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The third year of the Rothschild Archive Trust has been eventful, even dramatic. We have continued to build the collection, and are grateful for the arrival of important papers from both England and France, and especially from members of the Rothschild family: Evelyn, Miriam, Anita, Eric and Liliane. But the most spectacular arrival has come at the end of a much longer journey, in European history and European geography. This is the accession of the surviving archives of the Austrian Rothschilds. The story of their rediscovery, more than half a century after they were seized by the Nazis, is told elsewhere in this Review by Victor Gray. Their transfer to the ownership of The Rothschild Archive comes after ten years of negotiation, in which a number of people were closely involved. The Trustees are enormously grateful to them all, and particularly to Betty Looram, daughter of Alphonse de Rothschild, who generously donated the papers to The Rothschild Archive, and made the return possible.

The Moscow papers include a group of documents which Salomon himself identified in the 1840s as the most important archives in the history of the family, and the arrival of the collection has made it possible to reconstruct ‘the first Rothschild archive’, analysed and described by Melanie Aspey in another part of the Review.

The Archive has continued to attract a diverse and international group of scholars, and we hope over the coming months to develop the information available to researchers on our website, www.rothschildarchive.com. We are also pleased to be able to initiate a small programme of support to facilitate use of the Archive by research students. Details of this can be found at the end of the Director’s Review of the Year’s Work (p. 11).

The Archive Trust is enormously grateful, as in previous years, for the tremendous generosity of Evelyn de Rothschild and the Board of NM Rothschild & Sons in the support they provide to the Archive. The principal challenge for the Archive Trust is to establish a firm financial basis for the long term future of the Archive. We are particularly grateful to NM Rothschild & Sons for their contribution to our endowment fund, and to Château Lafite Rothschild and Rothschild et Compagnie Banque for generous contributions to the fund, which we greatly welcome, too, as evidence that the Archive really is once more, as the papers and other materials which constitute our collections once were, a European and a global resource.

The Archive was fortunate in May to be able to welcome David Cannadine, Professor of History and Director of the Institute for Historical Research, to deliver the third of our series of annual Rothschild Archive Lectures. Professor Cannadine’s research interests have traversed the world, but he has never become bored by the history of money, and how it relates to the rest of life. Professor Cannadine’s lecture on The Embarrassment of Riches, which we are pleased to publish here, is a timely contribution to the history of entrepreneurial values, and also to the wider debate on the place of economic history at the turn of the 21st century.
Acquisitions

Undoubtedly the most significant event for the Archive during the year was the arrival of the surviving papers of the Austrian Rothschild family from Moscow, where they were taken at the end of the War, having been seized by the Nazis in 1938. The story of the return is told more fully later in the Annual Review (see page 24). It marks the end of a concerted campaign to which many branches of the Rothschild family have lent support. The papers have been placed in the Archive in London through the generosity of Mrs Betty Looram, the senior surviving member of the Austrian branch of the Rothschild family, in making them over to the Trust.

A further substantial acquisition of papers relating to the French branch of the Rothschild family has been secured through Baron Eric de Rothschild. While largely of too recent date for immediate opening to research, the collection does contain some important papers concerning the estates and legacies of a number of major figures in the family, not least Baron James, the founder of the French bank, for whom an inventory of Château Lafite, made at the time of his death in 1868, has been preserved, striking in its modesty compared to that made after the death of Baron Alphonse in 1905 with its dazzling array of furniture and art in his Paris houses, at Ferrières and at Lafite. Other papers concern a number of foundations established by members of the family and papers relating to the design and building of the family tomb in the Père Lachaise cemetery in Paris.

The largest bulk of material received during the year has been made up of files relating to the work of N M Rothschild & Sons during the inter-War and immediate post-War period. This on-going transfer of files will eventually ensure that the account of the bank’s activities, so complete for the earlier period, will be brought much closer to the present day. The immediate target is for the period up to 1970. Other acquisitions are listed on page 42 of this Review.

The Library

An important part of the Archive’s activity is the development of a research library to support and elucidate the collections of papers. A major target is the acquisition of a comprehensive set of publications written by members of the family. Highlights of acquisitions towards this goal, secured this year, have been the first four volumes of Novitates Zoologicae, the zoological journal founded by Walter Rothschild in 1897 and co-edited by him until his death in 1937. Issues of this journal are now considerable rarities. A further, finely illustrated paper by Walter, on the Genus Casuarius (the cassowaries), published in 1899, has also been acquired.
In a completely different field, the lavishly produced catalogue of Édouard de Rothschild's collection of the French 16th-century ceramicist Bernard Palissy, published in 1952 with a biography of Palissy by Germaine de Rothschild, Édouard's widow, is a fine addition to the collection.

An early pamphlet La réponse de Rothschild 1er. Roi des Juifs à Satan, Dernier Roi des Imposteurs, published in Paris in 1846 is one manifestation of a vituperative pamphlet war waged in the wake of a fatal railway accident in July 1848 on the Chemin de Fer du Nord, James de Rothschild's newly opened railway line. The event provided a focus for anti-semitism in France at the time and the series of pamphlets, now rare, is an interesting record of the arguments advanced at the time both for and against the Rothschilds, Jewry, capitalism and railways.

Conservation
This year has seen the completion of the work of cleaning and conserving the collection of more than 700 photographic plates produced by Lionel de Rothschild using the Autochrome process, which created some of the earliest photographic images in colour. The plates include portraits of members of the family and images of Rothschild houses and gardens, in particular Ascot and Gunnersbury. Now restored to their original condition, the images are available for research and may one day form the focus of an exhibition. The gift by Edmund de Rothschild to the Archive of both the plates and the original cameras by which they were produced is a handsome contribution to the developing body of historical images housed among the collections.

Research Projects
The essential work of cataloguing the archives to make their content accessible to researchers continues behind the scenes on a day-to-day basis, though this year the arrival of the Moscow papers and other demands have eaten into the time available for this purpose.

Nevertheless, a continuing focus has been the project to list the 3,500 letters written in the year 1848 which survive among the Sunbury Private Correspondence Series (XI/109). This particular year had been chosen as a pilot for assessing the value of this huge 'spinal' series, running from 1814-1903 and as yet largely unexplored. 1848 is of interest because of the impact of the 'Year of Revolutions' on the Rothschild business activities. How far would these letters tell us more and in what detail?

The letters are written in French, English, German, and Judendeutsch. To date, work has been completed on the first two groups and is underway on the Judendeutsch letters. The German material will be tackled later in the year.

Results to date suggest that a great deal of information will emerge on the Rothschilds' reactions as events unfolded and on the detail of how they sought to shore up their operations in Vienna and Frankfurt by injecting support from the other family banks. This was by far the most serious threat to the family's operations since the founding of the five banks and the correspondence in this series will, it seems clear, tell historians a great deal about the scale of the financial turmoil set up in Europe by the events of the year.

A second project now underway is the listing of the letters and reports of August Belmont, the Rothschild agent in New York, during the years of the American Civil War. Once again, the intention is to assess the level of Rothschild engagement with the events of a period of civil, political and economic turmoil. The project is far from completion and it is not yet clear how far Belmont's accounts of the upsets in the markets and the developing political and military events will add new material to the body of historical knowledge. Certainly, his regular details of gold shipments and of the effects of the War on the trade in cotton and tobacco appear to provide a new and potentially important perspective on events.

Work has continued on the compilation of a bibliography of printed works by members of the family. Baroness Philippine de Rothschild has kindly given access to the collections of publications by Baron Henri and Philippe de Rothschild at Château Mouton in support of this project. It is hoped that work will be completed during 2003 on publications prior to 1900.

The long and complicated programme for the translation into English of the 20,000 letters in Judendeutsch between the Rothschild brothers has reached a first landmark with the completion of the translation for the key period 1814-1818. Work is now progressing on the next period, covering 1826-1833 (letters between the two periods have not, for some reason, survived).

Meanwhile options for publishing the 1814-1818 letters on the Internet are being explored, in order to make this major new source available to historians. The letters cover the period of the Rothschilds' funding campaign for the Allied armies in the Napoleonic Wars and give much new detail on the arrangement of post-War finance for many European governments.

Researchers
During the year, copies of two doctoral theses based extensively on work undertakens in the Archive were donated. Pedro Ortúñez Goicolea's work on the nationalisation of Spanish railways, presented to the University of Valladolid, draws heavily upon the later years of Rothschild railways in Spain, while Felicitas Knoth's University of Vienna thesis on the art collections of the Austrian branch of the Rothschild family is the most detailed study to date of the growth and coverage of those collections. Current research in the Archive is as wide-reaching as ever in its scope. Among subjects touched upon during the year covered by this Review have been the calico printing industry, the Channel Tunnel, the Marconi scandal of 1912, the bond market 1895-1906, British holders of cotton bonds issued by the Confederacy during the Civil War, Rothschild interests in Brazil and Russia, Rothschild business agents around the world and the history of the Naples bank of CM von Rothschild e figli. A growing number of research enquiries touch upon the architecture of Rothschild houses and the history of the family's art collections and of individual pieces within them. Biographical research is also common and varies in scale from the search for a specific detail to the full-blown biography. Four such are currently in preparation and will draw, in some cases heavily, upon the Archive's resources.

Research Links
The building up of contacts with other collections of archives which may illuminate papers in The Rothschild Archive is another part of the work of facilitating and improving research into Rothschild history. This year contacts have been made with...
the Director of the Archive of Vítkovice, the Czech iron and steel company in which the Rothschild family had a controlling interest between 1843 and 1939, when it was forcibly transferred to the Nazi industrial conglomerate Reichswerke Hermann Göring. A considerable number of documents survive among this Archive relating to the period of Rothschild involvement and contacts are being developed.

Another major industrial concern, in which the English and French Rothschild banks were heavily involved, were the mercury mines at Almadén in south-west Spain. In 1835, the Rothschilds secured the rights to the working and output of these mines, giving them a virtual worldwide monopoly on this vital component in the refining of gold. They retained an involvement until the mines were nationalised in 1929. Discussions have taken place with the staff of the Archive at Almadén and it is hoped that exchanges of information will broaden into possible microfilm programmes.

A number of Viennese archives have also been either visited or contacted in an attempt to gain a better understanding of what documentation may still survive to increase our understanding of the business and charitable interests of the Austrian family, particularly in the 19th century. Already a series of reports from Lionel de Rothschild to Chancellor Metternich, written as Austrian Consul-General in London and discussing the state of British commerce and industry in 1838, have been secured in microform from the Staatsarchiv in Vienna.

