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<td>Internal and File</td>
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Note: VOSS was interrogated at a special investigation center in Austria during the period 15 August - 15 September 1945. This report should be regarded as preliminary to the forthcoming Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 4, "LINZ: HITLER'S MEMBERS ART LIBRARY," which is based in part on VOSS' statements. Any supplementary information on VOSS will be included therein.

I. PERSONAL

A. Birth, Education and Early Career

Hermann VOSS was born on 30 July 1884, at Luneburg (Hanover). He attended school at Luneburg and Stralsund. Studied the history of art under Thode at Heidelberg University, and under Wölfflin at Berlin University. Doctor of Philosophy in 1906 at Heidelberg, summa cum laude, with dissertation Der Ursprung des Donaustils, published at Leipzig in 1907.

Traveled in Italy, 1907, also Paris and the Netherlands. Took up detailed study of Italian painting, particularly in its later phases. 1908, volunteer worker at the Berlin museums, first in the Department of Sculpture, later in the Print Room, in Decorative Arts, and finally in the Painting Gallery. Close contact during this time with Dr. Wilhelm von BODE, and later with Dr. Max J. FRIEDLAENDER. In 1911 - 1912, assistant at the Kunsthistorisches Institut, Florence, publishing several articles on the Florentine and Roman Renaissance. In 1913, became head of the Print Department, Leipzig.

During the war served in political intelligence, sharing an office with W. R. VALENTINER. Returned to Leipzig after the war.

Married Marianna BOSE in 1919. There are no children.

B. 1922 to 1933

In 1922, called to Berlin by von BODE to become his "second in
command" at the Kaiser Friedrich Museum, with the title Kustos und Professor bei den Staatlichen Museen. Published two books which achieved an international reputation: Die Malerei der Spätrenaissance in Rom und Florenz (2 vols.), 1920, and Die Malerei des Barock in Rom, 1925.

Traveled widely in these years, and organized several exhibitions for Berlin. Lecture tours included one to the United States, where he visited the museums and private collections of New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Boston, Cambridge, Princeton, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago and Milwaukee.

C. 1933 to 1945

VOSS soon had difficulties with the Nazi Party because of "cosmopolitan and democratic tendencies, and friendship with many Jewish colleagues." Late in 1933, he lost the directorship of the Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin, when KOSTOSCHAU was promoted to this position over his head, as successor to Dr. FRIEDLÄNDER, recently ousted on racial grounds. This action was taken by von OPEK, Referent in the Ministry of Education. VOSS then asked for a leave of absence of several months' duration, which was granted. During this time he tried unsuccessfuely to find a position in England.

In 1935 he was made Director of the small local museum at Wiesbaden. This was widely regarded in art circles as a politically inspired demotion, and in no sense a reflection upon his competence as a scholar or museum director. During eight years' tenure at Wiesbaden, he built up a collection of German 19th Century painting which became known for its completeness and quality.

Gave a course of lectures at the Courtauld Institute, London, in 1935. Made frequent trips to Paris, 1933 - 1940, to visit exhibitions, scholars and dealers.

In mid-March 1943, appointed Director of the Dresden Gallery and also Special Commissioner (Sonderbeauftragter) for the new Fine art
musuem, as Dr. POSSE's successor. VOSS retained, though without salary, his position as Director of the Wiesbaden Museum, leaving his assistant, Fraulein Juliane HARMS, as his representative there. The salary at Dresden was only slightly higher than that which VOSS had received at Wiesbaden. About 600 reichsmarks monthly remained after taxes were deducted. As Director of the Linz Museum, VOSS received the additional salary of 1000 reichsmarks monthly, tax exempt, as previously received by POSSE.

II. POLITICAL ATTITUDE BEFORE 1943

VOSS represents himself as a person of strong anti-Nazi sympathies who accepted the Linz position only with the idea of saving the pictures and handing them over, intact and inventorized, to the Allies, who he felt certain would win the war.

VOSS' case therefore rests on his demonstrating, first, his anti-Nazi ideals up to March 1943, when he accepted the Linz position; and second, an unchanged attitude thereafter, together with actions suitable to such an attitude.

There seems no reason to doubt VOSS' status prior to March 1943. His removal from an important Berlin post in 1935 was generally regarded as politically inspired; he had already established a secure reputation as a scholar and museum curator, but his anti-Nazi opinions were well known. Among those who have testified to this effect, under specific interrogation, are LOHSE and BORCHERS (both of the Einsatzstab Rosenberg staff), and the dealers Wolfgang GUHLITT, Hildebrandt GUHLITT, and HAHNERSTOCK (chief dealer to POSSE and an enemy of long standing to VOSS).

No interrogator of VOSS will fail to learn, at the very outset, that he wrote a four-verse poem in August/September 1940, in Paris, deploring the German conquest of that city. (The poem is reproduced as Attachment 1.) VOSS continually stresses the strongly anti-Nazi and pro-French tone of this poem as evidence of his beliefs. He states that he
showed this poem to many friends on his return to Germany, including Fraulein ADLERBERGER of Wiesbaden; and that he also showed it, two years later, to his friend Professor Roberto LONGHI, during a Fine Arts Congress in Venice.

III. LINZ AFFAIRS BEFORE MARCH 1943

A. General

Before he arrived in Dresden to take over the dual directorship of Dresden-Linz, VOSS states, he was entirely ignorant of how the Linz project had been managed, except for routine instructions given him by BORMANN just after the meeting with HITLER some two weeks before.

B. OERTEL and GOEPEL

VOSS admits, however, that OERTEL, whom he had known in Florence, told him a little about the Linz Museum in 1940 at two chance meetings in Berlin on his way to and from HITLER's headquarters. At the time, OERTEL was already POSSE's assistant, and enthusiastic about the new collection which, he said, would rival those of Cologne and Frankfurt. VOSS was under the impression that he exaggerated the importance of this work. But it is clear that VOSS knew from this time that POSSE was Director of Linz as well as Dresden, and that Linz was to undergo rapid expansion. VOSS insists that no mention was made of any confiscated works having come into the Linz collection.

