

## **To be unambiguously clear**

Comprehensive Statement by the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S.  
on its cooperation with the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge as well  
as the concerns raised by Dr. Michael Pinto-Duschinsky in this context

prepared by

Ansgar Wimmer  
Chief Executive Officer  
Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S.

## **Preface**

Following a complaint by Dr. Michael Pinto - Duschinsky, a senior research fellow at Brunel University and political scientist in the area of party finance, the universities of Oxford and Cambridge in late summer of 2009 established a joint sub-committee to Oxford University's standing Committee to Review Donations to re-examine its relations with the Hamburg based Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S.. For many years, both Oxford as well as Cambridge University have been cooperating with the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. (in the following called "the foundation") in the context of the so called "Hanseatic Scholarship Programme".

This cooperation was first established in 1936 by the Hamburg based grain-merchant Alfred Toepfer to reciprocate the Rhodes scholarships to Oxford, but was soon terminated with the beginning of the World War II.

### **Attachment No. 1 & 2:**

First Bylaws of the Scholarship Programme  
Report by Matthew Sullivan

The programme was then re-established in 1970 to foster British-German relations by providing scholarships for master or doctoral students enrolled at Oxford or Cambridge University, who wish to study in Germany as part of their studies.

### **Attachment No. 3 & 4:**

Correspondence regarding the reestablishment of the programme  
Excerpt from the annual report 1970

In its original design, the programme was limited to students from Oxford University and required students to study at the University of Hamburg, but was later opened to applicants from Cambridge University and allowed for the students to decide on their place of study in Germany independently.

Today, two students are selected on an annual basis by an independent panel within a wider selection committee meeting at Oxford University in March each year, which also decides about the Theodor Heuss as well as the Foster Scholarships sponsored by the German Academic Exchange Agency (DAAD). While nominating members of the selection committee, the foundation itself does not have a vote in the decision about the students who receive the grant.

### **Attachment No. 5 & 6:**

Current bylaws of the Hanseatic Scholarship Programme  
Names and function of the current members of the selection Committee

The Hanseatic Scholarship is exclusively funded by the foundation. It does not include any payments to the universities involved, but students receive their stipends directly through the foundation. There is no separate endowment established either at Oxford or Cambridge University to finance the programme nor do the Universities receive reimbursements for administrating the scheme. All members of the selection committee volunteer their time and expertise in selecting the students. Selected students receive monthly scholarship payments of € 1.200 for a period of up to two years; they may receive further reimbursement for travel and relocation expenses, health insurance or similar expenses and are invited to participate in

various activities of the foundation within its other scholarship programmes such as summer academies and reunions.

Over the last forty years nearly eighty students have been supported through the programme with the foundation having invested the estimated equivalent of about 1 Mio GBP into Hanseatic Scholarships throughout this period. A significant number of these students have majored in history, many later – either through their academic work or other professional contexts - have contributed significantly to Anglo-German relations.

**Attachment No. 7:**

List of names and biographical information on previous and current Hanseatic Scholarship recipients

The Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. is willing to continue this cooperation in line with the explicitly stated goal of the Hanseatic Scholarship Programme quoted from para of current bylaws mentioned above:

*“They should serve to develop and strengthen relationships between Germans and Britons, whilst inspiring and promoting European solidarity.”*

The subcommittee is scheduled to meet on June 14, 2010 to discuss the various factual and moral issues raised by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky’s intervention and to decide on the continuation of the current cooperation between the foundation and the universities involved. Dr Pinto-Duschinsky will be present as will Mr. Ansgar Wimmer, chief executive officer of the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. in London

Given the importance of the issue at stake, the different opinions articulated and – on a more practical level - the number of emails exchanged, the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. with this statement aims to clarify its view on the questions raised and to offer a consolidated documentation of the issue, the aim being to share its experience of the process in a comprehensive manner.

## **I. To be unambiguously clear up front about what is most relevant**

It is important to those representing the foundation today to address, acknowledge and clarify unconditionally three different aspects before entering into the debate in detail:

### **A. On the question of transparency and responsibility**

The Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. today – with no reservations whatsoever – acknowledges the difficult past of its founder as well as its own difficult institutional past. For more than ten years this foundation has been actively trying to promote transparency and to face its past in a responsible manner. No one at our foundation today trivialises any aspect of Alfred Toepfer’s biography. We do not engage in „greywashing“ nor do we try to inappropriately influence the way history is written in Oxford, Cambridge or elsewhere.

It is transparency, openness and responsibility that guide our work today. We are very much open and receptive to advice on dealing with our own history. The foundation today fully understands that it carries particular responsibility to answer any question regarding its past or the biography of its founder to the best of its knowledge, to be transparent in every possible way and proactively encourage public and academic discourse on the issue. In this spirit the foundation had - well before the publication of Mr. Pinto-Duschinsky’s article and as a summary of its efforts within the last ten years - published a statement reflecting on the particular obligations stemming from the past titled “Transparency as a guiding principle”, which summarized its position.

#### **Attachment No. 8:**

“Transparency as a guiding principle” Statement by the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. All books on the foundation’s history mentioned in this statement are on file with Prof. Earl as chairmen of the subcommittee.

### **B. On the question of an apology**

As to the question of a public apology, the foundation takes a clear stand:

An apology amounts to an expression of guilt, remorse or regret regarding *one’s own* actions in the past that did harm to others. With this understanding the foundation is prepared to apologize without any reservation to those who prove to have been harmed or victimized by this institution’s activities during the period of the ‘Third Reich’ or thereafter. It is equally prepared to apologize on an institutional level to those who feel they have been actively misled by this foundation about its past and its involvement with the Nazi regime in accepting prizes or awards after WWII and prior to the work of our historical commission. This particularly applies to any prize-winner or former scholarship recipient of this organization who demands an apology on that issue.