Research support has continued for the proposed exhibition on the Rothschilds as collectors, scheduled to open in the Philadelphia Museum in 2005 and thereafter to travel in Europe. Other items have also been loaned during the year to: the Museum of London for their exhibition on ‘Britain and Brazil’; the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto for the exhibition ‘Gift of the Gods’ (on the history of wine); to the Cultura Inglesa in São Paulo, Brazil for an exhibition on ‘The British Presence in Brazil’; to the Norwich Castle Museum for an exhibition of the paintings of Frederick Sandys; and to the Yeshiva University Museum in New York for an exhibition on the Jewish painter, Moritz Daniel Oppenheim.

During the year, a proposal has been drawn up within the Archive for a substantial research project to assess and analyse the volume and nature of the Rothschild family’s charitable activities throughout Europe. Of the many facets of Rothschild activities this is the area about which least is known and the project would attempt to set this within the context of the Jewish tradition of charitable giving and to use the results as an indicator of the contribution which this tradition has made, both to the Jewish community and to European society at large. At the end of the year under consideration for this Review, attempts were being made to secure funding to allow the project to begin.

The Rothschild Archive’s website (www.rothschildarchive.org) is visited by an increasing number of people and a growing number of initial approaches to the staff of the Archive are being received in this way. The website will be further developed in the coming year, with the addition of more research material and facilities for those pursuing studies which may benefit from the Archive’s collections.

At the same time, the attempt to attract greater numbers of researchers has led to the production of introductory leaflets in both French and German which have been distributed to a number of relevant sites in Europe.

NOTES
2. Stanley Weintraub on Lionel and Charlotte de Rothschild, George Ireland on the sons of Nathan Mayer Rothschild, Laura Schor on Betty de Rothschild and Kenneth Rose on Victor, 3rd Lord Rothschild

Rothschild Archive Bursaries

During the year, the Trustees, in recognition of the difficulties sometimes encountered by students in making practical arrangements to visit the Archive to undertake research, initiated the Rothschild Archive Bursaries. These may be awarded to researchers engaged in full-time education and committed to projects which involve substantial use of The Rothschild Archive.

The bursaries, which are limited in number, are not intended to cover the full cost of any period of research in the Archive but are designed to provide practical assistance with travel, accommodation or incidental costs associated with such work. Further details can be obtained from the Director.

The Vítkovice Ironworks (formerly Witkowitz), a lithograph by Ernst Knippel, c. 1850
The embarrassment of riches: historians and wealth in modern Britain

The third Rothschild Archive Lecture, delivered by Professor David Cannadine, Director of the Institute of Historical Research, 13 May 2002

I am both delighted and a touch intimidated to find myself here tonight, delivering the third annual Rothschild Archive Lecture. I am delighted because The Rothschild Archive is a magnificent enterprise in educational advance to the benefit of the public, and I hope in this lecture to do a little to explain those essential goals and further these admirable objectives. But I am also intimidated — in part because this is (quite appropriately) probably the most illustrious audience before whom I have ever lectured; in part because I shall be trying to tread in the footsteps of two exceptionally distinguished predecessors, either, let alone both of whom, is an impossible act to follow: the first, David Landes, himself a Trustee of The Rothschild Archive, and the most accomplished professor of history and economics of his generation, who for more than half a century has brought to his subject a brilliance of mind, a range of expertise, a cosmopolitanism of outlook, and a determined engagement with contemporary affairs that puts my generation of economic historians to shame (a point to which I shall later return); and secondly Niall Ferguson, whose many important works include his massive, pioneering history of the Rothschilds - a book so weighty that it is almost impossible to pick up, but also a book so fascinating that it is no less impossible to put down.1

In their lectures, Professors Landes and Ferguson drew attention to two of the ways in which The Rothschild Archive can advance, and is advancing, educational endeavours to the broader benefit of the public. In the first place, and this was Professor Landes's prime point, it makes available the most extraordinary collection of documents and artefacts, generated by one of the great families and enterprises of the last two hundred years, which means there can be scarcely any major topic in the recent history of modern Britain, Europe and the wider world which these documents and artefacts do not illuminate and embellish - from the financing of Wellington's Army to the building of French railways, and from the settlement of California in the 1850s to the economic development of Brazil in the late nineteenth century.2 But in addition, and this was the rub of Professor Ferguson's remarks, the sheer range of the Rothschilds' interests and activities is a constant reminder that we need to think, not addition, and this was the nub of Professor Ferguson's remarks, the sheer range of the Rothschilds' interests and activities is a constant reminder that we need to think, not only then, but also now, of the essential interconnectedness of economic, social, political and cultural activity — an interconnectedness which historians and policy makers are all too inclined to disregard.3

I am on the same page with both of these arguments, and I shall be saying much which will lend support to them. Like Professor Ferguson, I shall make some general observations on the way economic history is being done and ought to be done; like Professor Landes, I shall talk in some detail about the Rothschilds and their Archive; and like both of my predecessors, I shall urge that history matters, not only because of what it tells us about the past, but also because of what it tells us about the present.4

As my title suggests, my general concern is to explore the essentially ambiguous nature of many historians' attitudes to wealth they recognise it is important, and that it makes the world go round, but they are not always comfortable with it, and they are not altogether sure how to approach it. More precisely, I want to explore this concern by addressing three subjects. I shall begin by re-examining the debate over Britain's so-called "entrepreneurial culture" its supposed triumph in the nineteenth century, and its subsequent defeat in the twentieth, which saw (apparently) the defeat and marginalization of the forces of wealth creation. In the light of the continuing public and academic interest in this subject, I shall then turn to look at what may seem a surprising parallel development, which may best be described as the narrowing and weakening of the very discipline which should be most concerned with this debate and with the broader history of wealth, namely economic history. And in my final section, I shall seek to illustrate and explore these general themes with reference to the Rothschild history, the Rothschild family and The Rothschild Archive.

I.

The fluctuating fortunes of Britain's so-called "entrepreneurial culture" — otherwise known as the "industrial spirit" — have long pre-occupied Britain's politicians, pundits and academics, certainly since the late 1950s. Briefly summarised, the most famous and familiar version of this argument is as follows: From the 1780s until the 1870s, our nation enjoyed a golden age of unprecedented industrial advance, economic prosperity, imperial expansion and great-power grandeur, whose unrivalled wealth, efficiency and modernity were all appropriately celebrated at the Great Exhibition held at the Crystal Palace in 1851. And the key to all this was an unprecedented efflorescence of entrepreneurship, as heroic men of energy and resource — Boulton and Watt, Arkwright and Wedgwood, Stevenson and Cubitt — transformed the British economy, by invention, by innovation, by new modes of production, thereby creating the first industrial nation. And in so doing, they not merely transformed Britain they also raised themselves up, from humble beginnings, to riches and respectability, buying landed estates, getting themselves elected to parliament, and successfully emulating the landed, tilled, aristocratic elite. From this perspective, social ambition was the key to wealth creation, a view which found its most resonant expression in Samuel Smiler's book, Self-Help, one of the best-sellers of the mid-Victorian generation.4

But soon after (according to this interpretation), things began to go rapidly wrong. During the late nineteenth century, Britain lost its economic pre-eminence to Germany and the United States, and for much of the twentieth century, its decline continued, inexorable and irreversible — as the first industrial nation because the first to de-industrialise, as the British economy became the sick man of Europe, as Britannia ceased to rule the waves, and as the empire on which the sun had once proudly never set became one with Nineveh and Tyre. How, in turn, were these developments to be explained? Once again, the crucial variable was the entrepreneur, who now appeared in a very different guise from that of the heroic figure of earlier times. From the last quarter of the nineteenth century onwards, so this argument continued, British businessmen consistently underperformed, compared with their more ruthless, more ambitious, better-educated counterparts in Europe and north America. Instead of working hard, taking risks and maximising profits, as their forbears had done, they were seduced by the supine culture and anti-industrial attitudes of...
The collapse of British Power, or the \textit{Collapse of British Power}, as it is now more widely known, is a book that encapsulates the sentiment that the British economy had reached a peak and was now in decline. This sentiment was widespread, and it was used to explain the ebb and flow of entrepreneurial activity. However, the argument that sees the industrial spirit defeated by the ethos of gentrification is not without its critics. Barnett and Sampson's argument, for example, has been widely criticized for its use of anachronistic language and its failure to recognize the complex interplay of economic and cultural forces that shaped the British economy.

The book was written by a group of economists and historians who were concerned about the state of the British economy. They argued that the country was in decline, and that this was due to a failure of the industrial spirit. They claimed that the country had lost its entrepreneurial drive, and that this was due to the rise of the 'gentrified' middle class.

However, the book has been widely criticized for its reliance on anachronistic language and its failure to recognize the complex interplay of economic and cultural forces that shaped the British economy. Some critics have argued that the book was written by a group of economists and historians who were more concerned about the state of the British economy than they were about the impact of entrepreneurial activity on the economy.
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If all these qualifications are right, and it seems fairly clear that they are, then the whole thesis of a century-long British economic decline, brought about by the triumph of gentry and aristocratic values over the industrial and entrepreneurial ethos, is so discredited that it should sensibly be dispensed with altogether. For the very notion of a manichean division between one group who were vigorous, upwardly mobile and profit maximisers on the one side, and a second who were lethargic, snobbish and leisured on the other, grossly over-simplifies the social, economic, behavioural and cultural variety of modern Britain. Far from there being two collective categories, built around two simple stereotypes, the reality – of Britain’s social structure and economic performance – was always much more complex and nuanced. There never was a single "gentry culture", nor was there a monolithic "industrial spirit", locked in a battle where every advance by one side meant a retreat by the other. To maintain such a view implies that if and when fox hunting is abolished in this country, there will be a sudden upsurge in economic activity, as all the effort and energy previously lavished on gentrified pursuits will now be diverted to entrepreneurial endeavours. That is, to put it mildly, a very unlikely outcome. In explaining Britain’s economic performance from the mid eighteenth to the mid nineteenth century, the cultural polarities of gentrification versus the industrial spirit are mistaken, misleading, misguided and misconceived.¹¹

II.

One way of describing the set of historical issues I have just been discussing is to say that they are all concerned with wealth with the processes whereby wealth is created, with the character, background and motivation of those who create it, and with the broader consequences for society of such accumulations. Indeed, for those who take a positive view of things, and who always think that the proverbial glass is half full, economic history is all about wealth: how it was made, how it was distributed, and what were the consequences of that distribution. For those of a more pessimistic inclination (and many economic historians seem to be pessimists), who believe that the same proverbial glass is always half empty, then economic history is not about wealth but about scarcity, and about the processes whereby scarce resources have been allocated, and the consequences of such allocations. Either way, wealth (or scarcity) is (or ought to be) a central issue for economic historians. Yet the fact is that for much of the period during which economic history has existed as a recognisable intellectual activity in this country, that has not been so. Let me then, in this second part of my lecture, turn to examine economic history: how it has dealt (or failed to deal) with wealth, and how it has failed, as a result, to realise its full potential as what was once one of history’s most vigorous sub-specialisms.

