

‘Mediocre essays in medallic vituperation’

German First World War medals and the British Museum

Thomas Hockenhull

THE CENTENARY OF THE OUTBREAK of the First World War provides a timely opportunity to examine the British Museum’s acquisition of German art medals relating to the conflict. A modest collection of thirty-six medals was acquired between 1916 and the end of the war in 1918, but, in that same period, the museum successfully negotiated the acquisition of hundreds more that would arrive in the years immediately following. The aims of this article are to explore the methods used by the British Museum to acquire examples of these medals under difficult circumstances and to describe the role of the museum in bringing the medals to public attention, despite the fact that its galleries were closed to the public and sandbagged from 1 March 1916 until 1 August 1918 (fig. 1).

The museum began to collect German medals at a time when the prevailing anti-German sentiment intensified further owing to events away from the western front. These included the sinking of the passenger liner *Lusitania* by torpedo in May 1915 and the capture and execution of the British nurse Edith Cavell in October 1915 (for espionage) and Captain Charles Fryatt in July 1916 (his merchant ship had attempted to ram a U-boat).² It was also argued that the Germans were bombing civilians, intensifying submarine warfare, and using poison gas and flamethrowers on the battlefield.³ Such acts of advanced total war remained beyond the comprehension of the British until they too employed the same tactics during the war’s later stages. As Alan Simmonds notes, ‘despite their claims of British hypocrisy, Germany had become adept at making themselves look evil’.⁴ Generally speaking, critical response to the medals can be contextualised within a fierce propaganda war in which ‘Beethoven’s music was scorned; Goethe’s writings were ridiculed; some London bookshops banned Nietzsche’s works,’ and ‘the discordant unmelodic music of Richard Strauss was shunned’.⁵ By exploring some of the critical reactions to the medals, this article will assess the means by which the

British Museum deployed the medals to influence a receptive public against Germany.

The museum’s Department of Coins and Medals faced a number of challenges with regard to staff and funding during the war, especially after 1916. Its annual acquisition budget of £1,150 was scrapped at the start of 1916 owing to a cut in the government grant to the museum (the same cuts forced the closure of the museum to the public).⁶ Thereafter the department acquired primarily as a result of donations, although it was also able to raise money for small purchases by selling off duplicate objects from the collection.⁷ The money raised was put into a central purchase fund, to which it would seem that all departments had access upon application to the museum’s trustees.

A second challenge faced by the department was the loss of staff to military service. The depletion of the museum’s staff had begun in 1914, but became more pronounced in 1915-16 and particularly affected Coins and Medals.⁸ This was because the previous decade had seen great change, with several older members of staff reaching retirement age and being replaced by ‘energetic young men’ at the beginning of their careers.⁹ The younger generation consisted of the Asian numismatist John Allan, who joined the department in 1907, the Romanist curator Harold Mattingly, who joined in 1910, and Edward Stanley Gotch Robinson, who arrived in 1912.¹⁰ Having been employed at the museum since 1893, George Francis Hill was promoted to keeper of the department in 1912 (fig. 2).

By 1916 just three members of staff remained. These were Hill who, at forty-nine, was too old for military service, senior attendant R. Nicholson, and A.P. Ready, who was employed to make electrotype copies of objects in the collection.¹¹ Not every staff member from Coins and Medals experienced active military service and some were instead transferred to government departments. For instance, John Allan read German

1. *The Egyptian sculpture gallery, c.1916, British Museum.*



2. *George Francis Hill, c.1910.*

and this valuable war-time skill was put to use at the Military Intelligence Department of the War Office. The proximity of the War Office to the museum enabled Allan to make periodic visits, 'to deal with matters that required his attention'.¹² Meanwhile, George Brooke, assistant of the second class, was employed at the Central Board of Control to regulate the sale of alcohol.¹³

A further challenge faced by the museum resulted from Zeppelin airship raids on Britain, which began with an attack on Great Yarmouth on the night of 19 January 1915. In February the Kaiser declared London docks to be a legitimate target, and on 5 May this was extended to include London east of the Tower.¹⁴ Realising the danger, the British Museum had begun to move its collections to the basements in March 1915, but progress was slow.¹⁵ Although unrestricted bombing was permitted over the whole of London from 20 July, cabinets containing objects still remained in Coins and Medals as winter approached. In his autobiography Hill accused Sir Frederic Kenyon, the museum's director, of procrastination.¹⁶ Lack of space entirely halted their movement from November 1915 until May 1916, when at last a second empty cellar was identified. It is fortunate that the museum was not hit by bombs during this period (or, indeed, at any time during the First World War), although some fell quite close: one exploded at the south-east corner of neighbouring Russell Square in September 1915 whilst a second fell on Bedford Place in October.¹⁷ Finally, by the middle of May 1916 the entire

collection was stored in the basement, with the exception of about twenty cabinets that were being actively worked on.¹⁸ In early 1918, after Gotha bombers had begun daylight raids on London, the collection of coins and medals was removed entirely from the museum, to a tunnel adjacent to Holborn underground station, which was then under construction by the Post Office.¹⁹ Its removal gave Hill the added responsibility of 'periodic inspection of the collections in the deposit to which they [have] been removed'.²⁰ As well as this, he had the similarly time-consuming responsibility of coordinating the museum's response to night-time air raids. He was, at least, close at hand, since he lived with his wife in a residence on the site.²¹

Outside the museum, Hill's time was occupied by his presence on a number of committees, which he listed as 'the Committee appointed by Parliament on the Memorial Plaque and Scroll to be given to the Next of Kin of those who have fallen in the war, the inter-departmental Committee on the British War Medal, and the semi-official Committees on the Air Force crosses and medals, the Colonial Office medal for native allies, and the Mercantile Marine Medal'.²² Hill's autobiography provides more information about his role on the Memorial Plaque Committee and suggests that progress was smooth until after the war when he was called upon to mediate in a dispute between the engraver, Manning Pike, and the War Office.²³

Given all the challenges faced by the department, it would be reasonable to assume that its productivity fell significantly, especially after

3. Eue: *Zeppelins over London*, 1915, iron, 107mm., British Museum.



1916. No doubt in some areas this did happen, but Hill was able to prioritise matters in such a way as to ensure that a 'business as usual' attitude was retained for core functions such as the maintenance of correspondence: the number of letters dispatched between 1916 and 1918 dipped by merely a third from pre-war levels.²⁴ Hill's other major achievement was to ensure that the department continued to acquire objects for the collection, and the number of annual acquisitions fell below a thousand only in 1916.²⁵ Hill's broad knowledge of numismatics enabled him to acquire across the collection. For example, in a typical month (March 1918) 730 objects were acquired, a number not dissimilar to pre-war levels. These included one Greek, seventeen Roman, 549 medieval and modern, and 163 objects in the British and colonial series. In the following month, a further 241 objects were acquired.²⁶