To date, Mr. Daniel Johnson, the editor of Standpoint Magazine, has been the only one to ask for such an apology. Regardless of this fact the foundation - following the publication of Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky’s article and with reference to the accompanying commentary by Daniel Johnson - sent the enclosed letter to all its British scholarship recipients and prize winners to clarify its willingness to apologize. To illustrate one out of many reactions to this letter we enclose a short note received upon this letter by Mr. Tom Stoppard, Shakespeare prize winner of this foundation, member of the advisory board of Standpoint magazine as well as sponsor of the scholarship granted by this institution to Daniel Johnson.:

**Attachment No. 9& 10:**

Letter to Mr. Tom Stoppard as sent to all British prize winners and scholarship recipients

Note by Mr. Tom Stoppard

As to further public apologies, however, those carrying responsibility for the foundation today are convinced that no “symbolic declarations” can undo Alfred Toepfer’s *individual* responsibility or lessen his moral guilt in dealing with and supporting the Nazi regime or its proponents after the war. Here, it may be worth pointing to the letter written by the foundation’s chairman Ansgar Wimmer to Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky well in advance of the publication of his article in Standpoint Magazine:

*“I find the concept of „apologizing” for someone else’s guilt both erroneous and not helpful. It is particularly irritating when looking at family members and their descendents. Shouldn’t our discussion rather focus on acknowledging someone else’s misdeeds and on „taking responsibility“, on learning lessons from them rather than on „apologizing“ for them?”*

**Attachment No 11:**

Letter by Mr. Ansgar Wimmer to Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky dated January

In this foundation’s view apologizing publicly for someone else’s guilt is far more likely to present a quick and hollow escape from a more profound responsibility to learn the lessons from the past for the future, which this foundation readily accepts and actively tries to fulfil.

**C. On the question of respect**

As Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky at various stages of the discussion has introduced his particular biographical background as a context and motivation for his research on historical issues, it is of greatest importance to those acting on behalf of the foundation today to emphasize that this background is met with the utmost respect and humility. This position has repeatedly been expressed in our communications with Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky.

On this issue please also compare section I. in **Attachment no. 11**

## **II. To be unambiguously clear about what happened**

Having clarified the foundation's position on these three basic questions up front, it may now be useful to briefly review the events leading to the current debate before addressing the allegations themselves:

### **A. On the foundation's first encounter with Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky**

The Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. first learned about Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky's interest in its history and current operation after he had independently contacted a previous prize winner of the foundation, Dr. Albrecht Dümling, in August of 2008.

Dr. Dümling, a musicologist whose research focuses on music banned and labelled 'degenerate' by the Nazis, had accepted the foundation's KAIROS award in February 2007. The prize honours outstanding artists and academics working in the field of European culture and intercultural understanding. Among other projects Dümling created the exhibition 'Entartete Musik' which toured Europe, the UK and the US. He was an outstanding researcher with the Centre for Studies in Anti-Semitism at the Technical University, Berlin and is currently president of "musica reanimata", the society for the re-discovery of Nazi-persecuted musicians and their music.

In his discussions with Dr. Dümling Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky claimed that his research had unearthed new findings on Alfred Toepfer which should be sufficient reason to refuse the KAIROS award *ex post* as these findings would tarnish his – Dümling's - personal integrity and his own reputation as a historian in the field of musicology. Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky demanded that he return the prize *before* presenting further evidence, threatening Dümling that he would go public with this information and with his refusal.

Dr. Dümling had been extensively informed by this foundation about its difficult history and the debate surrounding it before accepting the prize. Given this and in view of the fact that Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky was not willing to present any evidence for his claims, Dr. Dümling did not return the prize and chose to ignore what in effect amounted to an attempt at pressuring him into compliance.

#### **Attachment No. 12:**

Letter by Dr. Albrecht Dümling to Mr. Ansgar Wimmer of August 31, 2008 detailing his experience with Dr. Pinto Duschinsky

Upon learning about this encounter the foundation reached out to get in touch with Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky both to learn about his prospective new findings as well as to explain that the foundation today is trying to be as transparent and responsible about its past as possible. In the following the foundation learned about Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky's biographical background, his significant reputation as a political scientist in the field of party finance and his previous participation in the discussion about grants that had been offered and transferred to Oxford University by the Flick family.

The foundation also learned that Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky has had considerable differences in this context with Prof. Hans Mommsen, who had been a member of this foundation's historical commission. It became obvious that he had grave doubts about the independence of the historical commission established by the foundation. These doubts seemed to be based on his disagreements with Prof. Hans Mommsen. Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky cast doubt on the independence of the commission, suspecting that its findings were influenced by the fact that this commission had been initiated and financed by the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S.

**Attachment No. 13:**

eMail Exchange between Dr. Michael Pinto-Duschinsky and Mr. Ansgar Wimmer of September 3./4. 2008

**B. On the foundation's active support for the research done by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky**

In order to address the concerns voiced by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky, the foundation from the beginning therefore invited him to review those documents on file with the foundation which provided insight into the works of the independent historical commission and to support his research unconditionally.

Not only did the foundation offer free access to the material on its files, it also pointed him to those who published highly critical work about the foundation elsewhere, provided names and addresses of contact persons in other institutions, set up contact with those administering the Alfred Toepfer Archive at the Carl Toepfer Foundation, and provided other practical advice. It sent to him the documentation of the work by the independent historical commission "Alfred Toepfer - Stifter und Kaufmann. Bausteine einer Biographie" as well as the biography on Alfred Toepfer by Dr. Jan Zimmermann. It even acknowledged his concerns and his research on its website:

**Attachment No 14 & 15:**

Excerpts from the email exchange between Dr. Michael Pinto-Duschinsky and Mr. Ansgar Wimmer between January 29 to February 27, 2009  
Printout from the website "Current Debates & Publications" by the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S.

A number of email exchanges followed including a long list of detailed historical questions, which Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky raised concerning activities of Alfred and his younger brother Ernst Toepfer during the Nazi period, all of which the foundation tried to answer to the best of its knowledge. While Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky made clear that he would not want to accept any form of financial support from the foundation for his research he agreed for the foundation to remunerate the Hamburg-based historian Dr. Jan Zimmermann, who is the leading researcher on Alfred Toepfer, for his support in answering his questions and demanded rather detailed research to be done by the foundation on his behalf.

**Attachment No 16 & No 17:**

Research done by Jan Zimmermann on behalf of Dr. Michael Pinto-Duschinsky as documented through his eMails dated November 25, 2008 and January 21, 2009

At that point in November 2008 questions of academic standards and ethics were discussed at length as it became increasingly irritating to those representing the foundation that Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky continued to demand transparency and detailed research on his behalf without offering any transparency in return about his field of research or - even more importantly - about his possible findings regarding the foundation's history.