The beginnings of economic history in this country are usually dated from the 1880s, when anxious contemporaries began to fear that the British economy was indeed beginning to slow down, and when Arnold Toynbee gave his famous Lectures on the Industrial Revolution, which not only began discussions of the central subject in modern economic history in a recognisably modern way, but did so in a powerfully pessimistic manner.¹³ For Toynbee thought it had been a disaster, overturning an idyllic rural civilisation and condemning generations to the brutal servitude of factory labour and squalid city living. Far from seeing the Industrial Revolution as the harbinger and creator of unprecedented misery: This view was further embellished by J.L. and Barbara Hammond, who in a series of books about The Village Labourer and The Town Labourer offered more detailed validation of Toynbee’s generalisations, insisting the Industrial Revolution reduced millions of people to degraded conditions of servitude and misery. Like Toynbee, the Hammonds were very uncomfortable with wealth, and this view was shared in the next generation by R.H. Tawney, author of a book on Equality, who once memorably observed that “what thoughtful rich people call the problem of poverty, thoughtful poor people call the problem of riches.” And in the next generation, writing during the 1950s and 1960s, Edward Thompson and Eric Hobsbawm continued to put the pessimists’ case, namely that for ordinary people, the Industrial Revolution had been a disaster and a disgrace, and that the only thing the proletariat had to show for it had been misery and suffering in life, and a large number of pages in the Economic History Review in death.¹⁵

By then, however, the pessimists were no longer having it all their own way, for in the decades after the Second World War, an alternative view was evolved which was much more positive and appreciative. From this perspective, the economic changes of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century had been transformative and irreversible, as Britain became the first nation in the world which simultaneously increased its wealth, its population and its standard of living, thereby opening up the eventual and unprecedented prospect of a more abundant life for everyone. Thus, more optimistically regarded, the Industrial Revolution was the great divide in the history of the world, and the task which faced contemporary policy makers was to ensure that all other, developing nations, could cross it too. Here was a very different view of wealth - as something which could do more good than harm, and as something which should be increased and spread around as much as possible.¹⁶ (It was also in this optimistic interpretation of the Industrial Revolution that the entrepreneur was assigned an heroic place, as the person who made it all happen.)

The 1950s, 1960s and early 1970s were the heyday of economic history: it seemed (as Marx had long ago urged) to offer the most fundamental route to understanding how societies evolved and developed, as economic processes drove social processes which drove politics; it was therefore broadly conceived as being related to society and politics and culture, and being international rather than national; and it captivated
scho lars and policy makers alike, the former through the vitriolic debates on the standard of living, where the optimists and the pessimists confronted each other, the latter because it seemed to provide historical validation for their efforts to promote contemporary third world development. The result was a massive proliferation of the subject, coinciding with the massive expansion of higher education in the 1960s and 1970s. Departments and professorships of economic history were established, not only in the new universities, but also in the old, the membership of the Economic History Society and the size and circulation of the Economic History Review expanded almost exponentially; and so when Donald Coleman gave his inaugural lecture as Professor of Economic History at Cambridge in 1972, he was able to depict a subject in a state of unprecedented buoyancy and optimism.21

But as he himself warned, it could not, and did not, last. By the end of that decade, economic history was already in decline, which has continued unabated since, as professorships in the subject have vanished, as departments of economic history have been closed, as the membership of the Economic History Society has contracted, and as the British Academy abolished a separate section for economic historians, and declared graduate studies in the subject to be an endangered species.22 There are many reasons for this. One is that economic history has been overtaken at the cutting-edge sub-specialism - first by social history, and more recently by cultural history: developments well exemplified by the fact that the debate on Britain's supposed economic decline has been more undertaken by cultural and social historians than economic historians. Part cause part consequence of this is that economic history has become more insular and turned in on itself less concerned with international or spirit look when approached from the perspective provided by the Rothschild dynasty and documents! And how, to remind you of my second subject, does The Rothschild Archive enable us – indeed, demand of – that we study economic history in the broadest, most imaginatively conceived way?

For anyone mistakenly in thrall to Messrs Sampson, Barnett and Wiener, and no less mistakenly minded to argue it, the nineteenth-century English Rothschilds may be presented as the paradigm example of the entrepreneurial spirit eroded, undermined, suffocated and stifled by the all-powerful gentrifying culture. Nathan Mayer Rothschild might have begun with relatively small resources and in grisy, industrialising Manchester in 1799, but within two generations, his family was well entrenched in the British establishment. From the 1840s, the Rothschilds bought up large swathes of Buckinghamshire, and took to fox hunting and stag hunting in a big way, and they also produced a Derby winner in 1869. They created palaces for large swathes of Buckinghamshire, and took to fox hunting and stag hunting in a big way, and they also produced a Derby winner in 1869. They created palaces for

The result is that in recent years, it has been non-economic historians who have been more interested in the broader issues and ramifications of wealth, especially the relation between national resources and international standing. Consider in this regard Paul Kennedy's famous study of The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers, 1750-2000, which advanced the argument that over the very long run, it was the wealth of nations which determined their standing in the great power league, and that it was the relative riches and resources of nations which ultimately determined the outcome of conflicts between them. To be sure, tactics and strategy mattered, but only in a secondary sort of way. Hence the succession of great powers, which was best explained in economic rather than military terms: Spain, France, Britain, the USSR, the USA. This was a broad-ranging, imaginative and original treatment (and, indeed, re-definition) of what might be called the new economic determinism of rising and falling powers caused by rising and falling economies. On the contrary, as he sees things, it is politics which manipulates wealth rather than the other way round. From this perspective, great power politics is primarily about the way in which states manage money, both domestically and internationally, and war is about flexible and innovative financing. Thus regarded, it is not the wealth of nations which explains the rise and fall of great powers, but the capacity of states to raise revenue and control money markets: the impact of politics on finance is greater than the impact of finance on politics.22
Thus summarised, the history of the nineteenth-century English Rothschilds seems perfectly to bear out the thesis advanced by Messrs Sampson, Barnett and Weiner with which I began. But just as I have sought to suggest, in a general way, that their arguments are wrong, so, in a specific way, are such arguments wrong when applied to the Rothschilds. For despite the evidence which I have presented a moment ago, it is abundantly clear that the family was never overwhelmed by the genteel and leisurely culture of leisure and idleness. When they bought land in Buckinghamshire, it was as a rational investment at a time of low prices and low interest rates, and because they wished to diversify their assets. When they bought pictures, it was in the confident belief that prices would rise, which they invariably did. When they took up fox and stag hunting, it was for much-needed exercise, and in a county which had a rapid rail link to London, so they could easily get back to work in the City. When they built great houses in London and in the country, it was primarily for dispensing what would now be called corporate hospitality rather than for living a leisureed and languid aristocratic life. And when they sought out connections with the great and the good, it was because most of their business was to do with raising money for governments, and they needed to be politically well-informed.

Moreover, as Niall Ferguson has recently shown, the Rothschilds themselves remained good at business, at least until the end of the nineteenth century, while in the twentieth century, the family has, to put it mildly, continued to produce an astonishing array of high achievers - not only in banking, but in many other walks of life as well. For all their undeniable grandeur, the Rothschilds are not now, and never have been, supine slaves to the culture of gentility. Indeed, if the Rothschild experience has any guide, it is far from self-evident that rich families who buy land, build great houses, and fill them with splendid pictures and magnificent furniture, are thereby giving up on the entrepreneurial spirit and succumbing to the siren songs of gentrification. Nathan Mayer Rothschild might have bought the family's first country house, at Gunnersbury, but he didn't like agriculture: “grunt grunt, squeak squeak,” was his view of farming animals. Lionel Rothschild lived magnificently in Piccadilly, and even he was sinfully unappreciative of the country houses of the aristocracy: he thought Castle Howard “rather a nice place, but nothing wonderful . . . not worth putting oneself out to see.” And for all his social links with the Prince of Wales and subsequent Edward VII, Natty first Lord Rothschild thought his conversation “commonplace and very slow”, that he was “excessively fond of the chase”, and paid insufficient attention to “war and peace and the state of politics” — activities the Rothschilds themselves never neglected or ignored.

Indeed, this argument may be carried (and corroborated) one stage - and also one continent - further. Consider, in this regard, what has rightly been called the “Rothschild style”: best exemplified at Waddesdon, but also to be found in their other great houses in Buckinghamshire - that particular combination of Old Masters and eighteenth-century English paintings, of French furniture and porcelain of the same period, and of heavy golden cornices, damask-long walls, and tasselled velvet curtains. This was how the Rothschilds decorated and embellished their many great houses, but it was a photocratic rather than an aristocratic aesthetic, and it appropriately provided the model for the likes of Frick, Huntington, Carnegie, Vanderbilt, Astor, Rockefeller and Mellon, not only on Fifth Avenue, but also in the American countryside as well. So far as I am aware, no one has ever reappraised the Fricks, Carnegies, Vanderbilts, Astors, Rockefellers and Mellons with being insufficiently committed to, or successful at, making money. For they, too, like the Rothschilds, and like many British entrepreneur, also bought houses and pictures and other beautiful things, without any necessary diminution of the industrial spirit. Nor should we forget that these families endowed universities, libraries, museums and research foundations, and were interested in politics as well as philanthropy. Even for those denounced by contemporaries as “Robber Barons”, there was always more to life than merely making money.

The nineteenth-century English Rothschilds, I have so far been suggesting, managed to be both vigorous and varied in their ways of living: indeed so vigorous and varied that they render wholly inadequate the attempts by many economic historians to focus only and exclusively on what are supposed to be (and what they clearly think ought to be) the profit maximising activities of individual businessmen. For as the history of the Rothschilds so eloquently demonstrates, homo economicus was little more than a dismal abstraction: in the nineteenth century, as in the twenty first, most people who were in business and making profits were doing many other things too, and an academic sub-specialism which pays scant attention to them is all too often lacking in any sense of human reality. For economic activity, as Adam Smith long ago pointed out, is not a distinct universe, a separate side of life: it is an integral part of the seamless fabric of individual activity and collective human endeavour, which it is the historian's job to recover, explain and evoke in all its varied diversity.

But this is not the only sense in which many economic historians err, by failing to recognise that for most people, economic activity is only one thread in a much broader tapestry of human affairs: it is far from self-evident that the geographical space within which these varied activities were carried on was often far more broad and wide-ranging than the narrow confines of the nation state. In an earlier era, of Sir John Clapham or of David Landes, there was a general recognition that economic history should not be confined to the national past of any one particular country: that the creation and distribution of wealth took place on a larger scale and stage than that, involving individuals, institutions and ideas which belonged to many different national cultures. But today, economic history as practised in Britain is all too often restricted to the British nation, and pays insufficient attention to the broader continental and international world. Yet such a view is not only intrinsically mistaken and unsustainable: it is also wholly contradicted by a brief contemplation of the way the Rothschilds lived their lives. For they not only saw themselves as an international family, whose interests and loyalties in some ways far transcended those of the nation state: they also recognised that the economy worked in an international, indeed transnational, way. And that recognition is one to which economic historians should give more attention than they now habitually incline to do.

