

WINDS OF CHANGE? NAZI LOOTED ART PROVENANCE RESEARCH

Ovadia Keessen SHIRIT, Ph.D

*Director of Museums and Visual Art Department, Ministry of Culture and Sport
keessenshirit@gmail.com*

Nicolae PĂUN, Ph.D Professor

*Professor Jean Monnet Ad Personam
„Bogdan Vodă” University of Cluj-Napoca
nicolae.paun54@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

Throughout history, the plunder of cultural assets has been integral to war. Cities with valuable private and public collections were looted over time. The rise of the National Socialist party in 1933 led to the largest theft of cultural property during WWII, which was an official policy rather than a mere war incident. This national revolution also became a cultural revolution. The consequences of this theft still affect us today. This paper addresses challenges like the lack of professional provenance researchers and conflicts of interest in cultural institutions regarding the provenance research of Nazi-looted art of Jewish ownership in Europe. It examines two main obstacles identified during doctoral research on establishing standards for handling such art. The research, based on interviews with various stakeholders and document analysis, emphasizes the importance of provenance research in restituting Nazi-looted art to rightful owners and in preserving European heritage. The paper presents two key recommendations from the research findings.

KEYWORDS *Nazi looted art, provenance research, cultural heritage, restitution, cultural diplomacy*

J.E.L Classification: B15, I28, J18

1. INTRODUCTION

History shows that cultural plunder and pillage was an integral part of war. Cities, which contained private and public collections of valuable goods, were looted through time. The national revolution created by the National Socialist party (NS) in 1933 was a cultural revolution as well as political or economic one. This revolution's forbidden fruits have haunted the international community till this day and age. The theft of cultural property during WWII was not a mere incidence of war, but an official Nazi policy, to destroy an existing culture and rebuild a new one. Many art objects were lost during and after WWII, moved between hands and places, some of them will never be found. Art pieces can be part of known museums or other cultural institutions' collections, with no knowledge to whom they belong to. Some are even part of a current art exhibition, where there is no knowledge of the piece's provenance. Some states created policy mechanisms to handle the issue of looted art and create restitution and yet it seems that none had succeed to solve the matter. Legal battles still exist between cultural institutions and the art's possible heirs, over who the art belongs to. Yet the question remains unanswered - What is justice in that aspect and how does it look like.

This paper aims to explore and map two main gridlocks in conducting provenance research of Nazi looted art and of Nazi looted art of Jewish ownership in European countries, in order to

function within the premise that every object has an owner. This paper will expose but a small part of an extensive research made as part of a doctoral research 'Provenance research policy for Nazi looted art and Nazi looted art of Jewish ownership'. The doctoral research's main goal is to develop a policy model for European countries regarding handling Jewish-owned Nazi-looted art. The research reviewed and explored the efforts made by different actors to raise the attention of looted art to an international level, and the attempts made to reset their cultural agendas on the matter. The data collected for the research describes the existing decision-making mechanism in Austria, Germany, and the Netherlands, in addition to Israel's initiative process, using information and data obtained from different participants, in combination with relevant existing literature. These European state initiatives works to follow and implement the Washington Principles (1998).

The findings of the research rely in-depth interviews, document analysis and focus group interviews. Interviews were conducted with states government officials, diplomats, curators, cultural institutions directors NGO's and Jewish community representatives. This paper argues that provenance research is of great importance in reaching restitution of Nazi looted art collections to its rightful owners. Furthermore, this paper claims that provenance research of Nazi looted art is of great importance in maintaining and rebuilding European heritage by creating due diligence within cultural institutions collections and facing collections' provenance. This paper wish to offer insights and present ideas to these selective components, which ultimately will be used to create a working model for European countries cultural policy for Nazi looted art, and Nazi looted art of Jewish ownership.

During the research it seems wind of change have been blowing recently within some European states. The topic of provenance research made headlines in international media. Even though the re-search did not reviews the French initiative one could not ignore The Art Newspaper publication made on March 2021; Musee du Louvre, launched a new digital database. The museum published online a complete catalogue of almost all of it's collection. Around 485,000 object records along with various details and photos to assist various researchers, simple art lovers, historians, museum personal and others of interests. The published catalogue lists as well, more than 170,000 work of art, which were recovered in Germany after WWII but yet to return to their rightful owners. These works art are managed by the museum and were entrusted to French national museums for safe keeping. In 2022 a French law was changed to allow restitution of looted art pieces, which are part of France national collections. The law allowed for the art to be deaccessioned from the national collection and to be resituated to their rightful owners. This law did justice with 15 art pieces, among them Gustav Klimt and Chagall paintings, which were looted by the Nazis and were exhibited on walls of French museums.

Another example can be found within the published report (2020) of the Committee for the Evaluation of the Restitution Policy for Cultural Heritage Objects from the Second World War, 'Striving for Justice'. This report shared an important view on the Dutch process of handling looted art. The committee made its audit with constant reference to the Washington Principles moral and ethical basis for restitution policy and made its public recommendations on December 2020. On June 25, 2021, the Netherlands government published a news item stating that more looted art was to be returned to its rightful owners. The Dutch government aims to return as much as possible of the art looted by the Nazis during WWII. Stating that systematic investigation of the art provenance should help achieve it. In September 2020, the Administrator General of the State of Israel reached out to the Ministries of Justice, Culture and Sport, Equality in Israel in order to renew the provenance research of Nazi-era looted art discourse, related to cultural objects located in Israel. Objects in museums' collections and other institutions where no provenance was made, no history or knowledge of the items' origins would be investigated. Stating the importance of conducting provenance research, the inter-ministries team formed a conference on Na-zi-looted art of Jewish ownership on June 28, 2021. The convention contained roundtable conversations and included all the interested parties. The conference goal was to put the matter on the public agenda, to listen to the different ideas

and solutions in order to create a working policy model. These few mentioned activities are only a fraction to what is currently occurring on the matter of Nazi looted art.

The art world is invested in looted art since the end of WWII, and yet with no practical solutions or practical policy to handle the matter. Some European states have initiated plans and tried to create some change but being a complexed matter, not much success has occurred. The matter of Nazi looted art involves not only feelings but a lot of money and conflict of interests. Combining these components together might lead to a tragedy but on the other hand, by taking an extensive look into it all, learning and understanding the terrain, might lead to a holistic solution, a cleaner art market for sake of the public interest and much needed justice.

The first reviewed category, lack of professional provenance researchers, shows the importance of a professional provenance researcher for a restitution policy. In order to create an inventory of looted art and identify possible heirs a state and an institution need competent and professional researchers. The second reviewed category is cultural institutions'/museums conflict of interests in practicing provenance research of Nazi looted art of Jewish ownership in European countries. On one hand, institution wish to keep the art inside its walls and on the other hand wish to keep a clean reputation as owners of the art.

This paper will first present a short review of Nazi's cultural plunder history, then the methodology, which has been used for the doctoral research and this paper, will be discussed. This paper will show some of the research findings, conclusions and recommendations, which will be used in the future to create a working policy model for European countries which wish to handle Nazi looted art and Nazi looted art of Jewish ownership.