GOEPHEL, POSSE's chief agent in Holland, was with OERTEL at these meetings, as they were staying at the same hotel. VOSS had the impression that they were intimate friends, an impression later confirmed by his experience. It was clear that GOEPHEL, like OERTEL, had to do with Linz, but VOSS did not learn at the time in what capacity. VOSS states that he had not heard previously of GOEPHEL's activities in Holland.

VOSS also recalls reading an article by OERTEL in Das Reich early in 1943, commemorating POSSE.
C. Einsatzstab Rosenberg

Concerning the Einsatzstab Rosenberg, VOSS repeatedly denied ever having heard of it before March 1943. In later interrogations, however, he admitted having a general idea of the work of this organization, but could not be more specific. LOHSE believes that the Einsatzstab Rosenberg was known to all museum directors in Germany.

LOHSE, BORCHERS and SCHIEDLAUSKY all state that VOSS never came to the J eu de Paume, and the point needs no laboring. POSSE, however, also stayed away from the J eu de Paume, but he made no objection when 53 items were turned over to Linz from this laboratory of confiscation; indeed, he complained to SCHOLZ that three items were missing. (See Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 1, Attachments 12 and 13.) How much VOSS knew of the activities of the Einsatzstab as they related to Linz before he consented to accept the responsibility for Linz, has not been definitely established.

D. Trips to Paris

VOSS' only trips to Paris after the beginning of the war were in August and September of 1940, on both occasions to give opinions on paintings. The first trip, in August, was by automobile from Saarbrucken with a courier, and lasted two or three days. VOSS inspected a "Raphael" Portrait in the vault of a small bank, and a "Titian" Portrait of Two Men in the Crédit Lyonnais, Boulevard des Italiens. Neither of these paintings was of any importance, he states. He was sent on authority of the Embassy, and was put up at the Quai d'Orsay, but saw only a minor functionary in the process of presenting his credentials. VOSS did not know who owned the pictures, and could only guess that the Embassy was interested in them. The "small bank" was north of the Boulevard des Italiens, and was Spanish or Portuguese. Nothing was said of the Devisenschutz.
kommando, and VOSS also states that he had never heard of it.

The second and last trip to Paris, in September (or October) of 1940, was also short. VOSS traveled by train from Wiesbaden. His mission was to inspect a "Veronese" Mythological Scene for Dr. HUPP, of the Düsseldorf Museum. The picture was a poor copy, and he advised HUPP not to buy it. The owner lived off Boulevard Raspail, near the Luxembourg, and VOSS recalls that he had strongly Fascist opinions and that he limped. During this visit VOSS saw Jacques DUPONT, X-ray technician of the Louvre, and conversed with him about entirely technical matters.

IV. THE DRESDEN-LINZ APPOINTMENT

VOSS' statement of the sequence of events, from the first telephone call by GOEBBELS' office to his final acceptance, is appended as Attachment 2.

VOSS insisted that the offer came to him entirely as a surprise in February/March 1943. At Wiesbaden, he states, he was out of touch with art circles, and particularly anything connected with Party decisions.

When he met HITLER at Rastenberg, the officer assigned to him as adjutant for the day said that he knew Frau POSSÉ and that she had told him it was POSSÉ's last wish that VOSS be appointed, in recognition of his accomplishments as scholar and museum director, and his special knowledge of German and Italian painting. VOSS stated that he did not inquire further, and that the explanation was satisfactory to him. Hildebrandt GURLEIT and DIETRICH state that they also heard POSSÉ had made this recommendation. HABERSTOCK, however, states that POSSÉ was almost fanatically active up to the very end, and that he never mentioned a successor of any kind. VOSS saw Frau POSSÉ in Dresden, and states that she confirmed the story of POSSÉ's last wish.
One must bear in mind that Voss had not seen Possel since 1935, had not corresponded with him, and had never been a particular friend of his. He attended Possel's funeral in December 1942 only because all museum directors were ordered to do so. Furthermore, he incurred the enmity of Haberstock by making it known that he disapproved of his methods and actions, which he termed incorrect. Haberstock, to whom Possel owed his position, always had a strong influence over Possel. Voss states, however, that relations between Haberstock and Hitler had become strained, according to what Bormann told him in March.

The actual appointment of Voss dated from mid-March. On the 18th, the Neues Wiener Tageblatt ran a notice; and on the 22nd Landers, chief of the Reichskanzlei, ordered the occupation authorities of Norway, the Netherlands, Alsace, Lorraine, and Luxembourg, and the appropriate authorities in Greater Germany, to communicate with Dr. Voss, as Dr. Possel's successor, anything on which he might wish to exercise the Führer's right to disposition of works of art. (See Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 4, "LINZ: HITLER'S MUSEUM AND LIBRARY," Attachments No. 9 and No. 9a.)

Reaction to the appointment of Voss appears to have been one of widespread surprise. Hoffer, Lorsch, Kajetan Muehlmann (chief confiscator in Vienna, Poland and Holland) and Haberstock all testify to this effect. They agree that Voss was competent, but they all feel it was strange that a man well known for his anti-Nazi sympathies should suddenly be pulled out of virtual retirement and placed in such an exalted position. Buchner (Munich), Feulner (Cologne), Baldass (Vienna) and Grimschitz (Vienna) were all spoken of as Possel's successor, and Baldur von Schirach put on a private campaign in favor of Adriani, whom he had elevated to Grimschitz' position in Vienna after a quarrel with the latter over The Man with a Tall Hat, by "Vermeer."

