

Research into art looted by the nazis – an important international task

MAARIT HAKKARAINEN AND TIINA KOIVULAHTI*

Abstract: *In the period 1933–1945 the Nazis orchestrated the most massive art theft in world history. The exact number of looted art objects is not known, although estimates vary from hundreds of thousands to millions. A huge number of art objects looted by the Nazis are still missing. They have been spread around the world through a variety of different channels and can still be found in the art market. Such looted art objects have also ended up in museum collections. All countries have a moral duty to participate in the efforts to identify and restitute objects looted from their owners by the Nazis.*

Keywords: Provenance, Nazi era, National Socialism, looting, confiscation, art, World War II, Third Reich, collecting, museum, holocaust.

Research into art looted by the Nazis- is topical even today, 60 years after the end of the Second World War, and an important task. Vivid international discussion on property seized by the Nazis started again in the 1990s, when the relevant archives became accessible for researchers and plenty of new information was published. There are still many unresolved questions concerning Nazi looting, which need the attention of scientists from various disciplines worldwide.

Between the years 1933 and 1945 the Nazis orchestrated the most massive art theft in history. The operation began in Germany and at the end of the 1930s it also took place in the countries occupied by the Nazis. The subjects for this looting were primarily the Jews, but also many other groups, organiza-

tions and communities that qualified as enemies of the Third Reich. Several state collections in occupied countries were also plundered.

The exact quantity of looted art objects is unknown. Estimates vary from hundreds of thousands to millions of pieces of art. After the Second World War, the Allies returned identifiable objects to the governments of the countries from which they had been stolen.¹ Despite the efforts of the Allies, a huge number of art objects looted by the Nazis are still missing. They have been spread around the world through various channels and can still be found on the art market. Works of art looted by the Nazis have also ended up in museum collections around the world via donations and purchases

THE DEAL PROJECT – RESEARCH INTO ART LOOTED BY THE NAZIS IN FINLAND

In Finland, the looting of art during the Nazi era has been subject to research for several years. The research project "Distributors of European art legacy – Finland as relocation region of Nazi-looted art, DEAL" was established at the University of Jyväskylä in 2001 by four researchers. The project was financed by the Emil Aaltonen foundation. Two of the DEAL researchers, Dr. Hanna Pirinen and Dr. Tomi Mertanen, studied the points of contact between German and Finnish political and art life during the 1930s and 1940s. Their aim was to create an overall picture of the German-Finnish cultural relations and the impact of Nazi ideology on the general lines of art policy. With the research of Tiina Koivulahti Ph.Lic. and Maarit Hakkarainen Ph.Lic., Finland rose to the international challenge of studying Nazi looting. Because Finland was not directly affected by seizures undertaken by the Nazis, the matter of lost cultural heritage has to be treated from the point of view of asking whether Finland was one of the countries that relocated Nazi-plundered art. The project clarified the possible routes and the channels whereby Nazi-looted art was acquired in Finland. The research also analyzed the art trade and art collecting. Relations between Finnish art collectors and Nazi Germany, as well as the impact of these relations on art acquisition, were therefore also examined. The project aimed at adding knowledge about Nazi confiscations, to improve expertise focusing on Nazi-era provenance research in Finland and by doing so to link Finland with the international field of research concerning this subject.

27 Finnish museums participated in the

DEAL provenance research and there are approx. 400 foreign works of art with gaps in their provenance for the Nazi-era, 1933–1945, as subjects of research.² The Nazi-era provenance research has not been undertaken in Finnish museums before. Foreign works of art have mainly come to the Finnish museum collections as donations from private collectors. According to archival material, private collectors did not pay much attention to the provenance of the works of art they acquired. Neither did the art dealers: it is only in recent years that the international art market has acknowledged the need of provenance research, even though works of art confiscated by the Nazis have been available on the international art market since before the Second World War.

The method behind Nazi-era provenance research, as used by the DEAL project, was developed in the 1990s to identify objects looted by the Nazis. In this method, the object itself is a primary source of information. In provenance research, all the inscriptions and markings on an object must be documented because they are traces of the history of that object.³ In addition to object documentation, all relevant archival material, bibliography and databases must be studied. This kind of provenance research requires expertise on Nazi-era art looting and co-operation within the international research field.

ART FROM INTERNATIONAL MARKET

The works of art confiscated by the Nazis spread into international art trade as early as the 1930s. The Nazis sold or bartered degenerate works of art, as well as other art considered undesirable, on the European art market, thus acquiring foreign currency.⁴ This chapter is not going to deal with all international con-

60 nections between the art trade and Nazi Germany but will bring forward the forced sales of Jewish property as well as links between the spreading of Nazi-confiscated art and black market trading after the war.

