

**Appendix I: Lowenthal's Letter to Janz (June 6, 1986)**

Lowenthal A Letter to Dieter Janz, June 6, 1986, *Universitätsarchiv Tübingen, Peiffer Archiv Signatur 2418*.

Letter translated by one of the authors [MS] from French into English:

*Dear Colleague,*

*As I promised you, I have contacted Dr van Bogaert. I answer your questions with his agreement:*

- 1. After leaving Antwerp Scherer went to Professor Thomas in Ghent. This happened after the beginning of the occupation [of Belgium]. Afterwards he has been at Foerster in Breslau.*
- 2. Dr van Bogaert ignores everything about the eventual brain studies of children killed in German Institutions.*
- 3. Dr van Bogaert cannot tell whether it was Foerster or Viktor von Weizsäcker who invited Scherer to come to Breslau.*
- 4. Dr van Bogaert only knows, as I already told you, that Scherer arrived in Antwerp as an anti-Nazi. Later he could manage, in a way we ignore, to have no problems with the German occupation authorities. He would have denounced Dr van Bogaert who in this way got involved in a lawsuit. It seems that it concerned scientific priorities.*
- 5. There is no bibliography of the works of Scherer at the institute, but reference to his work can be found in the volumes of the publications of the Institute Bunge, which besides I possess. Eventually we can communicate them to you.*

*Finally, I asked Dr van Bogaert whether he would accept to meet you. He told me that he was ready to do so. I hope that I have given you interesting information. I would greatly appreciate to be informed about the subsequent development of these questions.*

Dr A. Lowenthal

**Appendix II: Zülch's Letter to Janz (July 9, 1986)**

Zülch K J Letter to Dieter Janz, 9 July 1986, *Universitätsarchiv Tübingen Signatur 731/96, Peiffer Archiv Signatur 2419*.

Letter partly translated by one of the authors [MS] from German into English.

*Dear Mr Janz,*

*Thank you very much for your letter of 30.06.1986, which arrived today and which I answer immediately, since I will travel for one week to Munich for the conference on Angiology. Yesterday evening we had Mrs Dr Küttemeyer as our guest for a few hours, after about two weeks ago Cora Penselin and her husband visited us for a few hours. I absolutely didn't know anything about an accusation against Weizsäcker and learned about it only from outsiders, namely at the occasion of a reception I had organized for my Otfrid-Foerster medal, by the excited announcement from our internist, Prof. Kaufmann, who had just heard on*

television about the accusations at the Weizsäcker symposium In Heidelberg. Since he knew that I had been with Weizsäcker, he reported me this news, about which I only read relatively short communications in miscellaneous medical and other journals.

A few days before, Mrs Kütemeyer had called me, and asked me whether perhaps she could speak me, she belongs to the editor staff of the Weizsäcker writings and would really like to know from me what kind of a person Weizsäcker had been. I accepted, but postponed this for some time since I still was busy at that moment (see above). Then yesterday evening, she was with me, to show me – just as Mrs Penselin – the Polish documents and to ask me for my interpretation. I have given her – just as to the daughter Cora – an explanation, as I will describe you in detail now. I already had told Mrs Cora, that I didn't know what else I could add as information than what I remembered. However, I briefly mentioned that I had a huge quantity of documents consisting of thousands of pages, because since the middle of the twenties I regularly kept carbon copies from all letters I wrote by means of a typewriter, moreover I had plentiful stenographic reports from during the wartime. I didn't know whether I had also written diary notes during the Breslau period, and whether I had been able to save these out of Berlin, or during the flight out of Silesia.

A few days later, during a first browsing through the papers, I found by chance the report, that Mrs Cora obviously had sent you. I had dictated this [report] and had it been typewritten three or four years earlier without any connection to the Weizsäcker affair. The report corresponds exactly to the tenor, as I have given you today in our telephone call, and to Mrs Cora in our personal conversation. I do not know whether Mrs Kütemeyer has this text.

I would like to add that with van Bogaert I have a very exceptional and trustful personal relationship, during my whole life he has been an old friend and mentor for me. To portray the person van Bogaert, I enclose the latest letter, he has sent me a few days ago, at that moment he didn't know anything about the Weizsäcker affair and my recent "entanglement" as a witness. Meanwhile he is informed, as I learned from your letter, or more precisely from Mr Löwenthal's.

Now to the details:

For me the behaviour of Mr Scherer "at the writing desk" of Mr van Bogaert is not only impudent and brazen, but also an indication of his wretched – I cannot call it differently – character. Because when one behaves in this way to a host and human being, who has taken one out from nothingness (in Paris where he had ended up as a refugee) and has restored the possibility to work on one of the most interesting subjects in a magnificent institute, then this is not only stupid, but also an indication of an incredible bad character. The fact that van Bogaert told me this story, after we met for the first time only five minutes earlier – till then we knew each other only from the distance – shows how deeply he was hurt by this impertinence of Mr Sch.

Besides concerning your question: later he had – as far as I can remember – married a / or the secretary of van Bogaert. I don't know whether she still lives.