IV.
The extraordinary diversity of human endeavour and achievement, the bewildering complexity and global extent of the economic past, a broader notion of the subject and substance of economic history, an apt recognition of the essential international perspective: all this is urged upon us by contemplating the history of the Rothschild family. And all this is to be explored in teeming, magnificent detail here in The Rothschild Archive itself, containing as it does more than two million documents, in
virtually every European language, and spanning the whole period from the 1800s to the 1970s. Here are to be found: the records of N.M. Rothschild and Sons, material relating to the Rothschild Banks in Frankfurt, Paris, Vienna and Naples; correspondence with Rothschild agents and representatives around the world; and the personal and estate papers of many members of the family. And what a magnificent treasure house this is. The letters between the five sons of Mayer Amschel Rothschild span the years 1811 to 1868, and throw new light on virtually every great historical episode in European history, from the defeat of Napoleon to the Revolutions of 1848, in many of which the Rothschilds themselves were involved: in the same way, the correspondence between the London bank and their Madrid agents is an unrivalled source for the history of nineteenth-century Spain, just as similar correspondence between London and Naples should prompt a major re-consideration of the Italian Risorgimento.

I could go on all evening telling you about the Rothschilds’ involvement in the international tobacco trade, especially via Havana and New Orleans; about their part in the funding of the Suez Canal Bridge linking Buda and Pest; about their crucial role in the financing of American railways, about their interest in the development of the Mexican economy; about their dealings with virtually every European government concerning loans and debts and bonds. But time is pressing, and I must decline. Suffice it to say that the recent establishment of The Rothschild Archive Trust, the completion of a comprehensive catalogue, and the relocation of the Archive here in this building, have made it possible for an ever-growing number of scholars to use the collection. Moreover, their researches are not only telling us more about the Rothschilds than we already knew about them, but a much broader range of human activity, in all parts of the globe, thereby helping to bring about that broader conception of the economic past that I have been arguing for. And this is not only a magnificent archive: it is also a constantly growing archive, as new discoveries are being made, as new materials are being added, and as the range of subjects on which it boasts important holdings continues to expand. Indeed, if this expansion continues, it may be possible to envisage The Rothschild Archive as the base from which to launch that fundamental re-thinking and re-energising of the whole study of the economic past which is now so urgently needed.

But such an endeavour would not be of importance exclusively for our better and broader understanding of the economic past it would also be pregnant with possibilities for our better and broader understanding of the economic present. All of us—academics, bankers, civil servants, politicians, businessmen and women—are much less well informed than we ought to be about how, when and why the local, national, international and global economies of our own time have come to be the way they are. We urgently need a broad, imaginative, cosmopolitan account of the national, international and global economies of our own time have come to be the way they are. We urgently need a broad, imaginative, cosmopolitan account of the economic past which is adequate to the complexities of the economic present and the uncertainties of the economic future. And what better place is there to inculcate such an enterprise than here in New Court? The Rothschild Archive— in terms of what it is, what it is becoming, and what it might yet become—is thus not only an historical source and resource of the first order: it also has the potential for enhancing our understanding of ourselves in time and of the world today. That is why history and the archives matter in general, and that is why this family, their history, and these archives matter in particular. Truly, these are riches by which no one should feel embarrassed.
The return of the Austrian Rothschild Archive

Victor Gray describes the rediscovery of a collection of papers which for 50 years were thought lost as casualties of war.

A small ceremony in an anonymous building in the Moscow suburbs on 29 November 2001, the Head of the Russian Federal Archive Service signed a document acknowledging the transfer to the ownership of The Rothschild Archive of a collection of papers which for fifty years had lain secretly preserved, unsuspected by anyone in the West.

The signing of this agreement marked the conclusion of a ten-year story which began as the first news filtered out to western historians of the existence in Moscow of a 'Special State Archive' housing hundreds of collections of Western records which had been thought destroyed during the 2nd World War; and which had gone on to take a sinuous course through a bumpy succession of changes of government policy on the issue of repatriation, one of the centrepieces of confrontation between the Russian Parliament and President Yeltsin.1

The return of this collection was an important step forward in international cultural relations for the Russian Government, for this was the first time it had reached an agreement with any non-governmental body for the return of archives captured by the Soviet Army in the course of the 2nd World War. It was important for the Rothschild family since these documents were the last vestiges of the papers of a branch of the family which had been at the centre of Austrian business and society for over a century and which had been brutally separated from that position on 12 March 1938, when the Nazis marched into Vienna.

In the wake of the Anschluss, the firm of S M von Rothschild was placed under compulsory administration on 30 March 1939 on the orders of Walter Raphelberger, economic adviser to the Gauleiter of Vienna, who was charged with the systematic confiscation of all Jewish assets in Austria. It was put under the temporary control of the firm of Merck Finck and Co. and sold to them in October 1939. It is clear however that attention had been given to the archives surprisingly soon after the German army entered Austria on 12 March 1938. On 2 April Sonderkommando II.112 of the Sicherheitsdiensthauptamt (the Security Service High Command) completed a preliminary inventory of the papers which they had already found and secured on Rothschild premises, many of which form part of the Archive now received – along with the inventory itself, now crumpled but still bearing witness to the thoroughness of the operation.

What happened next is not yet clear but it seems highly probable that these, along with many other confiscated archives, were consolidated in a Gestapo store in Enserstrasse in Berlin. With the intensification of Allied bombing in 1943, papers stored in this building were evacuated from Berlin, first to Fürstenstein and then, from April 1944, to the Castle of Wölfelsdorf (now Walbrzych in Poland). In early 1945, a Red Army counter-intelligence SMERSH Unit with the Second Ukrainian Front uncovered the Wölfelsdorf treasures and shipped them to Moscow. In all some 30 rail freight cars were used to transfer the archives held at Wölfelsdorf.2

In March 1946, the Soviet Government established the Central State Special Archive (TsGOA) to house papers captured during the War. They were intended for the use solely of such bodies as the Ministries of Defence and Foreign Affairs and the Secret Police, the NKVD. Access beyond these bodies was prohibited until 1992 when it was renamed the Centre for the Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections (TsKhIKD). In March 1999 the Centre was abolished and incorporated into the neighbouring Russian State Military Archive.

With glasnost, the West became gradually aware, for the first time, of the survival of these ‘twice-plundered’ archives. During the 1990s, agreements were reached with the Governments of France, Liechtenstein and Great Britain for the repatriation of papers previously stored in the Special Archive. The French agreement had, through negotiation, provided for the return, along with 20 tonnes of French governmental papers, of a collection of papers snatched by the Nazis in 1941 from offices and houses of members of the French Rothschild family. These reached the Rothschild Archive in 1994. Other inter-governmental agreements are still under negotiation. The restitution of the Austrian Rothschild archive differs in that it is the first agreement arrived at between the Russian Government and a non-governmental organisation or individual for the return of archives. It was made under an amendment by President Putin in 2000 to the law on the restitution of cultural treasures initially plundered by the Nazis from occupied countries, Holocaust victims and other enemies of the Nazi regime.

In recognition of the care given in preserving and cataloguing the papers by several generations of Russian archivists, a collection of letters of Tsar Alexander II and Princess Yuryevskaya were gifted to the Russian Federal Archives by the Rothschild family.
The archive, now returned from the Russian State Military Archive, consists of 419 files in 29 boxes, made up, by the estimate of the archivists, of some 40,000 papers. Though much smaller than the French family archive released in 1994, it is historically far more significant from the point of view of Rothschild history.

That significance is twofold. In the first place the collection includes the small but important group of 'key documents' in Rothschild family history gathered together by Salomon von Rothschild in the 1840s and described in detail by Melanie Aspey elsewhere in this Review.

The second major significance lies in the opening up of a whole geographical swathe of Rothschild operations which has been largely unchronicled and, apart from files which, no doubt, lurk in government archives (where they have survived), are recorded nowhere else. The Frankfurt and Vienna offices together set up business and banking involvements in an arc stretching from Sweden, through Middle Europe, to Italy.

In this collection, although it represents only a random fragment of what must once have constituted the Bank's archive, are to be found, among others, records (admittedly varying in quantity and quality) of the South Austrian Railway, the Buschenthal Railway in Hungary and the Vladistavovka Railway in Russia, the Carl Ludwig Railway in Galicia, the Italian Electricity Trust Company, the Kronstadt Paper Factory in Budapest and the Danube Steamship Company. There are references to mining and to oil trading in Baku.

In the field of government involvement there are references to and reflections of loans to Austria, Hungary, Belgium, the Netherlands, France, Germany, Sweden, Russia, Herzegovina and Japan.

Personal loans to several European aristocrats and monarchs are mentioned, including the Esterhazys and King Alexander of Serbia who, it becomes clear, in 1893 placed substantial quantities of royal jewels with the Vienna House as security. The prize items in this area, however, were a series of letters from Prince Metternich, the Imperial Chancellor, and a close associate of Salomon, which were presented by the Russian Government, as a gift, to the Austrian Nation in 1960. Photocopies are retained in the collection.

Away from the business area, the collection includes miscellaneous records - mainly financial accounts - of the family estates in Austria: principally, Schillersdorf and Beneschau. Personal papers include several hundred family photographs from the early decades of the century, together with personal letters, and ephemera concerning social occasions, personal purchases, etc. A 1903, privately printed, catalogue of the paintings and furniture of Nathaniel von Rothschild is an important addition to our knowledge of the family collection.

The family’s philanthropic activities are reflected in a group of papers relating to the construction of the Bettina Pavilion, a hospital for women founded after the death of Bettina, the wife of Albert, in 1892. Other activities recorded are the donation by Salomon in 1844 of 40,000 gulden towards the building of a polytechnic institution in Brno and the founding of psychiatric institutions by Nathaniel in 1898.

The Austrian papers will be incorporated into The Rothschild Archive’s own catalogue system for eventual access via the Archive website. In the meantime, enquiries about the collection can be addressed to Melanie Aspey at The Archive.

NOTES
1. The most comprehensive account of the seizure of documents and of the issues involved in their restitution is to be found in Patricia Kennedy Grimsted: “Twice plundered or ‘Twice saved’ Russia’s ‘Trophy’ Archives and the Loot of the Reichssicherheits- hauptamt”, Holocaust and Genocide Studies, 4(2) September 2001.
Salomon's archive

The return of a collection of papers seized from the Rothschild family in Vienna in 1938 gives a glimpse of what was almost certainly the first attempt to create a Rothschild Archive a century and a half ago. Melanie Aspey explains

"The records in this register, together with the register itself, are, for all time, to be held in the safekeeping of my dear son, Baron Anselm Salomon von Rothschild, and thereafter in the archives of the entailed estate of his successors, in perpetual remembrance by these descendants of their ancestors. This is the firm and certain intent of the undersigned Baron Salomon Mayer von Rothschild, 20 October 1844."