In the summer of 1916 Hill began to collect contemporary German medals, beginning with two separate groups of acquisitions. One of these consisted of twenty-one medals donated by Henry Van den Bergh (1853-1937), a wealthy Dutch collector and major donor to all departments at the British Museum, described (but not named) in *The Times*, as 'a friend of the National Collections'.²⁷ Of the donation, Hill wrote that, 'the medals are in silver, bronze

and iron. Specimens in bronze can now only be obtained with difficulty, owing to the demand for that metal for military purposes.'²⁸ The second group consisted of the purchase of five cast iron medals from a dealer based in Amsterdam named Johann Schulman. This included a medal by Fritz Eue commemorating the Zeppelin air-raid on London of 17-18 August 1915 (fig. 3).²⁹ *The Times* and several other newspapers noted the 'highly imaginative design' of the reverse, which depicts two Zeppelins hovering over Tower Bridge whilst London burns in the background.³⁰ It was inspired by a report by the commander of Zeppelin L.10, Oberleutnant-zur-See Friedrich Wenke. Upon his return to Germany, Wenke had erroneously claimed that he had bombed a number of sites between Blackfriars and London Bridge. He had in fact confused the reservoirs of the Lea Valley with the river Thames and had instead bombed Walthamstow.³¹ German newspapers subsequently printed a painting depicting Zeppelin L.10 (which was destroyed by lightning only a few weeks later) hovering over Tower Bridge, an image that Eue probably saw and decided to reproduce on the reverse of the medal.³² Throughout the summer of 1916 Hill continued to make small purchases from Schulman.³³ Funds remained limited and he wrote that, 'it is not possible to say whether the Museum will



4. Maurice Frankenhuis, c.1920. (Photo: courtesy of Aaron Oppenheim)

desire or have the funds to acquire any other medals, until we know that they have been issued.³⁴

At around the same time another opportunity presented itself, when in July or August 1916 the authorities of the Postal Censorship contacted Hill to inform him that a large number of numismatic objects had been intercepted on their way to America. Upon inspection Hill found that many of the objects (224 in total) were German First World War medals, and it was later discovered that all but six had been dispatched by Johann Schulman.³⁵ Most of the medals were small silver *Siegespennige*, medallions or pendants commemorating such German exploits as the bombardment of Southend by Zeppelins. There was no question of either returning the medals to Schulman or of forwarding them to their intended recipients, and yet, since they had originated from a neutral nation, they could not be confiscated without the sender being recompensed. Hill valued the medals based on Schulman's catalogue at £68 4s. 6d. and stated that, 'it is unlikely that they would go for very small prices ... I should suggest making an offer of £30 or £40, if the Trustees have the money to spare for such an object. But even the price of £68 compares favourably with the £800 which another Dutch dealer asked recently for a much smaller collec-

tion of the same kind.³⁶ In the end, Schulman accepted an offer of £50 for the collection, less £1 8s. for the six that had been found to have originated elsewhere.³⁷ The fact that Hill continued to purchase medals from Schulman after 1916 suggests that there was no ill feeling on either part about the way in which these medals were acquired.³⁸ Although now promised to the museum, the collection would not actually arrive until after the war had ended. The advantage of this to the museum was that it was able to defer payment.

Two years later Hill was able to secure more medals from another source. In the summer of 1918 he entered into correspondence with a Dutch collector named Mauritz (later Maurice) Frankenhuis (1894-1969) (fig. 4). Born in 1894 in Burgsteinfurt, in North-Rhine Westphalia, Frankenhuis grew up in Enschede in the Netherlands and, upon leaving school, entered his father's cotton business.³⁹ In 1915 he was sent to Manchester to purchase cotton waste to be shipped to the Netherlands and then sold on to Germany, which, owing to the allied naval blockade, was struggling to obtain raw materials. Aware of the moral implications, Frankenhuis privately wrote that '[a] lot of money was made and the neutral countries like the Netherlands ... were economically very well off, as they supplied Germany, specially, with goods,



5. Goetz: *The Blockade*, 1919, bronze, 90mm., British Museum.

merchandise, whilst the allied soldiers, fathers, brothers, sons, were bleeding.⁴⁰ Along with a number of foreign nationals, Frankenhuis was deported back to the Netherlands in 1916. There he was able to take advantage of the country's neutrality to secure medals, plaques, posters and other memorabilia from both sides of the conflict.⁴¹ His collection began to be exhibited regularly in the Netherlands, and in 1918 he contacted the British ambassador Sir Walter Townley, informing him about an exhibition of his medal collection at The Hague. Keen to re-establish the lucrative business ties he had built up in Manchester, Frankenhuis professed himself to be an anglophile, writing that he 'considered the English a fair and honourabl[e] people'.⁴² At the same time he made it known to Townley that he was keen to donate duplicate medals from his collection to the British Museum. Townley accordingly contacted the museum about the offer, causing Hill to write to the Home Secretary to enquire about the possibility of Frankenhuis returning to Britain. Although hostilities had by now ended, restrictions remained in place preventing foreign nationals from visiting Britain, but Hill's letter to Frankenhuis dated January 1919 presented him with an opportunity:

I have today received from the Home Office an

answer to my enquiry about the possibility of your being permitted to return [to] this country. It is to the effect that in the ordinary circumstances the Secretary of State would not be prepared to allow you to return at present time for business reasons, but if your offer of war medals is considered by the trustees of the British Museum to be of value to the nation, he will not place obstacles in the way of your return. Your offer to make a donation of medals will accordingly have to be submitted to the trustees in a definite form.⁴³

Negotiations were successful and Frankenhuis was able to return to Britain in April 1919 'laden with his treasures destined for the British Museum'.⁴⁴ His medals were acquired in two batches in April and June 1919. Sixty came in the first group, among which Hill declared were some 'pieces very difficult to obtain', and seventy-nine arrived in a second batch.⁴⁵ Frankenhuis donated more First World War medals to the museum in 1920, including Karl Goetz' 1919 medal criticising the continuation of the blockade on Germany after the armistice of November 1918 (fig. 5).⁴⁶

The war was now over and staff were gradually demobilised and returned to the British Museum. There was no loss of life from the Department of Coins and Medals, although Robinson was wounded twice in the leg, the second time seriously, whilst Mattingly's expe-



6. Esseö: *The Hungarian Soviet Republic*, 1919, bronze, 70mm., British Museum.

periences brought on a nervous breakdown. He had been discharged in 1916, but was unable to return to work until November 1918.⁴⁷ Hill remained keeper of the department, going on to be director of the museum from 1931 until he retired in 1936 and receiving a knighthood in 1933.⁴⁸ Owing to Hill's efforts, almost four hundred German war medals had been secured for the national collection, representing work by all the major medallists working in Germany, including Eberbach, Esseö, Eue, Gies, Goetz, Leibkühler, Lindl, Loewental, May, Ott, Sturm and Zadikow.