Kajetan Muehlmann explains the appointment in the following way. Hoffmann, always influential upon the Führer, pushed Voss as Possel's successor because of the well known enmity between Voss and Haberstock.
whose competition he was anxious to eliminate. There was no special
relation between the two, except that VOSS had made expertises of Italian
pictures for HOFFMANN.

Interrogated on these statements, VOSS testifies that he never saw
HOFFMANN before becoming Director of Dresden-Linz, and that he had never
made expertises for him. He considers that HOFFMANN was against him from
the beginning, and this suspicion was borne out by HOFFMANN's actions in
the SCHLOSS affair. VOSS had some correspondence with the dealer Maria
DIETRICH, however, in connection with expertising some early Italian
pictures for her. On one occasion in Munich, in 1942, she told VOSS that
HOFFMANN had spoken warmly of his publications and was anxious to meet him.

During interrogation several months ago in Spain, Alois MIEDEL
explained VOSS' appointment along the same lines as did Kajetan MUEHLWANN,
adding that HOFFMANN boasted of his part in it.

HOFFMANN himself, interrogated directly on this question, denies
having used any influence in behalf of VOSS. (See Detailed Interrogation
Report No. 1, "HEINRICH HOFFMANN.")

V. VOSS AND THE LINZ MUSEUM

A. General

VOSS states that his primary concern was to save the Dresden and
Linz paintings from destruction, and to keep them out of the hands of
irresponsible. When he learned after taking office that some of the
Linz paintings were confiscated material, he considered that to have been
POSSE's affair. He determined, however, to do what he could to keep other
confiscated works from being added to the Linz collections. In this
desire he was opposed to OERTEL, who had warm Party sympathies, and he
had to bring REIMER around to his view. REIMER, the son of a jurist and
Referent under POSSE since 1941, took the attitude that however unfor-
tunate it might be, confiscation was carried out under German law, and
therefore Linz could accept such pictures.
Under further interrogation, however, VOSS declares nearly similar views. He states that the confiscated pictures were sure to go somewhere, and what difference did it make? For example, he once accepted several confiscated pictures at Wiesbaden. Though the Museum in every instance paid for them, VOSS is by no means certain that the owner received the money, except in the case of a Hesseneleven genre, for which he arranged to have the owner, a Berlin lady, paid 600 reichsmarks.

VOSS always considered the Dresden position of far greater consequence than Linz, although, of course, his purchasing activities for Dresden were almost nil compared to the volume of sales to Linz. Linz was never intended to rival Dresden, he states, and the job of safeguarding Dresden's pictures had first claim with him.

B. Repositories

VOSS claims credit for saving the Linz pictures, although he gives REIMER, his Referent, full honors for execution of the plan. HITLER had directed that the pictures were to be kept in the air raid shelters beneath the Führerbau in Munich, but VOSS persuaded Hans REGER, architect in charge of the Führerbau, that the air shafts descending to the shelters were a source of potential danger and that another solution was indispensable. The salt mine at Alt Aussee was determined upon as the main Linz depository after competent experts had inspected it, and REIMER was placed in charge. VOSS visited Alt Aussee only once, for about two hours. He was responsible for the appointment of Karl SINGER, of Berlin, of whom he had held a high opinion for some time, as restorer-custodian at Alt Aussee. VOSS selected Schloss Weesenstein, 19 kilometers outside of Dresden, as the main repository, and put SCHÜMERT in charge of it.

C. Control of Linz Affairs

VOSS emphasizes strongly his lack of talent in practical affairs, characterizing himself as of an artistic temperament. He states that he depended greatly on REIMER, whose ability along these lines he considered
remarkable. Many times under interrogation he said that REIMER would know answers which he could not give.

VOSS states that he was officially in full control of Linz, with certain exceptions. During 1944, Spring and Fall, he was confined to a sanitarium for a total of three months, leaving REIMER in charge. Secondly, many paintings were sold direct to the Führer for Linz, notably by DIETRICH and perhaps by HOFFMANN. Thirdly, money ran short towards the end of 1944, and VOSS was directed to submit all purchases over 30,000 reichsmarks for the Führer's approval, and to make only outstanding acquisitions. This limit was later lowered to about 10,000 reichsmarks, with the effect that the Führer passed on all purchases, since nothing important could be acquired for anything like that amount. VOSS cites two instances of HITLER's turning down his recommendations for purchase: a Waldmüller at 100,000 reichsmarks, and a Boecklin, Nude Figures at a Fountain, at twice that amount. Both times HITLER said the pictures were too expensive.

In more prosperous times, however, much of VOSS' energy was absorbed in making purchases for Linz. Unlike POSSE, who traveled considerably in Germany, VOSS centralized all purchases in Dresden, so that he could devote the necessary time to safeguarding works of art. In a sworn statement he estimates that he bought between 2000 and 4000 paintings for Linz, and in a later interrogation he states that he probably purchased more pictures than POSSE because of the large quantity of 19th Century German works which he acquired. The cost he estimates at 100 million to 300 million reichsmarks, probably about 150 million. The cost greatly exceeded the amount spent by POSSE because values had multiplied, sometimes as much as ten times. The number of pictures acquired by VOSS in less than two years seems to have surpassed POSSE's activity of four years.

Until late in 1944, VOSS did not have to get permission from BORMANN (or von HUMMEL) to make purchases, as WOLFFHARDT, Director of the Linz library, always had to do.
VOSS learned of acquisitions made directly by HITLER from Frau DIETRICH only when he went to the Führerbau for periodic inspections. VOSS stated that he was present on at least one occasion when DIETRICH received payment for pictures sold in this manner. He considers DIETRICH to have inferior knowledge of paintings, but he was powerless, he states, to prevent direct sales by her to the Führer.

Immediately upon assuming office, VOSS cut short HABERSTOCK's sales to the Führermuseum, because of his low opinion of the latter. After April 1943 only four paintings were acquired from HABERSTOCK, and these had already been contracted for by VOSS. Boucher's Mile. Murphy Reclining was the most important of these pictures.

