widely in scope. In particular, the headings for *movable artworks*, *Germany [lit. Heimat, homeland]*, *archaeology*, the *Kunsthistorisches Institut* (probably meaning the KHF), *southeast*, and the *east* are sparsely represented. While von Tieschowitz's list largely tallies with the OKH filing plan, Wolff Metternich's list seems more like a thematic summary, perhaps because it was intended for

91 NL FGWM, no. 251.

92 NL FGWM, no. 200.

use in the aforementioned “Kunstschutz white paper”, for which the documents had been gathered together.

Filing plan OKH, AN AJ 40/573	List of files sent to Bonn, NL FGWM, no. 34	List of Kunstschutz files in Bonn, NL FGWM, no. 34
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) General 2) Orders, ordinances 3) Personnel 4) Movable artworks 5) Reports Belgium 6) Belgium general 7a) Reports France A 7b) Reports France A 7c) Reports France B 7d) Reports France C 7f) Reports France (general situation and special reports) 8) France general 9) Holland 10) Germany [lit. Heimat, homeland] 11) Summary reports to OKH Gen.Qu. 12) Archaeology 13) Cars (including photographic campaigns) 14) Southern France 15) Italy 16) Newspaper clippings 17) Academic campaigns 19) Kunsthistorisches Institut 20) Southeast (Greece) 20a) Southeast (Egypt, Serbia) 21) East (Russia) Special files Group 7 (finalised). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) General, orders and organisation, reports France (general situation reports France), District C 2) Personnel 3) Movable artworks 4) Reports Belgium 5) Reports general 6) Reports France A–K 7) Reports France L–Z 8) Reports France Districts B and C 9) France general and Holland 10) Germany [lit. Heimat, homeland] 11) Summary reports to OKH Gen.Qu. 12) Archaeology, newspaper clippings 13) Research trips 14) Kunsthistorisches Institut, academic campaigns 15) Southeast (Greece) 16) Serbia, Egypt, East (Russia) Photographic campaign files: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) General 2) Orders, personnel, reports (planning) Signed Tieschowitz, MVR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) General orders from the military authorities. 2) General orders re: Kunstschutz, information booklets for troop commanders and troops re: protection of architectural and artistic monuments. 3) Movable artworks: protection and efforts to prevent abduction. 4a) Travel reports from representatives arranged by district. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Status reports (general), monthly reports from the Kunstschutz representative. c) Likewise for Serbia, Near East. 5) Reports on the destruction of artworks. 6) Protection of state storage facilities of French artworks. 7) Individual actions taken to protect architectural monuments (cathedrals pp). 8) Repatriation of artworks stolen by the French 1795–1813. Excerpts from state archive files, correspondence. (Repatriation never started).

The filing plan for the military administration area V 1/2 Kunstschutz cannot be reconstructed using the documents in the NL FGWM. Some of the subheadings in the filing plan do have thematically similar counterparts in the NL FGWM’s descriptive units, particularly for headings *o*—*Kunstschutz* and *I*—*Kunstschutz in the outer districts*, but for the most part the filing plan seems to deal with documents (such as reports and administrative papers) drafted in the military administration for the Kunstschutz representative at the OKH, i. e. for Wolff Metternich or von Tieschowitz. Additional information about some of the subheadings in the filing plan can be found in individual files in the supplementary sources (for example, Zimmermann’s Kunstschutz files in the archives of the LVR, Bunjes’s files concerning the Kunstschutz’s organisational structure in the Archives nationales, and the files of the German military administration in the Archives nationales and the military archives in Freiburg). The supplementary sources from French institutions that cooperated with the Kunstschutz contain further information. Examples include files relating to the management of the French national art collections (the holdings of the Musées nationaux in the Archives nationales), the files of the private association La Demeure historique, or the administrative files of the Monuments historique (Médiathèque de l’architecture et

du patrimoine). Subheadings *III—Movable artworks* (divided further into *repatriation*, *ERR*, *Devisenschutzkommando*, and *art trade*) and *IV—Passes and endorsements* are not well-documented but would be of particular interest for research into the provenance of Nazi-confiscated art. Information about these areas can be found in other holdings (the ERR and TvK files in the Bundesarchiv, correspondence in museum archives, and the archives or private Nachlässe of art dealers), but it is very difficult to reconstruct the involvement and actual activity of the Kunstschutz on that basis alone.

It is also interesting that information about movable artworks is only provided in abridged form in the OKH filing plan and the list of files sent to Bonn, and that it does not enable any conclusions to be drawn about the Kunstschutz's involvement in art looting. In Wolff Metternich's list, the heading for this topic explicitly positions the Kunstschutz as providing *protection and efforts to prevent abduction*.

Translated and edited by Cadenza Academic Translations