Forced auctions of Jewish property

It was previously thought that Finland was to some degree aloof from the international art trade, making it unlikely that Nazi-looted objects would have ended up in Finland via the international art market. The DEAL project has come to a different conclusion, however; Finnish art dealers and collectors travelled abroad acquiring art, establishing contacts to foreign art dealers and actively following the art auctions arranged in the art centres of Europe.⁵

For Finnish buyers, the London art market was probably the most important place for acquiring foreign art in the second half of the 1930s. Finnish art collectors acquired art from the London market by themselves but occasionally they also used middlemen, such as German-born Louis Richter, who acquired works of art for them.⁶ The works of art acquired from the London market are often considered as safe investments and thus hardly worth a closer look for the provenance researcher focusing on the Nazi era. The matter is not so simple, though. The fact is that the Nazis liquidated Jewish property in the 1930s not only in Germany but also abroad – for example in London.⁷

In the 1930s, the Nazis created laws to legalize the persecution of Jews and the expropriation of their assets. Hundreds of auctions of Jewish property were held between 1933 and 1938 across Germany, particularly in Berlin and Munich, centres of the art trade. Jews were forced to sell their treasures at auctions to sur-

vive. From these sales, they got only a fraction of the value of their sold treasures.⁸ It is known that objects were also purchased from such auctions, destined for Finland.⁹

As Mr. Lucian Simmons from Sotheby's auction house recounts, "There are many examples of sales of property by oppressed Jewish collectors within Germany, sales taking place in Switzerland, in Sweden¹⁰ and even in London. What happened is that the collector would be told that he had to consign his properties in London, where he would take a better price in foreign currency, which would then be repatriated to Germany to pay the flight tax so he could then leave." Because the Jews consigned their works of art using their own names, it was practically impossible for the buyer to know whether the seller had been forced to sell his property or not.^{11,12}

For the leaders of the Third Reich, the forced sales of Jewish property were not the only way to spread art on the international art market. Expropriated and seized art objects were liquidated abroad before and during the Second World War, both by the Nazi regime officially and illicitly by the members of Nazi party.¹³

Black market

During the war, the circle of Finnish art collectors extended; new groups of people became interested in acquiring art. The fear of inflation and the lack of investments made art a generally attractive object for purchase since the value of art objects was stable and there were no limits on their acquisition.¹⁴ A contemporary described the wartime situation in Finland in 1942 thus: "This is a very odd situation. There is lack of everything but too much money. Not much to buy. People buy works of art like maniacs."¹⁵ The black

market dealers also acknowledged this situation.

After the war, the situation in Central Europe was chaotic and the black market flourished. At the end of the Second World War, the Nazi's art collecting points were left unguarded. As a result, a lot of objects were stolen from these collecting points by both civilians and military personnel, and many of those objects ended up on the black market.¹⁶ At that time, it was possible to buy fine-quality objects very cheaply on the streets. Because there was a lack of groceries, one could also barter food for art. According to a Finnish art dealer, a lot of old paintings were brought from Central Europe to Finland after the war because they were cheap to acquire: "With seven loaves of bread, one was able to buy a painting."¹⁷

A Finnish sailor, Uno Tiainen, is known to have taken advantage of such opportunities offered by the Central European art market. Both during and after the Second World War, he acquired works of art mainly from Germany, Poland and the Netherlands. The collection includes approx. 40 paintings and sculptures of mixed quality. Mr. Tiainen never used money for acquiring such art. When leaving Finland, he took food and cigarettes with him so that he could barter them for art abroad. He had some permanent contact persons in different ports of Europe to deal with. To avoid customs officers, he smuggled the objects back into Finland.¹⁸ The provenance research on Mr. Tiainen's collection is still unfinished and it is too early to say whether any Nazi-plundered works of art have ended up in this collection.

Plenty of works of art have come to Finland via a wide range of channels and routes of acquisition from the 1930s until the present day. The history of the ownership of these ob-



Edouard Manet (attr.) "Portrait of a young girl", late 1870's. Photo: Kari Jämsén.

jects is usually unknown. For this reason, the provenance research on foreign art objects is important.

The DEAL project has already been able to identify some Nazi-looted objects in Finland. The next example describes the history of two paintings looted from a family that was designated as an enemy of the Third Reich.

CASE COLLOREDO-MANSFELD

The art collection of the diplomat Urho Toivola was bequeathed to Kuopio Art Museum in 1989. In Toivola's collection there are several old foreign paintings of fine quality, among them Mihály Munkácsy's (attr.) "Moses and Israelites" and Edouard Manet's (attr.) "Portrait of a young girl". While examining the pain-



Mihály Munkácsy (attr.) "Moses and Israelites", 1868.
Photo: Kari Jämsén.

tings by Munkácsy and Manet, it was noticed that these works of art bear identical wax seals. After heraldic examination, they proved to be seals of an Austrian-Czech Prince, Josef F.H. Colloredo-Mansfeld (1813–1895).

Prior to the Second World War, the Colloredo-Mansfeld family had owned an art collection consisting of several thousands of objects. Since the collection was very precious to the family, no work of art was ever sold from it. The Second World War was crucial to the Colloredo-Mansfeld family; all of their property, both in Czechoslovakia and Austria, was expropriated by the Nazis.¹⁹ The reason for the confiscation of Colloredo-Mansfeld property lay in the Declaration of the Czech Nobility, which the members of the family signed in 1938. This declaration proclaimed allegiance to the Czech nationality and demanded that the Sudetenland should not be united with Germany.²⁰

Several Nazi agencies specializing in the confiscation of cultural property operated in Czechoslovakia. The main organization responsible for the confiscation of Colloredo-Mansfeld art

collection was *Einsatzstab Rinnebach*, which was a subordinate of ERR (*Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg*), the Nazis' most effective art plundering agency.²¹ The Nazis left the majority of looted art objects in collecting points, such as castles and monasteries, in the protectorate of Czechoslovakia.²² The Nazis most probably sheltered the art works of the Colloredo-Mansfeld family in Czechoslovakia during the war because the protectorate was considered a safe storing place for confiscated works of art.