2. NAZI CULTURAL PLUNDER

All through history, plunder and pillage of cultural assets was an integral part of war. Cities, which contained private and public collections of valuable goods, were looted through time. The rise of the National Socialist party (NS) in 1933 showed all how a national revolution can be a cultural revolution as well as political or economic one. The forbidden fruits of this revolution have haunted us till this day and age. As several scholars have stated the theft of cultural property during WWII was not a mere incidence of war, but an official policy. The plundered art was mainly intended to fill the Fuhrermuseum located in Hitler's' hometown of Linz (Petropoulos 1996), (Nicholas 1995). Hitler's wish was to transform Linz in Austria into the Third Reich's art capital, and to display all Europe's treasures. The NS Party led by Hitler had an open policy of persecuting the Jewish people and destroying their cultural heritage; this well-orchestrated crime came to its conclusion on January 20, 1942, at the Wannsee Conference.

By following this policy, the Nazis knew it allowed them to confiscate major art collections belonging to Jewish families throughout Europe, as well as Jewish-owned businesses, bank accounts, etc. The theft of cultural property during WWII was an official and known policy acting towards cultural revolution (Kurtz 2006; Nicholas 1995; Petropoulos 1996). Joseph Goebbels, the propaganda minister, initiated and supervised this systematic plunder of Jewish public and private property. The looting of cultural property by the Nazis was recognised as a serious priority, as such it became one of the indictments against Nazi dignitaries at the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal (Feliciano, 1997). Several scholars (Breitman 1991; Edsel 2006; Kurtz 2006) review the following entities who carried out the plan to collect the appropriate art of Europe, namely Steinberg (2008): The Sonderauftrag Linz (Linz Special Commission), The Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg Special Command Force of Reich Leader Rosenberg (ERR). Reichsmarschall Hermann Göring Heinrich Himmler, the Reichsführer-SS, head of the Gestapo and the Waffen SS.

At the end of WWII, looted objects kept on changing hands. Looted art pieces transferred between art dealers, art galleries, museums' collections, and various private hands. Looted art, stolen from concurred territories, were brought back to the states, and it was up to the receiving governments

of each state, if and under which circumstances, they would return the objects to their rightful owners. It should be noted, that the vast majority of NS victims were Jewish citizens in Germany and territories annexed or occupied by German army, yet other groups of people and institutions were looted as well for reasons of race, world view, political opinions and religion (German provenance research manual, 2019). Yet, the Nazi's official war policy, was to destroy the Jewish community, by the destruction of their culture in order to create a new European culture. Culture's main character is manifestation, the ability to express the existence of society through creative art. The right to express one's thoughts, that is, freedom of speech as a fundamental right in a democratic society. This policy occurred in a methodical manner and on a large scale throughout occupied Europe.

Handling restitution of Cultural goods or engaging with provenance research was not any country's priority, in the years after WWII. It took decades for the problem to rise again to the surface. By the late 1990s, a new public and international awareness arose.

An unusual combination of historical, psychological and political events brought a new international and public awareness to the Holocaust and restitution over the 1990s (Beker, 1999). WWII's art' plunder was not a well-known part of history and did not often appear in the Holocaust narrative. The unification of Germany in 1990 and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 were followed by a number of goodwill agreements between Germany and the countries of the former USSR, as well as the opening of official negotiations on repatriation (Konstantin & Kozlov, 1991). Forgotten bank accounts, life insurance policies, seized property, and artworks that had changed hands many times were rediscovered in public museums or in foreign private collections by heirs of the previous Jewish owners (Steinberg 2009). The increasing value of art and the legal possibilities of recovering Jewish property arose in the late 1990s.

In 1986, the International Council of Museums (ICOM) adopted the ICOM Code of Professional Ethics. Since 1986 the Code has been amended, revised, and retitled the ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums 2013 (ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums (2013)). In 1995 an international symposium named 'The Spoils of War—World War II and Its Aftermath: The Loss, Reappearance, and Recovery of Cultural Property' was held in New York City (Simpson, 1997). It intended to discuss the artworks, cultural property and historic sites damaged, lost, and plundered as a result of WWII. A worldwide interest on the subject of lost cultural property arose in the late 1990s. The international symposium addressed another, unfamiliar dimension of the war and elevated the topic to a public forum.

In 1998 a clear statement concerning art restitution, confiscated by the Nazi regime in Germany before and during WWII, was heard for the first time at the Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets, December 3rd, 1998. Forty-four countries endorsed the Washington Principles and the task laid on each country was to adopt these principles to their own judicial system, legislate appropriate laws. Only five countries initiated some moves to implement the Principles to their internal laws, but only Austria legislated in 1998 the Federal Art Restitution Law (Fisher & Weinberger, 2014). In 2009, Austria updated and amended its restitution law in order for it to be less restrictive.

The restitution law allows state-run museums to deaccession (officially remove from list of a collection holdings) artworks if they are proven to have been looted or otherwise misappropriated. The goal of the 1998 Washington Conference and the non-binding principles was to complete by the end of the 20th century the unfinished business of the middle of the 20th century. Yet in November 2018, the German Lost Art Foundation organised a follow up conference to mark the 20th anniversary of the Washington Conference to take stock of progress and examine what remains to be done to improve access to the just and fair solution, which was promised by the Washington Principles. Twenty years on, that timetable had proved much too optimistic.

In 1999, the European Union issued Resolution 1205 of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (1999). The assembly added its weight to the process of restitution of looted Jewish cultural property to original owners or their heirs, be they individuals, institutions, or communities.

It called for the organisation of a European conference, further to that held in Washington on the Holocaust-Era assets, with special reference to the return of cultural property and the relevant legislative reform. In October 2000, the Council of Europe held the Vilnius International Forum in Lithuania as a follow-up to the Washington Conference of December 1998. As a result, the Vilnius Forum Declaration was drafted. All participated governments were asked to reach 'a just and fair solution' to restitute looted art. In 2009, a non-binding declaration was issued by 47 countries, agreeing for measures to right economic wrongs that accompanied the Holocaust against the Jews and other victims of Nazi persecution in Europe - The Terezin Declaration.

It is important to note that the Terezin declaration is neither a treaty nor legally binding international agreement. A year later, 43 of the signatories (excluding Belarus, Malta, Russia, and Poland) endorsed a companion document (Guidelines and Best Practices for the Restitution and Compensation of Immovable (Real) Property, 2010) which set best practices for immovable property. According to the guidelines, restitution of the property itself (in rem jurisdiction) is preferred, however, when that is not possible, payment or substitute property that is 'genuinely fair and adequate' is possible (Fisher & Weisman 2014). Summarising these major intergovernmental conferences and resolutions, it is safe to say that no mechanism exists to monitor progress by the 44 countries that endorsed the 1998 Washington Conference Principles on Nazi-Confiscated Art or by the 47 countries that endorsed the 2009 Terezin Declaration.