The museum continued to collect German medals after the war, although it abandoned the systematic acquisition of medallic art after Hill's retirement and did not appoint a specialist medals curator until 1974.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, Hill's achievements in establishing a broad collection of First World War medals enabled later acquisitions to focus on individual works of significance. In the late 1970s the department acquired two such works in Gies' *Totentanz 1914-1917* and Esseö's *Hungarian Soviet Republic*, in which victims of a lynching hang from a tree (fig. 6).⁵⁰ It also began to collect material related to these medals, and in 1992 the Department of Prints and Drawings (at the request of Coins and Medals) purchased a sketchbook of medal drawings by Karl Goetz.⁵¹

The sketches illustrate Goetz' working methods and enable comparison with several medals in the collection, including, for example, the medal commemorating the sinking of Zeppelin L.19 in the North Sea following engine trouble. A nearby English fishing vessel refused to pick up survivors as they clung to the airship's hull and all were drowned (figs 7, 8).⁵² In 2006 the museum made another significant acquisition, when it purchased a plaster model for a medal made by Arnold Zadikow while he was interned at Brocton prisoner-of-war camp in Staffordshire (fig. 9).⁵³

Having provided a background to the way in which the museum acquired its medals, the next section of this article examines how it introduced them to the public through war-time exhibitions and publications. With the British Museum closed to the public, there was nowhere to display the medals. Its closure caused considerable controversy, and, for example, in Vienna the *Neue Freie Presse* declared that this 'throws the strongest light on the mentality of the English' and amounted to a 'declaration of moral bankruptcy'.⁵⁴ Fortunately, the Victoria and Albert Museum had remained open and it was here that, from July 1916, the British Museum lent plaster casts of its German medals to be exhibited in a solitary display case.⁵⁵ The Victoria and Albert archives

7. Goetz: *Sketch for Zeppelin L.19*, 1916, pen and pencil on paper, 56mm., British Museum.



8. Goetz: *Zeppelin L.19*, 1916, iron, 56mm., British Museum.



preserve no record, photographic or otherwise, of the exhibition, but some idea of its content can be gained from Hill's 1917 book entitled *The commemorative medal in the service of Germany*, published by Longmans, Green and Co., which used images of the plaster casts for most of its illustrations, but seemingly not all, given that the book features Eberbach's *The Torpedoing of the Tubantia*, of which the British Museum has no example.⁵⁶ It is unknown where the cast of this medal was obtained for the exhibition. The number of medals displayed could not have numbered more than about twenty-five, because the British Museum had yet to acquire more, and *The Times* described the display as 'small'.⁵⁷ The British Museum casts on display were taken from both the first group purchased from Schulman and the donation by Henry Van den Bergh. As well as featuring Eue's *Zeppelins over London* and Goetz' notorious *Lusitania* medal (fig. 10), the exhibition displayed a medal of Admiral von Tirpitz, the reverse of which depicts Neptune seated on a U-boat, shaking a fist at English ships, with the inscription GOTT STRAFE ENGLAND 18 FEBRUARY 1915 (God punishes England, 18 February 1915) (fig. 11). This medal was issued to commemorate the submarine blockade of Britain, in which Germany controversially declared war on all allied shipping, both merchant and military.⁵⁸

Another prominent inclusion was Sturm's *The New Triple Alliance*, depicting the heads of the German emperor, the sultan of Turkey and the late emperor of Austria, which formed the frontispiece of Hill's book.⁵⁹ Photographs of these medals were sold at the V&A catalogue stall.⁶⁰

Sir Claude Phillips, the retired director of the Wallace Collection, wrote a long review of the V&A display in *The Daily Telegraph*, in which he claimed to balance his contempt for the subject matter of the medals with impartial artistic judgement: 'Before we criticise it is necessary in fairness to point out that the medals now submitted [for display at the V&A] may possibly not be representative of the best that modern Germany may produce in this category'.⁶¹ However, Phillips found the propaganda element of the medals to be 'tactless', further writing that, 'it is a little difficult at the present moment to judge these mediocre yet extraordinary significant works of art dispassionately.' Goetz' medal depicting the crown prince Wilhelm (fig. 12),⁶² 'more or less in the Pisanello style', was one of the few pieces about which Phillips wrote that he considered deserving of 'a word of criticism as works of art'. Its reverse shows the crown prince as the young Siegfried swinging a sword at a four-headed dragon, symbolising the Triple-Entente and Belgium. Its merit derived, according to Phillips,

9. Zadikow: *Brocton Camp*, 1919, plaster, 93 x 63mm., British Museum.



from Goetz' ability to work a minor miracle, imbuing his portrait of the otherwise 'weak and sinister' crown prince, 'the most repellent figure of the war', with a 'semblance of virility and high breeding'. For the rest of the exhibition, Phillips abandoned any attempt at impartiality: 'the smaller medals are for the most part nothing more than inept press cartoons and caricatures reduced to the smallest compass. As may well be imagined, these are ludicrously unsuited, in style as in motive, for translation into medallic reliefs.' But he reserved most of his ire for Goetz' medal *Lusitania*:

Incredible as is the shamelessness in crime which has prompted the execution of this medal, incredible as is the cynicism which has authorised and promoted its circulation, what strikes us most is the stupidity, the want of foresight of the whole proceeding.⁶³

Under the mini-headline *LUSITANIA INFAMY* Phillips compared this medal to the medal struck for Pope Gregory XIII to commemorate the massacre of the French Huguenots on St Bartholomew's Day in 1572, a comparison that had already been made by *The Times*.⁶⁴

At Strand House near the Law Courts, the Postal Censor medals that had been promised to the British Museum were by now already on

display, forming part of the so-called Censor's Museum of contraband articles.⁶⁵ The museum was open only to journalists and not to members of the public.⁶⁶ The material had been assembled since the outbreak of war, but received little coverage until an article appeared in *The Times* on 25 July 1916. It was widely reprinted in newspapers as far away as Canada, Australia and New Zealand.⁶⁷ However, the article does not mention the medals, which suggests that they may not have been on display at the time of the reporter's visit. Since Hill saw the medals in the same month, it is possible that they had been removed from display to enable him to inspect them more closely.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, the medals were certainly back on display when the Censor's Museum was visited by a correspondent from *The Southern Reporter* on 3 August 1916.⁶⁹