After the war, the position of Czech aristocrats persecuted by the Nazis improved for a while. The Czechoslovakian government returned some looted property to aristocrats, including the Colloredo-Mansfeld family. The situation changed, however, when the Communist Party ascended to power. The Communist government began to nationalize the property of Nazi collaborators and traitors to the country.²³ The Colloredo-Mansfeld family, whose entire property was expropriated by the Nazis during the Second World War, was now also accused of collaborating with the Nazis. As a result, their property in Czechoslovakia was expropriated again in 1947–48.²⁴

An interesting question is how the paintings that had formerly belonged to the Colloredo-Mansfeld family ended up in the art collection of the Finnish diplomat Urho Toivola. The results of research indicate that Mr. Toivola bought the Munkácsy and Manet paintings while he was serving as the Finnish ambassador in Communist Czechoslovakia from 1953 to 1957. As a result of political and social changes, there was plenty of fine art, including Nazi-looted objects stolen from collecting points, available at low prices in Czechoslovakia in the 1950s. The Communist government took advantage of the nationalization of works of art to improve the country's econo-

my by selling huge quantities of art abroad or to foreigners in the country. The black market flourished and works of art changed owners at a rapid rate. In addition, stolen objects ended up in the public art trade.²⁵

Mr. Toivola bought several works of art during his years in Czechoslovakia. In the case of the paintings by Manet and Munkácsy, the channel that he used to acquire these is still unclear. It is possible that his status as a diplomat meant that Urho Toivola may have been offered works of art during his posting in Prague by a Czechoslovakian officer, for example. Nationalized works of art are known to have been in the possession of Czechoslovakian government officers. By selling those objects to foreigners, they acquired foreign currency.²⁶ It is obvious that Mr. Toivola, as an art collector, knew the Czechoslovakian art market well and therefore he might have acquired Manet and Munkácsy from the public art market within the country.²⁷

The case of the Manet and Munkácsy paintings indicates how Nazi-looted objects may have come to Finnish collections after the Second World War from countries previously occupied by the Nazis. It also points out the influence of social changes on the spreading of objects once confiscated by the Nazis.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS ON NAZI-ERA PROVENANCE RESEARCH

Importance of provenance research on museum collections has been on subject of international debate since the 1990s. The Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets in 1998 was the most important opener of the discussion in this field. It was a conference of 44 governments and 13 non-governmental organizations. All the participating states, including

Finland, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, endorsed “Eleven Principles on Nazi-Confiscated Art” at the conference. These Principles are mostly related to museums. According to these, all public collections should be researched to identify looted works of art. The research should concentrate on works of art acquired by museums from 1933 until today and that have gaps in their provenance between 1933–1945.²⁸ In the Washington Conference, the participants morally undertook to find and return looted cultural goods.

After the Washington Conference, the International Council of Museums (ICOM) also reacted to the demands of provenance research. It created recommendations concerning Nazi-confiscated works of art. ICOM encourages museums to actively investigate and identify all acquisitions of dubious provenance. It points out that museums should also make relevant information accessible and actively address the return of all Nazi-looted objects of art.²⁹ The ICOM Code of Ethics stresses that museums should not acquire, evaluate, authenticate or exhibit cultural objects that do not have a satisfactory provenance.³⁰

British museums and galleries were the first institutions internationally to agree to research their collections to ensure that they do not contain works of art that might have been looted by the Nazis. In 1998, the National Museum Directors’ Conference (NMDC) draw up a Statement of Principles on the spoliation of art during the Holocaust and the Second World War period. One result of this is that Britain’s national museums and regional museums are investigating and documenting their collections. The reports on the research being undertaken by UK museums are published on NMDC’s website. There is also a searchable database of works of art with uncertain

64 provenance on the website (www.nationalmuseums.org.uk/spoliation.html).³¹

The American Association of Museums (AAM) has also created guidelines concerning “The Unlawful Appropriation of Objects During the Nazi Era”. Most museums in the United States have begun to follow these guidelines³² and have incorporated Nazi-era provenance research into their standard research on collections.³³ The AAM has created a Nazi-Era Provenance Internet Portal (www.nepip.org) with a searchable registry of objects in United States museum collections that were created before 1946 and changed hands in Continental Europe during the Nazi era (1933–1945). Several other countries, in addition to the United Kingdom and the United States, have also taken steps to implement the Washington Conference Principles on Nazi-Confiscated Art.

The restitution of cultural property looted during the Second World War has been subject of international resolutions. In 1999, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe adopted Resolution 1205 calling for the restitution of looted Jewish property in Europe. There is still a lot of work to do in this field. For example, the restitution procedures vary from country to country and this causes problems for the claimants. For this reason, the European Parliament is working to establish uniform legal standards for the restitution of seized cultural goods.³⁴ The European Parliament calls on its member states “to make all necessary efforts to adopt measures to ensure the creation of mechanisms which favour the return of the property referred to in this resolution and to be mindful that the return of art objects looted as part of crimes against humanity to rightful claimants is a matter of general interest for the purposes of Article 1 of