VOSS left Germany on only two occasions after April 1943: once for two days to Amsterdam to inspect a "Vermeer of Delft," which he did not buy because he considered the picture to be a forgery; and once in 1943 when he traveled in Switzerland for about two weeks, but made no purchases because von HÜGEL, who had arranged the trip, could not obtain Swiss exchange. On the Swiss trip, VOSS visited the REINHARDT Collection in Winterthur, the FISCHER Gallery in Lucerne, the NEUPER Gallery in Zurich, and many museums and exhibitions, including Basel.

Purchases for Linz outside Germany were made by VOSS' specially appointed agents, to most of whom he gave a travel certificate. Hildebrandt GURLITT, GOEBEL, and HERBST (of the Dorotheum, Vienna) were the most important.

VOSS did not hesitate to use his power to give out Linz travel certificates as personal favors. Thus, the dealer ROCHLITZ, from whom he bought almost nothing for Linz, got a certificate in order to keep him out of the Army (both ROCHLITZ and VOSS admit this point). Likewise, Wolfgang GURLITT obtained a certificate to facilitate travel to Strasbourg to settle family affairs. The certificate was signed by HEIMER, but VOSS knew about it. There was never any question of GURLITT's acquiring anything for Linz, and nothing was acquired as a result of this
trip. Both GURLITT and VOSS testify to this effect.

D. Relations with Nazi Officials

On the occasion of VOSS’ meeting with HITLER, he saw BORMANN on the train for a few moments. The forthcoming meeting was the only subject of conversation. After the interview, BORMANN told VOSS about the organization of the Sonderauftrag Linz, especially about relations with the Reichskanzlei and how the finances were managed. Nothing was said of confiscated material.

VOSS divided his relations with Nazi officials into three periods. In the first, he made an official visit to LANGES and to Dr. KILLY, his subordinate. He made an official inspection of the Führerbau and called on von HUMMEL. Then he visited the Linz depositories at Hohenfurth and Kremmenster, including an official call on Gaulleiter EICHER, whom he never saw again. He also visited Neuschwanstein/Hohenschwangau, in the company of von HUMMEL and EICHER. He states that his own reason for making this visit was to discover whether Linz paintings could be stored at Neuschwanstein.

In the second period, following on VOSS’ break with HAMERSTOCK, the latter denounced him as an anti-Nazi. He learned from GOMPERZ that the dealer MANDEL was gossiping in Paris that VOSS had said after the original meeting with HITLER, “He is even worse than I expected.” VOSS testifies that this was his opinion, but that he never stated it so baldly to anyone. As a result of these and other rumors, VOSS’ relations steadily deteriorated. In Munich, he generally conferred only with REGER. He saw HITLER only three or four times, and BORMANN no more than that. Von HUMMEL had to be consulted concerning transportation and security of works of art, but most of this was done by REGER.

In the third period, following upon the SCHLOSS affair, VOSS states that HITLER was angry because the Louvre had been allowed to select the best pictures from this collection, and considered VOSS to be at fault. HOFFMANN tried to make matters worse by stating that the paintings
acquired for Linz were far below standard; but EICHNER, who was consulted by HITLER, approved the selections made by GÖPEL for VOSS. From this time, VOSS had practically no relations with any of the high Nazi authorities.

E. Relations with the Einsatzstab Rosenberg

VOSS states that his visit to Neuschwanstein/Echenenschwangau, made in 1943 in the company of von HUMMEL and EICHNER, "seems to have been in relation to BORMANN's order." (The order of 21 April 1943 directed that the paintings belonging to the E.A.R. were to be transferred to VOSS for further handling. See Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 4, "LINZ: HITLER'S MUSEUM AND LIBRARY," Attachment 10.)

During the visit, VOSS met SCHOLZ and SCHIEDLAUSEY. He saw the Ghent Altar and many paintings from France. The only discussion in which he took part, VOSS states, concerned the possibility of the safety of Neuschwanstein from air attack.

A few weeks later, VOSS met SCHOLZ on the street in Berlin, and in the ensuing brief conversation SCHOLZ made it plain that he believed VOSS had initiated BORMANN's order. VOSS denied then and thereafter that this statement was true. He told SCHOLZ that he wished the E.A.R. paintings to remain under the same direction. The E.A.R. staff continued to work independently. VOSS never accepted SCHOLZ' invitation to visit the E.A.R. office, nor did he ever visit ROSENBERG.

F. HOFER

After the decline of HABERSTOCK's influence in Linz affairs, Walter Andreas HOFER, who had had no relations with POSSE and none with VOSS, except in connection with two or three expertises in the early forties and two or three visits by VOSS to his gallery, began to ingratiate himself with VOSS. On 7 April 1943 he wrote to congratulate him on his new appointment. Soon afterward HOFER began to offer pictures for sale to Linz, but VOSS refused them on various grounds.
On 16 December 1943, VOSS had written HOFER to thank him in advance for his proffered gift. On this occasion, VOSS expressed his relief to learn that HOFER had come through a recent air raid on Berlin, and added that it was a remarkable play of fate that three art dealers whose names began with "H" (HABERSTOCK, HINRICHSEN, HOFER) should almost alone have escaped with only slight damage. VOSS continued that one could add to these three "H's" yet a fourth, whose identity he left up to HOFER's quick-wittedness. See Attachment 3.

Interrogation of VOSS on this allusion at first produced a plea of complete ignorance of what he had meant to imply. He vigorously denied that HITLER was intended, but later stated that he must have meant HERMANN (GOERING). When faced with the conflict between such an allusion and his professedly unbroken anti-Nazi beliefs, VOSS offered no explanation other than to say the latter had no importance.

On 3 August 1944, HOFER wrote VOSS (a week late) to congratulate him on his sixtieth birthday. In January 1945 VOSS bought one painting from HOFER for Linz, a Nakart Triumph Scene, for 25,000 reichsmarks, after an extended correspondence concerning the price. This was HOFER's only sale to Linz.