Some of the conclusions of the doctoral research showing a much-needed change of states' behavior over looted art policy. Furthermore, some of the doctoral research focused states are part of the change which presides over Europe.

3. METHODOLOGY

The data that was used for this paper was collected while conducting a doctoral research. The research attempts to understand via key figures, views of the provenance research sphere, their visions and opinions, as well as their criticism towards states behaviour. The research attempts to study the subjects' thoughts, their personal experience, what they believe needs to be, and what assumptions lie at the basis of their behaviour. Through it we can gain a better understanding regard the provenance research of Nazi looted art phenomena.

Due to the nature of the research a qualitative research approach was chosen. Qualitative research produces findings by using data from the natural system, from the situation itself, while the researchers are studying issues in their own natural place, and trying to find meaning or to interoperate situations humanly (Shkedi 2003). A qualitative research seeks to gather an in depth understanding of the way people perceive and interpret the world of content from the participant's point of view (Weil 2005). The research main goal is to develop a policy model for European countries in regard to handling Jewish owned looted art under the premise that every object has an owner. Its secondary goal, is identify the social, ethical, legal, political and diplomatic issues and approaches which involve provenance research and to examine decision making mechanism and the way the international community sees the topic of illicit objects, restitution and provenance research.

The main research question is what components might comprise a policy model for European countries in regard to handling Jewish owned looted art? The sampling method is an important component in qualitative research because it has a significant impact on the quality of the research findings. The goal was to receive data from different points of view as per the same phenomena. Therefore, in order to view several aspects of one phenomena to look for possible patterns, the strategy of maximum variation was chosen. Convenience was also factored. The chosen contributors are professional curators and high-level museum personnel and government officials, each dealing with foreign policy and diplomacy, provenance researchers, etc. Hence, all chosen potential interviewees had the necessary characteristics and knowledge to contribute to the research.

The research criteria included relevant professional experience, analytic capability, important acquaintance with shaping policy or policy making, knowledge of the topic complexity, and experience working with international actors. However, those who could dedicate the time and were more accessible were interviewed. No compromise was made regarding their suitability to the research criteria and its requirements and the participants were selected intentionally. In light of the promised anonymity, there can be low risk of bias. The research objective was transferred to the interviewees and clarified prior to beginning the interview. Interviewees who took part in the research were very interested in expressing their personal thoughts and taking part in the research.

The research populations consisted of 17 participants who sat for in-depth interviews and five participants who took part in the focus group. The data was gathered from these 17 participants, focus group and through documents analysis. The group of interviewees includes 17 participants who served in the past and present key positions in Israel and different European governments, who served in the past and present key positions in various museums, cultural institutions and in the provenance research sphere (Israel and Europe). Interviewees include government officials, senior civil servants, ambassadors, diplomats, and lawyers, as well as senior officials in NGO agencies operating in the provenance research field. The interviewees' group includes eight women and nine men, ranging in age from 40 to 95 years. All the interviewees were promised anonymity. Because of the phenomena's characteristics and its ties to foreign policy, as well as the emotional impact of it, anonymity was necessary. In other words, it was important to give the interviewees a platform to express themselves freely, especially due to matters related to the conduct of the government, the emotional impact of WWII and, for some, the lost European culture.

As for the focus group, it included five participants, most of them in their 40s and 50s. All focus group participants currently work in the field of Nazi-looted art provenance research world wide and have significant international and national experience. In order to allow open discussions, participants of similar seniority and serving in different government branches were selected. In that manner, the discussion focused on the content, without other considerations.

The main issue in selecting the group participants was their experience in shaping policy models; it allowed them to express an opinion based on personal experience. All participants had substantial experience working with foreign entities operating in Europe. As for documents analysis, internal documents were gathered: working and various communication documents, various government publications, official press releases, and speeches. The material gathered provided information regarding the decision-making processes, the point of view of the country's foreign policy, internal considerations and the point of view of Jewish organisations. The various documents analysed for the research provided another perspective on the phenomena and in many cases supported the information gathered during the interviews. Some documents were received from the interviewees, delivered to the researcher or referred the researcher to where they could be located. Usually, during or after the interview, the interviewees noted the existence of a specific document that might be relevant to the issues raised during the conversation.

The research sought to explore the currently available knowledge and achieve wisdom of what needs to be done to create a more ethical moral international society and develop insights that will form an important component in creating a government's strategy in cultural diplomacy. Therefore, a case study approach was chosen. A case study approach uses the data which was collected in the field, and then been analyzed by the researcher. The researcher tries to understand the actions of the subjects, and to search and identify patterns for a deep understanding of a phenomenon (Yosifon 2016). For the sake of reaching insights for the research, a case may contain multiple small cases and their fusion. A number of smaller cases, such as Germany's, The Netherlands', Austria's and Israel's policy for Nazi looted art provenance research, were used. Examining these cases, allowed for a broader insight. From the analysis of the data, it is possible to understand some of the considerations needed and to identify patterns in policymaking. Due to the similarities with these states characteristics, the data can also draw conclusions about the situation in other European countries

policy regarding provenance research of Nazi looted art. Merger of these cases and cross referencing it, insights can be achieved (Yin 2012). A grounded theory model was selected, since this method does not attempt to present a theory and prove it, but the theory emerges from the research itself. Grounded theory is a structured and systematic scientific method (Strauss & Corbin 2015). Therefore, once instructions are followed, scientific research can be constructed, the main issue is how the researcher interprets the research findings.

The use of grounded theory for the purpose of this research allowed for a systematic collection of various types of information that describes an international phenomenon from different points of view. The process of gathering and categorising the information has created the possibility for the research discoveries and conclusions, with regard to the different procedures that have taken place in handling Jewish-owned looted art of Nazi era, and the recommendations of the participants for a suitable working model for European (Israel included) countries. The data analysis method used in this research is called 'coding', it was taken from the grounded theory approach and also called 'categorisation' (Shkedi, 2012). Strauss and Corbin (2015) suggest that coding describes a series of operations during which data are broken down, conceptualised, and assembled in new ways, and is a central process in which theories are built from the data. Coding allows researchers to reconstruct and control the research data, since it is an organised process.

The data analysis process is conducted in three stages, but at the end, there is a narrative, a storyline on which the research is based. The three stages are open coding - Each interview was analysed separately, meaningful excerpts extracted from it, and initial categories were created, based on the excerpts of each of the interviews, axial coding - at this stage the focus is on the process of creating the linkage between the different categories. The concepts are reorganised into categories and subcategories. The goal is to name the categories faithfully and empirically, in order for it to represent what has been said. Last stage is the selective coding - once the categories were formulated, the connections were reevaluated in order to make sure the storyline is consistent with the obtained data. It also emphasised the relevant information for the research.