This inscription, in the Baron's own hand, sits within the covers of a brown leather-bound index volume. On its cover, tooled in gold, the title 'Familien Archiv Register' defines the aspiration which led to this first attempt to bring together key documents in the history of the Rothschild family.

The volume was recently received in The Rothschild Archive as part of the consignment of documents seized from Nazi stores at the end of the War and recently released by the Russian Government.

It is perhaps not surprising that it should have been Salomon who took an interest in recording his family's achievements in this way. Among the family, his was the most sharply honed sense of history. In his letters to his brothers he often recalls the days when the five boys slept in one attic room in the Jewish ghetto in Frankfurt, and muses on the changes in the manner in which they are treated now that they have become rich and titled. Reputedly it was Salomon who first commissioned Moritz Oppenheim to paint scenes from their lives, in particular the twin paintings showing the Elector of Hesse entrusting his valuables to the Rothschilds and receiving them back at the end of the Napoleonic Wars. His role in the advancement of the family is in no doubt their most significant title, Baron, was conferred upon them by the Austrian Emperor in 1822, one year after Salomon, having worked closely with Prince Metternich after the fall of Napoleon, established a business in Vienna. His pride in their achievements is equally clear.

The immediate impetus for the creation of the Archive is probably to be found in two events in Salomon's life: the grant to Salomon in 1843 of honorary Austrian citizenship, the first such privilege ever granted to a Jew, and his 70th birthday in 1844. The mixture of a sense of achievement and of mortality surely spurred this new effort at self-memorialising.

Altogether 67 documents were gathered together by Salomon and classified alphabetically in the Register. A note on an early page indicates that eight items, marked with asterisks, were in the special keeping of Salomon. In fact there are ten items thus marked – seven relating to property – some with the additional remark that the item had been retained because still being used. Only three were returned to the Archive. Of the 67 items in the Register, 49 have so far been identified as having survived their enforced journey to Berlin, Silesia and Moscow. The oldest
item in Solomon’s Archive was already 75 years old when he gathered together his collection; others date from the very year of the Archive’s creation. The Register gives no real sense of Solomon’s selection criteria. Indeed, it is not clear where he found the materials for his Archive: did he search through business and domestic premises in Frankfurt and Vienna looking for ‘old’ things, or was the family already accustomed to preserving documents and artefacts? How much did he select, and how much had survived anyway?

Whether or not his aim was to represent specific aspects of his family’s achievement, the documents in the Archive do in fact pick up a number of themes that provide a convenient structure in which to examine them.

First among these is the life of Mayer Amschel Rothschild. The Rothschild brothers built on a business founded by their father, Mayer Amschel, who created the Rothschild partnerships that flourished formally for over a century and endure to this day. In their letters the brothers frequently invoke the memory of their father, and remind one another of his business maxims and principles. One of his cautions—"lack of order will make a beggar out of a millionaire"—perhaps underlay Solomon’s archival efforts. Mayer Amschel’s own balance of account for the year 1797, preserved here, is in meticulous order. The father had made clear to his sons, with whom he entered into business partnership, that he expected them to work together in harmony to create a business that would survive across generations of the Rothschild family, i.e. his descendants through the male line. He pointedly excluded his daughters from taking a role in the direction of the business. Records of family marriages and estate papers, together with the associated transfer of assets, were therefore of special significance, not only in terms of the family per se but to the family as businessmen and shareholders. Other documents relating to the holdings of individuals in the family business, which Solomon had intended to remain in the Archive, were removed after they were assigned to the Archive because they were still in use.

The acquisition of property had a deeper significance for the Rothschild family than for their non-Jewish contemporaries as Jews, they had long been debarred from the purchase of real estate, except in designated areas. Two items in the Archive relate to property in Frankfurt: one to the acquisition of land on Fahrgasse in 1809 on which to build a new banking house and the other a contract for the construction of a synagogue in 1843. Solomon also set aside plans and other information relating to property that he had acquired in the Austrian Empire as soon as he was able to do so, but these documents were removed from the Archive, presumably soon after 1844, again because they were still in regular use.

The earliest title acquired by the Rothschild family—the award of the status of Court Agent (Hoffaktor) of Hesse, granted to Mayer Amschel Rothschild in 1769—marks the very beginning of the Rothschild family’s rise as financial advisors in Europe. Its survival in these papers provides us with the family’s earliest known business document.

The significance of honours and titles, of which this was only the first, was not lost on the brothers: Carl von Rothschild’s remark, "When a Jew is a baron, all Jews are barons", shows the family’s pride in the effect their own achievements had on the rest of their community. The retention of documents conveying titles from Austria, Hesse, Prussia, France, Denmark, Russia, Naples and Belgium is in no way surprising.
Besides a strategy of benefactions intended to secure civil rights for themselves and the Jewish community, the Jewish tenet of Zedakah motivated members of the Rothschild family to participate in all aspects of social welfare. The philanthropic activities documented in Salomon’s Archive relate to his personal engagements in Austrian communities, specifically around the time that he was granted honorary citizenship.

A collection of addresses and letters of thanks in the Archive all date from 1842–1844 and reflect to the celebrations in 1843 of Salomon’s honorary citizenship and of his 70th birthday in 1844. They are the most visually interesting items in the collection, their beauty and the effort that produced them bearing testimony to the regard in which Salomon was held by his contemporaries.

In addition to Salomon’s original archive collection of 1844, the Family Archive Register lists a further 21 items, entered under different hands and over an indeterminate time scale, although one, a trading licence for Baron von Rothschild, is dated 13 October 1926. Salomon indicated in his preface to the Register that he wanted the Archive to pass to the care of his son, Anselm. A second, typewritten list, dated January 1927 and also preserved in Fonds 637, suggests that Anselm respected this wish. The list comprises 32 items, incorporating most of the contents of Salomon’s Archive, but adding to them later documents relating to the lives of Anselm and his children. A covering note indicates that it was compiled at the time the Archive was transferred to a new home.4 The places of dispatch and receipt are not indicated, but the use of the word ‘Jänner’ for January suggests it was sent to Austria, probably to Vienna, from Salomon’s original inscription in his Register, dated 20 October 1844, and the Archive probably remained there, most likely in family hands, until its transfer in 1927.5 The presence of one particular item of note on this typewritten list, a decorative 70th birthday greeting to Wilhelm Carl of the Frankfurt branch of the family, suggests that the member of the family who maintained the Archive was Wilhelm Carl’s wife, Mathilde, who was Anselm’s mother.6 She died in 1924, and the transfer of the Archive may have coincided with the winding up of her estate.

It is clear that the English family knew of the existence of the Archive, since a summary of the ‘Archive of S M de Rothschild, Vienna’ was preserved among family papers in the London bank’s vault (RAL 000/573/11, n.d.). There are only 28 elements in the summary, although one element consists of the group of appointments and titles that are identified separately in Salomon’s Register. The summary is accompanied by transcripts of some of the documents in the collection, which have been typed onto paper with the watermark ‘SMR’. This evidence points to the conclusion that the Viennese bank received the Archive at some stage, but there is no degree of certainty as to the chronology. What is certain is that the Archive was taken from the Viennese bank on 2 April 1938: the survival of a packing list in the files of Fonds 637 proves that the ‘family archive collection’ was among the items seized from the family after the Anschluss. The arrival of Fonds 637 at The Rothschild Archive presents the opportunity to reconstruct, for the first time since 1844, what remains of Salomon’s Archive, tracing its passage across many countries and through the hands of conflicting ideologies.7 That the Archive should once again be in the trust of the Rothschild family is a fitting conclusion.

Business papers of Mayer Amshel Rothschild

*Balance of the account, 1797 B7*

*Balance of the account, 1797 B7* [Balance of the account, 1797 B7]

**Contract, 1809 F1**

**Document concerning the trial and acquisition of Mayer Amshel Rothschild for trading in Worms, 1809 P1**

**Debenture (out of S M Rothschild in Frankfurt, 1775, 1775 Z1)**

Family documents

Biographical account of Mayer Amshel Rothschild by S. Cohen, 1853 B2

Marriage contract etc. of Salomon Mayer Rothschild, 1810 E2

Documents relating to the birth and marriage of Salomon Mayer Rothschild and marriage records of James and Betty, 1823 E1

Draft co. T1

Document about the receipt of capital by S M de Rothschild, 1859 E2

Document about the deposit of capital by S M de Rothschild, 1859 E2

Foundation to award dowries to poor girls, 1842

[Editor’s Note: an additional entry marked ‘out of Z1’ in the Register is excised.]

Documents relating to the deposit of capital by S M de Rothschild, 1859 E2

Foundation to award dowries to poor girls, 1842

Gifts and foundations

Foundation to award dowries to poor girls from Buchlau, etc., etc., contract 1844 B6

Awards and titles

Creation of Mayer Amshel Rothschild as Court Agent of Home in Frankfurt, 1797 E1

Naming of Anselm, Salomon, Carl and James as Royal Prussian Commercial Councillors with various letters, 1818, 1827 E3

Diploma of Austrian nobility, 1817 D3

Diploma (copies) of the nobility (1827) and of the latter (1822), 1845 D21

Diploma of the Danish Commercial Précis Councillor, 1819, and Order of Dannebrog, 1819 D2

Deeds of the Knight of Home of Financial Councillor, 1815, Financial Précis Councillor, 1821, Knight of the Order of the Lion, 1824, Commander, 1828 D2

Diploma of the Romanian Order of Vyatlina, 6th Class, 1822 D4

Diploma of the Neapolitan Order of St Ferdinand, [and Verdienst], 1823 D5

Diploma of the French Order of the Legion of Honor, 1826 D6

Diploma of the Belgian Order of Leopold, 1839 D7

Declarations of the rights of honorary citizenship, 1847 D10

Declarations from the City authorities in Vienna, 1843 D11

Gift to the Jesuit charity, 1844 D2

Gifts and foundations

Grants of honorary citizenship of S M de Rothschild, Vienna to Salomon, 1846 D23

Documents relating to the Freedom of the City, 1843 S1

Grant of honorary citizenship to S M de Rothschild, 1846 D23

Gift to the sick tradesmen’s institute, 1843 S4

Gift of the building of a polytechnic institute in Bratislava, 1843 S4

Diploma for the celebration of the foundation, 1841 D14

Gift of the building of a polytechnic institute in Bratislava, 1843 S4

Diploma for the celebration of the foundation, 1841 D14

Confirmation of gift from Couns. Ugarte and Isehuf, 1844 S6

Gift of the Catholic and Jewish communities in Pressburg, together with confirmation, 1844 S7