HOFER states that VOSS had no relations with GOERING, and that he never visited Carinhall.

VI. DRESDEN AND WIESBADEN 1943-1945

A. Dresden

Purchases for the Dresden gallery were very few in these years, and consisted mostly of works by 19th Century German painters, some from Dresden itself. Those were bought from German dealers. On the occasion of his trip to Switzerland in 1943, however, VOSS effected an exchange with the NEUPERT Gallery in Zurich, by which Dresden received an Orazio Borgianni, Death of St. John the Evangelist, in exchange for two Swiss 19th Century landscapes, one by Steffen, the other by Sandreuter.
Purchases from German dealers included:

Dieterici (Dresden 1830)
2 small portraits
LANGER sale, Berlin

Huntzsch (Dresden 1850/1870)
Genre
Luz, Berlin

Drebor
4 small paintings
Prof. TOLLEB, Dresden

Joe. Vernet
Storm at Sea
(Light 13 Feb. 1945, burned later in transport. Price RM. 10,000)
LINDPAINTER, Berlin

Toermer (Dresden 19 C.)
Harbor of Gaeta
Dresden

B. Wiesbaden

(Note: Some of the paintings listed below were bought in 1939/1943, but very few of them. WOSI states that his appointment to Dresden-Lins gave him much more opportunity to buy for Wiesbaden than had been the case since the beginning of the war.)

Amberling
Portrait of a Girl
GALERIE ST. LUCAS, Vienna

Huebner (Ulrich) (contemporary German)
Landscape
KUHEL, Dresden

Tuch (contemporary German)
Landscape
FRANKE, Leipzig

Hoguet
Still Life
Gift of Dr. KERN, Berlin

Schoedl (Viennese)
Landscape Study

Schoedl-berger
Landscape Study

Toma (Viennese, 19 C.)
Landscape
ZINCKGRAF, Munich

Schuch
Austrian Farm
(Hanged for a small Still Life by Paepke)
HINRICHS
Alt Aussee

von Keller (Munich)
Small picture
KOSTER, Hamburg

Steinhausen (contemporary)
Portrait of a Man Drawing His Daughter
Gift, Berlin

Becker (Frankfurt) 2 watercolor landscapes
Dresden

Viennese ca. 1760 Head of a Girl
" von OPPEL, Wiesbaden

Trusebner
Landseape, Odenwald
ABELES, Dresden

(Furnished for an anonymous Flemish Landscape, ca. 1600)
VII. THE SCHLOSS AFFAIR

Several months after VOSS took office, some 250 pictures from the SCHLOSS Collection (French Jewish) were acquired by purchase for Linz under questionable circumstances. During interrogation, VOSS brought up this subject of his own accord, with the idea of demonstrating that if anything was wrong, he had acted in good faith and was not responsible.

The SCHLOSS affair is treated in detail in Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 4, "LINZ: HITLER'S MUSEUM AND LIBRARY," Chapter III, to which two statements are appended as attachments; one by LOHSE, outlining the background of events, and the other by VOSS, describing his share in the proceedings. In this report, VOSS' activities are merely summarized for convenience.

VOSS learned about the SCHLOSS pictures from GÖPEL, after they had been brought to Paris, but prior to the negotiations which were carried out between the German Embassy in Paris and the Vichy government. He knew that the pictures had been transported out of the unoccupied zone "by some error," but instructed GÖPEL to go ahead with the purchase, cautioning him, however "to proceed with utmost fairness to France."
The fact that the sale had been forced by the Vichy government, potentially under German pressure, was not enough to stay VOSS' hand. He states that in any case "things had gone too far for me to stop them." He had an uncomfortable moment when told, during interrogation, that the circumstances were dubious enough to make GOERING order LOHSE to stop all purchase proceedings on his own account. He states that he had not known of GOERING's interest in the pictures, but the truth of this assertion is very doubtful.

VOSS agreed with GOEPPEL that it would be unfortunate if the collection were to be widely dispersed, as it included a valuable group of signed works by Dutch painters of the 17th Century.

VOSS considered the arrangement fair, whereby the Louvre would take first choice and Linz would buy what it wanted of the remainder at prices set by experts appointed by the French Government, that is, the Louvre officials and POSTMA.

HABERSTOCK adds an unexpected footnote to this sordid history by producing a letter from DEQUOY, dated 24 August 1942, stating that DEQUOY, owner of the WILDENSTEIN firm, was negotiating the SCHLOSS affair and that he was about to see one of the heirs in Grenoble. Another letter shows that DECREN, a close associate of DEQUOY's, was also trying to acquire all or part of the collection for HABERSTOCK as late as December 1942. For further details see Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 4.

One can safely assume from this information that HITLER learned about the SCHLOSS Collection, through HABERSTOCK or POSSE or both, long before the actual sale in 1943, and that his resentment at not acquiring the best pictures did not spring merely from hearing about the affair after it was all over. With the prior knowledge of the Germans thus established, one can also assume that grounds existed for German pressure on the Vichy government to force the sale of this Jewish collection. Considering the manner in which the proceedings were conducted
from the beginning in 1943, anyone really interested could have easily guessed that such German pressure was behind the Vichy government’s action.

VÖSS’ position in all this intrigue is the unenviable one of a professed lover of France who kept his hands clean by leaving the dirty work to others and not asking too many questions.

VIII. ACTIVITIES AFTER THE WAR’S END

Attachment 4 is VÖSS’ statement of his activities since May 1945. He considered it his duty to stay with the Dresden paintings until the arrival of the occupation authorities. In fact, he did stay with the cache at Wessenstein during the difficult last days of conflict, when the SS were considering turning Wessenstein into a point of resistance.