I never heard, and van Bogaert never has told me, that it came to a lawsuit as Löwenthal writes. With that it would have concerned scientific priorities. I can imagine that van Bogaert, who indeed was incredibly angry, has then taken some legal action, when Scherer had taken with him and utilized all his material; probably also previous personal reports and standpoints of van Bogaert. That is all for this point.

Now to the question how Mr Sch. came to Breslau: I wrote some words about that in my report, particularly also concerning the attitude of Hallervorden. I don't know when, neither on which acute occasion I talked with Weizsäcker about Scherer's appointment. Nevertheless, I can remember that it came to a very enraged controversy, at a moment when of course I didn't know anything about Scherer's behaviour towards van Bogaert, I learned this only in 1950. I know however that Weizsäcker and I have yelled during this dispute.

Now Weizsäcker and I were the most opposite types you can imagine. I was very strongly influenced by Foerster. In Breslau Foerster had a very great illustriousness with which of course Weizsäcker had to

*contend, because in Breslau he didn't find an open hearing for his scientific principles (I nevertheless found the appointment great, since he was the only one who could be compared to Foerster). From all of them, except of Gagel, or also Pette who were mentioned then, no one was ready to succeed Otfried Foerster.*

*Mrs Cora has told me that somewhere her father has written and she possesses a letter, that Scherer was only appointed provisionally; nowadays I can't tell whether this has been a response to our discussion.*

*I immediately will give you the interpretation as I imagine: it is an absolute tradition at the neuropathological laboratories that brain material which has been sent to them, is scientifically studied and classified. Hence, for the first two or three entries I would not think about anything special. They probably passed over Weizsäcker's writing desk, and Weizsäcker immediately forwarded them to Scherer, because – as you wrote it yourself – he wanted to continue the old tradition of the institute. Perhaps he also has said – and for me that is the most plausible explanation –: “Well, when such things arrive again, you directly hand them over to Mr Scherer.” For me this is the most favourable explanation I can give, although I have to say that the number of 350, which I believe to remember as basis of the concerned lecture, that this number is so huge, that after the first 30 to 50, one should have asked: where does this great amount of material come from and why is it sent just now in the middle of the war?*

*The next question is whether Weizsäcker was present at this lecture? I may assume that he was present. We lived in the military hospital for brain injury in Karlowitz, at a distance of 15 km from the Foerster/Weizsäcker Institute, and we then were invited, I may tell: to seminars, to discussions and to lectures, when Mr. Derwort or Mr. Christians, had found experimentally something new; we then enjoyed listening to the discussions, which all were related to the fundamental principles of the “Gestaltkreises.” I no longer know in detail what came to my mind. However, you see from my report, that at that time I already suspected that something unsavoury was going on and that therefore I imprinted these things so deeply. Just like you, I hold it for absolutely improbable that Weizsäcker had any interest in: (a) morphological studies in general; (b) the diagnoses of children who became victims of the euthanasia, if he ever has known about this. I can stress, that till then I certainly didn't know anything about the euthanasia of children, neither of other people in Germany, [I knew] about the shooting of Poles and Jews in the occupied territory. I heard something about Auschwitz and the whole broad annihilation actions, only in the second half of 1944, i.e. in the period in Branitz, in Upper Silesia.*

*It could be possible that when the big cleaning will start, I still will find somewhere some vague notes in letters or diaries, this however can only start earliest at the end of this year. I will have to go through thousands of pages, partly, in the favourable cases, carbon copies from typewriters, partly also stenographic reports, where at that time the stenography was not always careful.*

*As I experienced Weizsäcker there, I had the impression that his thoughts were completely somewhere else, and that he floated in higher spheres, when I am allowed to express it in this way; the Weizsäckers are inclined to this.*

[A great part of what follows in Zülch's letter is not translated since it has no relevance to this study. It concerns especially Zülch's experience with and his opinion about Viktor von Weizsäcker].

*I believe, I come to the end of what I can say about Weizsäcker for the moment. I regret a little bit that nobody had the idea to invite me at the meeting in Heidelberg, at that time I could already have contributed to a clarification, to what indeed in general became unpleasant. I also told this yesterday to Mrs Kütemeyer, because as things have been reported in the media and also in the newspapers, “bad marks” have come into being, and yet until now it couldn't be ruled out with some certainty in how far Weizsäcker has let run*

*these ugly things “by order” or only “by negligence” or almost “by not knowing.” If I hear something new I will notify you. I beg you to do the same when you learn something. I will send with pleasure a copy to Mr Löwenthal, who I know very well.*

*Best regards, sincerely yours,*

*Prof. Dr. Dr. h. c. K. J. Zülch*

*Annex:*

*Biography Scherer*

*Biography Foerster (in German)*

### **Appendix III: Zülch’s biographical note on Hans Joachim Scherer**

Zülch K J (1982/1983) Die Biographie des Hans-Joachim Scherer. Gedächtnisprotokoll, etwa 1982/83 ohne Kenntnis der Vorwürfe gegen V.v. Weizsäcker, *Universitätsarchiv Tübingen Signatur 731/96, Peiffer Archiv Signatur 2425.*

Text partly translated by one of the authors [MS] from German into English:

*Report made afterwards by memory, about 1982/83, without knowledge of the reproaches against V.v. Weizsäcker*