Protocol 1 to the European Convention of Human Rights.”³⁵

Against this background, it is paradoxical that in 2005 a working group of museum experts, set by the Council of the European Union, published recommendations on collection mobility for European museums in the framework of the working plan for Culture 2005–2006, which, among other things, aims to adopt a Europe-wide legal system of immunity from seizure while lending objects to exhibitions inside EU.³⁶ According to Mr. Ronald de Leeuw, chairperson of the working group: “At this moment museums and private owners increasingly refrain from lending objects to exhibitions if their safe return cannot be guaranteed.”³⁷ To facilitate European collection mobility, the working group wants “to secure the objects against any legal claims by former owners or claimants who dispute the legitimacy of the current ownership”. The report states that “the claimant takes advantage of the fact that the object is temporarily in a different country with a different set of laws and requests its seizure. Since the most recent enlargement of the European Union, immunity from seizure has become even more important, particularly in view of the involuntary removal of objects around the world since the Second World War”.³⁸ The report gives the impression that museums approve illegal possession and the exhibiting of objects looted by the Nazis. In this matter, moral and ethical aspects are consciously ignored. The ICOM Code of Ethics says: “Museums should avoid displaying or otherwise using material of questionable origin or lacking provenance. They should be aware that such displays or usage can be seen to condone and contribute to the illicit trade in cultural property.”³⁹

In May 2006, the Conference on Jewish

Material Claims Against Germany and the World Jewish Restitution Organization began to work with relevant Jewish communities around the world to bring increased attention to the restitution of looted movable cultural and religious property. According to these organizations, there have been some positive steps towards the identification and restitution of movable cultural property plundered from Jews, but the progress has been slow. There remains a very considerable amount of looted movable cultural property that has not been recovered and that is still in private and public hands. The Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany and the World Jewish Restitution Organization will focus on the systemic issues involved in art restitution with the intent of improving and creating processes to enable more owners and heirs to recover their property. A worldwide intensified effort for the restitution of cultural property looted from Jews will help ensure that families can re-acquire treasures that rightfully belong to them.⁴⁰

FOCUS ON NATIONAL MUSEUMS

From international point of view provenance research of national collections is seen both politically and morally important. To prove themselves worth public trust the national museums should actively investigate the provenance of objects in their possession.

Unfortunately, researching provenance of works of art in Finnish national collections has not been possible so far.⁴¹ There are hundreds of works of art with unknown provenance in Finnish national collections. Some of them are connected with names of art dealers who co-operated with the Nazis and that is why they would need the immediate attention of provenance researchers.

As an example of work of art which should be prioritized in provenance research is Giovanni Domenico Tiepolo's painting "Trojan Horse", acquired by the Finnish National Gallery from a Finnish auction house in 1996. Some pieces of the history of the painting are already known, but there is a gap in the provenance of the painting between years 1938–1948.⁴²

Before the Russian revolution of 1917, the "Trojan Horse" painting was probably owned by a Russian noble family. In the 1920s, the USSR state sold the painting in Paris. It was bought by the Parisian art dealer Mario D'Atri, who had Nazi contacts. The Tiepolo's painting was shown in the exhibition "Paintings, Drawings and Prints by Giambattista and Giandomenico Tiepolo" at the Art Institute of Chicago in 1938.⁴³ After the exhibition tour in the U.S.A. the trail of the painting disappeared, however. It seems as if D'Atri tried to sell the painting in New York, without success, and that the painting then returned to Paris. To whom D'Atri sold the painting in Paris and when is not known.

Nazi-registered art dealer Herbert Ulrich from East Berlin acquired the "Trojan horse" painting in 1947.⁴⁴ A year later, Ulrich sold it to the Finnish diplomat Tauno Sutinen via a middleman named Georgi Ribaroff.⁴⁵ By the time the painting was sold by Herbert Ulrich, the artist was no longer known. It is unclear at which stage between 1938 and 1948 the information disappeared. It would be extremely interesting to know how the painting ended up in the hands of art dealer Ulrich in Berlin.

It is known that at the end of 1990s the World Jewish Congress received a claim from a Jewish family concerning the Tiepolo painting. That is why the WJC started to clarify the case of the "Trojan horse".⁴⁶ There are still many unsolved questions in the provenance of

66 the painting, but the DEAL project is looking for answers to these.

As long as the national museums are not making efforts to clear up the provenance of works of art in their collections, they cannot be sure that no objects looted by the Nazis have ended up in their custody⁴⁷.

The absence of Finnish national museums was an unexpected obstacle for the DEAL project, and meant that the original research plan could not be proceeded with. The licentiate research conducted by Koivulahti and Hakkarainen, completed in December 2006, therefore did not include the provenance research in Finnish national collections. Due to these obstacles, the interest of the two researchers has been directed towards new research questions: the theory of provenance research and the power relations between objects of art and communities or individuals. Alongside such research, any ethical disadvantages will be noticed and brought out, and the wrongdoings will also be recognized. Koivulahti and Hakkarainen's licentiate research focused on provenance research, preceded by extensive field work that was an essential stage in clearing up whether any art looted by the Nazis has ended up in Finland. An integral part of this research was developing a method to identify Nazi-looted objects from Finland particularly.

ADVANTAGES OF PROVENANCE RESEARCH

It must be stressed that 27 Finnish museums were willing to participate in the DEAL provenance research project, despite their limited resources. On this basis, it seems as if provenance research is actually question of assigning priorities. These regional and foundation-owned museums have found the research a great opportunity to get new information on collec-

tions and in this way increase the museal value of their collections. Thanks to the 27 museums participating the DEAL project research, Finland is now the first Scandinavian country where the art objects housed in museums are being researched for Nazi-era provenance.