This research is based on informants' stories and each one has a unique value, they are a genuine source of information. Interviewees consider their participation as an opportunity to present their stories and point of view and share their interpretation of events. These facts lead to great openness during the interviews and even afterward. Anonymity of the participants was an essential part of this research, and it was decided in advance. Keeping participants' privacy allowed them the ability to tell their story and express their opinions freely. All information obtained for the research is kept confidential and published after the removal of all elements that might place the participants at risk. Nevertheless, the confidentiality of the data concerns only the details that may result in the identification of the research participants and does not in any way impair the data itself and the way it is presented to the reader.

The data gathered in the field and combines existing theoretical tools, in order to provide a new conceptual framework, policy recommendations of cultural policy for Nazi looted art and Nazi looted art of Jewish ownership suitable for European states. For the purpose of this paper, only two categories will be presented and discussed in this paper as follows.

This following section presents the findings, which emerged during the semi-structured interviews the documents analysis and the focus group interview. The content analysis yielded themes, each containing categories. This section will offer a discussion of the two main gridlocks which emerged from the research question and the conclusions emerging from this part of the study.

4. CULTURAL POLICY RECOMMENDATION FOR HANDLING NAZI LOOTED ART

Nazi-looted art consists of artworks, including paintings, prints and sculptures, as well as other cultural property plundered from Jews by the Nazis, their allies and collaborators. It includes Judaica, meaning not only the ritual objects but also libraries and archival materials relating to Judaism and to Jewish organizations and Jewish life generally (Fisher and Weinberger 2014).

As said, the Nazis looted huge quantities of "Fine art" defined by (Clowney 2011) as visual art, art that have been created, primarily for aesthetic and intellectual purposes and is judged for its beauty and meaningfulness; it includes specifically, painting, sculpture, drawing, watercolor, graphics, and architecture.

For the sake of this paper and to emphasize the different conflicts presides over Nazi looted art, it is important to explain the power that art possesses. Art has the power to inspire people, to excite them by ways of raising different emotions, such as anger or sadness, shock and even change ones' point of view. Art has the ability to be free of social bondage, to evolve in many unexpected ways. It does not have a set of cultural rules. Therefore, it brings hope for the oppressed and to new ideology (Edgar and Sedgwick 2008). Art often threatened rulers and governments due to its influence over society (Eberle 2007) and Hitler Nazi regime was no different. (Director 2005) described an exhibition held in Munich by the Nazi regime on 1937 called "Degenerate Art". 20th century modern art pieces were part of the exhibition, which according the Nazi regime these art pieces represented what was to their eye perverse, degenerate, corrupt and incompetent.

According to (Nemeth 2016), Art translate cultural ideals by touching our senses. Art has a range of psychological effects as well as emotional appeal. Art objects allows for a transnational appreciation of culture. These feelings motivate the protection of monuments and cause for fine art and antiquities acquisitions. These strong feelings motivate private owners as well as great institutions not to let it go or give it up without a fight. Art also serves as a commodity, it is a raw material that can be bought or sold, it changes hands and owners through time. Various Institutions own art as well as private owners. Art has an operational market all over the world. (Lehavi 2019) identifies globalization with the increasing growth in the cross-border movement of goods (tangible or intangible ones). It is an economic phenomenon of the global markets for trade, investment, or required services, driven by individuals, institutions and corporations, with both the demand and supply.

Art is valuable, it has an extensive monetary value. (Brodie and Mackenzie 2014) claimed cultural objects have monetary value, which derives from their cultural worth, a painting for instance is an obvious example for it. The price for art piece reflects the artistic merit: it is assessed by subjective consensus in terms of originality, use of colors, content, style etc., as well as the scarcity of the painting, meaning paintings' cultural value. Therefore, governments, hold an important role in the art global market, they can facilitate or hinder the art market, by public-policy and regulating capacities. Governments either can collaborate with the international level in order to set common rules for the global economy, or can decide not to.

The term liberalization can be use to describe a state willingness to open up a centrally operated or highly regulated domestic market, as well as to enable other international actors to invest, own, and control assets in its territory (Lehavi 2019). Furthermore, by art being valuable, emotionally and economically, it adds to the list of consideration of government decision-making process. As for social considerations, (Masurovsky 2020) goes back to basics, and tries to define art without paying attention to legal terms of other constructions, claiming art is an extension of humans. The artist creates an object which is a projection of his/hers most inner part of themselves. Through this creation, in any given media, the artist give life to memories, of sensory inputs, smells, feelings, using the tools to assist him/her in shaping that chaos into something expressive. Whether it is beautiful or not – that is up to the beholder to decide. The artist feelings, which poured into the art, being shared with the viewers. (Maravers 1998) claims that great art allows us to have the most valuable life experience. This experience touches simultaneously many aspects of our mental life. It fills our senses and at the same time makes demands on our intelligence, sympathies and our emotions. (Masurovsky 2020)

claims that art that is stolen from any community or from an individual, it is a trauma, a violation, a loss that can feel irreparable. This feeling of loss, due to theft is similar to all groups that by looting an object the artist himself and the creative force behind the object is erased. The object gets the attention now over its creator and owner. Once culture is a fundamental right, a force removal of art from their rightful owners is a cultural crime. When it is being done on a mass scale and according to a state cultural agenda, it should be regarded as a crime against humanity.

Cultural trade grew over the years, allowing Nazi looted art to circulate for decades. The 2008 financial crisis brought new players to the art market. Investors chose to invest in art as a means of investments, creating a diverse investments' portfolios, or as a loan guarantee (Kedar 2021). As the trade grew so did illegal trafficking of stolen art items. (Masurovsky 2020) compares the loss of Jewish collection during WWII and Nazi era to the ongoing recycling of looted cultural property for other conflict zones from indigenous groups. The international community sees these crimes as separate, but these are illicit acts, which were committed against the right for people to own their culture, hence treatment should be the same. Globalization has its impact as well over culture; open borders, the movement of service providers, labor migration, technology and social media influence culture and art. Yet, Culture policy has the ability to unify society, to allow individuals a sense of belonging, to share values and be part of a community. Society, which reaches out to those who lost their cultural belongings, reaches out for reconstructing its own culture and to its cultural heritage.

4.1 MAINTAINING CULTURAL HERITAGE – MAINTAINING HUMANITY

It is of a great importance for humanity, to protect cultural heritage objects. WWII cultural plunder destroyed concurred states cultural heritage. Developments in culture heritage show collective history, social changes which being reflected within cultural heritage objects. Selected pieces of culture objects are significant to people and cultural groups since it inspires pride and identity (Amineddoleh 2013). In order to live by the working axiom that every object has an owner, provenance research has to be conducted (Masurovsky 2020). Provenance is the place of origin or earliest known history of something. A record of ownership of a work of art or an antique, used as a guide to authenticity or quality (Oxford Dictionary).

Provenance is used to understand the history of art, it is in fact piecing together artworks stories, retracing movements by reattaching all the pieces of the puzzle. Provenance research sheds light on how collections came to be, it is a valuable information about the artists, collections, art dealers, curators and other important historical figures. Museum curators use provenance research in order to establish a complete story of an object from the day it left the artist's hands until it reached its current collection. Several scholars claim that public and private collections worldwide contain an unknown number of objects. It is of common knowledge that several cultural institutions holds collections that suspected of being with unknown provenance, hence no history and no understanding of who owned these objects (Steinberg 2008), (Masurovsky 2020). By creating provenance research's cultural policy of Nazi looted art and Nazi looted art of Jewish ownership, European countries will reconstruct cultural heritage which was once lost due to Nazi plunder.