#### *The Biography of Hans Joachim Scherer*

*These days some reports can be read in the newspapers concerning the activities during the war of one of the famous German psychiatric experts Prof. Hans Joachim Rauch.*

[The part in which he writes about Dr Schmieder has not been translated since it is not relevant to this study]

*Both men [Rauch and Schmieder] are mentioned in new documents and anamnesis which were found in Heidelberg and during the war [both] were assistants to Prof. Carl Schneider who was the main organizer of the action “killing of unworthy life” in which mental handicapped children in the south-west of the country were killed. In these documents it is always emphasized that both should be free of military duties, because they were working for the action of Prof. Schneider. Now an inquiry will be opened against both. We will see what comes out of it.*

*At this occasion I remembered some facts of the life of the famous Dr Hans Joachim Scherer [in] Breslau who, in the days before the war, had played a substantial and deserved role in the pathology of tumours, but later accepted other developments.*

*Hans-Joachim Scherer came from the school of Spielmeyer in Munich, went to Berlin and became assistant to Rössle in the pathology [department] of the Charité. In the middle of the thirties he had – as so many others – in the Charité, friends who intellectually belonged to the communist circle. When some of them were arrested by the Gestapo, his name was also found mentioned in a notebook. That is why he also was sent for “investigation” to the Prince-Albrecht Street. We do not know in detail what befell him there, but things there usually went on quite harsh. Anyhow, Scherer reacted with a hasty flight to Paris. From there he called on Mr van Bogaert, the director of the Institute Bunge in Antwerp, and informed him about what had happened to him. Van Bogaert immediately offered him a job in his institute. There Scherer worked assiduously, particularly on a large collection of microscopic cuts from the animal pathology, which were*

accumulated by van Bogaert in collaboration with the Zoo of Antwerp. The results are written down in the later by Springer-Heidelberg published book “The Pathology of Pet animals.”

Meanwhile war had started and about May 15, 1940 Antwerp was occupied by the Germans. This was followed by a few days of curfew. After expiration of this [period], van Bogaert returned to his institute and found to his astonishment Dr Scherer sitting behind his [van Bogaert’s] writing desk: “Mr Scherer what are you doing here?” he only asked. “Mr van Bogaert I believe you are not well enough informed about the new state of affairs, now we Germans are the masters here.” This account was given to me by van Bogaert on the first day we made acquaintance with each other in Antwerp. I was invited by him to give a series of lectures in Antwerp during one week, and he had just picked me up at the railway station. He took me to the opposite hotel and asked me, whether we still would drink a cup of coffee together. During this first hour the story gushed out.

One has to know, that the Belgian van Bogaert – [descendant] from an old Flemish family – in addition to his outward French hull, and his very close relationship with the French neurology, was clearly German-oriented in his relation to the neuropathology. He had worked in Munich with Spielmeyer and Scholz, was acquainted with Hallervorden and particularly with Spatz. This is important for the later development of the matter. He was close friends with Spatz.

I have described the incident when Mr van Bogaert, to his great astonishment, sees Mr Scherer sitting behind his [van Bogaert’s] writing desk. In spite of Scherer’s incredible comment, van Bogaert still believed in the type of the “good German”, as he knew him from Munich. He immediately went to the German commander of the town and told him about this encounter. This one provided his orderly, and both went to Mr Scherer who was still sitting at the writing desk. Thereupon van Bogaert announced him: “Mr Scherer you will leave this institute before tomorrow 12 o’clock. You are allowed – and hereby I want to be generous – to take with you the microscopic cut you are studying now, for the rest your working place will remain unchanged as it is now.” Mr Scherer then cleared out and carried off the entire collection of animal pathology, as Mr van Bogaert affirmed me. With this he moved to Ghent, where he still worked with a Belgian till 1942. Van Bogaert obviously didn’t take any other action against him.

In 1942 came a command, by which all Germans had to leave the occupied territories – in this case Belgium. Mr Scherer now went to Germany, spoke in Munich at the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institute for Psychiatry with Scholz, who didn’t want to employ him. He then saw Hallervorden in Berlin, who only advised him: “Mr Scherer if I had your past I would voluntary report myself to the army.” Mr Scherer didn’t do so, but on the contrary continued to make inquiries and learned that Prof. Gagel’s position at the Otfried Foerster Institute in Breslau had become vacant, since Gagel had accepted an invitation to Vienna as successor to Marburg. Meanwhile, after the superannuation of Foerster, the direction of the neurological research institute had changed, and Mr von Weizsäcker had been appointed at this place. At the beginning of January 1943, I was transferred from the Caucasus to Mr von Weizsäcker. At the beginning of 1943, I became aware of the fact that Mr Scherer would obtain the position of Gagel. I really didn’t know what I could put forward against Mr Scherer, he certainly was an excellent neuropathologist and I didn’t know the story of Antwerp. However, what made me angry was the fact that the office now would be occupied permanently by a German who had lived abroad for many years whereas the young neuropathologists would be left in the cold. At that time, I have defended my point of view in a fierce conversation with Mr von Weizsäcker, who agreed with me. I didn’t have any success, Mr Scherer was appointed permanently in the function of Mr Gagel and not – as I had proposed – on a temporary base till the end of the war.

