

Pragmatic and Dogmatic Physics: Anti-Semitism in *Nature*, 1938.

A. Loewenstein*,
Chemistry Department,
Technion, Israel Institute of technology,
Haifa 32000, Israel.
Tel: 972-4-8293758
Fax: 972-4-8242996
E-mail: chaharon@techunix.technion.ac.il

Abstract

The German physicist J. Stark has published, in April 1938, an article entitled: “The Pragmatic and Dogmatic Spirit in Physics” in the prominent scientific journal *Nature*. In this paper Stark divides the world of Physics into Dogmatic and Pragmatic fractions. According to Stark Jewish scientists dominate the undesired dogmatic spirit while the desired pragmatic fraction is represented mostly by Aryans scientists. The circumstances that led to this publication and the response it received from the scientific community are discussed in this communication. It is interesting to learn how such a combination of anti-Semitic and scientific views found their expression in the pages of *Nature*.

Key words: *Nature*, J. Stark, A.S. Eve, anti-Semitism and scientific publication.

* Aharon Loewenstein is Professor of Chemistry (Emeritus) at the Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel.

It is well known that anti-Semitism was an important factor in the progress of scientific research, in particular during the Second World War period. The expulsion of Jewish scientists from Nazi Germany had an adverse effect on German science and tremendously promoted the scientific research of the Allied. The contribution of Jewish "émigré" scientists to the development of the atomic bomb and the Radar can not be underestimated. It may be interesting to note that anti-Semitism has also infiltrated into non-German scientific publication media and the present study examines such a case.

The British weekly "*Nature*" is one of the most important scientific journals in the world. Since its establishment it has served as the medium for the announcement of many important scientific discoveries.¹ Apart from the scientific letters and articles, the journal devotes considerable space to matters that are of general interest to the scientific community. These range from comments on current economical, social and political issues to articles concerned with the History and Philosophy of science. As an example of many, one may give the Editorial from October 8, 1938 ("The Promotion of Peace"), which enthusiastically supports the Munich accord between Neville Chamberlain, Daladier, Mussolini and Adolf Hitler.² The journal also contains important book reviews, obituaries, etc. This report is concerned with the analysis of one particular article that a prominent German physicist published in *Nature* in 1938, the background of its publication and the response to it.

An article entitled "The Pragmatic and the Dogmatic Spirit in Physics" by Professor J. Stark, President of the Physikalische Technischen Reichsanstalt in Berlin-Charlottenburg, appeared in the April 30, 1938 issue of *Nature*. Before presenting the contents of this article, it is important to give a short outline of the biography of its author and a description of the circumstances that led to its publication.

Johannes Stark was born on April 15, 1874 in Schickenhof, Bavaria, Germany. He received his Doctorate in Physics from the University of Munich in 1897. In 1913 he discovered what became to be known as the 'Stark Effect', the splitting of the spectral lines in an electric field. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1919 in recognition of his work on electromagnetism. Stark resigned his Physics Chair after angry polemics against Einstein and his theory of relativity. Stark also rejected the Bohr-Sommerfeld quantum theory as 'dogmatic', though it might be noted that the "Stark Effect" is in fact a very good demonstration of the success of Bohr's early quantum theory. In 1922 Stark was driven out of

German academic life and in 1924 declared his allegiance to Hitler. In April 1930 he joined the Nazi Party and together with Philipp Lenard (1862-1947, Nobel Laureate in physics, 1905) formulated what has become to be known as “Aryan Physics”. The rise of the Nazis brought Stark back into the Academia and he became President of the Imperial Institute of Physics and Technology from 1933 to 1939 and of the German Science Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) till 1936. Stark published his books ‘Nationalsozialismus und Wissenschaft’ (National Socialism and Science) in 1934 and ‘Jüdische und Deutsche Physik’ (Jewish and German Physics) in 1941. Stark was an ardent racist and anti-Semite. In July 1947, after the war, he was sentenced to four years of hard labor but his sentence was later suspended. Stark died in Traunstein on June 21, 1957.³