The purpose of the Censor's Museum was to incite popular opinion against Germany and, according to the Chief Censor, the medals played an important part in this propaganda campaign.⁷⁰ *The Southern Reporter* wrote that, 'they leave the average Englishman seeing red and itching to get his hands on the man who was responsible for them'.⁷¹ Once again, Goetz' *Lusitania* medal attracted much of the criticism, with *The Southern Reporter* commenting that, 'it must be a queer mind that conceives the idea of perpetuating in bronze the massacre of a few

10. Goetz: *Sinking of the Lusitania*, 1915, iron, 57mm., British Museum.



helpless men, women, and children.⁷² Owing to the interest that the medals aroused, the Chief Censor was keen to keep them at the Censor's Museum until the end of the war.⁷³ This arrangement was mutually beneficial, since, with the British Museum closed, Hill had nowhere to display them. He did, however, request that, if the Trustees were determined to bring them to the museum with immediate effect, the medals should be exhibited 'in a small case near the entrance to the Reading Room ... Permission could then be granted to the persons who would otherwise have seen them at the Censor's Museum or to other persons on special application.'⁷⁴ In the end this proved unnecessary: the medals continued to be displayed at the Censor's Museum, where they nestled alongside items that looked like 'a stock of samples culled from the bags of a number of commercial travellers who dealt in everything, from cheap jewellery to bacon.'⁷⁵ At the end of the war they were transferred to the British Museum and formally registered for the collection in August 1919.⁷⁶

In May 1917, with the British Museum remaining closed, Hill was part of a committee that helped to organise an exhibition of historic medals held in the Georgian Hall on London's Oxford Street, which was lent for this use by the furniture manufacturer Messrs Waring and Gillow Ltd. Also on the committee was Sir

Arthur Evans, a trustee of the British Museum, numismatist and president of the Royal Numismatic Society. Evans lent First World War medals from his own collection, including Goetz' *Lusitania* and Eue's *Zeppelins over London* (see figs 10 and 3).⁷⁷ His interest in them had begun, or at least been intensified, as a result of Hill's speech to the Royal Numismatic Society in June 1916.⁷⁸ Evans realised that the output by British medallists was being eclipsed and had written to several newspapers that, 'so far as I am aware there is no evidence of a similar activity in this country beyond a solitary piece conveying the gallant assurance that Scarborough, despite the bombardment, is "still undismayed"'.⁷⁹ Posing the question, 'are we still to leave this whole field of historic record unchallenged to the enemy's lying vaunts?', he had offered a prize of one hundred pounds for the best model by a British artist for a medal commemorating the recent clash of naval forces at Jutland.⁸⁰ The 1917 Georgian Hall exhibition was also organised with the intention of promoting British interest in medallic art. In August 1917 it travelled to Manchester, where it was displayed for a month at the Whitworth Institute.⁸¹

By the summer of 1918 the British Museum was ready to readmit the public.⁸² As most of the collection was still in storage in the Post Office underground tunnel, a small exhibition



11. Goetz: *Admiral von Tirpitz*, 1915, bronze, 80mm., British Museum.

of replicas, appropriately titled the *Temporary war-time exhibition*, opened on 1 August 1918 in the western ground-floor galleries. According to Sir Frederick Kenyon's account of 1934, it had received 100,000 visitors by the time the guns were fired to signal the armistice on 11 November 1918.⁸³ Kenyon (who had written the preface to the exhibition catalogue) also stated that the museum's German medals had been included in the display: 'it was composed of casts of the Parthenon marbles and the Demeter; electrotypes of coins and medals, with a set of the medals issued in Germany during the war, which furnished so remarkable an illustration of the mental attitude of that nation'.⁸⁴ The 'large series of electrotypes of coins and medals' and the German medals appear to have been shown in the Elgin Room (the present-day Room 17, currently displaying the Nereid Monument).⁸⁵ In his history of the British Museum, Sir David Wilson corroborates this account, stating that the exhibition 'provided the public with a taste of the collections through casts and electrotypes of some of the Museum's greatest treasures, but also displayed items of more immediate interest, including German propaganda medals obtained in Holland, together with documents, manuscripts and maps relating to such places as Mons and Ypres, names only too familiar during the war'.⁸⁶

However, this information is at odds with the exhibition catalogue, which lists the coins and medals on display in the Elgin Room as those 'illustrating English History' between 1545 and 1815.⁸⁷ German First World War medals receive no mention and neither are they mentioned in newspaper reports about the exhibition (which, admittedly, received only modest coverage).⁸⁸ A solution to this discrepancy may be found in an article in the *Daily Chronicle* dated 13 December 1918, in which 'a representative learnt yesterday that additional galleries are likely to be re-opened to the public by Christmas. German medals have been added to the exhibition, including a Lusitania medal'.⁸⁹ Arguably, therefore, Kenyon had misremembered. German medals did go on display. However, this display was not in the *Temporary war-time exhibition* in August, but rather in December 1918, when the Assyrian transept gallery was reopened.⁹⁰

The extent to which Hill's views steered critical and public opinion towards the medals requires further examination. His 1917 book had been extensively reviewed in the press and, as a polemic against perceived German moral attitudes, it was well received. The Anglo-French (and vehemently anti-German) writer Hilaire Belloc endorsed the book by writing that, 'it costs sixpence and is, for the quiet student of history, the best sixpenn'orth



12. Goetz: *The German Crown Prince*, 1915, bronze, 82mm., British Museum.

I have ever come across'.⁹¹ But Belloc and other critics declared themselves unimpressed by the artistry of the medals: 'what is remarkable [about the German medals] is not the perversion of their motive – we are all familiar with that, and we all expect it – it is their inability to create anything above the very lowest level which, one imagines, plastic art could touch.'⁹² *The Times* was similarly disparaging and criticism of the works, it said, was driven by 'not mere prejudice but genuine disappointment ... The pity is that in no instance does it reveal an artist. Thin-sown indeed with profit or delight is its survey, thin and flat even the fun to be derived from it'.⁹³ Similarly, the *Manchester Guardian* wrote that, 'from the general crudity and ugliness of the medals it is fair to conclude that no decent German designer has had a hand in them'.⁹⁴ The book was sold at the V&A until the exhibition closed in late 1918 or early 1919, whereupon seven hundred unsold copies of the book were transferred and put on sale at the British Museum.⁹⁵