At the beginning of 1943, I was ordered to Breslau to the military hospital for brain-injured under Prof. von Weizsäcker. I met Mr Scherer in the institute for neurology research at the occasion of a scientific afternoon discussion. I only exchanged a few words with him since I didn’t like him because of his method of brain research where he completely rejected the “American classification.” But we didn’t have a scientific



discussion. During one of these scientific afternoon discussions – probably at the end of 1943 or the beginning of 1944 – Mr Scherer gave, to my astonishment, a lecture on the pathological / anatomical brain research of about 350 brain-sick children. At that time, I didn't know anything about the so-called "euthanasia killing-actions," it is true that I had heard from the shooting down of Polish people and Jews in the hinterland of the occupied territory, I think informed by a holiday-maker during skiing at the beginning of 1942.

I was extremely astonished then, I was not able to see neither rhyme nor reason and could not explain how Mr Scherer, after he had been working till then on brain tumours and the pathology of mammals, was now able to report on such a surprisingly large series of brains of handicapped children. Nevertheless, I didn't ponder on this any longer, since I had enough to do with the training in clinical neurology.

When Breslau became a stronghold, Mr Scherer could still escape and reported to Spatz in Berlin at the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institute. At that moment Spatz had problems: the institute had moved in time to the west the totality of the scientific material from several departments in order to escape bomb attacks. He had sent the "contents" of his department by railway carriage to Munich. He had lost contact with this carriage and could not localize this transport. Therefore, he gave Mr Scherer the task and the official authorization to look for this carriage in the German freight transport system. This was of course extremely hard because of the permanent bombing attacks of the railway stations. During this action Mr Scherer arrived at the railway station of Landshut – as far as I remember – where he was deadly wounded in a bomb attack. So far, the biography of Mr Scherer.

I already mentioned that I personally didn't hear about "euthanasia" in the Reich. I first heard from the accusations against Prof. Hallervorden, after the war, at the time of the Nuremberg Trial, when news was published in the newspapers. Finally, I learned the details in connection with the 1st World Congress on Neuropathology and Neurology in Lisbon, 1952. At that time the Dutch rejected Hallervorden as a lecturer, because he had been involved in such a killing-action at the Brandenburg-Görden Institute. However, van Bogaert energetically stood up for him, and could obtain, from the Dutch and the Belgians, that Hallervorden was accepted as a speaker, by vouching personally for the good behaviour of Hallervorden during the war. Recently, I still have once more read the charge against Hallervorden in a notice of the "Zeit."

The continuous support from Mr van Bogaert for Germans has urged me, later – at the occasion of an important anniversary – to propose Mr. van Bogaert for a German decoration. It was possible to introduce this proposal for a medal into the Foreign Office, where he got the support of acquaintance in the ministry. At that time van Bogaert obtained the German Distinguished Service Cross as Knight, ie "Ritterkreuz." He obtained this high degree because at the same time he was appointed baron by the Belgian king. A man of this importance should not receive a low level of service medal.

Baron van Bogaert remained the "great friend" of the Germans. As a Belgian he was the outstanding prototype of a mixture of French and German ingenuity. Today he still lives in Antwerp, enjoying a good physical condition and in particular a brilliant mental health, as I can deduce from the many fine letters I often receive from him."

#### **Appendix IV: Summary of Belgian Foreigners Police File A95.522, National Archives of Belgium, Brussels**

##### Introduction

In 1933, to stay legally in Belgium, a foreigner needed one of the following documents:

1. A valid passport with (if required) a valid visa issued by a Belgian embassy or consulate abroad.

2. A “**certificate of registration in the register of foreigners**” also called the “**white card**.” This was issued by the mayor of the municipality where the foreigner had his domicile. To issue this document the mayor needed the written authorisation of the head of public security. The certificate was valid for six months but could be renewed. To renew a certificate the foreigner had to make his application with the mayor, who had to ask the authorisation of the head of public security, who could give a positive or a negative answer without having to justify his decision.

3. An “**Identity Card**” or “**yellow card**” which was only given if the holder was registered in the municipal population register. This card was also issued by the mayor of the municipality where the foreigner had his domicile. To issue this document the mayor needed the written authorisation of the head of public security. The certificate was valid for two years but was renewed automatically by the mayor, who no longer needed the authorisation of the head of public security. Therefore, having an Identity Card allowed the foreigner to stay indefinitely in the country as long as he was not convicted by a tribunal for some criminal action, in which case he could be expelled.

#### Hans Joachim Scherer’s file A95.522

On 11.10.1933 HJS arrives in Belgium in Berchem (Antwerp) coming from Paris where he had stayed in Hotel du Mont Blanc, rue de la Huchette 28 (5th Arr.). He had a German Passport Nr. A.19161, issued in Munich on 19.02.1929, which was valid until 19.02.1934. He had obtained a visa Nr. 20999 valid for 15 days starting from 10.10.1933, issued by the Belgian embassy in Paris “to allow the holder to make a trip to Belgium and to leave again.”

The address of his domicile is Marie Josélaan 7 in Berchem (Antwerp). Therefore, he could stay there legally until 25.10.1933.