Public and private collections worldwide contain an unknown number of objects, for which there is no provenance, no history, therefore no understanding of who owned these objects. Museums failed to ask specific questions about their purchased items, donations and gifts. Curators now have the ability to look for works of art via the computer, searching lost art databases. The internet has allowed institutions to share collections information as well as provenance information. The Louvre's collection's catalogue publicity on line, is one example. By demanding due diligence and transparency of an object's ownership lineage (provenance research), governments can lead to a cleaner art market and prevent illicit activity.

Reaching transparency and creating due diligence consist of researching for provenance of Nazi looted art and revealing the story behind the art object. The goal is to find and locate the object's

owner and eventually, face institutions' greatest fear and practice restitution or achieve some agreeable compensation. (Neuer and Hance), called for the development of a standard of due diligence. The growth of the art market into financial power and the past decades of restitution cases, suggests that due diligence is of high priority. (Neuer and Hance) suggested to impose the obligation to inquire about an item provenance, upon the original owners as well as upon the acquirer. To consult art loss database as a necessary practice in purchasing art. That way one can justify due diligence in securing the legality of an art item. (Panella 2015) suggests to create an "aesthetic truth", while writing about archaeological objects provenance.

Research findings show strategy of transparency in circulation will ensure the traceability of the un-provenance object. It will produce knowledge and will build confident policies for museums. Digital databases have the ability to play the key role in provenance research and its need of due diligence. Still the research showed there are not enough qualified researchers in the field of Nazi looted art.

The content analysis conducted with regard to the data collected through the semi-structured interviews with past and present government officials as well as high-level officials and document analysis. The content analysis yielded three themes, each containing three categories.

4.2 TRAINING PROFESSIONAL RESEARCHERS

Two main difficulties rose during the doctoral research, even if a country wishes to engage in provenance research of Nazi looted art, there are not enough capable researchers. Furthermore, it seems the public does not aware or educated about the topic.

In December 2020 the Dutch government published a report prepared by the Committee for the Evaluation of the Restitution Policy for Cultural Heritage Objects from the Second World War. The report published under the name "Striving for Justice" and it shares an important view over the Dutch process of handling Nazi era looted art. The committee stated at that report, the importance of researching for provenance, claiming that the first two pillars of a restitution policy are creating of an inventory of looted art and being able to identify possible heirs to the items. As mentioned above the Musee du Louvre new digital database, published to the public a catalogue of almost all of its collection online along with various details and photos to assist various researchers, simple art lovers, historians, museum personal and others of interests to be able to search for an object's provenance (Noce 2021). These tasks can only be achieved by professional and capable researchers. The literature shows, that there are not enough knowledgeable nor trained researchers to assist in researching Nazi looted art (Lupfer and Obenaus 2019).

Jewish cultural plunder of the Nazi regime was an insignificant dimension in holocaust studies, claiming that WWII art's plunder was not a known part of history and did not appear in the Holocaust narrative (Beker 1999). Furthermore, the topic was neglected, and did not appear as part of WWII history studies, was not part of the public education. (Masurovsky 2020) states that cultural crimes, might be resolved in an ethical manner but the academic institutions need to include the notions of cultural crimes and ethics ideas into the current and future studies. When one wish to address cultural crimes against Jewish communities of Europe during the NS regime there is no curricular standard to be found. Without raising awareness as well as not teaching about the Jews cultural losses, a crucial aspect of history and the Nazis war against the Jewish people is being denied.

Provenance research of Nazi looted art is a historical quest of a country, to learn about the art objects historical story. By searching for provenance a country can practice remembrance, educate the public of the Holocaust by using a different view. Moreover, the country cultural heritage will be revealed.

Content analysis identified lack of training as one of the main problems in the field. Lack of expertise in the field leads to not enough provenance researchers to work of Art collections. Museum curators not always know to what they should pay attention, what artifacts can raise questions or raise

suspicion and interviewees mentioned that there are no faculties which teach it in various universities, not as part of art studies or history studies: 'you need to learn about so many aspects in art and of the history of the war, of the different routes of the looting accrued.

Each country and its own collections, art dealers and curators'. Another participant stated that 'I read a lot and I study all the time and I was sure I am familiar with my field as a curator. I meet a lot of curators suddenly I realized that they know much more than I do about the holocaust and stolen art. I thought, well I need to study the topic and quickly to show I know something about it as well'. Furthermore, another said 'It cannot be that it is not part of art studies, students can learn and investigate during their academic years, it has to be part of the topics they learn, its mandatory for training new researchers'. Participants were very adamant and claimed: 'progress will be achieved once there is commitment to teach it as a subject, to push and support those who research it', 'we need training, it's the first thing we need.' Participants stated that it has to be part of education process 'provenance research is very important part of educational work, for Shoa remembrance, the story of the collections can make important contribution of the culture and of education... we are talking about art history that should be told and be educated'. By researching collections, the story, of what people lost during the war, can be told, 'it has to be part of Holocaust education for people to remember'. Participants believed that 'using the knowledge gained from the research in order to remember the families and educate the people'.

Out of all the findings, the integrative findings show training and education issues are relevant for the topic of provenance research of Nazi looted art, suggesting that, Provenance research of Jewish owned Nazi looted art assists in telling the story of the Holocaust, educates the public and maintain remembrance. Furthermore, the procedure lacks capable researchers and therefore, training programs designated for provenance research are very important for achieving professional and competent researchers.

The finding can be explained by the fact that cultural assets are valuable to society since it tells a society's story and people tales. These endless stories are pieces of people that, when combined, create one big image of society. History shows the Nazis lead an open policy of persecuting Jewish people and eliminating their culture and cultural heritage. Moreover, the Nazis lead cultural plunder all over Europe occupied territories. At the end of WWII huge quantities of looted art and cultural goods were found by allied forces (Steinberg 2008). The literature shows that governments placed the burden of initiating and proving restitution claims on holocaust victims and their heirs (Steinberg 2009). To produce a proof is to research the piece's provenance, meaning institutions did not look into their collections which were brought to them or bought during or after WWII, did not research their collections' provenance.

The findings show that institution, which practice provenance research, not only do they know and learn about their collections, but can use the information they gain by the research to tell the story of a cultural society – people tales. By doing so the public is educated of the cultural plunder, occurred during WWII, as well as the Holocaust, that way one creates remembrance. The literature tells us and the findings confirm, that the academic institutions do not include the notions of cultural crimes and ethics ideas into the current and future studies. When one wish to address cultural crimes against Jewish communities of Europe during the NS regime, there is no curricular standard to be found. Without raising awareness as well as not teaching about the Jews cultural losses, a crucial aspect of history and the Nazis war against the Jewish people is being denied (Masurovsky 2020). The literature confirms that provenance research of Nazi looted art is by its essence a historical quest to learn and remember the Holocaust. The findings confirm, that provenance is part of a restitution policy, it starts by creating an inventory of looted art and being able to identify possible heirs. These two tasks can only be achieved by professional and capable researchers. The literature does not expend of lack of knowledge and the research findings paint a broader picture stating, that lack of knowledge to research Nazi looted art's provenance to or lack of trained researchers is indeed an issue to be dealt with as part of long-term solution.