The 1938 article was not Stark’s only anti-Semitic contribution of to *Nature*. Back in 1933, Professor A.V. Hill⁴, in his Huxley memorial lecture, described the plight of the Jewish learned and professional classes in Germany under Hitler. An extract of this lecture was published in *Nature* on December 23, 1933. Stark responded to Hill in *Nature* in the beginning of 1934. Stark claimed that Hill’s statements are “not in accordance with the truth”. Stark wrote that all the measures of the German Government were an “attempt to curtail the unjustifiable great influence exercised by the Jews” ... “Jews had created a monopoly for themselves and in which they had taken possession of almost all academic posts”... “Jews who had come after the war (i.e. 1st WW) from the east... had been tolerated and encouraged by the *Marxist*⁵ Government of Germany. Only a small part of the 600000 Jews ...has been affected by the National Socialist measures”... “only half of the number that Hill gives (over a thousand) have been dismissed and among these are many Jewish and slightly fewer non-Jewish scientists who have *voluntarily* given up their jobs”. Examples of the latter persons given by Stark are Einstein, Franck, Born, Schrodinger, Landau, Fraenkel and others. Stark continues to state that there are not even 10000 people in concentration camps (Hill wrote 100000) and that they are there “not because of their desire for freedom and of thought and speech (as Hill wrote) but because they have been guilty of high treason and actions directed against the community”. Stark ended by writing that: “It would be a good thing to keep political agitation and scientific research apart....”

Hill responded briefly to Starks letter writing as “an Englishman *without any Hebrew ancestry or Marxist allegiance...*” He refutes Starks claims and states that they are nonsense and not true. Hill writes that “as regards ‘high treason’ and concentration camps’, in England

we do not call liberalism or even socialism by that name”. Hill sarcastically assumes that after his reply “my works in the *Journal of Physiology* and elsewhere will be burned (in Germany)” and ends his reply by calling for contributions to the Academic Assistance Council that helps dismissed scholars and scientists.

Back in Germany, the July 15, 1937 issue of *Das Schwarze Korps* (The Black Corps), the weekly publication of the SS, published an article entitled “‘Weisse Juden’ in der Wissenschaft” (‘White Jews’ in Science).⁶ The article was written in part by the Editor of *Das Schwarze Korps*, Gunter d’Alquen under the guidance of Stark and partly by Stark himself. The main theme in the article was that it is not sufficient to exclude all Jews from sharing in the political, cultural and economic life of the German nation, but *to exterminate the Jewish spirit*, clearly recognizable in physics through its most pronounced representative, A. Einstein. “There is one sphere in particular”, the article holds, “where we meet the spirit of the ‘White Jews’ in its most intensive form and where what is common between the outlook of the ‘White Jews’ and Jewish teaching and tradition, can be directly proved, namely in Science. To purge science from this Jewish spirit is our most urgent task. For science represents the key position from which intellectual Judaism can always regain a significant influence on all spheres of national life”. Several gentile scientists of international reputation (Planck, Sommerfeld) were named in the article as followers of Judaism in German intellectual life and it was remarked that “they must be got rid of as much as the Jews themselves”. It might be noted that the same journal published on August 26th, 1938 another article entitled “Wirtschaft Ohne Dogma” (economy without dogma) which was closely related to its scientific counterpart.

Foremost among those Aryan Germans theoretical physicists who were attacked by Stark in *Das Schwarze Korps* was Werner Heisenberg. Stark attacked Heisenberg as a ‘White Jew’ and as the “Ossietzky of Physics”.⁷ Stark stated that the award of the Nobel Prize to Heisenberg in 1933 was “a demonstration of the Jewish influence on the Nobel committee against the German National Socialism... Heisenberg is one example of many others”. One of Stark’s motives in his attack on Heisenberg was his wish to sabotage Heisenberg’s effort to obtain the Chair of Theoretical Physics in the University of Munich from the retiring Sommerfeld. Stark won this battle and the Munich Chair was given to Wilhelm Muller. After this publication in *Das Schwarze Korps*, Stark was asked by the Editor of *Nature*, Sir Richard Gregory⁸, if its contents represent his considered views upon the relative values of

experimental and theoretical physics and whether he would care to make them known to other men of science through the columns of *Nature*. Stark responded positively to Gregory's request and agreed to contribute an article to *Nature* that was published on April 30, 1938.

Stark's article in *Nature* opens with a general statement about physical research: "The aim of physical science is the investigation of the laws which govern the properties and processes observed with objects of inanimate *Nature*. These inherent laws are independent of human existence, action and thought, and are the same all over the world. But the manner in which physical research is carried out and described depends on the spirit and *character* of the men of science engaged upon it, and this spirit and character differ individually, as do men, nations and *races*." We note that already in the first paragraph of the article the combination of race and character is presented.