Eventually, as of February of 2009, the foundation stopped hearing from Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky, as he explained later, due to private reasons on his part.

During late summer 2009, those communicating with Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky at the foundation were surprised and irritated to hear informally that he had apparently submitted a request to Oxford University to terminate its cooperation with our foundation's Hanseatic Scholarship programme on historical grounds. Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky's initiative was even more surprising as the foundation had not heard from him at that stage for quite a while and the foundation's cooperation with Oxford and Cambridge University had previously never been a subject of discussions between the foundation and Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky.

The foundation was even more surprised when on Wednesday, November 19, 2009 it received an email message in which Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky announced a visit to Hamburg for the following week and asked for access to the Alfred Toepfer Archives as well as to the material of the independent historical commission in order to complete his research. At that point the foundation unsuccessfully tried to raise the question with him why he had submitted his request to Oxford University *before* fully completing his research on the matter and why – as a matter of fairness - he did not give the foundation any notice of his initiative at Oxford. Despite this severe irritation the foundation stood by its commitment to support his research.

**Attachment No 18:**

eMail exchanges between Dr. Michael Pinto-Duschinsky and Ansgar Wimmer between November 19, 2009 and January 4 2010

**C. On the question of unrestricted access to historical material and other documents**

Between Tuesday, November 24, 2009 and Thursday, November 26, 2009 Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky finally took up the offer to visit the Alfred Toepfer Archive at the Carl Toepfer Stiftung in Hamburg, where he received *unrestricted und uninhibited access to all material which he demanded to see*. In his research he was assisted by Mr. Jürgen Heinrich, who had served as curator for the archive for many years.

According to his own writing it was there that he was, among other documents, shown a letter of recommendation written by Alfred Toepfer in 1950 for Hartmut Lauterbacher, a former SS Major-general . Equally, it was Mr. Heinrich, who was not aware of Mrs Barbara Hacke's previous position with Edmund Veesenmayer, who confirmed to Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky upon his questions that Hacke later did serve as secretary to Alfred Toepfer.

During a meeting over an informal lunch on November 24, 2009, Dr. Antje Mansbrügge, programme director for the foundation's academic activities as well as Mr. Ansgar Wimmer, CEO of the foundation finally did have the opportunity to meet with Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky for about 90 minutes. On the same day, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky also met briefly with Mrs Birte Toepfer, head of the supervisory board of the foundation and daughter in law of Alfred Toepfer.

During his visit to the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S., which is located some three kilometers away from the Alfred Toepfer Archive, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky was offered the opportunity of seeing the documents of the independent historical commission on file with the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. It was clear to both sides that given the short notice and time limitations of Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky' stay and more importantly the state of the material which was kept in the basement of the foundation with other documents, it would neither be feasible nor appropriate to do thorough research into the material at that stage. Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky therefore did not take up the offer.

Mr. Wimmer, however, did answer a number of questions as to the remuneration of the member of the historical commission and conflicting views were exchanged politely.

The quintessence of Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky's visit to Hamburg may be best captured in his own words:

*"...I have no complaint about lack of access to material. Concerning documents about the work of your historical commission, some of these were available in the Alfred Toepfer Archive"*

Comp. eMail dated December 15, 2009 within **Attachment 18**

Subsequently, however, two parallel and interrelated discussions between Dr. Pinto Duschinsky and the foundation evolved, which became increasingly controversial in the following weeks:

#### **Attachment No 19**

eMail exchange between Dr. Michael-Pinto-Duschinsky and the Mr. Ansgar Wimmer between January 11 and January 29, 2010.

- (1) In his encounters in Hamburg Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky for the first time had laid out demands for a public apology by the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. as well as the descendants of Alfred Toepfer for Toepfer's involvement with the Nazi regime during the period of the 'Third Reich' and his relations with those involved with the regime afterwards. The foundation set out its basic position on the issue in a rather substantive and clear letter to Dr. Pinto Duschinsky dated January 12, 2010, which at that point was shared with the members of the sub-committee. To further clarify its position publicly, the foundation in February 2009 also issued the above mentioned statement: "Transparency as a guiding principle", which summarized positions long held and facts long published. It also issued a press release pointing to this statement as well as the transfer of its archive to about 150 journalists – with no public reaction whatsoever.

#### **Attachments No 20 & 21:**

Press release by the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. "Stiftungen stehen in der Verantwortung / Foundations carry a responsibility" dated February 18, 2010  
List of journalists contacted with this press release

- (2) Following his visit to Hamburg and an escalating email exchange on the question of an apology, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky then demanded that the foundation send him specific correspondence from the material of the historical commission assumed by him to be on file with the foundation. During a phone call in January 2010, it was implied by him that Dr. Christian Gerlach, who had been a junior member of the historical commission and is now a professor of history at the University of Bern (Switzerland), had been pressured by representatives of the foundation to ignore or not publish historical findings which were damaging to Alfred Toepfer. It was further implied that representatives of the foundation had actively tried to conceal documents in its archive from members of the historical commission.

Following these allegations, Ansgar Wimmer as representative of the foundation immediately contacted Prof. Gerlach to learn more about his view on the issue. While Prof. Gerlach confirmed his feeling that the head of the independent historical commission, Prof. Arnold Sywottek, at the time had exerted undue pressure and that he still had doubts about Mr. Heinrich's position as a "gate keeper" to the Alfred Toepfer Archive, he also confirmed that he had been able to incorporate his findings in the edition published by the historical commission in a form that was acceptable to him.

**Attachment No 22:**

Email exchange between Prof. Christian Gerlach and Mr. Ansgar Wimmer between January 19 and February 3, 2010

In order to avoid any further discussion about access either to the papers relating to the historical commission or the integrity of the material itself, the executive board of the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. took further steps. At the next meeting of the supervisory board it was proposed that the material of the independent historical commission should be added to the historical documents already transferred to an independent archive, the Hanseatische Wirtschaftsarchiv, run by the Hamburg Chamber of Commerce. *The explicit aim of this proposal was not to hinder the research done by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky and others, but to provide for- and secure - impartial and proper access for third parties to historical sources.* At this point, Dr. Pinto- Duschinsky - after having been offered access to the material for seventeen months - on January 29, 2010 for the first time claimed that access had been refused to him due to the relocation of the documents.