In summery – European states cultural policy handling Jewish owned Nazi looted art needs to be associated with locating professionals and capable researchers. These will be able to create an inventory of looted art, find the lost stories and even identify heirs. By doing so stories will be told of the plunder, awareness to the Jewish cultural losses will be raised, and remembrance will be achieved.

5. PREVENTING CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS' CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The doctoral research revealed another difficulty in the search for provenance. Cultural institutions were and still are key players of the art market. The literature describes that museums noticed for some time, that their collection might contain artworks, which were unwillingly taken from their prior owners during WWII and via the Nazi regime (Masurovsky 2020). Museums chose to ignore the problem, due to art being a commodity, which generates revenue for the institutions as well as for the country. Tourists visit museums, they will show up to see the art. Furthermore, art can be branded and it constructs education (Amineddoleh 2013). (Nemeth 2016), looks at art as a powerful political economical tool. Accordingly, tourism and art market are an economical source of revenue for states. Nemeth claims museums have the potential to draw tourists, therefore, to ensure a country economy. Hence, a state has a reason to aggressively pursue repatriation of cultural property as well as to fight against claims for restitution.

The art market thrives when museums purchasing illicit objects, it also motivates people to steal and even to destroy art objects. The fate of illicit art objects rarely been discussed since the object's value and importance is a higher priority and no one wishes to disturb or affect the object availability and value. Instead, cultural art becomes more attractive. The main reason an institution disregards the illicit origin or lack an object's provenance, is the institution or an individual aspiration to protect the art, safeguard it from the possibility of destruction, claiming it to be the public interest (Masurovsky 2020). Public interest's argument was used on June 30, 1939 at the Theodor Fisher Gallery in Lucerne, Switzerland. American buyers arrived to the gallery to purchase "degenerated art". Works of art, which were de-accessioned from German public collections and were put for sale on the art market (Nicholas 1995). Buyers came to "save" the art. (Cuno 2011) mentions the same argument in a paraphrase to "source nations" - museums leaders and the art world suggest that "source nations" are in capable of caring for their cultural heritage, basically claiming that they are the protectors and caregivers of the cultural objects, that is why the items are found in their collections. The same claim has been heard in various courts rooms and committees, while considering an application for art restitution. As the Dutch Committee report, "Striving for Justice" mentioned as well.

The reserch findings, confirm that cultural institutions, museums, do not want to see their collection leave their walls, they will not willingly restitute art to its owners. However, institutions do want to protect their reputation as legitimate owners of collections and not to be identified with harboring Nazi looted art, as the latest newspaper article, dated December 12, 2021 show. A controversy over Emil G. Buhrlé, collections' ownership rose, while in loane to the Kunsthaus museum in Zurich as part of the museums new extension. The situation was describes as as an insult to the Nazi victims and the museum decided that the foundation will disclose the paintings provenance. Public awareness can change museums attitude when their reputation is at stake.

Content analysis indicates there is conflict of interests due to the will of the museums to keep it collections in side museums walls, but at the same time have to wish for justice, to have their collections clean, to show good faith –and not to harm their reputation: 'there is the conflict of interest, the curators who research the collection answers to the museums and they don't want to give something up' said one of the participants, and another stated: 'there is no doubt that there is a conflict of interests'. Another claimed 'museums' main interest to keep the art, not to allow it to leave, therefore there is a big chance that museum personnel will not priorities correctly which of the art

objects will be the first to be researched, they might go for those which are less likely to produce heirs’.

Participants described museums’ conflict of interests by stating: ‘museums fall in love with their art objects, the same as people, its only human not to want to let it go, but they need to think how much it puts them in jeopardy, or creates problems. The world of museums is a conservative one, their aim is to conserve and preserve collection which they bought or received during time, sometimes not in a legitimate way’. Another stated: ‘it’s difficult for museums, to lose art, when it is their cultural need to keep it’, and ‘it is not easy for museums or other institutions to lose their art, they are conservative institutions, that is their job’. Furthermore, the will to attract visitors is also the reason why museums image is so important: ‘the conversation today, especially in western European states is rather defensive, since no one wants its museums to be empty of art, not the Louvre or in London, but on the other hand the debate is there to find the right guidelines to see to the collections, it’s a matter of museums reputation’ claimed one participant while another said ‘museums need their visitors, they wish to maintain their reputation’.

Document analysis also shows museums’ conflicts of interest. For example: in a speech of museums and art department director, at the Ministry of Culture and Sport of the state of Israel speech in 2014 it was stated that: ‘we can allegedly see the conflict of interests and the different opinions about provenance research and restitution of cultural treasures: Museums’ goal is to be owners of important collections and to own as many as possible, their duty is to keep their collection safe and to present it to the public. To use it to create beautiful and impressive exhibitions. The museums share our own wish, the people who are proud of their culture, to see these cultural objects left for the benefit of the public - it is the public interest’.

Historical facts show many artworks disappeared during and after WWII, and entered some new owners’ collections, passed from one seller to another, purchased or donated to museums all over the world, without warning of the history of these new acquisitions (Masurovsky 2020), (Steinberg 2008), (Nicholas. 1995). Furthermore, the literature shows that museums failed to ask specific questions about their purchased items, donations and gifts. Furthermore, museums chose to turn blind eye and over-looked the lack of information while receiving art works from donors or even purchased them by taking a chance it will come back to haunt them (Steinberg 2009). As (Walton 1999) describes, the international museum community recognized the problem of illicit art trade, long before WWII. It is the museum occupation to acquire collections through the art market, private owners etc. Moreover, it is a well-known fact that museums in general are in possession of stolen art, and some have knowingly accepted art with no provenance or an incomplete one. The literature describes and is consistent with the findings, that museums and the art world sees “source nations” as incapable of caring for cultural heritage, proving the cultural institution conflict of interests - the protectors and caregivers of cultural objects versus their wish to be true to their owners as well as to promote universal awareness to these cultural artifacts by putting it on display (Mullen 2002).

The growth of the art market turning into financial power as well as past decades of restitution cases, suggests that due diligence is of high priority. Ethical codes implemented acquisition codes for the museums to follow, but museum officials failed to adhere those principles into their museum practice. Museums recognized their moral and ethical obligation to reconstitute looted art to Jewish owners and yet their action, to look into their collections and research it, was a very slow one (Weiss 2007). Now days, when curators have the ability to look for works of art via lost art databases, and the internet has allowed institutions to share collections information as well as provenance information the conflict of interest had increased. The literature describes the global markets as an integral part for international economic diplomacy and its negotiations states international economic negotiations are conducted within the framework of a global economy (Gray 2018). Art is part of the economic negotiations’ framework, as one uses categories such as transportation goods exchange, exchange of services, government regulations and assistance. In many cases, international trade will

be a result of treaties and agreements between states rather than creation of a competitive market (van Bergeijk 2009).