Stark then continues to describe "two principal types of *mentality* in physics" or "two types of mental attitude" of physicists:

The first is the "pragmatic spirit" which is "directed towards reality". The aim is "to discover new phenomena and bodies as yet unknown". Though they "form a conception as to what the body or process to be investigated may be like in reality", such conception "is solely the means to the end of devising experimental arrangements for the empirical formulation of their question in reality itself". "Their final goal is always to establish reality.... The mathematically formulated theory is to physicists of the pragmatic spirit not an end in itself..."

The second type is the physicist of the dogmatic school. "He (the dogmatic physicist) starts out from ideas that have arisen primarily in his own brain or from arbitrary definitions of relationships between symbols to which a general and so also a physical significance can be ascribed". The dogmatic physicist seeks to give his mathematical formulae a physical meaning by applying them to the results of experience. If his theory is in accord with the experiment he ascribes it to the virtue of his theory. Otherwise he doubts the validity of the experiments. "Dogmatic physicists present things as through their theories and formulae exhaustively covered the whole range of phenomena treated by them;..."

“The aim of the pragmatic spirit is the reality,...the goal of the dogmatic spirit is the formula”. In this way Stark further analyzes the two types of physicists and does not hide which of them he favors: “The pragmatic spirit advances continuously to new discoveries and new knowledge; the dogmatic spirit leads to crippling of experimental research and to a literature which is as effusive as it is unfruitful and tedious, intrinsically akin to the *theological dogmatism* of the Middle ages...”.

Next Stark presented two names of his favorite ‘pragmatic’ physicists, Lenard and *Rutherford*, and analyzes their scientific work. Prominent examples for ‘dogmatic’ physicists are Einstein and Schrodinger. Einstein’s “relativistic theories are based on arbitrary definition of space and time coordinates” while Schrodinger “by an amazing feat of physico-mathematical acrobatics obtains ... a differential equation. He then asks what sort of physical significance the function... may have... the electron is arbitrarily smeared in a large region round about the atom”. Other examples of ‘dogmatic’ physicists mentioned are Born (a Jew), Jordan, Heisenberg and Sommerfeld (who is associated with the creation of the "old quantum theory"). All four laid the foundations to Quantum Mechanics, a revolution in Physics, though it might be noted that Jordan was a member of the Nazi party and that Heisenberg ultimately cooperated willingly with the Nazi regime.

Stark further pointed out another difference between the two types of physicists: “The pragmatic spirit does not conduct propaganda for the results of his research... he finds his satisfaction in obtaining new knowledge...and that it will serve as a step towards new advances”. On the other hand, the ‘dogmatic’ physicists “almost before they have published, a flood of propaganda... is started by articles in journals, by textbooks and by lecture tours”. As examples for this attitude Stark brings again the behavior of Einstein as compared to Lenard and *Rutherford*. The dogmatic spirit has gained in the last three decades “a dominating influence in Germany” through “their collective action and their connection with early (Weimar) Ministries, were able to acquire numerous chairs in physics, above all in Theoretical Physics”. Stark takes upon himself the mission to save Germany from “Einstein and his dogmatic imitators”.

Finally there appears the crucial issue in his arguments: “I have also directed my efforts against the damaging influence of *Jews* in German science, because I regard them as the *chief exponents and propagandists of the dogmatic spirit*”. The question immediately arises why

are the Jews the Propagandists of the ‘dogmatic spirit’? Stark states that “the great discoverers, from Galileo and Newton to physical pioneers of our age were almost exclusively Aryans, predominantly of the Nordic race”. Stark asks for the reason that “propagandists of modern dogmatic theories are men of Jewish descent”. The answer is “that Jews played a decisive part in *the foundation of theological dogmatism and that the authors and propagandists of Marxism and communistic dogmas are for the most part Jews*”. Stark admits that there are some Aryan men of science who follow the dogmatic spirit (e.g., Heisenberg, the ‘white Jew’) and concedes that some Jews “produced valuable experimental work carried out in the pragmatic spirit”. Stark concluded by writing that he “combats the harmful influence of the dogmatic spirit in physics.... regardless whether the culprit is a Jew or not” and that he had started his battle already in 1922 with a paper entitled “The Present Crisis in German Physics”.