On 26.10.1933 the General Administration of Public Security writes a letter to the mayor of Berchem in which it is stated that HJS no longer has the authorisation to sojourn in Belgium and that the mayor should warn him [HJS] that he should have left the country on 6.11.1933. If on that date HJS would still be in Belgium, the mayor had to deliver him a travelling warrant with a validity of 2 days. HJS receives this document on 8.11.1933.

On 28.10.1933 the General Administration of Public Security also sends a request to the police in Paris to check if HJS is mentioned in the criminal records kept by the prefecture. The answer is “no.”

On 6.11.1933 the attorney F. Collin (Lange Lozanastraat 209, Antwerp) writes a letter to the Minister of Commerce and Industry, Van Isacker, with the petition to grant the permit to HJS to sign a work contract with the Bunge Institute. In this letter Collin writes that:

- During 2 years HJS has been the assistant of Spielmeyer in Munich where he has been active in the pathological anatomy of the central nervous system, later he has been the assistant of Rössle in Berlin during 14 months.
- HJS has left Germany because in August [1933] he had been arrested and kept in custody for 3 days because of “anti-Hitler opinion.” Two weeks after his release he left Germany.
- HJS is not a Jew and was baptised at birth.
- Among the Belgian physicians it is not possible to find a candidate with a scientific background comparable to HJS’s one.
- It is of utmost importance for the Bunge Institute to secure the collaboration of HJS.
- HJS will start his work on 1.01.1934 if the Minister grants him the permit.

To corroborate his demand Collin joins a letter from Dr. Vanderstricht, director of the Institute Bunge. In this letter Vanderstricht writes that the activities of HJS will be purely scientific; that to undertake studies in the field of anatomical pathology and pathological studies of the nervous system a very

specialised formation of several years is required; that HJS fulfils all these conditions and that it is impossible to find a physician in Belgium who could do the job.

Collin also sends a copy of his and Vanderstricht's letter to the director of the Public Security together with the petition to allow HJS to stay in Belgium until the Minister has taken a decision.

On 10.11.1933 a note written by the director of the Public Security states:

A petition has been introduced at the Minister of Industry and Work in order to obtain that Scherer can be attached to the Institute for surgical and medical Studies Bunge in Antwerp. The Institute Bunge has the highest interest to employ Scherer who is a young scientist. I have extended until the 1st of January 1934 the travelling warrant which Mr. Collin has handed over.

In the meantime, he writes a letter to the Mayor of Berchem in which is stated that the travelling warrant of Hans Scherer has been extended in his office until 1.01.1934.

On 25.11.1933 Liekendael, director of the Public Security, writes to Collin that he has given instructions to the mayor of Berchem that HJS should be registered in the register of foreigners and that a certificate of this registration should be given to HJS which will allow him to stay in the country for 6 months.

On 8.01.1934 Collin writes to Liekendael that HJS has moved some of his belongings from Germany to Belgium (a piano, a gramophone and his records, books and microscopic sections, clothes and his linen). To have these belongings at his disposal HJS had to deposit a sum of 3223.05 Belgian francs at the customs office. On several occasions, Collin has tried to obtain the reimbursement of this sum, but in vain. The answer was given to him that this could earliest be done after the first renewing of HJS's "white card." Collin continues by writing that HJS could immediately obtain this reimbursement if he would have an Identity Card, ie a "yellow card," and since HJS needs this money Collin asks Liekendael whether it would be possible to grant HJS this "yellow card."

On 11.01.1934 Liekendael answers that no "yellow card" will be given and that HJS will get his money back after the first renewal of his "white card." Moreover, Liekendael asks the mayor of Berchem to communicate to him the address of HJS in Germany.

On 29.01.1934 the mayor of Berchem sends the requested address: Berlin-Siemensstadt, Jungfernheideweg 26/III.

On 3.02.1934 the Belgian Public Security Administration sends a letter to the "Staatliche Polizeiverwaltung in Berlin" to obtain information concerning HJS and the correctness of his declaration concerning his parents and his address in Berlin.

On 12.02.1934 the answer given by "Das Einwohner-melde-amt des Polizei Präsidium" is handwritten on the backside of the Belgian demand. This answer is translated into French by the Belgian administration "Nothing unfavourable is known concerning the medical doctor Hans Joachim Scherer born in Bromberg on 14 May 1906."

On 19.04.1934 Collin writes to the director of the Public Security: "Last November I have asked for Mr Hans Joachim Scherer the authorisation to sojourn 6 months. On November 25, 1933 you wrote me that this authorisation was granted. This authorisation comes to an end and I allow myself to ask you to extend this permit to sojourn for a new term of 6 months."

On 28.04.1934 the Public Security answers Collin: "Concerning your letter of the 19th I have the honour to let you know that Mr Scherer Hans can automatically obtain from his municipal administration, the extension of his certificate of inscription in the register of foreigners."



On 30.04.1934 Collin writes a letter to Monsieur Liekendael, Director at the Ministry of Justice, Service de la Sûreté de l'Etat, to thank him for his letter of 28.04.1934.

On 3.05.1934 HJS writes to the director of the Public Security with the petition to grant him the permit for a permanent sojourn.