In the following weeks the members of the independent historical commission affected by the transfer of the material and others involved were informed of the proposal. They all supported this step. As expected, the supervisory board gave its unconditional agreement in a meeting on March 30, 2010 and the material eventually became publicly available at the Hanseatische Wirtschaftsarchiv on May 5, 2010. Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky was informed about every step of this procedure without delay.

**Attachments No 23, 24, 25 & 26**

Letter to the members of the historical commission

eMails to Dr. Pinto Duschinsky dated March 22, March 30 as well as April 30, 2010

**D. On the following publications**

In his initial communication with the authorities at Oxford University, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky had apparently emphasized that he wished to keep his complaint entirely confidential to allow for an undisturbed review of his concerns. Consequently the universities kept confidentiality and did not contact the foundation until December 2009. While Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky had apparently submitted his concerns as part of a written memorandum to Oxford University as early as summer 2009, authorities there were asked not to share this document with the foundation as a matter of confidentiality. Adhering to the intention to keep the procedures non-public, the foundation itself did not contact any third party outside of its own bodies about Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky's complaint. The foundation was advised that the allegations raised by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky should be discussed during a joint meeting scheduled for March 30, 2010. This meeting was later cancelled. Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky had asked for the meeting to be rescheduled because it clashed with Passover.

During a visit to the annual Hanseatic Scholarship selection procedures on March 15, 2010, the representative of the foundation, Ansgar Wimmer, learned that Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky, regardless of his request for confidentiality, had contacted faculty members such as Professor Jane Caplan or Prof. Nick Stargard with his concerns about the foundation.

On March 25, 2010, then, the British monthly journal “Standpoint Magazine” published an extensive article by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky headlined “The Prize Lies of a Nazi Tycoon”. In this article he claimed to have investigated that Alfred Toepfer had played a “key role in the Third Reich” and, among other allegations accused the foundation of continuing to concealing or downplaying (“greywash”) Alfred Toepfer’s involvement with the Nazi regime and his support for its proponents after the war. He accused the foundation and the founder’s family of not being willing to apologize for Alfred Toepfer’s misdeeds and warned that further funding by institutions such as the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. may tarnish the integrity and independence of research done at British Universities as undue influence in the way history is written in academia may be exercised through such funding.

**Attachment No 27:**

Copy of the article

Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky’s article was published as “Standpoint Magazine’s” cover story of the April edition. The cover of the journal showed a silhouette of Oxford University buildings with a headline reading

“The Toepfer Files  
A Nazi shadow over Oxford  
*Special Investigation*  
by Michael Pinto-Duschinsky”

**Attachment No 28:**

Copy of the cover of the April 2010 issue of “Standpoint Magazine”

The April edition of “Standpoint Magazine” also contained a leading article written by its editor, Daniel Johnson, under the title “The Merchant of Hamburg”. In his highly critical comment, Daniel Johnson, who had been a scholar within a different scholarship scheme of the foundation as part of its Shakespeare Prize in 1979, repeated the allegations raised by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky, asked the foundation to apologize to all those who, in his view, were misled about its past and to open its archives “without ifs or buts”. Furthermore he stated:

*“Oxford, meanwhile, can continue to endorse the Hanseatic Scholarship only if their problematic provenance is fully and openly acknowledged, which is not yet the case.”*

Daniel Johnson had neither contacted nor talked to the foundation prior to the publication of his editorial and has refused to meet with representatives since.

**Attachment No 29 & 30:**

Copy of the editorial

eMail correspondence with Daniel Johnson

On March 28, The Sunday Times published an column by Dominic Lawson headlined “No, Fritz, we won’t stop mentioning the war”, which took up the article in Standpoint Magazine. Mr. Lawson praised Dr.Pinto-Duschinsky’s “remarkable investigation”, repeated its grave

allegations against the foundation today and basically presented the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. as an unrepentant institution unwilling to face a shameful Nazi past. Dominic Lawson neither contacted nor talked to the foundation prior to his article.

**Attachment No 31:**

Commentary by Mr. Dominic Lawson

On March 31, the German academic publisher De Gruyter published a press release announcing that the “well-known British political scientist” Dr. Pinto- Duschinsky had discovered significant new details about the Hamburg based Philanthropist Alfred Toepfer and that his findings in Standpoint Magazine would soon be published as an academic contribution to a larger collection of articles under the direction of Dr. Michael Fahlbusch und Dr. Ingo Haar. Dr. Pinto- Duschinsky’s findings, the press release stated, by far exceeded the details known about Alfred Toepfer to date and would lead to a re-evaluation of both Alfred Toepfer and his foundation. This press release was widely circulated by Dr. Michael Fahlbusch, editor of the publication which plans to publish Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky’s findings.

**Attachment No. 32 & 33**

Press release by the publisher DeGruyter

eMail by Dr. Michael Fahlbusch on the issue

On the same day, the foundation was contacted by Ms Gina Thomas, London based correspondent of the German daily “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” to enquire about the issues raised in both the commentaries by Mr. Lawson and Mr. Johnson as well as Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky original article. In the course of the discussions with Ms. Thomas, the foundation learned that she had been told as early as February 2010 by Mr Johnson, whom she has known for many years, about the forthcoming article by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky and that Mr Johnson had suggested she write about it when it was published. Upon completing her own research including reviewing extensive material provided by the foundation, Ms. Thomas published an article in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung on April 7, 2010.

**Attachment No. 34:**

„Gutes Geld, dunkle Absichten“, Article by Ms. Gina Thomas, London Correspondent of the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung

Subsequently, a number of letters to the editor appeared in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung on the issue including letters by Dr. Michael Pinto-Duschinsky, Prof. Hans Mommsen and Ansgar Wimmer

**Attachment 35, 36, 37, 38 & 39:**

Letters to the editor by Peter Schmidt, Dr. Lindita Arapi, Dr. Michael Pinto-Duschinsky, Ansgar Wimmer; Prof. Hans Mommsen

The Sunday Times published two letters on the issue, including a personal letter to Mr. Dominic Lawson by Mr. Wimmer, which - in Mr. Wimmer’s view - was unfairly edited.