Asked why the Linz catalogue was not transported to Alt Aussee with the paintings, VÖSS gave the following explanation. The air bombardment of Dresden, in February 1945, brought to an end almost all transportation. Many of the trucks which had been used by Dr. REIMER for such transportation were burned out, and only Diesel oil, not gasoline, was available. Almost none of the few remaining trucks were oil-burning. In March, it was generally supposed that the Russians would occupy Dresden, but in April and May, after the American drive was under way, there was considerable speculation that the Americans, not the Russians, would take over. As the Dresden authorities had always planned to hand over art treasures to the British or the Americans, and not to the Russians, this speculation was a further incentive to them to leave the catalogue and the relatively few remaining Linz items at Wessenstein, rather than to attempt the great dangers of another transport to Alt Aussee.

In March, however, one attempt was made to move some of the Wessenstein cache to the West. Hildebrandt GURLITT, one of VÖSS’ chief buyers for Linz, figured in these plans. GURLITT had lost his house in Dresden and was making arrangements to move to the Mainfranken area.
which the British radio was announcing as a safe place. GURLITT
planned to move his family and a considerable number of paintings be-
longing to him. VOSS and he discussed the possibility of moving the
Wiesbaden pictures (some 70 items) at the same time, as this would
place them much nearer to their proper location. Removal of some of
the Dresden pictures also was discussed, and VOSS wrote for permission
to GRAEF, Party member in charge of all Saxon State Museums. Gauleiter
MUTSCHMANN, however, was strongly opposed to allowing anything Saxon to
go outside the state, and he never answered VOSS' letter. In the con-
fusion which existed in the lack of communications, GURLITT, after
great difficulties on his own account, got off before VOSS knew about
it, and without taking any Dresden or Wiesbaden paintings whatever. The
testimony of both GURLITT and VOSS is in full agreement on these points.
There was also some talk of VOSS' going along to accompany the paintings
under his care and to see that they were properly stored, but VOSS
states that if he had gone it was his intention to return immediately to
Weesenstein. During much of this time VOSS was seriously ill.

The Russian occupation authorities continued VOSS in office as
Director of the Dresden Gemäldegalerie, giving him a certificate which
is still in his possession. This certificate is dated 30 May 1945. Be-
cause of the destruction of Dresden, Weesenstein became a popular place
of refuge, even for Party members like GRAEF, and VOSS encountered so
many difficulties in administering Weesenstein as an art repository
that he asked for and received from Will GROHMAANN, who was appointed
GRAEF'S successor in the civil government, another certificate setting
forth the importance of VOSS' task. This certificate, dated 13 June
1945, is also in his possession. VOSS was instructed to establish a
central repository in Dresden of all objects owned by art museums of
the Saxon State, but because of the shortage of transportation, nothing
could be done about it.

When VOSS determined to go into the American zone, for reasons out-
lined in Attachment 4, he wrote GROHMAANN for permission, and received
the permission orally. The trip did not take place until the end of July.

VOSS itemizes the contents of Weesenstein, other than works belonging to Dresden, as follows:

1. Linz: Over 200 framed watercolors and drawings; no paintings.


3. Dortmund: 2 or 3 18th or 19th Century German paintings.


VOSS complains of the abruptness of his reception and incarceration at Wiesbaden, and appears surprised that the Americans did not know all about him and welcome him as the savior of valuable works of art. He expected that no one would question his motives in becoming the Sonderbeauftragter of Linz, that he would be able to return to Dresden without incident as soon as he had finished his business in Wiesbaden, and that the Americans would transport his wife, himself and his belongings out of the Russian zone.

IX. SUMMARY

In the absence of complete documentation, the part played by Hermann VOSS in HITLER’s scheme of things is not altogether clear. Many doubts will be settled if and when the card catalogue for the Linz collections is brought from Dresden/Weesenstein, together with VOSS’ personal papers. A request that this be done has been submitted through channels. The BORMANN/von HUGEL files so far discovered stop at June 1941; likewise, REGER’s register, which shows the source and date of receipt of all pictures delivered to the Führerbau, goes as yet only to October 1942, although copies of the lists of what went to Alt Aussee form part of the inventory made there. A search is being made for the supplementary files, but until they are found, many questions will remain difficult to answer.

With these reservations in mind, it is nevertheless possible to
outline the direction and meaning of VOSS' activity, and to give some picture of the man. During a month of interrogation, he impressed his several questioners very unfavorably. It was their unanimous opinion that VOSS' character is vacillating, and that he is an extraordinarily conceited and ambitious man. His constant reliance on failure of memory to explain discrepancies in his testimony did not improve the atmosphere of the interrogations.

While there is no doubt that he was anti-Nazi before March 1943, the Nazis did not bother him after passing him over in Berlin, and he was never a martyr to principle. Although his opinions and personal feelings about the Nazis remained as hostile as before, he accommodated them to existing circumstances. In the same way he is now trying to use the Americans, and every effort should be profoundly distrusted.

The paradox of the men who wrote Paris 1940 just after the occupation of France, and who turns up at the end of the war as the highest functionary in Nazi art circles, cannot be denied. Faced with this paradox, VOSS has given only weak and implausible explanations. He constantly evaded the question of moral responsibility involved in accepting the position of Sonderbeauftragter of the Linz Museum. If, as he contended, he guessed that the war would soon be over, and felt that he was bound to take on the preservation of priceless works of art, one can only answer that he guessed wrong, and that others could have done the work. As a result of his decision, VOSS became involved in the most elaborate purchasing expedition in the history of art dealing, under artificial economic conditions designed by the Nazis as one of the subtler methods of despoiling occupied territories.