On 11.05.1934 HJS fills in a document of the municipality Berchem in order to obtain his Identity Card. On the backside of this document the mayor writes that every month HJS receives the sum of 1500 Belgian Francs from his parents to provide for his living costs; that his conduct is correct and that therefore he [the Mayor] gives a favourable advice. This document has been sent to the Public Security.

On 25.05.1934 the Public Security writes to the Mayor that they refuse to give the permit for HJS's Identity Card and that HJS has to ask for prolongation of his "white card."

On 1.06.1934 HJS writes to the Public Security with the petition to prolong his white card. He adds that he would appreciate if he could obtain this as fast as possible since his old card expires on 5 June, and without valid card he will not be able to receive registered letters and money sent to him.

On 11.06.1934 the Public Security sends to the Mayor the permit to renew HJS's "white card."

On 22.06.1934 the Mayor informs HJS that his "white card" is prolonged until 5.12.1934.

On 27.06.1934 in a letter to Bernays, attorney G. Fribourg writes that he would like to render a service to his physician Dr Ludo van Bogaert who has an assistant HJS, of German nationality, who has to renew every 6 months his permit to stay in the country. He asks Bernays who has some good connection with the top of the Public Security to intervene to obtain the Identity Card for HJS. He finishes his letter as follows: "Note that I don't mediate as attorney but as a friend of Dr Ludo van Bogaert, and it is unnecessary to add that if the least reproach could be formulated against his protégé, it is for sure that he [LvB] would not protect him, neither would he take him as his assistant for his scientific works."

As attachment to this letter there is a declaration of Ludo van Bogaert in which he writes:

"Dr Hans Joachim Scherer left Germany not as Israelite, neither as politically unwanted, but because of the political situation [in Germany] his personal sensitivity had turned for the worst and therefore any scientific work became impracticable for him. [...]"

Since the money he received from his parents was not sufficient for his subsistence and his needs, the Bunge Institute granted him a monthly gratuity of about 1200 Belgian francs. He doesn't practise as a physician and he will not have any paid laboratory activity. We grant him this modest reward only for the research work he performs under my supervision."

On 9.07.1934 the following letter is sent to Bernays:

In response to your action in the name of your colleague M. Fribourg, I have the honour to inform you that right now Scherer H J can obtain the restitution of the pledge he deposited at the customs. At the qualified office, he only has to show his certificate of inscription completed with the extension. In this case, there is no need for an identity card.

On 17.07.1934 in a handwritten letter to R. de Foy, head of the Public Security, Bernays asks for some explanation and answers on the questions of van Bogaert since he doesn't know the answers himself. He joins the undated letter of Ludo van Bogaert, written in French. A translation into English follows:

*"M. Fribourg has just communicated me the response of the Administrator of the Public Security at the demand concerning M. Scherer you were so kindly to introduce. I heartily thank you for your intervention in his favour. One point however is not clear in my mind: 'in this case, there is no need for an identity card.'*

*It is precisely important to obtain this identity card. At this time, every six (or five) months M. Scherer has to renew his demand. The renewing of the extension takes five to six weeks of formalities during which he is not able to cash a postal money order, to send a registered letter, etc.*

*Are there insurmountable difficulties which don't allow that a permanent identity card or at least a longer period is granted to him?*

*I apologize for asking this new clarification; I seem to abuse your kindness, but after all it is possible that I didn't understand correctly the meaning of the answer. If the meaning is as I think the pledge can be given back, but the identity card is refused. May one know if there is a reason for this refusal, which seems not to be applied in all cases.*

*If M. Fribourg would have been here, I would not have allowed myself to contact you personally.”*

On 18.07.1934 Robert de Foy answers Bernays:

[...] in principle the Identity Card is not granted to Israelite refugees. The permission of 6 month which Scherer Hans enjoys will be extended as long as his activities will not affect the interest of our fellow citizens. Moreover, this permission can be automatically and immediately be renewed by simple petition at the municipality.

On 27.07.1934 Bernays writes to R. de Foy:

I allow myself to send you another letter of Dr van Bogaert, from which it follows that Dr Scherer is not a Jew and that he didn't leave Germany for political reasons. Dr van Bogaert sent me a copy of the birth certificate of his friend which shows that he was born in Bromberg – now in Poland – from Catholic parents. This is much better: finally, he is a laboratory man, and not a practising physician. Would it be possible, under these conditions, to grant him the Identity Card he asks?

In fact, the birth certificate is a legalised copy of HJS's certificate of baptism (on 23.05.1906) issued by the church in Bromberg (Taufschein N° 489).

In his letter van Bogaert writes:

I thank you for the steps you took in favour of my scientific assistant Dr Hans Joachim Scherer. It seems that you didn't obtain the grant of his Identity Card because he is supposed to be an Israelite. In fact, he is not an Israelite and he has not been expelled from Germany for political reasons otherwise I would never have accepted him at the Institute Bunge. His activity, purely scientific and not medical, cannot harm in any way the interest of our fellow citizens. On the other hand, I know that other foreigners, non-Israelite, have obtained their Identity Card and I would be very grateful if, based on the enclosed document justifying his race identity, you would introduce a new petition in his favour. I apologize for insisting that you try once more, but you should understand that it is with the objective to assure this scientist, the quietness necessary for the continuation of his work.