The research findings consist with the literature, show museums as conservative bodies, as part of the art market, but it also shows that any loss of art objects to restitution, might lead to museums losses of visitors, of researchers, to loss of museums' benefactors, and ultimately to loss of museum income which lead to it being in-capable to perform its work for the public's interest. In summary, museums are in constant conflict of interests. Museums are conservative institutions. Their main work is to conserve received, bought, donated objects etc., objects which are part of it collection. The conclusion, once a European country wish to be part of the coming change as to handling Jewish owned Nazi looted art, it's cultural policy should be associated with the notion of museums maintaining preserving and protecting their collections for the public interest. Cultural policy should be associated with the use of information, communication technologies and to apply due diligence during which museums rebuild their reputation by becoming collections' rightful owners.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Provenance research of Nazi looted art and Nazi looted art of Jewish ownership is once again present on the international stage. The year 2021 brought a few initiatives that the international community cannot be ignored, for instance; the French initiative to change its laws in order to allow restitution, the Louvre online digital database; The international debate, which occurred over the 203 works of art displayed at the Kunsthau Zurich - the museum of fine art loaned by the Bohrle foundation and ended by the museums and foundation agreeing to disclose their contract; several Dutch statements over restituting Nazi looted art to its rightful owners which come as a response to the recommendations of the council for culture and the Kohnstamm Committee.

These above-mentioned European initiatives are only part of a much-needed process, which the international community need to continue. This paper presented parts of a doctoral research's findings and showed some of the complexities of the topic 'provenance research of Nazi looted art of Jewish ownership process'. The paper reviewed in short, the history of the phenomena, the action taken by the international community post WWII and discussed the important of art and its great power in shaping minds of involved interest groups. The doctoral research concentrated on the behaviour patterns of focus European states with regard to provenance research of Nazi-looted art.

The research explores and maps selected state activity and attempts to reset rules, standards, and practices used by the European' focus states with regard to provenance research of Nazi-looted art. The research develops propositions regarding what needs to be done to create a more ethical, moral inter-national society and to offer an appropriate government strategy in cultural diplomacy.

The research was conducted in Israel and includes interviews with past and present ministerial level decision makers, senior civil service officials, and representatives of EU member states, as well as Jewish organisations operating in Israel and abroad. The study also includes document analyses of material from national and international archives and focus group analyses on validating the information and adding more perspectives from a different population. The main goal of the research is to develop a policy model for European countries regarding handling Jewish-owned Nazi-looted art, under the premise that each object has an owner. A model which is suitable for use in EU member states, a compatible model with the many similarities of the region's countries and peoples.

Museums work is to preserve and maintain cultural heritage, by physically keeping their collections intact and ideologically keeping cultural heritage stories alive and educating the public. Maintaining cultural heritage, educating the public for culture heritage cannot be done without professional re-searchers who will be able to create an inventory of the looted art, find the lost stories and even identify heirs. Stories of the plunder will be told and awareness to the Jewish cultural losses

will be raised, once educated and trained researchers will work towards it. Remembrance will be achieved.

This paper based on the doctoral research show that a change needs to be done in cultural policies of states. A change needs to be a part of cultural institution view over provenance research, museums' view in particular, as well as part of public opinion, which will force states and institutions decision makers to change their thinking patterns and work together. Doing so will maintain and strengthen decision makers credibility and enhance the country status as part of the international art market. Transparency will not only make a state stronger, but it will become a role model in the effective implementation of various international conventions and provide for just and fair solution. Transparency will strengthen the country's art market and assist art consumers; it will raise public awareness to its history and cultural heritage. It will expand public knowledge about art and art history and of the Nazi's greatest plunder. It will deepen the public knowledge about the challenges of provenance research and the protection of society rights and will change societal norms as for looted art in general. A country, which will choose to deepen its knowledge and take part of the process will eventually build a network of researchers, experts who will support the executive oversight.

Author Contributions: "Conceptualization, S.O.K. and N.P.; methodology, S.O.K; validation, N.P.; formal analysis, S.O.K.; investigation, S.O.K.; resources, N.P.; data curation, N.P.; writing—original draft preparation, S.O.K.; writing—review and editing, S.O.K; visualization, D.P.; supervision, N.P. D.P.; project administration, S.O.K; funding acquisition, D.P. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript."

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Amineddoleh, Leila.** 2013. *The Role of Museums in the Trade of Black Market Cultural Heritage Property*. Art Antiquity and Law XVIII.
- Beker, Avi.** 1999. *The Trial of History Awareness: Jewish Property In The Holocaust. The Path to Memory*. Yad Vashem 31.
- Breitman, R.** (1991). *The Architect of Genocide: Himmler and the Final Solution* (1st ed.). Knopf.
- Brodie, N., and S Mackenzie.** 2014. *Trafficking Cultural Objects: Introduction*. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*.
- Charmaz, K.** 2000. *Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods*. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research* Edited by N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. London: Sage Publications, pp. 509-35.
- Clowney, D.** 2011. *Definitions of Art and Fine Arts Historical origins*. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 69: 309-22.
- Cuno, J.** 2011. *Who Owns Antiquity, Museums and the Battle Over Our Ancient Heritage*. Princeton University Press.
- Director, R.** 2005. *Talking to You Contemporary Art: The First 100 Year*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved Publication.
- Eberle, E.J.** 2007. *Art and Speech*. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Law & Social Change* 11.
- Edgar, A., and P. Sedgwick.** 2008. *Cultural Theory, The Kea Concept*. New York: Routledge.
- Edsel, R. M.** (2006). *Rescuing Da Vinci: Hitler and the Nazis Stole Europe's Great Art - America and Her Allies Recovered It* (1st ed.). Laurel Publishing, LLC.
- Feliciano, H.** 1997. *The lost Museum: the Nazi conspiracy to steal the world's greatest works of art*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Fisher, W.A., and R. Weinberger.** 2014. "Holocaust-Era Looted Art: A Current World-Wide Overview." In *Icom Museums & politics Conference*. St. Petersburg.
- Gray, T.J.** 2018. *South-South Cooperation in the World Trade Organization's Dispute Settlement Body*. *Journal of Global South Studies*; Gainesville 35: 1-28.
- Kedar, H.** 2021. *The Art of Free-Portism: A Disappearing Act, Collecting and Provenance*. In *Collecting and Provenance*. Edited by Andrea M. Galdy, Ronit Sorek, Netta Assaf and Gal Ventura. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kurtz, M. J.** (2006). *America and the Return of Nazi Contraband*. Cambridge University Press.
- Landmann, E. S.** (2021, December 12). *Zurich Museum and Foundation agree to more transparency* SWI Swissinfo.Ch. <https://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/nazi-looted-art--zurich-museum-and-foundation-agree-to-more-transparency/47185948>
- Lehavi, A.** 2019. *Property Law in a Globalizing World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lupfer, Gilbert, and Maria Obenaus.** 2019. *Provenance Research Manual – to identify cultural property seized due to persecution during the national socialist era*. The German Lost Art Foundation.
- Lynn, Nicholas H.** 1995. *The Rape of Europa, The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Maravers, D.** 1998. *Art and Emotions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Masurovsky, Marc** 2020. *A Comparative Look at Nazi Plundered Art, Looted Antiquities, and Stolen Indigenous Objects*. *North Carolina Journal of International Law* 45.
- Mullen, W.** "Museums balk at art returns." *Chicago Tribune* (2002), <https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/ct-xpm-2002-12-15-0212150272-story.html>
- Nemeth, A.** 2016. *European Capitals of Culture – Digging Deeper into the Governance of the Mega-Event*. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 4.