The poem, Paris 1940 (see Attachment 1), is a key to VOSS' character. The opinions it expresses are not only anti-Nazi, but anti-German. One would expect the man who wrote it, deploiring as he watched "les Boches dévaliser la France," to join the French Resistance movement, if the expression of these feelings were anything but a luxury. Under interrogation, VOSS stated that he did not have works of art in mind
when he wrote "devaliser," only economic robbery, and that the movement of works of art from France to Germany was no reason for moral concern. Juxtaposed to his letter to HOFER of December 1943 (see Attachment 3), VOSS' poem presents a sorry spectacle in human character. When this letter was shown to him, he was visibly embarrassed, and it took him a full day to produce even the explanation that the fourth "H" might refer to "Hermann."

To understand VOSS' activity, it is necessary to clarify his general view of scholarship. VOSS takes the profoundly German attitude that art history is pure science, and that one can pursue it without exterior moral responsibility. He constantly speaks of himself as a "scientific" man, divorced from the obligations of practical life. Since he was able to hand over to REINER almost all administrative detail and all the direct dealings with the Party bosses, he claims immunity from the consequences. Challenged as to the degree of his control, however, he senses that his prestige is in question, and his pride leads him into making contradictory statements. In short, he pictures himself as both the important man who was responsible for saving the pictures of Dresden and Linz, and as a pure scientist who was not concerned with what went on behind the scenes. The fact that both of these contentions are partially true does not make the estimate any easier.

The motivation behind VOSS' appointment is likewise ambiguous. It was very unusual, especially as late as 1943, that the Nazis should accept for such a position a known anti-Nazi whom they had banished from Berlin to Wiesbaden eight years before. VOSS qualified, of course, as an expert, but there were others, although VOSS is extremely hesitant to admit it. The others were talked of, but no source yet interrogated ever heard VOSS' name mentioned as POSSE's successor. The announcement came as a complete surprise.

It appears to be true that VOSS personally accepted no looted art for Linz, but as POSSE's successor, he inherited a vast store of confis-
cated works. He accepted the SCHLOSS Collection under very dubious circumstances, and he was officially named expert in charge of final distribution of all confiscated works of art held by the Einsatzstab Rosenberg (BORMANN order of 21 April 1943), and likewise all works of art confiscated by the SS in Greater Germany and all occupied territories (HITLER policy instructions to HIMMLER prior to 26 January 1945). The relevant documents are reproduced in Attachments 10 and 11 to Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 4. That these orders were not put into effect is no fault of VOSS. The fortunes of war alone forestalled their implementation. If, for example, VOSS had been called upon to decide on the treasures from Monte Cassino (Naples), he would have been in an impossible position, but no more impossible than he should have foreseen in March 1943.

In the SCHLOSS affair, VOSS' activity was particularly questionable. (A full account is given in Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 4, Chapter III.) It is clear, from testimony given by LOHSE in VOSS' presence which VOSS was unable to refute, that he learned fully of the details of the case from LOHSE in a conversation at Munich on or about 25 April 1943. This was well before the sale, and not many days after he had received GOEBBELS written report on the affair. Although he remembers such minutiae as having just come from the Führerbau and having missed lunch, his memory conveniently fails him on all details of the conversation, or even on the fact that the SCHLOSS affair had been discussed. He admits, however, that such a conversation might have occurred.

Until the correspondence between VOSS and BORMANN/von HUMMEL is found, it will be difficult to define accurately VOSS' position in the SCHLOSS case. It is clear, however, that he had the chance to stop proceedings and that he did not, even though he was sufficiently informed to know what he was getting into. He could have taken the position that the pictures were below the Linz standard, if he did not dare to refuse them outright. He states that he used this ruse on some occasions to keep confiscated items out of the Linz collections, but he has been unable to cite any example. In short, his contention that "things had gone too far for me to stop them" falls apart when closely examined.
In VOSS' mind Dresden was always the more important part of his dual appointment. During interrogation, he made full use of this point. One can agree that Dresden always eclipsed Linz in artistic value, although considerable doubt hangs on the amount of looted art VOSS would have been called upon to process for Linz if Germany had won the war. The important point is that, second only to Berlin, Dresden was the crown of a career such as VOSS'. Moreover, VOSS in his day was unquestionably the leading figure in German art circles, and even though Berlin had more prestige than Dresden, the combined Dresden-Linz position clearly surpassed Berlin in significance, at least during the time in question.

In summary, it appears that Linz was the moral price that Hermann VOSS was prepared to pay for Dresden in the satisfaction of his own vanity.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that VOSS be detained as a potential war criminal for the forthcoming War Crimes trials.

2. Pending these trials, it is recommended that VOSS be utilized at the Central Collecting Point (Verwaltungsbau, Munich) in inventorizing the Linz collections for whatever redistribution is determined upon.

3. Attention is invited to VOSS' request made at the end of Attachment 4, for whatever action is deemed advisable.

4. It is recommended that VOSS be made available for further interrogation when, as is anticipated, additional documents are delivered for study at the Central Collecting Point, Munich.
Hélas, j'ai vu Paris, courbé sous l'esclavage,
Souffrant de l'ennemi l'insolence et l'outrage;
Hélas, je les ai vus, ces bataillons de Boches
Dévaliser la France au profit de leurs poches.

J'ai vu la croix gammée, emblème de la haine,
Flotter du haut des toits, monstrueuse et obscure,
J'ai vu dans les palais la horde militaire
Et dans l'ombre des cours la faim et la misère.

J'ai vu les boulevards et — ô triste fantôme —
L'orgueil anéanti de la Place Vendôme;
Fallait-il la revoir, cette enceinte royale,
Changée brusquement de Vendôme en Vandale?