On 8.08.1934 the Public Security sends following answer to Bernays:

In answer to your letter of July 27, and in the absence of Mr de Foy, administrator of the Public Security, I have the honour to inform you that satisfaction can be given to M. Scherer Hans Joachim, if he really is a personality whose works are proper to yield a large contribution to the advancement of science. However, this foreigner should not take the place which could have been occupied by a Belgian physician. If he satisfies these conditions, his case should be submitted to the Minister of Internal Affairs.

On 24.10.1934 HJS writes a petition to the Mayor of Berchem to renew his “white card.”

On 25.10.1934 the petition of HJS is transmitted to the Administrator of the Public Security.

On 31.10.1934 the Mayor of Berchem answers that the prolongation is granted.

On 5.11.1934 attorney Fribourg writes to R. de Foy:

Two weeks ago, during an attempt I made to meet you, with the aim to solicit for Dr Scherer the authorisation to reside definitively in Belgium, your secretary who received me in your place, told me that my petition could be granted if it would be certain that Dr Scherer provides a real service to the advancement of the sciences in the country, and that his works are not of a type to harm the legitimate interest of the Belgian physicians and could not be done by them. I immediately communicated this to my protégé, and send you enclosed a declaration formulated in this sense, and signed by Mr Victor Bracht, Administrator of the Institute Bunge, and eleven physicians some of them belong to this institution, others belong to the hospitals of Antwerp, Stuivenberg and Borgerhout. I dare hope that under these conditions you will consider favourably my petition.

The attached document, dated 21.10.1934, states:

We who signed beneath declare that Dr Hans Joachim Scherer, full-time research fellow at the Institute Bunge for medical and surgical studies, really serves the advancement of science by his scientific research in the domain of the pathology of the nerves and tumours; that his presence is not a prejudicial hindrance for one of our Belgian physicians, since his work could not be done by any of us and since he has not any professional [medical] activity.

This declaration was signed by:

Mr Victor Bracht, Administrator of the Bunge Institute  
 Dr Nestor van der Stricht, Director of the Medical Bunge Institute  
 Dr L. van Bogaert, Prof. University Brussels, head of department hospitals of Antwerp  
 Dr J. Verbrugge, Surgeon at the Stuivenberg hospital  
 Dr P. Amy, Physician at the hospitals of Antwerp  
 Dr J. Sweerts, Physician at the hospitals of Antwerp  
 Dr Helmoortel, Otolaryngologist at the hospital of Borgerhout  
 Dr L. Bauwens, Ophthalmologist at the hospitals of Antwerp  
 Dr Wéry, Radiologist Bunge Institute  
 Dr Andersen, Physician at the hospitals of Antwerp  
 Dr Adalbert van Bogaert, Dr in Sciences at the Sorbonne  
 Dr de Jaegher, Physician at the hospitals of Antwerp

On 8.11.1934 R. de Foy answers Fribourg: “[...] the Mayor of Berchem has been authorised to register Scherer Hans Joachim in the population register and to issue him an Identity Card.”

On 21.11.1934 the municipality of Berchem gave a yellow Identity Card (valid until 21.11.1936) to HJS; on this card his address is written “Marie Josélaan nr. 7.” Administrative cost 80 Belgian francs.

On 2.06.1936 an extract of the register of marriages of the town of Antwerp is sent to the Public Security.

On 19.06.1936 the address of HJS on his yellow card is changed to “Pastoor van de Wouwer 35.”

On 16.11.1936 HJS’s Identity Card is renewed; this card is valid until 16.11.1940; administrative cost: 80 Belgian francs. Later, a stamp is put on this card stating that this card is valid without limitation in time (circular of the Minister of Interior Affairs, 30 August 1940)

On 5.01.1942 (?) HJS and his daughter leave for Magdeburg, Pappelallee 12, in Germany.

## Appendix V: Hans Joachim Scherer at the State University Ghent

Summary of Scherer's personal file at the Archives of the University of Ghent

On 11.10.1938 Prof. Vernieuwe writes to the chairman of the faculty that he received from HJS, who is German, a letter in which he requested for the office of half-time scientific assistant; considering the curriculum vitae of HJS; he fully supports this demand.

On 21.10.1938 the faculty endorses HJS candidacy, which is backed by the Rector, and transmitted to the Minister of Education on 10.11.1938.

On 17.11.1938 The Administrator-Inspector of the University, Prof. Alfred Schoep, writes to the Minister that he cannot support the appointment of HJS because (1) HJS has German nationality, and (2) HJS lives in Antwerp and therefore Schoep cannot imagine how HJS could hold this office even if it is only a part-time job.

On 30.11.1938 the Minister writes to the rector that since HJS was the only candidate for this job and since he has the German nationality, a vacancy for this office should be published in the Belgian Bulletin of Acts, Orders, and Decrees.

On 24.02.1939, Schoep writes to the Minister that no new candidacy was received, and therefore he proposes to appoint HJS until a Belgian candidate would show up.

On 16.03.1939 Schoep forwards to the Minister, a letter of the rector who at the demand of Vernieuwe, insists for a quick appointment of HJS.