Although he had diligently assembled the museum's collection, Hill too was for the most part unmoved by the artistic qualities of the medals, as can be seen in both his published book and his correspondence. He wrote to the museum's trustees, for example, that, 'the coarse brutality which German art at so many

periods of its history has mistaken for force is characteristic of a number of [medals]'.⁹⁶ There were some artists to whom he was particularly ill-disposed, writing in his book that Paul Sturm 'attains the distinction of producing the worst composed and the most clumsily modelled of all the medals we have seen'.⁹⁷ He was similarly scathing about Eberbach's *Dance of Death* series, with its 'hackneyed skeleton motif', but his attitude towards Karl Goetz, whom he admitted was a 'competent craftsman', was more complex.⁹⁸ When showing the medals at a meeting of the Royal Numismatic Society in June 1916, he commented that Goetz' medal representing 'the Crown Prince as a degenerated type' (see fig. 12) was 'the only really artistic one'.⁹⁹ His remarks probably influenced Sir Claude Phillips, who wrote about the medal in similar terms five weeks later.¹⁰⁰ No doubt Hill approved of the obverse bust design because its style and high profile were reminiscent of his preferred Italian Renaissance medals. However, he claimed that Italian medallists differed in that they 'were ruthless in their exposure of the vicious qualities of their sitters; but they never failed to render at the same time that touch of distinction, of nobility'. The lack of nobility apparent in the portrait of the crown prince was, according to Hill, owing to 'the difference of race'.¹⁰¹ Moreover, Goetz' provocative and



13. Gies: *German Auxiliary Force*, 1917, iron, 83mm., British Museum.

overtly anti-British satirical stance clearly riled Hill, who noted rather gleefully that, of the twelve French words featured in *The Landing of the Indians at Marseilles*, five were spelled incorrectly.¹⁰² He also remarked on the date discrepancy apparent on the *Lusitania* medal.¹⁰³

The only German medallist admired by Hill without reservation was Ludwig Gies, whom he described to the trustees as 'the most original and powerful of the German medallists now working'.¹⁰⁴ However, he explained, little progress had been made in acquiring Gies' medals during the war, 'owing to the fact that they are produced in limited numbers'. He had succeeded in obtaining only two by the time of the armistice in November 1918: *America in the War* and *German Auxiliary Force* (fig. 13).¹⁰⁵ The latter depicts conscripted workers entering a German munitions factory. It foreshadows German expressionist films such as Fritz Lang's *Metropolis* (1927), which opens with 'faceless, nameless workers march[ing] to their shifts, serving insatiable machinery in the bowels of the city'.¹⁰⁶ Hill was impressed by the lack of a propagandist (or anti-British) element in medals such as this, as he wrote in 1924:

[Gies' medals] rise above the usual level of the journalistic propaganda characteristic of the mass of medals produced in this connexion in all

countries, and make some attempt to express the colossal scale of the disaster, and of the sufferings of humanity.¹⁰⁷

The view that Gies' works were not overly politicised has persisted, with Bernd Ernsting noting that, 'the student of Gies' medals looks in vain, one is happy to say, for the rabble-rousing element in Goetz' works'.¹⁰⁸ Indeed, a comparison between Gies' medal *Lusitania* (fig. 14), acquired by Hill in 1919, and Goetz' more biting satire on the same subject (see fig. 10) reveals a more subtle and sympathetic approach, in which humanity is dominated by the towering hull of the sinking ship.¹⁰⁹

Despite his positive reaction to the works of Gies, the corpus of German First World War medals was of interest to Hill primarily as an historical document: 'The medals, which, though apparently not issued officially, are evidently part of the propaganda of the German government [and] are of considerable interest as illustrating the mental condition of the Germans at the present time'.¹¹⁰ His view was adopted (either coincidentally or in consequence) by the press, with *The Times* writing that, 'they are of historical value as showing the psychological condition of the nation that produces them'.¹¹¹ Similarly, the reviewer of Hill's book in the *Manchester Guardian* commented that,

14. Gies: *Sinking of the Lusitania*, 1915, bronze, 94mm., British Museum.



'one must ponder the mentality of a people among whom they could be produced and find a market.'¹¹² Hill's view persisted after the war, and in 1934 Kenyon claimed that the medals were 'interesting, less for artistic merit than as illustrating the mentality of the people'.¹¹³

Public interest in the medals continued, and in March 1919 electrotype replicas of them went on sale in the British Museum shop at the price of a shilling each alongside postcards and copies of Hill's book.¹¹⁴ The medals remained on display and a section was devoted to them when a new display of coins and medals opened in 1924.¹¹⁵ In 1936 they were seen by the American sculptor David Smith, whose visit to the museum inspired him to produce a series of anti-war medals, which he called *Medals for Dishonor*.¹¹⁶ However, following Hill's promotion to the directorship in 1931, the museum's interest in its medal collection went into decline.¹¹⁷ Scholarly neglect continued until long after the Second World War, a period in which, following the destruction of the Medal Room by bombing in May 1941, the department was thrown into disarray.¹¹⁸ Reconsideration of the artistic qualities of the medals began in the 1970s, resulting in two publications by Mark Jones and in the British Museum exhibition *The medal: mirror of history*, which ran from 17 May until 9 September 1979.¹¹⁹ This exhibi-

tion, which received 83,342 visitors, covered all aspects of medallic history.¹²⁰ The First World War section, written by Jones, focused almost exclusively on the German medal output and recognised that the styles employed by the artists constituted a deliberate break with tradition:

Many, like Fritz Eue, turned to a heroic realism suited to the glorification of the armed forces ... other medallists, however, unable to respond quite so enthusiastically to modern warfare and its horrors, revived the ancient Germanic tradition of savage and fantastic satire. Karl Goetz pitilessly caricatured the British and their war policies, Walter Eberbach created a world peopled by mocking skeletons, and Ludwig Gies, obsessed by the machinery of war, depicted frail mankind dwarfed by gigantic guns, warships and forts.¹²¹

Significantly, the exhibition also confronted the wartime attitude that, in accordance with the prevailing anti-German sentiment, had dismissed the medals as tactless propaganda lacking any kind of sympathy: 'for all the apparent brutality of these medals, emphasised by the deliberately rough way in which they are cast, they often, as for example in Karl May's 'Hanging Sniper' [acquired by Hill in 1919; (fig. 15)], display a strain of intense pity for suffering



15. May: *Hanging Sniper*, 1914, iron, 105 x 42mm., British Museum.

humanity'.¹²² Reappraisal of the medals continued and several were featured in the British Museum's 2009 exhibition *Medals of dishonour*.¹²³ Finally in 2014 these medals have been granted a retrospective of their own in a British Museum exhibition entitled *The other side of the medal: how Germany saw the First World War*.¹²⁴ As the exhibition demonstrates, these 'mediocre essays in medallic vituperation' continue to retain considerable scholarly and public interest a century after they were first made. **M**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Stephanie Alder, Philip Attwood, Marjorie Caygill, Cecilia Meir, Aaron Oppenheim, Farah Qureshi and Mel Wacks for their invaluable help and assistance in the preparation of this article.