Conditional pension for Dr Pospurnoh, 1844 P2

Address and letters of thanks

Letter of thanks from the Jews of Hungary, 1842 D8

Letter of thanks from the town authorities of Pressburg, 1843 D9

Letter of thanks from P. Oflianszky, together with addenda, 1843 D12

Letter of thanks from the Mayor of Ollmuh, 1843 D10

Letter of thanks from the Mayor of Bratislava, 1844 D17

Letter of thanks from the town authorities in Olmue, 1844, D17

Letter of thanks from the Jewish sympathizers in Pressburg, 1844 D14

Letter of thanks from the committee proposing instutions for the protection of small children in Hungary, 1849 D10

Letter of thanks from the children’s home in Pressburg, 1849 D10

Letter of thanks from the Jews of Bratislava, together with statistics and annual report, 1844 D20

Confirmation letter from the German-Jewish and the Turkish-Jewish communities in Vienna, 1845 G2

Confirmation and thanks from Pressburg, 1844 D10

Homage of the Jewish community in Alt Olmuh, 1844 D10

Homage of the Jewish community in Pen, 1844 H2

Letter of thanks for the goldil and dedicatory address from Pressburg, 1844 D22

Homage of the Jews to the German-Königlich, 1843 A1

Report from the Jewish community of Leoben, 1843 A2

Address by the Jewish community in Leipzig, 1843 A3

Report from the Mayor of Czapa, 1844 B4

Floral wreaths from Freilich, 1844 B5

Weiterkirchen, 9 July, 1844 B3
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Salomon’s archive: a schedule

The documents listed below form the original contents of Salomon’s family Archive Registre and were all listed by the same hand. The items that have not been located in Fonds 637 are shown in italics. Items marked * were recorded in the Archive as having been removed from the Archive because they were still in use. The titles as given here are unadorned or literal rather than elegant transliterations of those written in the Register.

The categories of document shown here have been adopted simply for ease of reference. The original Register has no sub-divisions and is purely alphabetical in arrangement. The position in the Register of each item is given at the end of its description; the reference indicates the letter of the alphabet under which it was listed (the original Register is of course written in German) and the sequential number within that letter of the alphabet.

NOTES

1. The volume was given the reference number T 114 by Baron Bismarck during their listing of the Austrian Rothschild papers, Fonds 637 in the collections of the Special State Archive, now part of the Russian State Military Archive.

2. Salomon, in common with all the family, was a frequent visitor to Frankfurt, where the mother of the five brothers, Frieda, lived until her death in 1849. The visits were partly on account of business but also social in form. Salomon’s son and daughter-in-law, Anselm and Charlotte, had two properties in Frankfurt: a town house on Nussmarkt Innere and the Gründelschmann estate to the west of the city.

3. Salomon’s property purchases began as soon as he was granted honorary citizenship.

4. Verzeichnis des Familienarchivarchivarchivarchivarchivarchivarchivare.

5. Address of the Archive of S M de Rothschild, Vienna was preserved among family papers in the London bank’s vault (RAL 000/573/11, n.d.). There are only 28 elements in the summary, although one element consists of the group of appointments and titles that are identified separately in Salomon’s Register. The summary is accompanied by transcripts of some of the documents in the collection, which have been typed onto paper with the watermark ‘SMR’. This evidence points to the conclusion that the Viennese bank received the Archive at some stage, but there is no degree of certainty as to the chronology. What is certain is that the Archive was taken from the Viennese bank on 2 April 1938: the survival of a packing list in the files of Fonds 637 proves that the ‘family archive collection’ was among the items seized from the family after the Anschluss. The arrival of Fonds 637 at The Rothschild Archive presents the opportunity to reconstruct, for the first time since 1844, what remains of Salomon’s Archive, tracing its passage across many countries and through the hands of conflicting ideologies. That the Archive should once again be in the trust of the Rothschild family is a fitting conclusion.
Photography and the Victorian age were born together. The invention of photography and the coronation of the young queen happened within six months of each other. Before her reign was halfway through, those who could afford it were assiduous collectors of the new art/science — and sometimes practitioners. The picture opposite shows some of the photographs collected by Hannah Rothschild (1851-90) hanging among other pictures on the walls of her studio at Mentmore, her home in Buckinghamshire. The other illustrations on these pages come from an album in The Rothschild Archive once owned — and probably compiled — by her aunt Charlotte (1819-84), the artistically inclined wife of Baron Lionel de Rothschild.

The picture of Hannah’s studio is one of two by an unknown photographer in an 1871 album of architectural photographs of Mentmore (built soon after she was born, the house became hers after her father and mother died in 1874 and 1877 respectively). The album is now at Dalmeny House, outside Edinburgh, which became Hannah’s home after she married Archibald Primrose, Lord Rosebery. Like many ladies of the time, Hannah was an accomplished artist, and the work on the easel and in the print frame may well be her own. If it is intriguing to try and work out her taste from the prints she chose to hang on the walls, it was the half a dozen photographs by the great Victorian Julia Margaret Cameron (1815-79) that interested me most, as a photographic historian.

Julia Margaret Pattle — her maiden name — was one of seven daughters of a family which had been part of the English presence in India for a century or more. Born in 1815 in Calcutta, she married Charles Hay Cameron, a distinguished lawyer and senior administrator in India and Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) in 1838. They returned to Britain ten years later and spent some years in London, where they became friendly with Alfred Tennyson and his now-forgotten rival for the post of Poet Laureate, Sir Henry Taylor. Then they bought a house in Freshwater, on the Isle of Wight, next door to ‘Farringford’, where the Tennysons had settled down. The Camerons called their new home ‘Dumbola Lodge’, after one of their coffee plantations in Ceylon.

It was on one of Charles’s visits to his coffee plantations in 1863–4 that the Camerons’ eldest daughter and her husband gave Julia a camera. ‘It may amuse you, Mother, to try to photograph during your solitude at Freshwater’. It was the beginning of thirteen years of extraordinary creativity, which produced some of the most powerful portraits of the nineteenth century, in any medium, as well as a very considerable number of pioneering and dramatic illustrations of literature and the Bible.
The photographic process of the time was difficult, dirty and dangerous, requiring photographers to mix a dozen or so different chemicals, one of which was collodion, otherwise known as gum cotton. The resulting syrupy liquid had to be spread as evenly as possible over a large glass plate (Cameron’s were at first 11” x 9” – later increased to a mammoth 15” x 12”), put in a camera, and exposed while still wet. Further chemical formulae were mixed to develop the negative, and to make and fix the print. According to Cameron, each photograph used no less than ‘nine cans of fresh water from the well’, and her cumbersome wooden camera needed two men to carry it. None of this would have come naturally to someone who, like most women of her class, employed servants to do the household tasks. Though it seems probable that she had experimented with other people’s cameras and in their darkrooms before she possessed her own, there is no reference to this in her autobiographical notes – or in other sources. All we know about her introduction to the medium is that she told her friend Sir John Herschel: ‘I have had one lesson from the great Amateur Photographer Mr Wynfield and I consult him (in correspondence) whenever I am in a difficulty’.

David Wilkie Wynfield was one of the founders of the St. John’s Wood Clique of painters and, a year or two before Cameron took up photography, he made a series of photographs of his fellow artists in fancy dress. These share many of the qualities for which we prize Cameron’s work – extreme close-up, removal of extraneous detail so as to concentrate on the face, and enthusiasm for the profile. But the pupil totally surpassed her teacher in her control of light. Though I cannot be sure, one of the photographs on Hannah de Rothschild’s wall looks as if it might well be by Wynfield. It hangs close to Cameron’s supreme profile portrait of her niece Julia Jackson (whose children were to include the publisher Gerald Duckworth and the Bloomsburyites Virginia Woolf and Vanessa Bell). This profile is a clear illustration of how, having converted an old glazed chicken shed into the glasshouse, the new portraitist was well placed to find distinguished sitters for her camera. Her six sisters had all married well and one, Sara Thoby Prinsep, had returned to London from India before the Camerons – established a fashionable salon at Little Holland House, where she surrounded herself with a coterie of painters (notably George Frederic Watts, who lived there for thirty years) musicians, scientists and politicians. Here, Cameron met many of the celebrities of the day who would soon become subjects of her portraits. Later, when the Tennysons and Camerons were established on the Isle of Wight, Freshwater became a place of pilgrimage for many of these cultural figures and the guest list at Dombola and Farringford reads almost like a Victorian Who’s Who – from Darwin to Garnabald, from Carlyle to Joachim, from Btsoning to Tsilope. I do not know how well the Rothschilds and their daughter knew Little Holland House, though they surely did so. They were related by marriage to one frequent visitor – Sir Courts Lindsay, painter and later owner of the influential Grosvenor Gallery (his wife, Blanche, was Hannah’s cousin and Charlotte’s niece). He had, at one stage, been dangerously intimate with another of Julia’s sisters, Virginia, Lady Somers. He and Blanche were regular visitors to Mentmore, to Charlotte’s houses and even to New Court, headquarters of the Rothschild bank. The Rothschilds certainly knew Tennyson and Thackeray. The latter’s daughter Annie (see p.56) for instance, wrote to her publisher in 1860: ‘In April, 1869, my mother travelled to Rome with Lady de Rothschild and her daughters, to stay with the Storys’. Five years later, Tennyson’s wife Emily recorded in her diary, on the occasion of the visit to England of the Shah of Persia ‘A. [i.e. Alfred Tennyson] has invitations from Aunt Franklin, Baroness Rothschild & the Goschens who have heard that he would like to see the Shah’. G F Watts painted Hannah in 1875, and the painter’s second wife M. S. Watts, who catalogued all his works and wrote a somewhat anodyne biography of him after his death, believed it ‘may be clasped as one of Mr. Watts’s finest examples of women’s portraits. . . . It gave such pleasure to her husband, that after Lady Rosebery’s too early death, Lord Rosebery told him that since her loss it was carried when and where ever ever he moved; as he could not submit to be parted from it’.

Cameron’s portrait of Hannah in Charlotte’s album is previously unknown, and was taken on a visit to the Isle of Wight in the autumn of 1871. At the time, Charlotte wrote to her daughter, Leonora, referring to Virginia’s ‘non-fair sister, the photographing Mrs Cameron’, and telling her that Hannah had ‘spent a day with the lady at Freshwater, and, I believe, was amused’. The dress Hannah was wearing was possibly not her own. Cameron often dressed her female models in loose draped dresses and this rather mediaeval – not to say pre-Raphaelite – example, or ones very similar, can be seen in many of her biblical, classical and literary illustrations. Charlotte’s album contains five more Cameron portraits, as well as a series of photographs taken at Gunnersbury by the well-known art photographer Oscar Gustave Rejlander, and a portrait of the biologist – and first editor of The Photographic Journal – Arthur Henfrey. The Camerons are all illustrated on these pages Of Tennyson, one of the most painted, drawn and photographed men of the age, no less than seventeen of her portraits survive. He did not enjoy the experience, having to be cajoled – or bullied – to visit her ‘little dark room’ – half-reluctant, half-willing to take part in this shadowy presentment, but wholly interested in his old friend’s success. Cameron never flattered him, and so perhaps tells us more about...
the real Tennyson than any of his other painted and photographed portraits. ‘When I have had such men before my Camera’, she wrote, ‘my whole soul has endeavored to do its duty towards them in recording faithfully the greatness of the inner as well as the features of the outer man’. 