- Neuer, Jean-Jacques, and Clea Hance.** "A Common Standard of Due Diligence in Art Practice: towards a harmonization of restitution claims." edited by Cabinet Neuer: Avocats Paris - Solicitors London.
- Noce, V.** 2021. "Louvre Probes its Collections For Nazi and Colonial Loot in Massive Provenance Resear Project." The Art Newspaper, 26 March 2021.
- Panella, Cristiana.** 2015. *Lost In Translation. 'Unprovenanced Objects' and the Opacity/Transparency Agenda of Museums' Policies.* Anuac 4: 66-87. 10.7340/anuac2239-625X-1874.
- Petropoulos, Jonathan** 1996. *Art as politics in the Third Reich.* Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina Pres.
- Seidman, I. E.** 1991. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research.* New York: Teachers Collage Press.
- Shabak, Tamar** 2022. "Mark Chagall and Gustav Klimt paintings, looted during the Holocaust, will return to their rightful heirs. available online." YNet, 17.02.2022.
- Shkedi, A.** 2003. *Words of meaning: Qualitative research- Theory and practice.* Tel-Aviv: Ramot Tel-Aviv University.
- Simpson, E.** (1997). *Spoils of War: World War II & Its Aftermath: The Loss, Reappearance, & Recovery of Cultural Property* (0 ed.). Diane Pub Co.
- Steinberg, S.** 2008. "Orphaned Art: Looted Art from the Holocaust in the Israel Museum, Exhibition Catalogue,." The Israel Museum, Jerusalem.
- . 2009. *Provenance Research in Museums: Between History and Methodology, Taking Responsibility.* In *Nazi-Looted Art - A Challenge for Museums, Libraries and Archives.* Edited by, **Herman Parzinger Bernd Neumann and Gerold Letko.** Magdeburg.
- Strauss, A., and J Corbin.** 1994. *Grounded theory methodology: An overview.* In *Handbook of qualitative research.* Edited by N.K. Denzin and Y.S Lincoln. Sage Publications.
- van Bergeijk, Peter A. G.** 2009. *Economic Diplomacy and the Geography of International Trade.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Walton, Kelly Diane.** 1999. *Leave No Stone Unturned: The Search For Art Stolen by the Nazis and the Legal Rules Governing Restitution of Stolen Art.* Fordhan Intellectual Property, Media and Entertainment Law Journal 9.
- Weil, Shalva.** 2005. *Qualitative Methods in Israel.* Forum: Qualitative Social Research 6.
- Weiss, L.J.** 2007. *The Role of Museums in Sustaining the Illicit Trade in Cultural Property.* Cardozo Arts & Ent 25.
- Yin, R.K.** 2012. *Applications of case study research California:* Sage Publications.
- Yosifon, M.** 2016. *Case study.* In *Traditions and Genres in Qualitative Research- Philosophies, Strategies and Advanced Tolls.* Edited by Naama Sabar-Ben Yehoshua. Tel Aviv: Mofet Institute.
- International Conventions and European Union Web Resources 1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event. (2021, October 10). UNESCO. <https://en.unesco.org/protecting-heritage/convention-and-protocols/1954-convention>
- The Austrian Art Restitution Law.* (2009). Commart Recovery Org. <http://www.commartrecovery.org/docs/TheAustrianArtRestitutionLaw.pdf>
- Claims Conference & WJRO, Fisher, W. A., & Weinberger, R.** (2014). *Holocaust-Era Looted Art: A Current World-Wide Overview.* Holocaust Looted Art and Cultural Property Initiative. <http://art.claimscon.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Worldwide-Overview>
- DIRECTIVE 2014/60/EU OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 15 May 2014** on the return of cultural objects unlawfully removed from the territory of a Member State and amending Regulation (EU) No 1024/2012 (Recast). (2014). Official Journal of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014L0060&rid=7>
- EUR-Lex - culture - EN - EUR-Lex.* (n.d.). EUR-Lex Access to European Union Law. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM:culture>

Guidelines and Best Practices for the Restitution and Compensation of Immovable (Real) Property Confiscated or Otherwise Wrongfully Seized by the Nazis, Fascists and Their Collaborators during the Holocaust (Shoah) Era between 1933–1945, Including the Period of World War II. (n.d.).

Deutsche Botschaft Tel Aviv. <https://bit.ly/3zyG0Nz>

Joint Declaration concerning the implementation of the Washington Principles from 1998. (1998).

US Department of State. <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Jt-Decl-US-Germany-re-Nazi-looted-art.pdf>

Terezin Declaration - Holocaust Era Assets Conference — Centre du droit de l'art. (2009). ArtHemis Art Law Culture University of Geneva. <https://plone.unige.ch/art-adr/cases-affaires/blumengarten-2013-deutsch-heirs-and-moderna-museet-stockholm/terezin-declaration-holocaust-era-assets-conference/view>

Texts adopted - *Cross-border restitution claims of works of art and cultural goods looted in armed conflicts and wars* - Thursday, 17 January 2019. (2019). © European Union, 2019 - Source: European Parliament. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-8-2019-0037_EN.html

The Final Statement, 10th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers of Culture, MinConCult. (2016). [E-book]. the Indicator Framework on Culture and Democracy Policy Maker's Guidebook. https://culturalindicators.org/downloads/IFCD_Guidebook_v1_Oct2016.pdf

The Art Restitution Law of 1998 - Art Database. (1998). Art Database. <https://www.kunstdatenbank.at/the-art-restitution-law-of-1998>

The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. (2019, September 24). Diversity of Cultural Expressions. <https://en.unesco.org/creativity/convention#:~:text=The%202005%20Convention%20aims%20to%20systems%20of%20governance%20for%20culture>.

The Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets. (1998). Florida Center for Instructional Technology. <https://fcit.usf.edu/holocaust/resource/assets/index.HTM>

Vilnius International Forum on Holocaust-Era Looted Cultural Assets, 3–5 October 2000. (2000).

Looted Art. <https://www.lootedart.com/MG8D3S66604>