NOTES

- 1 This title quotes a review of the Victoria and Albert Museum's exhibition of plaster casts of the British Museum's German medals in 1916. See Sir Claude Phillips, 'German war medals', *The Daily Telegraph*, 26 July 1916, clipping held by the Victoria and Albert Museum Newspaper Archive (henceforth V&A), 49/2/96, p. 73.
- 2 Hew Strachan, *The First World War* (London, 2003), p. 216; John Keegan, *The First World War* (London, 1998), pp. 213-14.
- 3 Richard van Emden and Steve Humphries, *All quiet on the home front: an oral history of life in Britain during the First World War* (London, 2003), p. 80.
- 4 Alan G.V. Simmonds, *Britain and World War One* (London, 2012), p. 238. See also Gerard DeGroot, *Blighty: British society in the era of the Great War* (Harlow, 1996), p. 185.
- 5 Simmonds, *Britain and World War One*, p. 255.
- 6 George Hill, Report to the Trustees, 10 August 1915, Department of Coins and Medals Reports (henceforth CMR), 1915-16, p. 32; Hill to the Trustees, 1 March 1915, CMR, 1915-16, p. 30; F.G. Kenyon, 'Military and other war service of the staff', handwritten manuscript, British Museum, Central Archive, pp. 17-18.
- 7 BM, Central Archive, Trustees Standing Committee Report, 1915-18, 12 January 1918, p. 3569; 12 October 1918, p. 3607. In 1923 the practice of selling duplicate coins from the collection came under criticism because coins were being sold abroad in Lucerne, Switzerland, and provincial museums were not given the opportunity to acquire them. See 'Sale of duplicate coins', 9 June 1923, Minutes of Department of Coins and Medals (henceforth Minutes), 1921-26, pp. 160-61; 'Sale of duplicate coins', 11 November 1922, Minutes, 1921-26, p. 110; 'Museum duplicate coins', *The Times*, 6 June 1923, p. 14.
- 8 Out of a total British Museum staff of 384, 137 went to war and 44 were seconded to government departments, resulting in just under one half being absent. The proportion of staff absent from the Department of Coins and Medals was closer to two thirds. See Sir Frederic Kenyon, *The British Museum in war time: being the fourth lecture on the David Murray Foundation in the University of Glasgow delivered on June 11th 1934* (Glasgow, 1934), p. 5.
- 9 Wilson, *The British Museum: a history*, p. 203 and app. 3, pp. 380-93; Hill to the Trustees, CMR, 1915-16, pp. 67-8.
- 10 Wilson, *The British Museum*, p. 203.
- 11 George Hill, 'The Department of Coins and Medals during the War, 1914-1918', CMR, 1917-18, pp. 132-7; Hill to the Trustees, 11 March 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 97.
- 12 Hill to the Trustees, CMR, 1917-18, p. 110.
- 13 Hill to the Trustees, 19 March 1917, CMR, 1917-18, p. 38. See also *The Spectator*, 24 July 1915, p. 2.
- 14 Ian Castle, *London 1914-17: the Zeppelin menace* (Oxford, 2008), p. 9.
- 15 Hill to the Trustees, 3 March 1915, CMR, 1915-16, p. 97. See also Hill to the Trustees, 1 November 1915, CMR, 1915-16, p. 111.
- 16 Sir George Hill, 'An autobiographical fragment', *The Medal*, 12 (1988), p. 43.
- 17 Castle, *London 1914-17*, p. 38.
- 18 Hill to the Trustees, 2 May 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 207; Hill to the Trustees, 23 May 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 199. In the director's view the floors of the museum were impenetrable to the types of bombs being used in the early part of the war, but technological developments put the museum at greater risk in 1917-18. See Kenyon, *The British Museum*, p. 12.
- 19 M.L. Caygill, 'The protection of national treasures at the British Museum during the Second World War', in P.B. Vandiver (ed.), *Material issues in art and archaeology, III, Materials Research Society symposium proceedings*, cclxvii (Pittsburgh, 1992), pp. 31-2.
- 20 Hill to the Trustees, 1 May 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 125.
- 21 Hill, 'An autobiographical fragment', p. 41. See also Hill to the Trustees, 1 May 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 125; Hill to the Trustees, 19-20 May 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 119; Hill to the Trustees, 26 April 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 118; Hill to the Trustees, 17 July 1915, CMR, 1915-16, p. 31. In spite of these extra responsibilities, Hill was able to take his full leave entitlement, taking thirty-seven days in 1917, including an extra day for the funeral of his mother, and forty-eight days in 1918, including the entire month of September. See Hill to the Trustees, 3 January 1919, CMR, 1917-18, p. 114; Hill to the Trustees, CMR, 1917-18, p. 43.
- 22 Hill, 'The Department of Coins and Medals', pp. 135.
- 23 'G.F. Hill and the production of the First World War memorial plaque', *The Medal*, 8 (1986), p. 25; Philip Dutton, 'The Dead Man's Penny: a short history of the next of kin memorial plaque', *The Medal*, 29 (1996), pp. 69-70.
- 24 Hill, 'The Department of Coins and Medals', pp. 132-7. The number of letters dispatched in 1912 was 3,488, and in the war years: 1914, 2,888; 1915, 2,118; 1916, 2,111; 1917, 1,981; 1918, 1,178.
- 25 Hill, 'The Department of Coins and Medals', p. 135.
- 26 Hill to the Trustees, 2 April 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 123; Hill to the Trustees, 1 May 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 124.
- 27 'German war medals for the nation', *The Times*, 14 July 1916, in V&A 49/2/95, p. 63. See also Hill to the Trustees, 30 June 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 131; Bergh, Van den, Henry, *Who was who* (Oxford, 2007), online edition, <http://www.ukwhoswho.com/view/article/oupww/whowaswho/U206013> (accessed 20 December 2013). In 1913 Van den Bergh had subscribed to a fund enabling the Department of Coins and Medals to purchase a rare gold dinar of King Offa of Mercia (BM CM 1913,1213.1); see 'A unique coin of Offa', *Tamworth Herald*, 20 December 1913, p. 2. During the First World War he lived in London above Mark Lane underground station (located near present-day Tower Hill station).
- 28 Hill to the Trustees, 30 June 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 131.
- 29 BM CM 1916,0705.1. See Hill to the Trustees, 30 June 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 162; 8 July 1916, Minutes, 1916-20, p. 148; Hill to the Trustees, 30 June 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 131. The price paid for all five medals was £3 18s.
- 30 'German war medals', *The Times*, 29 December 1916, p. 167. See also Phillips, 'German war medals', p. 73; 'Vain glorious', *Express & Echo*, 21 August 1918, in V&A 49/2/96, p. 56.
- 31 Castle, *London 1914-17*, pp. 28-9.
- 32 Castle, *London 1914-17*, p. 29.
- 33 Hill to the Trustees, 1 August 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 166.
- 34 Hill to the Trustees, 20 July 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 165.
- 35 Hill to the Trustees, 19 October 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 167.
- 36 J. Schulman, *La Guerre Européenne 1914-1916* (Amsterdam, 1916); Hill to the Trustees, 19 October 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 167.
- 37 Hill to the Trustees, 7 December 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 169.
- 38 See, for example, Hill to the Trustees, 1 November 1917, CMR, 1917-18, p. 31; Hill to the Trustees, 7 June 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 87; Hill to the Trustees, 2 November 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 90.
- 39 Frankenhuis Archive (courtesy of Aaron Oppenheim, grandson of Maurice Frankenhuis), FC 01-01. See also 'Maurice Frankenhuis, 1894-1969', *The Shekel*, ii, 3 (Autumn 1969), p. 16.
- 40 Frankenhuis Archive, FC 01-03.
- 41 This information on Frankenhuis can be found on a printed leaflet accompanying *Holocaust Medal* by Elizabeth Weistrop (1916-99). The BM example of this medal is CM 1967,0406.1. For his collection of medals, see M. Frankenhuis, *Catalogue of medals, medalets and plaques relative to the World War 1914-1919* (Enschede, n.d.), which lists 1,589 objects.
- 42 Frankenhuis Archive, FC 01-03; FC01-04.
- 43 Frankenhuis Archive, FC 01-48. On 10 January 1961 Frankenhuis wrote to the Department of Coins and Medals asking for a copy of Hill's original letter, because he wished to use it as supporting evidence in an application for British citizenship. John Walker, keeper of the department, replied on 20 January 1961 that the letter, along with all correspondence, had been destroyed when the department was destroyed by bombing on 10 May 1941. See Frankenhuis collection, Library of the Kadman Numismatic Pavilion, Eretz Israel Museum, Tel-Aviv.
- 44 See n. 41 above.
- 45 Hill to the Trustees, 12 April 1919, Minutes, 1916-20, p. 129; Hill to the Trustees, 14 June 1919, Minutes, 1916-20, p. 148.
- 46 BM CM 1920,0233.16.
- 47 Hill, 'The Department of Coins and Medals', pp. 132-3; Hill to the Trustees, 21 October 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 108; Hill to the Trustees, 4 May 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 100. From across the museum ten men were killed or died of disease on active service. The names of the dead are engraved on the wall adjacent to the main entrance, along with four lines from the poem 'For the Fallen' by Laurence Binyon, himself a member of staff. See Kenyon, *The British Museum*, p. 11.
- 48 Wilson, *The British Museum*, pp. 238, 386.
- 49 Mark Jones in Frances Carey, *Collecting the 20th century* (London, 1991), p. 14; Wilson, *The British Museum*, p. 297.
- 50 BM CM 1977,0615.2 and