Apart from showing total miscomprehension of the creative evolution of science in general and modern physics in particular, Stark used his article to propagate his very strong anti-Semitic attitude. One might have expected that such an article would stimulate strong response from members of the scientific community, most of whom were readers of *Nature*. *This however was not the case.*

The *only* response to Stark’s article in *Nature* appeared in its November 12, 1938 issue (about six months after Stark’s article) and was written by Professor A.S. Eve⁹ who entitled it: “Foundations of Physics”.^{10,11} Eve was a close friend of Rutherford and was involved with him in research on radioactivity. Later he also wrote a biography of Rutherford. Rutherford was a founder and supporter of the Academic Assistance Committee and chaired its important meeting in the Albert Hall, London, and (October 1933) in which also Einstein participated. In Stark’s article Rutherford is named as an example of a ‘pragmatic’ physicist and I believe that this may have triggered Eve to respond. It might be pointed out that Rutherford died about six months before Stark’s article appeared.

Eve’s article starts with the statement that “Professor J. Stark attempted to divide physics into two groups or tendencies and at the same time made an unpardonable attack on the Jewish people in general and Einstein in particular”. Eve writes that the “article has been met with cold disfavor by the generality of physicists, who have made no reply to it”. Eve believes that

the reason for this silence was because all deemed “that the statements carried with them their own refutation so that no answer was required”. However, Eve does not seem to be happy with this reasoning and adds: “Men fear to pour oil, not on troubled water, but on a blazing furnace, which if left undisturbed might reach exhaustion by its own violence”. This kind of reasoning was a quite popular, also among German Jewry, until the “Crystal Nacht” events in November 1938 violently disproved it.

Eve’s article presents a review of the development of modern physics, from Fourier to Dirac. He shows that in many instances, theory and experiment complemented each other irrespective of who preceded. He quotes Rutherford who was willing to abandon the theory of radioactive decay when a single experimental result will contradict it and shows that Rutherford could not be termed as a pragmatist or a dogmatist. Other examples are the electromagnetic theory of Maxwell that supplemented Faraday’s work; Planck’s quantum hypothesis; Bohr’s atomic model and others. “Here, as in many cases, ideas which might be termed ‘dogmatic’ by some have led directly to the ‘pragmatic’”.

Eve comments on the use of “propaganda” of scientific discoveries made, according to Stark, only by the ‘dogmatists’. Eve claims that the big scientific discoveries, from Copernicus, Galileo and Newton to Bohr and Einstein, never needed any ‘advertisement’. He quotes Rutherford who “believed that it was one of his duties to interpret and spread the good news of scientific discovery and progress. He would be a rash man who dared to use the word ‘advertising’ in this connexion and no fair-minded man would connect the word with Einstein.....” It might be noted the Eve replaces the term ‘propaganda’ with ‘advertisement’. Eve possibly did not comprehend the importance of propaganda in the Nazi regime.

It is interesting to note that only *one* paragraph in the article is concerned with Stark’s racist anti-Semitic views: “The fact that physical interpretation lags far behind the mathematical calculation ... in no way detracts from the work of these men of genius, who belong to various nationalities. If these men are deemed to be dogmatic, then it would indeed be an honor to be included in their ranks. But the whole theory of pragmatics and dogmatics is pure moonshine and to link such discoveries mainly with the Jewish people is a poor compliment to the rest of mankind”.

The division between experimental and theoretical scientists exists throughout the history of science though many scientists had ‘mixed’ careers devoting their time to both theory and experiment. It has always been generally accepted that theorists and experimentalists complement each other and this symbiosis constitutes the essence of the scientific method (a theory must conform to known experimental facts and be able to predict new phenomena). The uniqueness of Stark’s paper is not his division between “pragmatists” and “dogmatists” but his total rejection of the “dogmatists” and his assertion that most “dogmatists” are Jewish or possess ‘Jewish mentality’ (“white Jews”). According to Stark the ‘dogmatic’ elements of science should be completely eradicated.

Two questions remain to be considered. The first is: Why did *Nature* agree to publish Stark’s article that was essentially a refined version of his publication in “Das Schwarze Korps”? In ‘News and views’ section of the April 30, 1938 issue Richard Gregory (*Nature*’s Editor) writes that “At the moment we make no comments upon the views expressed by Prof. Stark and we *gladly* give him the opportunity of making them known to the scientific world. We should, however, be surprised if the limitations which these new principles impose on the scientific truth are generally accepted as the *highest or best* means of promoting the advancement of natural knowledge”.^{12, 13} The second question is why the *only* response in *Nature* to Stark’s article came so late and was relatively mild?