**Attachments No 40, 41 & 42:**

Letter to the editor as written and as published

eMail exchange with Mr. Lawson and Mr. Witherow

Further Letters to the editor were sent to Standpoint Magazine, but they have not been published so far:

**Attachment No 43:**

Letter by Prof Bernd Wegner, member of the selection committee

On April 30, the Oxford based student magazine “Cherwell” published a cover story, “Scholarship ‘serverely tainted’ by Nazi Past”, on the issue. , which had apparently been contacted by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky and prompted by his articles in “Standpoint Magazine under the title “Scholarship “severely tainted” by Nazi past” published a cover story on the issue. Other than Daniel Johnson and Dominic Lawson the student in charge of writing the article, Harry Phillips, also talked to the foundation prior to publication.

**Attachment No 44:**

“Scholarship ‘severely tainted’ by Nazi past”, Article by Mr. Harry Phillips in Cherwell Magazine

All those publications mentioned, which were made available online by their publishers, have been immediately and voluntarily documented by the Alfred Topfer Stiftung F.V.S. on its website together with statements on the issue in English as well as German. To date, the foundation has neither received Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky’s initial intervention submitted to the University of Oxford nor any other written and substantiated documentation on the issue other than those published in Standpoint Magazine.

**E. On the reactions following these publications**

In his letter to the editor of the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung mentioned above, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky described his perception as follows:

*“In the long process of researching into Alfred Toepfer, I have taken heart from the support I have received from historians in a number of countries – but especially Germany itself. They assure me that my publication on Toepfer is an encouragement to them. I believe that many in Germany are fed up with continuing propaganda on behalf of unworthy persons and institutions and institutions about their roles in Hitler’s Germany”*

Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky may have received such responses of which the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. is not aware. In the foundation’s working relationships with other institutions and individuals, in the general public and among those who have observed its work for many years, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky’s efforts have met with a very different reaction, both nationally and internationally. From the many supportive reactions that have reached the foundation both formally and informally, five reactions may serve as samples of how different perceptions can be:

**Attachments 45, 46, 47, 48, 49**

eMail by Dr. Detlef Garbe, director of the memorial KZ Neuengamme

eMail by Prof. Dr. Georg Kastner, University of Vienna

eMail by Prof. Matthew Jeffries, former Hanseatic Scholar

eMail by Dr. Frank Bajohr, Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte

eMail by Dr. Rainer Schaper, Director, Cultural Programme Swiss Public TV

### **III. To be unambiguously clear about the allegations – and the facts**

Having outlined the interaction between Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky and the foundation and having illustrated how his concerns have evolved into a full-fledged campaign it may now be worth looking at the allegations which are at the core of his concerns. These may be summarized both from his article in Standpoint Magazine, his letter to the editor in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung published on April 16, 2010 as well as the accompanying commentaries apparently published in close coordination. They can be separated into three major categories:

(A)

First and foremost, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky claims to reveal a series of extremely damaging new facts about Alfred Toepfer's biography and his involvement with the Nazi regime, both during the war and with people closely affiliated with the regime after the war. In particular, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky claims that Alfred Toepfer played "a key role in the Third Reich".

(B)

Secondly, he raises grave accusations against the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S., with regard its past and its current operations. He effectively accuses the foundation

- of trying to explain away a disgraceful historical record
- of having misled prize winners and cooperation partners such as the universities of Oxford and Cambridge about its past and the biography of its founder,
- of refusing to face the past and actively engaging in "greywashing", thus concealing important facts about its history
- of refusing to apologize and take responsibility for its past and its founder's biography
- of having manipulated the work of what it claimed to have been an independent historical commission
- of having hindered his research
- of still glorifying its founder despite highly damaging historical evidence
- of trivializing the Holocaust
- of intimidating its "critics" with personal attacks, legal threats or even homophobic insults,
- of giving grants to Jewish organizations as tokens or for purely cosmetic reasons, i.e. to fund causes to hide its past.

(C)

Finally, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky alleges that the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. through funding programmes such as the Hanseatic Scholarship Programme is trying to influence the way history is written in Oxford, Cambridge or elsewhere and effectively aims to undermine the integrity of the research done by providing "tainted money".

#### **A. On the claim to reveal new facts**

To avoid any possible misunderstanding at the current stage of the argument it is important for the foundation to acknowledge that the vast majority of facts about the biography of Alfred Toepfer and his involvement with the Nazi regime during the war mentioned by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky are accurate. The same applies to the information about the contacts and working relationships Toepfer had with proponents of the regime after the war. For this very reason the foundation has been at pains to explicitly acknowledge its particular historical responsibility and the need for transparency.

The irritating and academically questionable aspect of the issue, however is the fact that the vast majority of the factual information, which was presented by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky in his article „The Prize Lies of a Nazi Tycoon“ as stemming from his own research, has, in fact, been unearthed and widely commented upon in the past ten years by others, in many cases by historical investigations initiated and funded by the foundation.

A source of the presented facts unmentioned by the author is the biography "Alfred Toepfer" by Dr. Jan Zimmermann, published in Hamburg 2008. Dr. Jan Zimmermann, on his own initiative and with the support of this foundation has illustrated in a precise analysis that the overwhelming number of facts used by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky in his "investigation" have long been researched and published by others and have been open to critical review and interpretation by historians for quite some time.

#### **Attachment No 50**

“Michael Pinto-Duschinsky: the Prize Lies of a Nazi Tycoon – Complete text with notes, source documentation and references by Dr. Jan Zimmermann”

Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky in his article and Standpoint Magazine's editor Daniel Johnson in his accompanying editorial create the impression that these facts were revealed by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky for the first time. It seems important to emphasize however that the foundation does not intend to accuse Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky of inappropriately using other authors' research or representing it as his own. The foundation is fully aware that within a journalistic piece, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky was under no obligation to operate according to academic standards or fully name his sources.

Dr. Zimmermann's analysis however clearly proves that Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky in his journalistic contribution to Standpoint Magazine blatantly misrepresents the foundation's efforts to make its past transparent and to address the consequences. The overwhelming amount of research done on Alfred Toepfer and the past of his foundations, which Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky relies on in his article, has been done with the active support of this foundation with free and unrestricted access to those materials that are on file with us. The foundation has allocated a significant amount of resources to support genuinely independent research and publication. A wide range of different historians have had an opportunity to make free unrestricted use of the material and this foundation has repeatedly encouraged others, including Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky, to publish whatever new findings they may have.