- 1978,1206.1. See M.P. Jones, 'Department of Coins and Medals: new acquisitions no. 1 (1976-77)', *British Museum Occasional Paper*, 25 (1981), p. 123; Philip Attwood and Felicity Powell, *Medals of dishonour* (London, 2009), pp. 76-7.
- 51 BM PD 1992,0229.23.1-26.
- 52 BM PD 1992,0229.23.11; BM CM 1919,0404.29. See 'Zeppelin L19 wrecked in the North Sea', *The Aberdeen Daily Journal*, 4 February 1916, p. 5.
- 53 BM CM 2006,1202.1. See Daniel Fearon, "Out of the barbed wire": a newly discovered medal design by Arnold Zadikow', *The Medal*, 54 (2009), pp. 45-7.
- 54 'The German press', *Morning Post*, 4 February 1916, in V&A 49/2/94, p. 211.
- 55 'Victoria and Albert Museum', *Morning Post*, 20 July 1916, in V&A 49/2/95, p. 65; 'Vain glorious', *Express & Echo*, 21 August 1918, in V&A 49/2/96, p. 56.
- 56 G.F. Hill, *The commemorative medal in the service of Germany* (London, 1917), p. 25.
- 57 'German war medals', *The Times*, 26 July 1916, in V&A 49/2/95, p. 68.
- 58 Hill, *The commemorative medal*, pp. 15-16; Strachan, *The First World War*, p. 215.
- 59 BM CM 1916,0707.5. Hill, *The commemorative medal*, frontisp.
- 60 'Victoria and Albert Museum', *Morning Post*, 20 July 1916, in V&A 49/2/95, p. 65.
- 61 Phillips, 'German war medals', p. 73. Phillips complained that plaster casts were on show and not the originals.
- 62 BM CM 1916,0707.5.
- 63 Phillips, 'German war medals', p. 73. For a summary of the *Lusitania* controversy, see Mark Jones (ed.), *Fake? The art of deception* (London, 1990), p. 74. See also Jones in Carey, *Collecting the 20th century*, p. 12; Attwood and Powell, *Medals of dishonour*, pp. 26-7.
- 64 'German war medals for the nation', *The Times*, 14 July 1916, in V&A 49/2/95, p. 63.
- 65 *Evening Telegraph*, 2 April 1919, p. 4.
- 66 Hill to the Trustees, 11 January 1917, CMR, 1917-18, p. 27. See also *Evening Telegraph*, 6 November 1919, p. 10.
- 67 'Censor's Museum', *The Times*, 25 July 1916, p. 3; *Dawson Daily News* (Canada), 12 February 1917, p. 2; *Hawera & Normanby Star* (New Zealand), 5 March 1918, p. 2 (reprinted from the *Sydney Morning Herald*), published in edited form in *The Spectator*, 28 July 1916, p. 3 and *Liverpool Echo*, 31 August 1916, p. 4.
- 68 Hill to the Trustees, 11 January 1917, CMR, 1917-18, p. 27. Hill wrote that, according to the chief censor, the medals 'formed one of the chief attractions' and he 'therefore begs that the medals may be returned to him for exhibition until the end of the war'.
- 69 *The Southern Reporter*, 3 August 1916, p. 6.
- 70 Hill to the Trustees, 11 January 1917, CMR, 1917-18, p. 27.
- 71 *The Southern Reporter*, 3 August 1916, p. 6.
- 72 *The Southern Reporter*, 3 August 1916, p. 6. The *Lusitania* medal in the Censor's Museum was not acquired by the British Museum because an example had already been donated by Henry Van den Bergh (BM CM 1916,0707.9). In 1917 Hill donated an English copy of the medal (BM CM 1917,0503.1).
- 73 Hill to the Trustees, 11 January 1917, CMR, 1917-18, p. 27.
- 74 Hill to the Trustees, 11 January 1917, CMR, 1917-18, p. 27.
- 75 *The Southern Reporter*, 3 August 1916, p. 6.
- 76 BM CM 1919,0817.1-217. See Coins and Medals, Acquisitions Register, Medieval and Modern, 1919.
- 77 Sir Claude Phillips, 'Medallic art', *The Daily Telegraph*, 29 May 1917, in V&A 49/2/96, p. 16.
- 78 'German war medals', *The Daily Telegraph*, 16 June 1916, in V&A 49/2/95, p. 41.
- 79 Sir Arthur Evans, 'Commemorative war medals', *Morning Post*, 21 June 1916, in V&A 49/2/95, p. 51.
- 80 For more detail about the competition, see Philip Dutton, "An enterprise directed northward": some medallic tributes to the Battle of Jutland', *The Medal*, 11 (1987), pp. 47-9.
- 81 'Historic medals in Manchester', *Manchester Guardian*, 23 August 1917, in V&A 49/2/96, p. 57.
- 82 Kenyon, 'Military and other war service', p. 34.
- 83 Kenyon, 'Military and other war service', p. 38. See also *A short guide to the temporary war-time exhibition in the British Museum* (London, 1918); Joanna Bowring, 'Chronology of temporary exhibitions at the British Museum', *British Museum Occasional Paper*, 189 (2012), p. 8.
- 84 Kenyon, *The British Museum*, p. 34.
- 85 Kenyon, 'Military and other war service', p. 38.
- 86 Wilson, *The British Museum*, p. 212.
- 87 *A short guide*, p. 16.
- 88 See, for example, *The Times*, 27 July 1918, in V&A/49/2/96, p. 286; *Morning Post*, 27 July 1918, in V&A/49/2/96, p. 288; *The Daily Telegraph*, 2 August 1918, in V&A/49/2/96, p. 291.