If these museums choose to follow international developments in the museum field, they need to incorporate the provenance research into standard research on their collections and also to take financial responsibility for this research. Only in this way can they ensure that their collections are built up in accordance with universally recognized moral principles.

What provenance research means for victims of the Nazi era

The Nazi-era persecution affected several millions of people in Europe. Those victims of the Nazis who survived the Holocaust lost their personal heritage, collective memory and identity. Every document relating to their past, such as a work of art, that is subsequently found is therefore specially precious for them and their families.⁴⁸ The art collections that were stolen represented an important aspect of the cultural lives of their owners, and the communities in which they lived, and were often assembled and treasured over several generations.⁴⁹ For this reason, the sentimental and symbolic value of recovered works of art is extremely high. The monetary value is irrelevant in this context. The following example sheds light on the issue.

The Neumann-family

A few years ago, an American named David Neumann contacted the DEAL project. He had seen a picture of a graphical work entitled

“Lake scenery with pine trees” with the Neumann signature in the Lost Art database. This work of art belongs to the collections of the Pietarsaari Museum, which has allowed the DEAL project to transparently research its objects. Mr. Neumann recognized the picture as a work by his grandfather, Berthold Neumann (1868–1934), a German artist. To confirm this attribution, Mr. David Neumann sent copies of official documents signed by Berthold Neumann to DEAL-project researchers. The signatures were identical with the signature on the “Lake scenery with pine trees” work. Mr. Neumann stated “My family lived in Berlin and was persecuted by the Nazis, had their assets seized by the Nazis, and was finally driven from Germany and then Holland for various countries in the period 1933–1940”.⁵⁰

Mr. Neumann was interested in knowing the history of this work by Neumann. Unfortunately, no detailed information on the acquisition of Neumann’s work, which was bequeathed to the museum by the sailor Uno Tiainen, could be found. Nor does the Neumann family possess any documents about the lost property. When the family fled Nazi Germany, the family members were allowed to carry little but their passports.⁵¹ The Neumann case is very common in the sense that victims of Nazi persecution rarely have any evidence whatsoever about their lost property.

Even though there is no certainty whether this particular work previously belonged to the Neumann family, the object – and the finding of it – is especially meaningful for this family.⁵² The work of art is unique, since there is so little of Berthold Neumann’s work that survived the war. For the family, the object is a document from the life of their deceased grandfather. It is also documentation of the history of the family, its values and memories.⁵³ For

the Neumann family, the sentimental value of this work of art is enormous.

The new information received has given this work of art a special significance. The story told by the Neumann family sets the work in a new light. Knowing the history of the artist and his family reminds anyone looking at the object of the people who were persecuted by the Nazis, and of their descendants still looking for documentation of their destroyed history. Along with its sentimental value, the graphics work has become more than a museum object.

In issues connected with the Holocaust era, moral and ethical obligations are always present. According to Ronald S. Lauder, the chairman of the Commission for Art Recovery, “The problem of stolen art must be recognized as a moral issue that can be solved only with morality as its primary basis. Art must not be withheld from the victims of the Holocaust or their heirs on the basis of legal technicalities, such as statutes of limitation, laws that purport to confiscate or nationalize stolen art or post-war ‘global’ settlements.”⁵⁴

NOTES

1. Rothfeld 2002: <http://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2002/summer/nazi-looted-art-2.html>.
2. Provenance is the full history of an item from the time of its discovery or creation to the present day, from which authenticity and ownership is determined. Works with gaps in their ownership history between 1933-1945 are the subject of Nazi-era provenance research.
3. Some markings may even straight indicate Nazi-history; such are for example suggestions to persons subject to Nazi-looting or persons linked with Nazi art dealings. Not all Nazi-confiscated