Concerning the first question: One possible answer is that Gregory agreed to the publication because he held views that international science is the key to a solution of many of the world’s problems. We know that he maintained that political conflicts between nations could be remedied through international scientific cooperation since ‘science has no frontiers’. Furthermore, Stark, as other Nobel Laureates, held a special esteem in the scientific community. We may also find the answer in a more profane matter: Gregory’s reaction to the prohibition of *Nature* in Germany. In the January 22, 1938 issue of *Nature* Gregory quotes a document, issued by the German Ministry of Culture, saying that *Nature* published “unprecedented and base attacks against German science and the National-socialistic State... Therefore this journal must be excluded from general use in scientific libraries”. In his response Gregory states that “it is untrue that *Nature* has ever attacked German contributions to scientific knowledge...”. “We welcome the opportunity of recording worthy additions to the literature of science or to natural knowledge from any country or any race; but we should be false to the traditions of science if we failed to condemn any influence which would make

scientific research subservient to political or theological domination.” ... “We regret that the penalty involved in the withdrawal of *Nature* from libraries... will be felt more by some of our readers in Germany than by ourselves”. After such statements Gregory probably had little choice but to accept Stark’s article for publication. On the other hand it is also possible that Gregory maintained relatively tolerant views towards the Nazi regime as evidenced *Nature*’s endorsement of the Munich accord (mentioned above) and the citation from Lenard’s speech¹³ in 1935.¹⁴ It is evident that a *scientific* Journal such as *Nature* that has political, social and economic aspirations is liable to stumble and perform grave historical misjudgments.

It is difficult to answer the second question. It could be that some readers of *Nature* just thought that it is not worthwhile to waste time responding to the absurd ideas expressed in Stark’s article. Still, the article with all its anti-Semite connotations should have drawn the attention at least of *some* of the Jewish German "émigré" scientists in Britain or elsewhere (who certainly were *Nature* readers and also contributors of scientific material). It is surprising that none of them responded. This may reflect their insecure feelings in their new environment. The political atmosphere in Britain (the wish to appease the Germans and avoid war) might have also contributed to the lack of response. One might also speculate that Gregory would not be too enthusiastic to publish a response to Stark’s article that would anger his German readers. A plausible guess, mentioned above, is that the ‘trigger’ to Eve’s response was the mention of Rutherford, in Stark’s article, as a "Pragmatic Physicist". Eve must have been very annoyed by this statement. Gregory could not refuse publishing Eve’s article since he was well acquainted with him.

It should be mentioned that in Nazi Germany Stark eventually lost grace to the authorities (Ministry of Science, Education and Culture and the SS) because of his fanatic attitudes. His patron, Alfred Rosenberg, did not belong to the ‘correct’ top Nazi hierarchy and could not help him. Heisenberg, a ‘white Jew’ and a 'dogmatic physicist', held the leadership of the German atomic project during the war.

Acknowledgement: I am thankful to Professor Andreas Kleinert of the Martin-Luther-University at Halle-Wittenberg for reading the manuscript and offering some comments.

NOTES.

1. The first issue of *Nature* was published on November 4, 1869.
2. It might be pointed out that the corresponding American journal, *Science*, also welcomed the Munich accord. F.R. Moulton, Secretary of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (which publishes “*Science*”), wrote an article to that effect in the *Science* issue of October 7, 1938.
3. Some biographic details of Stark can be found in: Alan D.Beyerchen, *Scientists under Hitler*, Yale University Press, 1977 or Mark Walker, *Nazi Science* Plenum Press, 1995.
4. A.V. Hill, 1886-1977, Nobel Laureate (with Otto Meyerhof, 1922) in Physiology or Medicine for his discoveries concerning the production of heat in the muscles, was an important and active member of the British Academic Assistance Council (AAC, later the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning, SPSL). The AAC was founded by Lord Beveridge (William Henry Beveridge, 1879-1963), Director of the London School of Economics.). The AAC and SPSL assisted over 2000 Jewish (and other) academic refugees to obtain positions in the United Kingdom. A description of the AAC can be found in: Jean Medawar and David Pyke, *Hitler's Gift-The True Story of the Scientists Expelled by the Nazi Regime*, Arcade Publishing, NY ,2001.
5. All *italics* denote the author's emphasis.
6. An English translation of this article can be found in: Klaus Hentschell, Editor; Ann M Hentschell, Translator, *Physics and National Socialism. An Anthology of Primary Sources.* , Birkhauser Verlag, 1996.
7. Carl von Ossietzky, 1889-1938, a German pacifist. A journalist and writer who was a leader of the peace movement in Germany after World War 1. He wrote against German rearmament. The Nazis imprisoned Ossietzky after the burning of the Reichstag in 1933. He was awarded the Nobel Prize for peace in 1936. Ossietzky died of tuberculosis in a Berlin Hospital in 1938. By Hitler's orders the German Government decreed that in the future no German could receive any Nobel Prize.