‘The Kiss of Peace’ was one of Julia’s own favourites. Shortly before her death, she gave a print to her youngest son, with the inscription: ‘Dearest Charlie, I give you this Prize Copy of the most beautiful of all my photographs. This is a very splendid print so like a sepia painting that it is difficult to believe that it is genuine untouched Photograph’.

As we know from the inscription on Charlotte’s print of ‘The Kiss of Peace’, it was given to her by the photographer. So, perhaps, were the other prints in the album and on the wall of Hannah’s studio. Cameron could not resist giving free prints to artists and others who might help to forward her career, and she would certainly have included Charlotte and Hannah among that number. But perhaps they also purchased some prints (which would have cost between ten shillings and one guinea each). The Camerons were always rather hard up, increasingly so as the Ceylon coffee crop became less and less reliable – ultimately being so ravaged by disease that the island’s estate owners replaced it by today’s staple, tea. Julia was constantly trying to make money from her photography, exhibiting her work at commercial dealers, and arranging to have carbon (permanent) copies of her best images marketed by the Autotype Company.

On Hannah’s wall can be seen two Cameron portraits of Julia Jackson – the niece whom the photographed more than any other woman – and one of Tennyson’s American friend and rival, Longfellow, author of ‘Hawthorne’. There is also an example of one of Cameron’s literary illustrations, a version of Shakespeare’s ‘Friar Laurence and Juliet’. Friar Laurence, with flowing locks and luxuriant beard, is Sir Henry Taylor, the Juliet the much-photographed maid Mary Ann Hillier. In another version of this picture, Mary wears a dress that could well be the one in which Hannah Rothschild was photographed. There is one photograph, almost in the centre of the complete picture, which I have been unable to identify, though it is certainly similar to one of the over 1200 images by Cameron I have seen. But perhaps it is unique?

Finding the prints illustrated on these pages has been typical of the rewarding hunt for photographs by Julia Margaret Cameron which I began twenty-five years ago. Over the last five years, I have been joined by colleagues in Los Angeles (at the J Paul Getty Museum) and Bradford (the National Museum of Photography, Film & Television). The result is that the Getty will publish a catalogue raisonné of Cameron’s work at the beginning of next year (astonishingly, the first ever catalogue raisonné of a photographer). It would be happy to end this detective story with the news that we had discovered the prints which used to be in Hannah’s studio. Unfortunately, that has not happened – but the search goes on!

Colin Ford, CBE was the founding Head of the National Museum of Photography, Film & Television and Director of the National Museums & Galleries of Wales. He is curator of an exhibition of Julia Margaret Cameron’s work opening at the National Portrait Gallery, London, in February 2003, and author of the accompanying book. The exhibition will tour to Bradford and Los Angeles later in the year.
In 1850, Anselm von Rothschild (1803-1874) moved to Vienna to take over the running of the family-owned banking house S. M. von Rothschild. In the following years, he was to make his name in the capital city of the Austrian monarchy not only as a financier, but also as an art-collector: he laid the foundation for the significant art collections of the Viennese Rothschilds, which were extended and improved continuously right through until 1938.

Earlier, while living in Frankfurt, the Baron had begun to devote his attention to art. An important assistant in building up his collection was the Jewish artist Moritz Daniel Oppenheim, who had already served Anselm's uncles in Naples and Paris. While Oppenheim was originally appointed as art tutor to Anselm's wife, Charlotte (1807-1859), he quickly progressed to become the Baron's art advisor and family portraitist.

Anselm von Rothschild was a great lover of miniatures and miniature craft objects: "The older I get and the greyer I get, the more I love these delightful miniature objects with their uncomplicated pleasures". Oppenheim, who did not share his master's preferences in the least, continually attempted to persuade the Baron to buy oil paintings, which in his opinion were the only true art – although initially with absolutely no success. He had better luck once the family moved into a new town-house at Neue Mainzer Straße 45 in Frankfurt. At this point, Anselm von Rothschild was receptive to Oppenheim's recommendation to buy the art collection of the deceased Dutch businessman, Klerk de Reuss, to decorate the walls of his new home. He acquired the entire collection in 1842, at a price of 100,000 guilden. These 32 paintings served later as a practical illustration of the world of art for Anselm's children. At a stroke, the Baron had acquired important works from the Dutch School, with paintings by Wouverman, Teniers, van Ostade and Cuyp.

Interest in works by the 17th-century Dutch School was to weave its way like a leitmotif through the collections over the following generations as well. When Anselm moved to live in Austria, these paintings were newly accommodated in the rooms of his Palais in the Renngasse. While some works graced the walls of the red and green rooms, the majority of the paintings were housed in the so-called ‘Gemäldesaal’ or ‘Museum’. This room adjoined the Baron’s bedchambers which, furnished in Spartan style, contrasted with the impressive splendour found elsewhere in the Palace. The gallery was built especially for Anselm von Rothschild by the architect Flohr. It was lit from above – a rarity for private galleries of the time.

The Baron had led a lively social life in Germany. Both his home in Frankfurt and his country seat, the ‘Grüneburg’, had always been open to guests and the family were welcome invitees at the city’s social events. In Austria, however, his...
social outings were noticeably less frequent. Anselm dedicated his energies to the banking house, spending his free hours smoking cigars as he viewed his collections. In these, his miniature craft objects continued to have pride of place: Franz Schestag, who in 1866 drew up his first catalogue of the collections of Anselm von Rothschild, lists a total of 452 individual items. These included ivory sculptures, medals, works by goldsmiths, wood-carvings, glass vessels, small boxes and manuscripts. These were supplemented by several miniatures, but oil paintings did not appear in the catalogue. Most of the small art objects probably came from the collection of his grandfather, Mayer Amschel, who even in his youth had started to collect coins and precious stones. When Schestag published a second edition of the catalogue in 1872, an additional 127 items had been added to the collection.

Ferdinand, Anselm’s second son, would occasionally criticise his father’s preference for the "lesser" arts. In his opinion, he had failed to take advantage of the possibilities which the art market had to offer at the time, and only in the rarest of instances had he followed up leads provided by relatives. With regard to the collections of paintings, his son’s criticism was to some degree justified. It should not be forgotten, however, that the record of Anselm’s estate at the time of his death in 1874 nonetheless lists 116 oil paintings, all impressive in their quality. Amongst these works, there were a total of 81 paintings by Dutch masters. Given that Dutch artists were represented neither in the Imperial Collection nor in other private collections in Vienna and enjoyed no great appreciation amongst the art-lovers of the time, these were not works collected with a view to establishing credentials in art circles. Anselm’s interest in a foreign School, from a country where the collector had never lived nor with which he had a particular affinity, remains surprising. Within Dutch painting, he was particularly taken with the genre paintings and landscapes. But the Baron also laid the foundations of a collection of paintings by Frans Hals, whose outstanding portrait of Tieleman Roosterman had not been acquired at auction in 1872 for 15,200 florins from the Plach auction house. In the decade prior to his death, he became a more active collector of paintings. His son Ferdinand attributed this to his increased ambition to outdo his competitors. In fact, he engaged in bidding at international auctions, acquiring 13 paintings of the French School and portraits of the English School. Astonishingly, his collections also reveal seven works of Italian Schools, of which four are representations of the Madonna. This interest in Christian images may seem surprising in a Jewish collector, but it is said of the Baron that in his later years he developed an interest in Catholicism, which could be the reason behind these purchases.

Anselm did not confine his buying to works acquired simply for his own pleasure. He also committed himself to supporting and acquiring works for public museums. Following his own personal preferences, he showed a special interest in craft items and was a member of the Society for the Promotion of Applied Art (Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Angewandten Kunst). After Anselm’s death in 1874, his sons Albert and Nathaniel von Rothschild significantly expanded their father’s art collection and gave the works a prestigious setting by building two Palais in the Fourth District of Vienna. These grand houses were taken on by Albert’s sons, Louis and Alphonse, who further enhanced the collections but also extended the range by purchasing works by 19th-century Austrian painters. As a result of this extensive collecting by his descendants, Anselm’s rôle as the founder of the
collection has, perhaps, been overshadowed. While Salomon von Rothschild, his father and the founder of the Vienna banking house, had needed to devote his entire energies to building up the bank and into integrating into Viennese society, it was Amelius who was able, on the back of these achievements, to spend time in pursuit of other, non-business interests and in so doing not only to found but, by example, to encourage his children to develop one of the great Austrian collections.

SOURCES

Franz Schustag: Kunstausstellung der Freiherren Amelius von Rothschild in Wien [The art exhibition of Baron Amelius von Rothschild, Vienna] Vienna 1866

City Archive, Vienna (WenW), Schatzzammlung der Ölgemälde, Miniaturen, Aquäretische, Kupferstiche und Kupferwerkzeuge aus den Besitz von Amelius Salomon Freiherrn von Rothschild. 1874. Schatzung durchgeführt von Herrn Digital [Valuation of the oil paintings, miniatures, watercolours, engravings and tools on copper in the possession of Amelius Salomon, Baron von Rothschild. 1874. Valuation by Herr Digital]

Rothschild Archive, London. Papers formerly in the State Military Archive, Munich (File 637). Correspondence: B AL- 000/189169-73, 132, 334, 336
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Anselm von Rothschild with his family in the studio of his wife Charlotte; a group portrait by Charlotte herself.

Tiepolo Rostschen by Franz Hals (by courtesy of Christie’s)
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NOTES
1. Amelius von Rothschild had already been managing the Vienna branch of the bank since 1846, the year in which his father Salomon had left the city in the wake of the political upheavals. See Morton, Frederick, Die Rothschild, Portrait einer Dynastie, Vienna 1961, pp. 294-296. After he moved permanently to the Austrian capital in 1850, he co-founded the Leipziger Museum Inventar [Inventory of the Leipzig Museum], FAND 1/217/8. Amerikanische Militärregierung in Deutschland [American Military Government in Germany] (OMIGUS).