- 89 'Unburied treasures', *Daily Chronicle*, 13 December 1918, in V&A 49/2/97, p. 57.
- 90 For which see Kenyon, *The British Museum*, p. 35. More galleries were reopened on 1 February 1919. See 'British Museum', *The Times*, 1 February 1919, V&A 49/2/97, p. 90; 'British Museum reopening', *Morning Post*, 1 February 1919, in V&A 49/2/97, p. 92; *The Daily Telegraph*, 1 February 1919, in V&A 49/2/97, p. 92.
- 91 Hilaire Belloc, 'German war medals', *Land and Water*, 21 February 1918, p. 19.
- 92 Hilaire Belloc, 'German war medals', p. 19. The article concludes by stating that, "There are those who think that bad art is a proof of national greatness. They may increase their admiration of Prussia by studying her medals."
- 93 'German war medals', *The Times* (supplement), 14 February 1918, in V&A 49/2/96, p. 202.
- 94 'German war medals', *Manchester Guardian*, 14 March 1918, in V&A 49/2/96, p. 57.
- 95 BM, Central Archive, SC 11/1/19, p. 3633; SC 11/1/19, p. 3621.
- 96 Hill to the Trustees, 30 June 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 131.
- 97 Hill, *The commemorative medal*, p. 26.
- 98 Hill, *The commemorative medal*, p. 26.
- 99 'German war medals', *The Daily Telegraph*, 16 June 1916, V&A 49/2/95, p. 41.
- 100 See n. 62 above; also Hill, *The commemorative medal*, p. 26; 'German war medals for the nation', *The Times*, 14 July 1916, in V&A 49/2/95, p. 63 (for which Hill was probably interviewed).
- 101 Hill, *The commemorative medal*, p. 18.
- 102 BM CM 1916,0707.11.
- 103 Hill, *The commemorative medal*, pp. 25-8. On the theme of inaccuracy, he also noted that the Eberbach medal depicting the sinking Dutch ship *Tubantia* was incorrect, the ship, he pointed out, having been sunk by a German and not an allied torpedo. If these versions of events were to be believed, he noted, 'it is to be the Germans who will write the history of this war' (p. 25).
- 104 Hill to the Trustees, 2 November 1918, CMR, 1917-18, p. 90.
- 105 BM CM 1918,1105.1 and BM CM 1918,0607.4.
- 106 Ian Roberts, *German expressionist cinema: the world of light and dark* (London, 2008), p. 64. For the medal, see Mark Jones, *The Dance of Death: medallic art of the First World War* (London, 1979), p. 27; Bernd Ernsting, 'Ludwig Gies: the Munich years', *The Medal*, 13 (1988), p. 59; Bernd Ernsting, *Ludwig Gies: Meister des Kleinreliefs* (Cologne, 1995), pp. 216-17.
- 107 *A guide to the exhibition of historical medals in the British Museum* (London, 1924), p. 13; also p. 71.
- 108 Ernsting, 'Ludwig Gies', p. 65.
- 109 BM CM 1919,0404.38. See Jones, *The Dance of Death*, p. 16.
- 110 Hill to the Trustees, 30 June 1916, CMR, 1915-16, p. 131.
- 111 'German war medals for the nation', *The Times*, 14 July 1916, in V&A 49/2/95, p. 63.
- 112 'German war medals', *Manchester Guardian*, 14 March 1918, in V&A 49/2/96, p. 57.
- 113 Kenyon, *The British Museum*, p. 40. See also n. 84 above.
- 114 BM, Central Archive, SC 11/1/19, pp. 3621, 3633. The electrotypes were supplied by Mr Ready at the price of 6s. 10d. a dozen.
- 115 *A guide to the exhibition*, pp. 129-40.
- 116 Attwood and Powell, *Medals of dishonour*, p. 82.
- 117 Mark Jones, 'The medal collection of the British Museum', *The Medal*, 6 (1985), p. 10.
- 118 Andrew Burnett, 'The British Museum and numismatics past and present', in Barrie Cook (ed.), *The British Museum and the future of UK numismatics: proceedings of a conference held to mark the 150th anniversary of the Department of Coins and Medals, 2011* (London, 2011), p. 6.
- 119 Mark Jones, *The art of the medal* (London, 1979), pp. 144-51; Jones, *The Dance of Death*.
- 120 Bowring, 'Chronology of temporary exhibitions', p. 47.
- 121 *The medal: mirror of history. Handlist of an exhibition at the British Museum 17 May to 9 September 1979*, section 18: 'German Expressionism'. The exhibition displayed thirty-nine German medals, including eight by Goetz and nine by Gies.
- 122 BM CM 1919,0610.73. See *The medal: mirror of history*, section 18: 'German Expressionism'.
- 123 *Medals of dishonour*, British Museum, Room 90, 25 June - 27 September 2009, and State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg, 28 September 2012 - 13 January 2013. See Attwood and Powell, *Medals of dishonour*, pp. 26-7, 70-79; Philip Attwood, "Honi soit qui bon y pense." Medals as vehicles of antipathy' *The Medal*, 54 (2009), pp. 4-34.
- 124 *The other side of the medal: how Germany saw the First World War*, British Museum, Room 69a, 9 May - 23 November 2014.