Dr Zimmermann's analysis also identifies a significant number of instances in Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky's elaborations where he substitutes interpretation and assumption for facts and details long known and available to those interested.

As in the past, the foundation not only accepts but welcomes new facts unearthed by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky or any other serious researcher, which contribute to the evaluation of Alfred Toepfer and the history of his foundation. Subject to publication and review in an academic context this seems to be the case in four different instances in his article in Standpoint Magazine as identified in Dr. Zimmermann's analysis:

*“The important new information provided by Michael Pinto-Duschinsky's article is contained in the section on Toepfer's activities after the war. I refer in particular to the role of a) Gerda Toepfer as mediator in Oxford, the employment of b) Barbara Hacke in Toepfer's company, the letter of recommendation for c) Hartmann Lauterbacher and the “silent aid” for d) Hermann Bickler.”*

Beyond these new findings, which have also been made possible in at least two instances through the opening of the foundation's archives and in one instance through information confirmed by the archive's curator, the main contribution by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky to the debate seems to be a different interpretation of Alfred Toepfer's significance to the 'Third Reich' as well as a far more critical assessment of Toepfer's motivation to maintain relationships with Nazi war criminals such as Riecke, Haller, Veessenmayer and others after the war.

For the purpose of this examination, three aspects may be pointed out from the foundations perspective:

(1)

For at least the last ten years the foundation has gone to great lengths to respect any possible interpretation of Toepfer's intentions that may follow from the facts as a relevant contribution to an ongoing historical debate. No one at the foundation today aims to "defend" or "explain away" aspects of Alfred Toepfer's biography. It is neither our intention nor task today to promote a certain image of Alfred Toepfer, his work or his biography. This foundation today does not see itself as a monument to its founder, but as an open, developing and learning organization.

In this spirit however, the mere mention of the fact that a significant number of independently minded and respected historians, who have taken note of the same set of facts as Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky, do not share his interpretation that Toepfer "played a key role in the Third Reich", should and may not be mistaken in an academic environment as "greywashing" or an attempt to "explain away a disgraceful past".

(2)

Even if the facts as presented by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky should and will not be disputed by the foundation in the course of this argument, some of them may merit closer attention that they have received from Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky.

As Dr. Jan Zimmermann points out in his analysis, a more profound knowledge of the sources and the biographical context could have helped in some instances to substantiate – or falsify – the subsequent interpretation. This may apply to the question of Toepfer's willingness to join the NSDAP, his repeatedly emphasized role as a sponsoring member of the SS and the disgraceful act of hiring Edmund Veessenmayer. According to the material on file with the Alfred Toepfer Archive available to Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky, Veessenmayer did not at all serve as Toepfer's close confidant as is implied throughout the article, but as a peripheral representative for Toepfer's enterprise in Teheran in 1952 and was apparently fired by Toepfer in 1954 for reasons not precisely clear from the sources. These facts may indeed be irrelevant to an evaluation of Toepfer's decision to hire Veessenmayer, whose responsibility for the Holocaust in Hungary and elsewhere in the Balkans indisputably make him one of the worst war criminals but they are still part of the full picture.

(3)

Finally it may be worth noting that the foundation by no means informed Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky only of facts that appear to make Mr. Toepfer appear in a "more favourable" light. It also pointed him to critical relationships which had not been properly researched before. One example of this can be found in an email sent to Dr. Pinto - Duschinsky as early

as February 20, 2009, where he was encouraged to review Toepfer's relationship with Georg Rauschnig, head of the „Reichsfinanzdirektion Hamburg“ from 1925 – 1943.

#### **Attachment**

Please review attachment No. 14, eMail by Ansgar Wimmer dated February 20, 2009, para. No. 4

The selective use of facts is dangerous from *any* position, no matter how honorable and understandable the motives may be. The same applied to blurring the line between factual information, speculation, insinuation or interpretation.

#### **B. On the accusations against the foundation**

As to Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky's allegations against the foundation's past as well as to its current operations, it is equally important do differentiate:

(1)

Those working at the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. today find it just as disturbing as Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky that Toepfer, like many Germans of his generation, never publicly addressed his own involvement during the Second World War or thereafter, and certainly never acknowledged any personal guilt or mistakes. It is undisputed that on various occasions Toepfer denied his own involvement and, even to his closest friends, described aspects of his life as though he had stood in opposition to the regime, or at the very least regarded it with a critical personal distance.

Prior to the findings of the independent historical commission many of those affiliated with the foundation trusted Toepfer's self representation and perpetuated his version of events without critically examining its historical validity. For many decades after the war – and during Toepfer's entire lifetime – criticism of his version was ignored and legitimate questions were deemed inappropriate, all the more so as Toepfer's postwar philanthropic engagements - in the vast majority of its projects and programmes – were mainly directed towards worthy causes such as nature conservation, European reconciliation and integration as well as to the promotion of arts and sciences through cultural prizes and scholarships.

In light of Toepfer's philanthropic largesse and personal modesty any critical question on the founder's biography was branded as an “improper attack” against the foundation, which ought to be dealt with on a tactical, rather than a substantive level. One out of many examples of such a “tactical view” was an expertise given to the foundation by the public-relation experts Görres & Partner in 1997.

#### **Attachment No 51**

Report and Recommendations by Görres & Partner, 1997

This basic position was, by and large, maintained until the first findings of the independent historical commission surfaced. The foundation therefore has to accept the criticism that it largely ignored a questionable historical record up to this date as it tried to preserve its founder's “legacy”.

(2)

But the picture changed fundamentally when the the independent historical commission, initiated and funded through the foundation, took up its work.

Prompted by the forced termination of its Strassbourg award, the foundation asked a series of respected and competent academics, both on the junior and senior level to conduct research on aspects of Toepfer's biography that demanded transparency. On the selection of the commission, the foundation was advised by the director of the "Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte", Professor Arnold Sywottek, and by Professor Dr. Klaus Müller of the "Universität der Bundeswehr".