- objects were marked, though, and therefore every object with gap in the provenance between 1933-1945 must be researched.
4. [Art dealers Association of America] 1997, www.artdealers.org/press/looted.html (April 2004). Fishko Robert, "Looted art and the art dealer", interview of Hector Feliciano.
 5. Several foreign dealers also came to Finland to sell works of art to collectors. Good political, trade and cultural relations between Nazi-Germany and Finland created contacts also between German art dealers and Finnish people. Dr. Erik Burg Berger was one of the several art dealers from Middle-Europe who came to Finland to sell art objects to Finnish collectors and art dealers regularly during the second half of 1930's. [Letters from Erik Burg Berger to Bertel Hintze 1935-1938. File 5. Archive of Bertel Hintze.CAA.]
Dr. Burg Berger is worth mentioning while researching Nazi-confiscated art since he was in touch with Karl Haberstock, one of the most notorious of Nazi art dealers, but also some other prominent dealers who acquired art for Hitler.[Cultural Property Research Foundation]1998, <http://docproj.loyola.edu/oss1/toc.html>, The ALIU final report 1.5.1946, p.21, p.38. (October 2005).
 6. Testimonial on Mr. Louis Richter from Dr. Hintze, 14.6.1946. File 29. Archive of Bertel Hintze. CAA.
 7. Simmons 2005: 114.
 8. Watson and Thomas 1999: <http://www.museum-security.org/ww2/holocaust-claim.htm>, "Holocaust widow set to win back UKP.3m painting"; "Discovering truth about the auctions of despair", Times of London, June 3, 1999.
 9. Receipts. File 30. Archive of Bertel Hintze.CAA.
 10. The role of neutral countries like Sweden, Spain, Switzerland, Portugal, Turkey and Latin American countries as recipients and distributors of Nazi-looted art was brought up in the reports of Allied intelligence service reports in 1940's. <http://docproj.loyola.edu/laio.html>.
 11. Simmons 2005: 114.
 12. Since London was the centre of international art trade in 1930's naturally also German art dealers, like Karl Haberstock, the most prominent Nazi art dealer, made business there.[Petropoulos 2000, 78].
 13. Petropoulos 1996: 76.
 14. Eric Idestam's radio lecture "Vanhojen taulujen keräily" 3.1.1953. Archive of Eric Idestam. NBA. ; "Ostokyky heikentynyt. Taidekaupoissa varovaisuutta, osto- ja myyntiliikkeissä hiljaista." Uusi Suomi 29.10.1947.
 15. Voionmaa 1971:186.
 16. Feliciano 1997: 176.
 17. Interview of Wenzel Hagelstam 4.6.2001.
 18. Interview of Pekka Toivanen 9.4.2003.
 19. Letter from Jerome Colloredo-Mansfeld to Koivulahti 28.2.2000.
 20. E-mail from Derek Colloredo-Mansfeld to Koivulahti 5.10.2004.
 21. Cepicka 1998: 49.
 22. Cepicka 1998: 47.
 23. Larmola 2003: 310.
 24. Letter from Jerome Colloredo-Mansfeld to Koivulahti 28.2.2000.
 25. E-mail from Ondrej Vlk to Koivulahti 19.12.2003; Ondrej Vlk's announcement 26.5.2004.
 26. Letter from Felix Nevrela to Koivulahti 29.2.2000.
 27. Letter from Eduard Palin to Urho Toivola 20.5.1956. NA.
 28. Washington Conference Principles on Nazi-Confiscated Art 1998: www.state.gov/www/regions/eur/981203_heac_art_princ.html.
 29. ICOM Recommendations concerning the Re-

- turn of Works of Art Belonging to Jewish Owners 1999:
<http://icom.museum/worldwar2.html>.
30. According to the ICOM “Code of Ethics” “Every effort must be made before acquisition to ensure that any object or specimen offered for purchase, gift, loan, bequest, or exchange has not been illegally obtained in or exported from, its country of origin or any intermediate country in which it might have been owned legally (including the museum’s own country). Due diligence in this regard should establish the full history of the item from discovery or production. (Acquiring collections, 2.3.Provenance and Due Diligence: <http://icom.museum/ethics.html>).
 31. New Research to Uncover Looted Treasures in England’s Regional Museums 2002: http://nationalmuseums.org.uk/pr_spol_research_June02.html.
 32. Yeide 2000: <http://www.vilniusforum.lt>, Vilnius International Forum on Holocaust Era Looted Cultural Assets.
 33. Guidelines Concerning the Unlawful Appropriation of Objects During the Nazi Era 2001: http://www.aam-us.org/museumresources/ethics/nazi_guidelines.cfm.
 34. Resolution 1205, Looted Jewish cultural property 1999:
<http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=http://assembly.coe.int/%2FDocuments%2FAdopted-Text%2Fta99%2FERES1205.htm>.
 35. European parliament resolution and report of committee on legal affairs and the internal market 2003:
<http://www.europarl.eu.int/meetdocs/committees/juri/20021007/477224en.pdf> ; In addition there are international recommendations like the Washington Conference Principles on Nazi-Confiscated Art (1998) and the Vilnius Forum Declaration on Holocaust Era Looted Cultural Assets (2000) which advice how to deal with the issues of restitution. Also the ICOM “Code of Ethics” offers guidelines for restitution of cultural property. In connection with restitution issues of Nazi-looted cultural property there are several international conventions like the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954), UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970) and Unidroit Convention on Stolen and Illegally Exported Cultural Objects (1995).
 36. Lending to Europe, Recommendations on collection mobility for European museums 2005, 7, 15.
 37. Introduction to the Report Lending to Europe - Recommendations on Collections Mobility for European Museums by Ronald de Leeuw, Director Genral, Rijksmuseum, Netherlands, 2005. http://www.culture.gov.uk/mobility/conf_papers.htm.
 38. Lending to Europe, Recommendations on collection mobility for European museums 2005, 13.
 39. [ICOM] Code of Ethics. <http://icom.museum/ethics.html#4.5> Display of Unprovenanced Material.
 40. Issues relevant to the restitution of cultural property include;
 - Public awareness of and attention to the unfinished nature of the restitution of cultural and religious property looted from Jews.
 - Impediments to the identification of movable cultural and religious property looted from Jews.Museums, libraries, archives, auction houses and dealers should open their records, and those public and private museums and other institutions that have not engaged in provenance research on collections should do so or should certify that they have no looted items
 - Institutions currently holding looted items do not always engage in adequate provenance rese-

arch. This is critical in enabling families to find looted art.

-The creation of a hospitable climate for individual claims in all countries, and the establishment of practical, non-litigation claims processes is a priority. In some cases this may require legislative changes

-Governments now holding looted movable cultural and religious property are not always willing to return the assets. Restituting this looted property is a fundamental principle.