4. In his capacity as art tutor, Oppenheim was a visitor to many houses belonging to the family in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Among his inheritances were also a few paintings ‘Herren sitting in front of a tavern’ by Watteau (362 x 435 cm, inventory number W 632/42, catalogue Waddesdon 1967, pl. 79, p. 182) and Adrian van Ostade’s ‘Musicians’ (28.5 x 22.2 cm, catalogue Waddesdon 1967, fig. 57). Both paintings are still at Waddesdon. Those other paintings, inherited by Ferdinand from his father, were returned to the collection of his surviving brothers in Vienna after his death (see letter in the dissertation by Kunth).

9. See Sources, 2.

10. 40 percent in total.

11. 29 percent in total.

12. Inventory of confiscated Jewish art collections.

13. Since Moritz Oppenheim remained in Germany when Amelius moved to Vienna, the Baron looked for new advisors in Vienna. The main person who served him in that capacity was the dealer and auctioneer Gustav Plach.

14. Mainly works from the 18th century. Probably under the influence of his wife Charlotte, for whom he had arranged to have a room at the Gruneberg country house decorated in the manner of Louis XIV.


16. Mainly works from the 18th century. Probably under the influence of his wife Charlotte, for whom he had arranged to have a room at the Gruneberg country house decorated in the manner of Louis XIV.

17. Sources, 3.
**Principal acquisitions**

1 April 2001 – 31 March 2002

This list is not comprehensive but attempts to record all acquisitions of most immediate relevance to research. Some items listed here may, however, remain closed to access for some time and for a variety of reasons. Researchers should always enquire as to the availability of specific items before visiting the Archive, quoting the reference number which appears at the end of each paragraph.

1. **BUSINESS RECORDS OF N. M. ROTHSCILD & SONS**

Files produced by:
- The Correspondence Dept., c.1918-1970 (000/936, 940, 942, 952, 953, 974, 977, 979, 980, 989).
- The Audit Dept., c.1918-1970 (000/999, 996, 998, 1003).
- Secretary’s Dept. c.1918-1970 (000/1004, 1039, 1079).

2. **RECORDS RELATING TO THE ROTHSCILD FAMILIES IN AUSTRIA AND GERMANY, 1769-1939, FORMERLY FONDS 637 IN THE SUR FOR HISTORICO-DOCUMENTARY COLLECTIONS, MOSCOW (000/1059)**

Early records of Rothschild business activity:
- Appointment of Mayer Amschel Rothschild as Court Agent of Hesse, 1769; accounts for Frankfurt business, 1797 and 1807.
- Rothschild banking business, 1815-1939: Family partnership agreements, 1815-1862; balance sheets, 1828-1910; records of loans to individuals, 1821-1895.
- State Loans: Austria, 1854-1902; Hungarian, 1873-1902; various states, 1823-1906.
- Hungarian Boden Credit Anstalt: Dealing in bonds of the company, 1866-1897.
- Records of loans to companies: Siedlach, 1897-1903; Buchalter railway, 1896-1901; various railway companies, 1844-1905; Italian Electrical Trust, 1898-1909.
- Correspondence of Albert von Rothschild: 1880-1898.
- Rothschild estates, 1874-1897: detailed annual reports on the management of the Schillersdorf and Bensau estates, 1887-1897; receipts and plans relating to Ensefeld, 1911-1934.
- Philanthropic activities: letters of thanks from Jewish communities to Salomon von Rothschild for gifts received, 1844; construction and financing of the Bettina Pavilion women’s hospital, 1892-1902.

3. **FAMILY PAPERS RELATING PRIMARILY TO THE FRENCH ROTHSCILD FAMILY (000/1037)**

**Inventories:**
- Inventory following the death of Alphonse de Rothschild, 1905.
- Inventory following the death of James Mayer de Rothschild, 1869; inventory following the death of Gustave de Rothschild, 1912.
- Wills and winding up of estates: copies of wills of Amshel Mayer, 1831-1855, including ‘liquidation’ of the Frankfurt house; will of Adèle, Baroness Salomon, 1922; succession of Adèle, 1887-1891; succession of Gustave, 1912.
- Birth, marriage and death certificates for various members of the family: Bénédite, Alphonse, Lesonora, Julie, Adolphe, Jeanne, Gustave, James Mayer, Betty, Salomon James, Salomon Mayer, Charlotte, Robert, Ferdinand, Eveline, Henrik, Lionel, Nathaniel.
- Rothschild Foundations: statutes for the Carl Mayer & Alexandre de Rothschild Foundation to help Jewish schools, 1838; list of the various foundations created by Wilhelm Carl in Frankfurt, 1901; details of legacies and donations from Julie and Adolphe, 1899-1908; building work for the Salomon de Rothschild Foundation, 1866-1888; donation by Alphonse to create the Bettina de Rothschild Foundation for New Mothers, 16 Dec 1892; acquisition of land in Paris to build Jewish schools and seminars, 1876-1879.
- Children’s essays and school reports, 1854-1908.
- Catalogue of some of the collection of works of art of Nathaniel von Rothschild, 1905; photographs of members of the Rothschild family, c.1903-1937.

4. **A COLLECTION OF PAPERS FORMERLY IN THE POSSESSION OF EMMA, LADY ROTHSCILD (1844-1935) (000/972)**

- Typescript copy of will of Lionel de Rothschild, 1865; copy will of Carl Mayer von Rothschild, 1893; copy will of Louise, widow of Mayer Carl von Rothschild, 1892; copy will of Bertha Clara, Princessse de Wagram (née Rothschild), 1903; list of items from the estate of Adolphe de Rothschild bequeathed to Carl, Lionel and Willy, n.d.
- Copy marriage certificate of Nathaniel de Rothschild and Emma Louisa, 1865; legal opinion and other papers re their marriage settlement.
- Inventory of Lady Rothschild’s jewels, n.d.; Schedule of deeds of the Champspeys Estate, 1905; Deed of gift from Lady Rothschild to the Trustees of the Tring Nursing Home of land for the erection of a home, 1891; list of Lady Rothschild’s pensioners, 1914; summary of the estate of Lady Rothschild, deceased, 1915; copy deed of endowment of the Clementine Children’s Hospital, Frankfurt, 1887, and other associated papers; list of plate from Frankfurt at 148 Piccadilly, 1887; deed of gift of collection of birds’ eggs from Lionel Walter Rothschild to his brother Nathaniel Charles, 1891.

5. **PAPERS RELATING TO THE LIFE AND CAREER OF BETHSÁREÉ ROTHSAHILA DE ROTHSAHILB (BATSHEVA DE ROTHSAHILN) (1914-1999) (000/1010)**

- Passports, ID cards etc., 1914-1992; cards and letters from family members; photographs; correspondence from danciers, 1950-1993; essays and memoirs, n.d.

Business papers:

6. **A COLLECTION OF ROTHSAHILDANA BROUGHT TOGETHER BY BARONESS ELIE ROTHSAHILDA DE ROTHSAHILB (000/941)**

- Inventory of the collection of Max von Goldschmidt-Rothschild returned by the Frankfurt authorities, 1949; music composed by Mathilde von Rothschild; music dedicated to Baroness Alphonse de Rothschild; unpublished typescript account of the female descendants of the Rothschild family and their offspring; miscellaneous correspondence, photographs and published materials.
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7. OTHER ACQUISITIONS

Microfilm of seven reports on British commerce and industry sent by Lionel de Rothschild, Austrian Consul-General, to Metternich, 1838. Originals held in the Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Vienna (Staatskanzlei, Notenwechsel mit der Hofkammer, Kart. 231) (000/986).

Stockbroker’s tokens of John Ashby of J, Bartholomew Lane, issued between 1824 and 1834 and bearing, on the obverse, the figure of a bull with the head of Nathan Mayer Rothschild, and on the reverse, a bear with the head of Moses Moscata (identified by J.B. Caldecott, The Stock Exchange Christmas Annual, 1906) (000/1036).

Decorative pre-printed one-penny envelope addressed to N M Rothschild & Sons at New Court, London, relating, inter alia, to the history of the Vítkovice Iron and Steel Works, Ostrava, Czech Republic:
- Postcard: Portrait study of Laura-Thérèse de Rothschild (1847-1931) at the Villa Madrid, Cannes, 1902 (000/1000).
- Letters to Rozsika Rothschild regarding the welfare of Hungarian prisoners-of-war in Britain and Russia, 1916-1926 (000/988).
- Share certificate for 100 francs in the Société Immobilière du Domaine de Rothschild, Grasse, 21 June 1926 (000/1012).
- Seal die of the Palestine Jewish Colonisation Association (PICJ) (000/939).
- Two bonds with coupons for the Witkowitzer Bergbau-und-Eisenbahn-Gesellschaft, issued by N M Rothschild & Sons (000/1020).
- Letter from Rozsika Rothschild to an unidentified Government official seeking British intervention in Hungary and Romania to counter the growing influence of Nazi Germany and to stop anti-Semitic propaganda and attacks, 10 May 1938 (000/992).
- Microfiche of Reichskanzelei files (R 43 II) in the Bundesarchiv, Germany, relating, inter alia, to the “Treaties of the former Rothschild estates” (Reichshändler für die ehemals Rothschildischen Vermögen), 1940-1942 (000/1048).

Printed pamphlets:

Rectangular commemorative plaque for the Assemblée Générale des Actionnaires of the Paris-Lyon-Méditerranée Railway, 1901, by L.O. Rotty, allegorical obverse, reverse shows exterior of the Gare de Lyon, Paris (000/1071).

Photographic plate carrying portrait study of Laura-Thérèse de Rothschild (1847-1931) at the Villa Madrid, Cannes, 1902 (000/1000).

Printed materials relating to the history of the Vítkovice Iron and Steel Works, Ostrava, Czech Republic:
- 100 Jahre Eisenwerk Vítkovice, 1828-1928, 1928, Vítkovice, Compagnies des Mines, Forges et Aciers de Vítkovice, c.1935, Eisenwerk Vítkovice (in German, Czech and English);

PhD Thesis submitted to the University of Valladolid by Pedro Ortúñoa Coscóla, El proceso de nacionalización de los ferrocarriles en España. Historia de las grandes compañías ferroviarias, 1913-1943, on the nationalisation of the Spanish railway network (000/1012).

PhD Thesis submitted to the University of Vienna by Felicitas Kunth, Die Genossenchaften des Österreichischen Zuwirts der Rothschild-Familie (000/1158).

Album of photographs of the topping-out ceremony for the reconstruction of No.1 St. Swithin’s Lane, London, part of the premises of N M Rothschild & Sons Limited, together with silver trowel used on the occasion, 5 April 2001 (000/968 and 000/1088).

Printed Parliamentary Paper: Correspondence respecting the affairs of Egypt (Counsel. 2549, 1880), incorporating papers re Egyptian finances and the Rothschild loan of 1877 (000/1033).

Bond for the 1889 4½% Russian Consolidated Railroad Loan, issued by N M Rothschild & Sons (000/1032).