On 12.04.1939, by royal decree, HJS is appointed part-time assistant to Prof. Vernieuwe.

On 22.09.1939 Schoep reminds Vernieuwe that HJS was appointed assistant at the clinic for ORL but that it appears that he never showed up in this service. He insists that HJS should immediately take up his work in Ghent otherwise Schoep would propose to stop paying HJS's salary on 1.10.1939.

On 24.09.1939 Vernieuwe answers that Schoep has been correctly informed; that HJS never came to the clinic in Ghent because he has nothing to do there, since he had been appointed to make outside the clinic scientific examinations of valuable anatomic ORL material which Vernieuwe regularly forwards him; that HJS examines this material at the Bunge Institute where Prof. Thomas and Prof. De Busscher collaborate with him; that Vernieuwe himself travels to Antwerp where he confronts HJS's results with the clinical notes for each case; that he admits that since 20.08.1938 he no longer had any contact with HJS who had been invited to present scientific results at a cancer congress in America.

On 25.09.1939 Vernieuwe informs Schoep that HJS sent a cable informing that he soon will be back.

On 28.09.1939 Schoep writes to Vernieuwe that he has informed Minister Duesberg about the unusual case concerning HJS, and that HJS should assist in the clinical work if he wants to keep his job.

On 5.10.1939 Schoep writes to the Minister reminding him their telephone call concerning HJS, and proposes to dismiss HJS. He stresses that this will be very easy to realise since in the royal decree appointing HJS, the length of his mandate was not specified; in order not to rush he proposes the date of 31.12.1939 for this dismissal.

On 31.10.1939 Vernieuwe meets the Minister of Education Duesberg to defend the HJS case.

On 8.11.1939 Vernieuwe writes to the rector informing him about his meeting with the minister, and the decisions he has made for the future activities of HJS. Once a week HJS will be in Ghent either in the laboratory of Thomas to perform microscopic studies, or in the ORL library to compile literature.

On 20.11.1939 the rector writes to the Minister and proposes that HJS finishes a first mandate of 2 years.

On 19.12.1939 the suggestion of the rector is accepted.

On 7.01.1941 the faculty unanimously endorses the prolongation of the mandate for 1 year.

On 1.02.1941 the prolongation is refused for some administrative reason.

On 26.05.1941 HJS's mandate is exceptionally extended for 1 year.

On 15.12.1941 the rector petitions the German Occupation Authorities to allow HJS to stay at the University.

On 19.12.1941 Prof. Vernieuwe informs the rector that HJS was ordered to go back to Germany on 15.01.1942.

On 12.01.1942 the rector receives a letter from the "Verwaltungschef" of the "Oberfeldkommandantur 570" stating that "unfortunately and despite all efforts he has not been able to prevent the recall of Dr. Scherer, because his, Kräfte, were needed elsewhere."

On 15.01.1942 HJS writes to the rector that he is forced by the German authorities to go back to Magdeburg; he expects that his stay there will only be temporary.

### Comments

Schoep's unrelenting and excessive zeal first to thwart HJS's appointment at the university, and later his action at the highest level to obtain the dismissal of HJS, is difficult to explain. Alfred Schoep (1881 - 1966) had been appointed administrator-inspector of the university in 1932, while retaining his professorship in mineralogy, crystallography and applied mineralogy. He certainly must not have known HJS personally and had not the competence to judge about the value of HJS's work.

The second argument he used to hinder the appointment, viz. HJS lives in Antwerp and therefore cannot hold an assistantship in Ghent, does not hold and clearly shows Schoep's prejudice against HJS since, having obtained his office at the university, HJS could have decided to move to Ghent.

Schoep must have been informed about the non-attendance of HJS at Vernieuwe's clinic by somebody who was acquainted with the situation. Indeed, HJS was appointed in April but Schoep only started his action to sack HJS when he was in the USA and therefore was not able to defend himself.

The only one who knew very well about the whereabouts of HJS, and would have profited from the dismissal of HJS in Ghent would have been LvB who on page 55 of his selective memoirs writes: "Since the beginning of 1939, his [HJS] activities were, with my consent, split between Ghent and Antwerp, for the highest benefit of his scientific activity but with a decline of ours."

No evidence could be found that LvB has been in direct contact with the university administrator Schoep. However, LvB frequently met Norbert Goormaghtig, head of pathology at the University of Ghent. Both were corresponding members of the Belgian Royal Academy of Medicine (Goormaghtig since 28.01.1928 and LvB since 15.12.1934) and regularly attended the monthly meetings of the Academy.



They talked about HJS and, according to LvB, during one of these discussions, Goormaghtig would have told him that some steps had been taken by De Busscher, Vernieuwe and Thomas for an appointment of HJS at the university of Ghent; moreover, he would have added that “one should distrust HJS and particularly the legend of his so-called anti-Nazism” (LvB, p56). If Goormaghtig really said this, he must have had an equivocal behaviour since, on 8.11.1939, Vernieuwe in his letter to the rector writes that HJS “is patronised by Goormaghtig, Thomas, Nyssen, all collaborators of the current research.” Moreover, Goormaghtig was member of the faculty which approved unanimously the appointment of HJS and its prolongation.