-Where Jewish owners, individuals or legal persons, or their heirs cannot be identified, the cultural or religious property should not be permitted to become the property of those governments but should be returned to the Jewish people.

(Artworks and Other Cultural Property Restitution and Compensation, Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, Looted Jewish Art and Cultural Property Initiative, May 15, 2006, http://www.claimscon.org/?url=looted_art).

41. Letter from the chief director of the National Museum of Finland Ritva Wäre and the chief director of the Finnish National Gallery Tuula Arkkio to DEAL-project 14.9.2004. The national museums have suggested that DEAL-project may research their collections free of charge if the researchers are able to do it according to the museums' timetables. Due to busyness of the museum staff and due to considerable amount of works of art, relevant for research, mere documenting phase would take many years and therefore the suggestion of the national museums' can't be considered. The DEAL-project must make the research within the framework of project financing. The documenting phase can't be neglected because the inventory of works of art in Finnish national collections is insufficient with respect to provenance research.
42. By now Tiepolo's "Trojan Horse" is the only object in the collections of Finnish National Gallery which the DEAL-project has been allowed to research free of charge.
43. E-mail from Bart Ryckbosch to Hakkarainen 6.4.2005.
44. Inventory book 1946-1949. Archive of Kunsthandlung Herbert P. Ulrich (C. Rep.105,Nr.23062). LB.
45. [MOT,Yle 1] : http://www.yle.fi/mot/100599/2a_.htm. Letter from Georgi Ribaroff to Tauno Sutinen 30.6.1948.
46. E-mail from Bart Ryckbosch to Hakkarainen 6.4.2005.
47. The ICOM's president Alissandra Cummins has emphasized the importance of provenance research recently. Ms. Cummins tells that for many years the International Council of Museums (ICOM) has insisted that museums and their staff must take great care to ensure that additions to their collections are always both legal and ethical. Since the adoption of the 1970 ICOM Recommendation on the Ethics of Acquisitions museums have been advised that "there must be a full, clear and satisfactory documentation in relation to the origin of any object to be acquired". The ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums (ICOM, 2006), binding as a condition of membership in the ICOM, strengthened this provision. According to Ms. Cummins museums must take all reasonable steps to ensure that their previous history does not include illegal acquisition or transfer contrary to the laws of the country of origin or of any intermediate country through which they have transited. [ICOM] Alissandra Cummins, Promoting the use of Mediation in Resolution of disputes over the Ownership of objects in Museum Collections, January 2006, http://icom.museum/mediation_eng.html.
48. Sola 1997, 17.

49. [CAR] the chairman Ronald S. Lauder, <http://www.comartrecovery.org/>.
50. Email from David Neumann to DEAL-project 15.1.2004.
51. Email from David Neumann to DEAL-project 15.1.2004.
52. The words of Mr. Neumann express the importance of provenance research for those persons as subjects of Nazi-persecution and their descendants:
 “This is truly a tribute to the importance, efficacy, and the usefulness of the database at www.lostart.de at the Koordinierungsstelle für Kulturgutverluste in Magdeburg, GE. We are grateful that your program at the University of Jyväskylä placed this work on that database. I would say that the Dept. of Arts and Culture Studies of the University of Jyväskylä have made this a lovely occasion for his grandchildren and their families. I hope that one of our family will one day have a chance to visit Finland and see the work in person.” Email from David Neumann to DEAL-project 20.1.2004.
53. Email from David Neumann to DEAL-project 15.1.2004.
54. [CAR] the chairman Ronald S. Lauder, <http://www.comartrecovery.org/>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

Abbreviations.

CCA = Central Art Archives, Helsinki, Finland.

NA = National Archives, Helsinki, Finland.

NBA = National Board of Antiquities, Helsinki, Finland.

LB = Landesarchiv Berlin, Germany.

Letter archive of Hakkarainen and Koivulahti, Jyväskylä

Colloredo-Mansfeld, Derek, 5.10.2004.

Colloredo-Mansfeld, Jerome, 28.2.2000.

Nevrela Felix, 29.2.2000.

Ryckbosch, Bart, 6.4.2005.

Vlk, Ondrej, 19.12.2003.

Interview

Art dealer Hagelstam, Wenzel, 4.6.2001. Helsinki, Finland.

Museum director Toivanen, Pekka, 9.4.2003. Pietarsaari, Finland.

Researcher Vlk, Ondrej, 26.5.2004. Documentation Centre for Property Transfers of Cultural Assets of WW II Victims. Czech.

Archival material

Central Art Archive, Helsinki (CAA)

Archive of Bertel Hintze

Correspondence:

File 29, Testimonial on Mr. Louis Richter from Bertel Hintze, 14.6.1946

File 30, receipts.

File 5. Letters from Erik Burg Berger to Bertel Hintze 1935-1938.

National archive of Finland, Helsinki (NA)

Archive of Rakel and Urho Toivola:

Letter of Eduard Palin to Urho Toivola 20.5.1956.

National Board of Antiquities, Helsinki (NBA)

Archive of Eric Idestam:

Eric Idestam's radio lecture "Vanhojen taulujen keräily" 3.1.1953.

Landesarchiv Berlin, Germany (LB)

Archive of Kunsthandlung Herbert P. Ulrich (C. Rep.105, Nr.23062).

Inventory book 1946-1949.