While those who had initiated the research on the part of the executive board of the foundation had originally hoped that the research would clear Toepfer from criticism it soon became obvious that the facts would not "defuse" the issue and that full disclosure was required. Looking at the academic résumés of those involved in the exercise it becomes rather clear that given their experience, diversity and competence, this was not a group assembled for "greywashing", but for a proper confrontation with the past.

It is no secret that those who were personally attached to Alfred Toepfer, such as members of his family or the head of the supervisory board, Prof. Marie-Paule Stintzi, Toepfer's companion for a long time, were hesitant about taking on this painful confrontation. The same held true for those who had worked with Toepfer such as Mr. Hans-Jürgen Heinrich, who had served as head of human resources in the Toepfer group and was now entrusted with disentangling the historical material on file with the Carl Toepfer foundation to create a "Findbuch" for the "Alfred Toepfer Archive" as a basis for the work of the historical commission. In retrospect some of the procedures reflect the inexperience with processes such as these. Joint sessions of the historical commission with board members of the foundation or meetings of the historical commission in foundation guesthouses may have made the work of the commission vulnerable ex post to criticism on a formal level.

In essence, however, the commission was able to work entirely independently and with full autonomy. Prof. Gerlach's experience mentioned above is a case in point: Despite disagreements on the scope and the results of his research within the commission, he was able to publish his findings as he saw fit. A statement provided by Professor Georg Kreis of the University of Basel (Switzerland) may best summarize this argument. The subcommittee is invited to contact further members of the independent historical commission to explore their opinion on the independence of the commission.

#### **Attachment No. 52**

eMail message of February 15, 2010 by Prof. Georg Kreis commenting on the work of the historical commission

It may also be worth noting that that the remuneration for the academic work within the historical commission, both on a professorial as well as a junior academic level, was in no way excessive or disproportional so that there could be no question of trying to obtain a 'favourable' outcome on this basis, nor was the selection of the members of the commission made with a view to influencing the findings. Payments to the commission have been made transparent with the transfer of the material of the historical commission to the Hanseatische Wirtschaftsarchiv.

Upon the publication of the report of the historical commission in 2000 the foundation widely circulated the documentation and pointed out its revised position on its founder and its history in a press conference as well as in its annual report 2000/2001.

### **Attachment No. 53**

Preface of the annual report of the foundation 2000/2001

A list of those who received the final report of the historical commission included representatives of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, who were affiliated with the Hanseatic Scholarship programme at the time such as Prof. Niall Ferguson, Prof. Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann and Prof. James Reed.

### **Attachment No. 54**

List of those jury and committee members affiliated with the work of the foundation which received the report of the independent historical commission upon publication in 2000

Hanseatic Scholars, who were interested in the issue at the time, also received copies of the report free of charge.

### **Attachment No. 55**

Letter by Dr. Pallach to Mr. Guy Tourlamain, Hanseatic Scholar 2000 - 2002

The results of the historical commission have also been made available to all university libraries and major public and state libraries across Germany free of charge and continue to be disseminated free of charge to those interested in the topic academically. When the original publisher of the commission's findings, the Christians Verlag, went out of business in 2005, the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. on its own initiative produced a reprint to allow for further unrestricted access to the material. The introductory remarks summarizing the main findings of the book have been made available on the website of the foundation and have been translated into English and French.

It is worth noting that the foundation in parallel to the work done by the independent historical commission also supported a voluminous and rather meticulous dissertation by Dr. Jan Zimmermann on the cultural awards of the foundation F.V.S. between 1935 and 1945 ("Die Kulturpreise der Stiftung F.V.S. 1945 – 1945"). As pointed out earlier, a copy of this book as well as the final report of the independent historical commission are on file with Professor Earl for review by the members of the subcommittee.

(3)

Since the initial questions raised about Toepfer concentrated on this period, the work of the independent historical commission had – with a few exceptions - focussed its research on Toepfer's biography up until 1945. The following years, however, showed that a full biographical review seemed desirable to allow for a more complete evaluation of Toepfer's life and work.

The Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. therefore actively encouraged and supported the Hamburg based ZEIT Stiftung Gerd und Ebelin Bucerius to commission and publish within its series "Hamburger Köpfe" a comprehensive yet compact biography of Alfred Toepfer to ensure the independence of the research and publishing process. The ZEIT Stiftung chose Dr. Jan Zimmermann to write this book which was published in 2008. This book is on file with Professor Earl as well. It received unconditional support and endorsement by the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S.. and has been equally sent to all commission and jury members of the foundation at the time.

## **Attachment No. 56**

“Hartnäckig Transparenz ermöglichen” & – “Ordnung – Über die Arbeit an der Biographie Alfred Toepfers”

Excerpts from the foundation’s Jahrbuch 2007/2008

Beyond the historical research dealing with its own past the foundation has made an extra effort to support critical academic work which covers areas related to Alfred Toepfer and his foundations. In this context the foundation, for example, helped to publish a dissertation on Gustav Adolf Rein, a former rector of the University of Hamburg in the beginning of the ‘Third Reich’ and a close advisor to Alfred Toepfer.

In the spirit of explicitly encouraging further independent research on the foundation’s history and its founder’s past, the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. recently decided to provide further resources to enable scholars to access all relevant material. It now offers academic researchers interested in this issue the opportunity to apply for archive scholarships which may cover costs relevant to the research. Applications are reviewed and decided upon by an independent and competent panel under the participation of the head of the „Institut für die Geschichte der deutschen Juden (IGDJ)“, Prof. Dr. Stefanie Schüler-Springorum, the academic director of the „Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte Hamburg der Universität“, Prof. Dr. Axel Schildt as well as the director of the „KZ Gedenkstätte Neuengamme“, Dr. Detlef Garbe.

(4)

Having discovered more about its founder’s past, this foundation has taken great care to review and develop its programme in the light of these findings.

The foundation has long distanced itself from an award programme based on Toepfer’s concept of „Kulturräume“ and has been focussing its attention and resources on honouring artists and academics who promote cross cultural understanding and reconciliation in Europe. Fostering dialogue, allowing for the exchange of different views and encouraging tolerance and innovation is at the heart of our work today.

This also applies to the foundation’s scholarship programmes. The letter sent to Dr. Pinto Duschinsky (compare *Attachment no. 11*) included a list of just a few out of many more master or doctoral theses supported through scholarships by the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S., which reflect our foundation’s particular historical responsibility. It is not by coincidence that a number of Hanseatic Scholars appear on this list.

