

## Table of Contents

<b><i>Part I: Study on the European added value of legislative action on cross-border restitution claims of works of art and cultural goods looted in armed conflicts and wars with special regard to aspects of private law, private international law and civil procedure</i></b>	13
Executive Summary	15
Chapter 1 - Terms of Reference	19
I. Mission: Tackling legal uncertainty within the civil law dimension of cross-border restitution claims by EU legislative action	19
II. Overall objective: Improving “private enforcement” against looting of art and cultural property	19
III. Reason: Limited scope and success of public enforcement	20
IV. Caveats: Procedural and material justice of civil law	22
V. Incomplete history of public and private “partnership” in the protection of cultural property	23
VI. Support for a comprehensive regulatory framework by the United Nations	25
VII. Focal points of an effective private enforcement for claims for restitution of looted cultural property by EU legislative action	26
Chapter 2 - On the scale of illicit trade with Looted Cultural Property	27
I. The global art market: Up to USD 57 billion per annum?	27
II. Illicit trade: Up to USD 8 billion per annum?	27
III. ILLICID: A German pilot project for investigating the illicit art market	28
IV. Figures from Databases in the field	29
1. INTERPOL	29
2. Art Loss Register	29

3. Lost Art Database (Nazi Looted Art)	30
4. Central Registry of Information on Looted Cultural Property 1933 - 1945 (Nazi Looted Art)	30
V. Many more recent signs of concern	30
1. UN Security Council Resolution 2347 (24 March 2017)	31
2. Terrorism and Illicit Finance Subcommittee of the US House of Representatives (23 June 2017)	32
3. FBI Report “Art Theft” (3 May 2017)	32
4. Council of Europe Convention on Offences relating to Cultural Property (3 May 2017)	33
5. European Commission Proposal for a Regulation on the import of cultural goods (July 2017)	34
VI. Recommendations	34
 Chapter 3 - Focal Points of Private Law	 36
I. International jurisdiction for the restitution of cultural property	36
1. General observations on the EU system of international jurisdiction for civil matters	36
2. Need for a special ground of jurisdiction based on the location of movable cultural property	37
3. Legislative Reaction of the EU: Article 7 no. 4 Brussels Ibis Regulation	39
4. Issues in relation to Article 7 no. 4 Brussels Ibis Regulation	39
a. Definition of “cultural property”	40
b. Fragmentation	42
(1) Status quo	42
(2) Different results without reason	44
(3) In particular: Similar but not identical definition of cultural object under the UNIDROIT Convention and Article 7 no. 4 Brussels Ibis Regulation	45
c. Declaratory Relief	46
5. Recommendation and Policy Options	46
a. Option 1: Introducing jurisdiction in rem for movable property	46

b. Option 2: Using the definition of cultural property of Article 2 UNIDROIT Convention in Article 7 no. 4 Brussels Ibis Regulation	47
c. Option 3: Spelling out the definition of Article 2 of Directive 2014/60/EU directly in Article 7 no. 4 Brussels Ibis Regulation	47
d. Option 4: Updating the reference in Article 7 no. 4 Brussels Ibis	47
II. Immunity for cultural property on loan in foreign states	48
1. Context	48
2. Fundamental distinction: Legislative immunity granted by a state and immunity from seizure under customary public international law	49
3. Case studies	51
a. Exhibition “Treasures of the Sons of Heaven” at Bonn, Germany	51
b. Exhibition “DYNAMIK! Kubismus / Futurismus / KINETISMUS” at the Belvedere, Austria	53
c. Exhibition “From Russia” (Pouchkin Museum Moscow) in London	54
d. Exhibition from the Stedelijk Museum of Amsterdam to New York (“Malevich case”)	54
4. State legislation (“anti-seizure legislation”)	55
a. Fragmentation in the EU and beyond	55
b. Unclear relation between national anti-seizure statutes and Directive 2014/60/EU	58
c. Exception for Nazi Looted Art?	60
5. State Immunity under Public Customary International Law	60
a. Legal Foundation	61
(1) Treaty Law	61
(2) Customary International Law	62
b. Conclusion: Rule of customary international law exists, but uncertainties remain	67
6. Recommendations	67
a. Joint Declaration on immunity from seizure for cultural property of foreign states on loan for the purpose of cultural exchange in other states	67

b. Harmonization of state legislation on legislative immunity	68
c. Clarifying the relation between anti-seizure legislation of the Member States and Directive 2014/60/EU	68
III. Choice of law	69
1. Different concepts in the legal regimes on property law	69
2. Choice of law issues	72
a. Design elements of a choice of law rule for the acquisition of cultural property	72
b. Recommendation: Harmonized choice of law rule along the lines of Article 90 of the Belgian Code of Private International Law	73
c. Application of foreign public law	75
3. Recommendation	76
IV. Substantive Law	78
1. Fundamental differences in the substantive laws of the Member States	79
2. Recommendation and Policy Options	79
a. Policy Option 1: Encouraging the remaining EU Member States to accede to the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention	79
b. Policy Option 2: Incorporating Chapter II of the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention into EU secondary law (e.g. as new part of Directive 2014/60/EU)	81
c. Policy Option 3: Adopting Articles VIII.-3:101 and VIII.-4:102 DCFR	82
d. Policy Option 4: Introducing a general prohibition of sale and acquisition for stolen and illegally exported/imported cultural property	84
V. The special issue of Nazi Looted Art	87
1. No retroactive legislation	88
2. Sales law for transactions in the future	90
a. Case study: The auction of Lodovico Carracci's "St. Jerome" (Max Stern Gallery) by Lempertz	90
b. Recommendation: Defining the sellers due diligence and the buyer's remedies under a European sales law when Nazi looted art is sold	92
3. Property law in respect to Nazi looted art	95

a. Invalidity of “foiced sale” transactions from 1933 to 1945	95
b. Validity of “non-forced sale” transactions from 1933 to 1945	98
c. Burden of proof for invalidity of transaction during 1933 to 1945	98
d. Valid post-war good faith acquisition / prescription in many (not all) cases	100
e. No retroactive legislation on good faith acquisitions / prescription in the past	100
f. Case study: The Schwabing Art Trove (“Gurlitt case”)	101
g. Recommendation: No retroactive legislation	102
4. Just and fair solutions beyond the law	103
a. Background	104
b. Increasingly diverging and contradictory restitution recommendations	105
c. Recommendation: (Non-binding) Restatement of Restitution Principles	108
VI. Complementary Measures	109
1. Cross-linking provenance research amongst local and national institutions and entities	109
2. Common Cataloguing System / Object IDs	112
3. Alternative Dispute Resolution	113
4. EU Agency on Cultural Property Protection	114
Chapter 4 - European Added Value by Proposed Measures	116
<b><i>Part II: Conclusions of the European Added Value Assessment (Christian Salm)</i></b>	<b><i>117</i></b>
Introduction	119
The illegal art market, legal challenges and indicators on the amount of restitution claims	123
EU Policy Context	126
Weaknesses in the existing EU legal system	128

Possible EU legislative action	132
European Added Value	135
<b><i>Part III: Draft Opinion of the Committee on Culture and Education</i></b>	<b>137</b>
<b><i>Part IV: Amendments</i></b>	<b>141</b>
Bibliography	163
A. Secondary Sources	163
B. Legislative and Governmental Materials	169
C. Treaties/Conventions	171
D. EU instruments	172
E. National legislation	172
F. Cases	173