8. Sir Richard Arman Gregory 1864-1952. For biographical details see: W.H.G. Armytage, *Sir Richard Gregory: his life and work*, London Macmillan, 1957; also: F.J.M. Stratton, in *Obituary Notices of fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 8, number 22, November 1953.

9. Arthur Stewart Eve, F.R.S., (1862-1948) was born in England. He studied in Cambridge and in 1903 became Lecturer in Mathematics in McGill University Montreal, Canada. He was the Director of Physics at McGill from 1919 to 1935. Eve served in World War 1 and retired as a Colonel. He was President of the Royal Society of Canada 1929-1930. Between 1898 and 1907, Rutherford (1871-1937) Nobel Prize in Chemistry 1908, stayed at McGill University.

10. In its May 29, 1938 issue the New York Times published a short Editorial entitled "Nordic Science" which concerned Stark's article in *Nature*. It states that Starks himself is a 'dogmatist' because of his thesis that most 'dogmatic' scientists are non-Nordic (non-Aryan). "Pragmatic anthropologists long ago exploded the racial myth to which he (Stark) clings. There is no pure race anywhere on earth"... Furthermore, "Even on the relative merits of dogmatism and empiricism (note the different notation!) Professor Stark is both illogical and obscure"... Also Stark forgets to mention the deadening influence of "Nordic" metaphysicians. Hegel, Schelling and Fichte"... Professor Stark prefers to dogmatize in behalf of pragmatism with Hitler and Streicher". In many respects (mostly concerning Stark's racial arguments) this Editorial uses a much stronger language than Eve's response. The Editorial is unsigned, but my guess is that it was Franz Boas (1858-1942) who may be its author. I am indebted to Professor Andreas Kleinert for drawing my attention to this Editorial.

11. Professor Kleinert pointed out to me that Philipp Lenard in a letter to his friend Stark, criticized the latter's decision to publish his article in *Nature* because *Nature* (in his opinion), has become a "Judenblatt "(a Jewish paper).

12. Attempts made by the author to obtain any remaining correspondence between Professor J. Stark and Sir Richard Gregory, failed. Both the present Editor of *Nature*, Dr. Philip Campbell and its former Editor Sir John Maddox, stated *Nature* has no past archives and therefore such possible correspondence does not exist. Brenda Maddox, in her book "*Rosalind Franklin, The Dark Lady of DNA*", writes (p.211): "The voluminous and unsorted *Nature* archive was thrown out during a move to the new offices in 1963". This could explain the lack of documentation. Inquires at the Staatsbibliothek (State Library) in Berlin, where some of Stark's correspondence is held, produced negative results.

13. Stark's article was not the only German anti-Semitic material published in *Nature*, *without comment*. Back in 1935 A. V. Hill drew Gregory's attention to a note by Lenard that was published in the students' magazine of the University on Heidelberg. Lenard addressed students who congratulated him on the occasion of renaming the Physics Institute in Heidelberg as " Philipp Lenard Institute". Gregory published Lenard's note in the News and Views section in *Nature* from June 1, 1935. It reads as follows: "I am very grateful to the students of the University of Heidelberg for their congratulations I hope that the Institute may stand as a battle flag against the Asiatic Spirit in Science. Our Leader has eliminated the same spirit in politics and national economy- where it is known as Marxism. In natural science, however, with the over-emphasis of Einstein, it still holds sway. We must recognize that it is unworthy of a German- and indeed only harmful to him- to be the intellectual follower of a Jew. Natural science properly so called is of completely Aryan origin.....Heil Hitler!"

Gregory added : "*we prefer to make no comment upon it.*"

14. Richard Gregory, in a letter addressed to A. V. Hill, dated May 21st 1935, concerning Lenard's note, writes: "How sane or scientific people could be associated with such expressions of opinion as those given by Lenard *passes the comprehension of any reasonable being. I think I must print the extract practically without comment and let it speak for itself to the scientific world*" . Also, in another letter to Hill dated 27 November 1935 concerning Hill's decline of an invitation to attend a Congress in Berlin during the Olympics, he writes: "I am glad you have stated so definitely why you are unable to be associated with any such movement while the *Germans are behaving disgracefully to members of the Jewish people*". I thank the Churchill College, Cambridge archives for kindly providing these letters