Vers Toi vont mes soupirs, ô Dieu de la Clémence,
Délivre des Teutons la malheureuse France,
Fais resplendir sur nous ta divine justice,
Bénis, ô Tout-Puissant, l'armée rédemptrice!
Statement by Dr. VOSS

on his acceptance of the Dresden-Linz Directorships

About February (or March) 1943, I received in Wiesbaden an entirely unexpected telephone call from the Ministry of Propaganda in Berlin, requesting that I present myself to Minister GOEBBELS the following day at noon. I went to the indicated place, and Ministerialrat BIEBRACH told me before the audience that the matter in question was the Dresden Gallery. I had known BIEBRACH superficially in Berlin, where he had a small position as an art historian. When I was ushered into GOEBBELS' room, he indeed asked me whether I was inclined to take over the Gallery. I first pointed out that I was not a member of the National Socialist Party. GOEBBELS replied that the task did not require any party affiliation, but only technical qualification. Thereupon I declared myself ready to accept Dresden, but on the condition that I continue in the post of Director at Wiesbaden (without salary). GOEBBELS declared that he would notify HITLER accordingly.

He inquired as to my former career, publications, etc., and asked about my personal situation (whether married; if children). Several officials of the Ministry were present at the conversation, but did not take part in it.

About ten days later I was summoned to present myself to HITLER at his headquarters in Restenburg, East Prussia. I took the night express from Berlin and reached my destination the next morning. Late in the evening I was admitted. GOEBBELS was present at the conversation as a silent third party. For more than an hour HITLER talked almost without stopping. He gave a sort of lecture on the origin and importance of such old princely galleries as that in Dresden, and subsequently explained his intentions with regard to the Linz Gallery. The main emphasis, he directed, should be placed on German 19th Century painting, particularly the Schools of Munich and Vienna. In addition, older German painting should be collected, and also that of the Netherlands, Italy and France.

He then complained that up to that time cultural activities had been centralized in Vienna. Smaller centers like Linz, Graz and Salzburg were now to receive cultural assistance. Linz, as capital of Upper Austria and because of its beautiful site on the Danube, was to be especially favored. While the Linz Gallery could not and was not intended to rival such first class galleries as Vienna and Dresden, it should attain a decent place.

With regard to other museum projects, HITLER emphasized that in Munich the Schack Gallery and the Neue Pinakothek should be united so as to set up a great 19th Century gallery.

(signed) Dr. Hermann Voss
Sehr geehrter Herr Hofer!


Auf die Ankunft der von Ihnen freundlich gestifteten Bilder bin ich gespannt und wage Ihnen glücklich nach Erhalt schreiben.

Inzwischen wünsche ich Ihnen angenehme Festtage und spreche Ihnen meine besten Wünsche zum Jahreswechsel aus.

Mit verbindlichen Empfehlungen und

Heil Hitler!

Ihr

gez. H. Voss

Translation

Dear Mr. Hofer,

I thank you for your letter of December 16th, and hope that you have withstood all the air raids in the meantime. It is a remarkable turn of fate that these art dealers whose names start with an "H" (Haberstock, Hinrichsen, Hofer) have almost alone escaped with slight damage. One could add a fourth "H" to those three, whose name I leave to your sagacity.

I am eagerly awaiting the picture which you have kindly donated, and I shall write you immediately upon its arrival. Meanwhile I wish you a Merry Christmas and send you my best wishes for the New Year.

With best regards and

Heil Hitler!

Yours

signed H. Voss
Statement by Voss
Concerning His Activities since the End of the War

Since the bombardment of Dresden in February 1945, I had made my residence at the Castle of Weesenstein, 19 kilometers from Dresden, chief depot of the Saxon State Collections, especially of the Dresden Picture Gallery and the Print Room. Immediately after the Russian occupation of Dresden and Weesenstein, a commission, called the "Trophy Organization," was sent to Weesenstein (and to the other depots) to make a choice of the best works of art belonging to the Saxon State. It was my duty to assist as State representative the activities of this organization, and to give any information required.

In addition to the greater part of the Dresden paintings, a certain number of pictures and drawings belonging to non-Saxon museums, such as Wiesbaden (about 70 items), Linz, Frankfurt and Dortmund, were inspected by the Russian experts. Almost all those belonging to Linz and about seven paintings owned by Wiesbaden were selected by the Russians. As Director of both the Linz and the Wiesbaden galleries, I felt that it was my duty to report these facts to the proper authorities. Therefore, I asked permission from my superiors at Dresden, specifically Will Grohmann of the Kulturanstalt, and, provided with the needed documents for travelling, undertook the trip from Dresden to Wiesbaden with two salesmen who had made the trip before. I acquired the regular American permit at Hof.

I arrived at Wiesbaden on 29 July and presented myself first to the Oberburgermeister, then to the American authorities residing in the Museum. To the latter I could give only a short and incomplete account of the purpose of my journey, because after a conversation of about 15 minutes I was arrested, and remained in custody for 5 days at Wiesbaden.

It was only at Aussee, where I arrived 9 August, that I was able to give a full account of the reasons for my trip, which are the following:

1. To report about the Wiesbaden paintings, and to suggest that the necessary steps be taken to ensure the transport of these paintings (and drawings) to their legitimate place.

2. To make a statement about the Walter Weber collection of Dutch paintings of the 17th Century (mostly acquired on the London market before the war), a collection which has been for the most part taken away by the Russian Trophy Organization. These pictures should be restored to the owner, if he is still alive, and otherwise to Wiesbaden, in accordance with the will of the owner.

3. To report about the Linz works of art which before being taken away by the above-mentioned organization were being preserved mostly at Weesenstein and, for the smaller part, at the Zwinger at Dresden.

4. To give account of my activities as Director of the projected new art museum of Linz, and to help to identify the works of art acquired and stored at Aussee (Austria) under my direction.

5. To suggest that a unique collection of scientific documents belonging to me, consisting of a valuable art library, photographs of prints of about 25,000 items, about 2,000 engravings after paintings, and some drawings and paintings, mostly of the later Italian schools, be transferred from Dresden to the American zone, because I desire to give this collection to some public institution or university in the American zone, for use in the study of art history.

Alt Aussee, Austria
20 August 1945

(signed) Dr. Hermann Voss

ATTACHMENT 4