On various occasions the foundation has acknowledged outstanding individuals or groups of people who, through their research or practical efforts, have worked for a better understanding of history and for projects of reconciliation within Europe among them Prof. Dr. Ursula Büttner, the initiative „Stolpersteine“, Dr. Albrecht Dümling, Timea Junghaus, Eckart Krause und Dr. Rainer Nicolaysen.

A particular focus of the foundation’s work in the Hamburg area is the active support of initiatives of remembrance and tolerance. Upon request by the respective institutions, the foundation has supported projects by organizations such as the Jüdische Gemeinde Hamburg, the Jüdische Salon e.V. or the Verein “Jüdisches Museum Hamburg e.V”. Over the past few years the foundation has funded publications such as “Die Verfolgung und Ermordung der Hamburger Juden 1933 – 1945”, “Annäherungen – 50 Jahre christlich jüdische Zusammenarbeit in Hamburg” or a map and an internet website of places of remembrance and Jewish life in Hamburg. Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky’s claim raised in his letter to the editors of the

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung that this foundation gives token grants to Jewish organizations for purely cosmetic reasons is therefore as insulting and inappropriate as his even more absurd insinuation that this organisation sets out to trivialize the Holocaust.

The foundation's programme today reflects the conviction of those entrusted with its operations that it is not only important to be aware of one's past, but also to learn from it. This belief is central to the way this foundation tries to communicate with the general public today.

The foundation's website explicitly refers to the debates about the foundation's history and allows its users to search and find relevant material about its past without eschewing highly critical and controversial publications.

At almost every public event organized, the foundation refers to its past and the historical responsibility deriving from it. All prospective prizewinners are informed about the historical roots of the foundation before they decide whether to accept the prize or reject it. Scholarship recipients are encouraged to develop their own critical opinion on their sponsoring organization's past. At the event commemorating the 75th anniversary of this foundation in January 2007, a public discussion about Toepfer's past involving a number of historians was organized. The panel focused its attention on the question of historical responsibility and included the widely respected French sociologist Alfred Grosser.

In an interview with the French daily „Midi Libre“ in the autumn of 2008 the foundation's chairman Ansgar Wimmer made clear that the inclusion of the founder's name in the name of the foundation (it was added after his death in 1993) should today be regarded rather an act of transparency than as an attempt to honor Toepfer. In order to avoid even the slightest misunderstanding in this respect the foundation is currently re-reviewing all the old references or images of its founder used in its publications and programme activities.

(5)

These explanations makes clear that the foundation is by no means trying to “explain away a disgraceful historical record”, “glorify its founder”, conceal important facts about its history, nor does it manipulate historical research or refuse to face up to its past. It may have become equally clear that the allegation that the foundation today actively misleads prize winners and cooperation partners such as the universities of Oxford and Cambridge about its past and the biography of its founder are entirely unfounded, uninformed and unfair. In light of the foundation's efforts as outlined in section II. A – C. of this statement, Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky's claim that his research has been undermined or even systematically hindered by the foundation is just as outlandish as his perception that the foundation is trying to intimidate its “critics” with personal attacks, legal threats or even homophobic insults.

Here, just as with every other allegation made by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky it may be worthwhile to review the facts: When he wrote in his letter to the editor of the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung on April 16, 2010:

*“A posting on the foundation's website sees fit to mention that one earlier Austrian critic was a homosexual leader”*

he in effect referred to footnote 24 in a publication by Prof. Georg Kreis, former head of the official Swiss Commission against Racism and member of the independent historical commission of the foundation, which is reproduced on the foundation's website.

### **Attachment No. 57**

“A dubious relationship with a 'dubious past' -On the ongoing controversy surrounding the Alfred Toepfer Foundation”, by Georg Kreis, Basel, taken from: Vorgeschichte zur Gegenwart. Ausgewählte Aufsätze, vol. 3, Schwabe Verlag, Basel, 2005.

Once more, it may be worthwhile to repeat: The selective use of facts is dangerous from *any* position, no matter how honourable and understandable the motives may be. The same applies to blurring the line between factual information, speculation, insinuation or interpretation.

### **C. On the allegation that funding by the foundation is inappropriately influencing the way history is written and academic opinions are formed**

What is most striking, however, is that Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky does not present any evidence whatsoever on the most central point of his argument put forward to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which is that the funding by the foundation is inappropriately influencing the way history is written and academic opinions are formed in Oxford, Cambridge or elsewhere.

The foundation, in fact, would greatly welcome a professional and qualified study on the question of how the Hanseatic Scholarship Programme has influenced the lives and professional careers of those benefiting from it. Such a review, if undertaken with the same zeal and energy as Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky's other research, would likely show that the foundation's efforts from 1970 onwards have encouraged a highly intelligent, independently minded and extremely gifted group of young scholars to pursue their academic and professional plans with integrity and independence, enabled them to explore the reality of different academic settings within Europe and provided them with opportunities to further learn how to draw their very own conclusions.

### **Closing remark**

Having said that, the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. would like to emphasize once more that it is hopes to continue the working relationships with the universities of Oxford and Cambridge with regards to the Hanseatic Scholarship programme in the future. It remains prepared to answer any further questions on the issues raised, gladly accepts any advice that both institutions may have in this context and would greatly appreciate a transparent, unambiguous decision on this question soon.

# Index

<b>Preface</b>	Page 1
<b>I. To be unambiguously clear up front about what is most relevant</b>	3
A. On the question of transparency and responsibility	3
B. On the question of an apology	3
C. On the question of respect	4
<b>II. To be unambiguously clear about what happened</b>	5
A. On the foundation's first encounter with Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky	5
B. On the foundation's active support for the research done by Dr. Pinto-Duschinsky	6
C. On the question of unrestricted access to historical material and other documents	7
D. On the following publications	9
E. On the reactions following these publications	12
<b>III. To be unambiguously clear about the allegations – and the facts</b>	13
A. On the claim to reveal new facts	13
B. On the accusations against the foundation	16
C. On the allegation that funding by the foundation is inappropriately influencing the way history is written and academic opinions are formed	21
<b>Closing remark</b>	21