Articles

Cepicka, Ladislav, 1998: *Czech Republic. Spoils of War 5*. Koordinierungsstelle für Kulturgutverluste, Magdeburg.

"Kymmenien miljoonien arvosta salakuljettavat merimiehet tavaroita Suomeen vuosittain", *Helsingin*

sanomat 20.9.1935, nr 253.

[Marianna] ”Salakuljetus epäedullista liiketoimintaa... Petsamon tie, Helsinki ja Tornionjokilaakso salakuljettajien pääpaikkoja”, *Helsingin Sanomat* 21.6.1941, nr 164.

”Ostokyky heikentynyt. Taidekaupoissa varovaisuutta, osto- ja myyntiliikkeissä hiljaista.” *Uusi Suomi* 29.10.1947.

Simmons, Lucien, 2005: “Lost Heritage and the Art Market”. *The Lost Heritage of Cultural Assets, Proceedings of the international academic conference in Brno 2003*. Tilia Publishers, Prague 2005.

Books

Feliciano, Hector, 1997: *The Lost Museum*. Basic Books, New York.

Larmola, Heikki, 2003: *The ”Czechoslovak path”: A Communist route to power monopoly in 1943-1948 within the framework of ”Mitteleuropa”, great power setting, and the Soviet sphere of interests*. University of Helsinki.

Lending to Europe. Recommendations on collection mobility for European museums, 2005. Netherlands Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. Tripiti, Rotterdam.

Petropoulos, Jonathan, 1996: *Art as Politics in the Third Reich*. University of the North Carolina Press, USA.

Petropoulos, Jonathan, 2000: *The Faustian Bargain*. Allen Lane. The Penguin Press, Great Britain.

Sola, Tomislav, 1997: “Essays on museums and their theory”. *Gummerus Kirjapaino Oy*, Helsinki.

Voionmaa, Väinö, 1971: *Kuriiripostia 1941-1946*. Tammi, Helsinki.

Material published on the internet

[The American Association of Museums], 2001. Guidelines Concerning the Unlawful Appropriation of Objects During the Nazi Era. http://www.aam-us.org/museumresources/ethics/nazi_guidelines.cfm

[Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany], 2006. Artworks and Other Cultural Property Restitution and Compensation. Looted Jewish Art and Cultural Property Initiative, May 15, 2006. http://www.claimscon.org/?url=looted_art.

[Council of Europe], 1999. Resolution 1205, Looted Jewish cultural property, 1999. <http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=http://assembly.coe.int%2FDocuments%2FAdopted-Text%2Fta99%2FERES1205.htm>

[Cultural Property Research Foundation], 1998. The ALIU final report 1.5.1946. <http://docproj.loyola.edu/oss1/toc.html>

[European Parliament], 2003. European parliament resolution and report of committee on legal affairs and the internal market. <http://www.europarl.eu.int/meetdocs/committees/juri/20021007/477224en.pdf>

[The International Council of Museums], 1999. ICOM Recommendations concerning the Return of Works of Art Belonging to Jewish Owners. <http://icom.museum/worldwar2.html>

[The International Council of Museums], 2004. ICOM Code of Ethics. <http://icom.museum/ethics.html>

[The International Council of Museums], 2006. Alissandra Cummins, Promoting the use of Mediation in Resolution of disputes over the Ownership of objects in Museum Collections. http://icom.museum/mediation_eng.html.

[Leeuw, Ronald de], 2005. Introduction to the Report Lending to Europe - Recommendations on Collections Mobility for European Museums. Increasing the Mobility of Collections Conference, Manchester, UK. http://www.culture.gov.uk/mobility/conf_papers.htm.

[MOT, Yle 1], 1999. Letter from Georgi Ribaroff to Tauno Sutinen 30.6.1948. http://www.yle.fi/mot/100599/2a_.htm

[National Museum Directors’ Conference], 2002.

- New Research to Uncover Looted Treasures in England's Regional Museums. http://national-museums.org.uk/pr_spol_research_June02.html
- [Rothfeld, Anne], 2002. Nazi Looted Art, The Holocaust Records Preservation Project, Part 2. <http://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2002/summer/nazi-looted-art-2.html>. US National Archives & Records Administration.
- [United Nations], 1998-2005. Principles Recognized in the Nürnberg Tribunal, Article 6(b) of the Nürnberg Charter, 1939. <http://www.un.org/law/ilc/texts/nurnfra.htm>
- [United States of America, Dept. of State, Bureau of European Affairs], 1998, Washington Conference Principles on Nazi-Confiscated Art. 1998. www.state.gov/www/regions/eur/981203_heac_art_princ.html
- [Watson, Peter and Thomas, Sharne], 1999. Holocaust widow set to win back UKP.3m painting; Discovering truth about the auctions of despair, Times of London, June 3, 1999. <http://www.museum-security.org/ww2/holocaust-claim.htm>, 23.9.2005. Museum Security Network.
- [Yeide, Nancy], 2000. Presentation. Vilnius International Forum on Holocaust Era Looted Cultural Assets <http://www.vilniusforum.lt>

**Maarit Hakkarainen Ph.Lic. and Tiina Koi-vulhti Ph.Lic.*

Address: Dept. of Arts and Cultural Studies

PL 35 (JT)

FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä

E-mail: sahakkar@cc.jyu.fi, tikoivul@cc.jyu.fi