



SEARCHING for
JUSTICE AFTER
the HOLOCAUST

Fulfilling the Terezin Declaration and
Immovable Property Restitution

MICHAEL J. BAZYLER
KATHRYN LEE BOYD
KRISTEN L. NELSON
RAJIKA L. SHAH

SEARCHING FOR JUSTICE
AFTER THE HOLOCAUST

SEARCHING FOR JUSTICE AFTER THE HOLOCAUST

Fulfilling the Terezin Declaration
and Immovable Property Restitution

Michael J. Bazyler
Kathryn Lee Boyd
Kristen L. Nelson
Rajika L. Shah

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Searching for Justice after the Holocaust. European Shoah Legacy Institute.

© European Shoah Legacy Institute 2019. Published 2019 by Oxford University Press.

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America.

© European Shoah Legacy Institute 2019

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law, by license, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reproduction rights organization. Inquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Bazzyler, Michael J., author. | Boyd, Kathryn Lee, author. | Nelson, Kristen (Lawyer), author. | Shah, Rajika, author.

Title: Searching for Justice after the Holocaust : fulfilling the Terezin declaration and

immovable property restitution / Michael Bazzyler, Kathryn Lee Boyd, Kristen Nelson, Rajika Shah.

Description: New York : Oxford University Press, 2019. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018019063 | ISBN 9780190923068 ((hardback) : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Terezin Declaration on Holocaust Era Assets and Related Issues (2009 June 30) | World

War, 1939–1945—Claims. | Jewish property. | Holocaust, Jewish (1939–1945)—Economic aspects.

Classification: LCC KZ193.2 2009 .F85 2018 | DDC 940.53/18144—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018019063>

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2

Printed by Sheridan Books, Inc., United States of America

Note to Readers

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is based upon sources believed to be accurate and reliable and is intended to be current as of the time it was written. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional person should be sought. Also, to confirm that the information has not been affected or changed by recent developments, traditional legal research techniques should be used, including checking primary sources where appropriate.

(Based on the Declaration of Principles jointly adopted by a Committee of the American Bar Association and a Committee of Publishers and Associations.)

**You may order this or any other Oxford University Press publication
by visiting the Oxford University Press website at www.oup.com.**

*In memory of victims of mass murder and mass theft, which take place during
every genocide and other mass atrocity*

and

*To Halyna Senyk, former Executive Director of the European Shoah Legacy Institute, whose
vision led to the Holocaust (Shoah) Immovable Property Restitution Study and this book*

Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	xi
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xiii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xv
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xix
<i>Introduction</i>	xxxiii
1. Albania	1
2. Argentina	7
3. Australia	9
4. Austria	11
5. Belarus	29
6. Belgium	35
7. Bosnia-Herzegovina	45
8. Brazil	59
9. Bulgaria	61
10. Canada	79
11. Croatia	81
12. Cyprus	99
13. Czech Republic	103

14. Denmark	117
15. Estonia	123
16. Finland	133
17. France	137
18. Germany	151
19. Greece	171
20. Hungary	179
21. Ireland	193
22. Israel	195
23. Italy	201
24. Latvia	213
25. Lithuania	225
26. Luxembourg	241
27. Macedonia	249
28. Malta	265
29. Moldova	267
30. Montenegro	273
31. Netherlands	291
32. Norway	303
33. Poland	311
34. Portugal	357
35. Romania	359
36. Russia	379
37. Serbia	385
38. Slovakia	401
39. Slovenia	415
40. Spain	431
41. Sweden	435
42. Switzerland	441

43. Turkey	447
44. Ukraine	449
45. United Kingdom	455
46. United States	463
47. Uruguay	479
Conclusion	481
<i>Index</i>	497

Foreword

HOW TO DO JUSTICE TO JUSTICE?

There is a general assumption that people at their core are good, given ordinary circumstances. In the early part of the twentieth century during the two world wars, circumstances were, however, quite extraordinary, in fact extraordinarily horrible for some. Since the end of the Second World War, our modern civilization has been grappling with the reality of the Holocaust's blunt traumatic blow to our assumptions of humanity's goodness. Through many attempts, the postwar democracies consoled their hurt consciences by restoring a modicum of justice. Yet the results were unsatisfying and inadequate. There remains much unfinished business in the aftermath of the Holocaust. However, it is not right to be dispirited. On the contrary, this unfinished business spurs and encourages our collective imagination to persevere and hope that we, as people, still can be in principle good—without forgetting anything or forgiving everything. Moreover, we realize our human efforts can only approximate a Platonic justice. There is not, and should not be, any silver bullet, magic formula, or quick fix for full restoration of post-Holocaust losses. Within this post-modern realization of our imperfect collective “goodness,” we strive.

From this vantage point, the Czech Republic in 2009, while holding the Presidency of the Council of the European Union, convened the International Holocaust Era Assets Conference in Prague. This conference led to the adoption of the Terezin Declaration, endorsed by all 47 participating countries, in which these nations committed themselves to ensuring assistance, redress, and remembrance for victims of Nazi persecution.

The European Shoah Legacy Institute, created in 2010, strived over the following seven years to carry out activities addressing several key post-Holocaust issues included in the Terezin Declaration: restitution of immovable property, art, Judaica, and Jewish cultural assets stolen by the Nazis; social welfare for Holocaust survivors and other victims of Nazism; and the promotion of Holocaust education, research, and remembrance, in order to help with the process of restoration of justice.

In 2017, after exploiting its full potential, the work of ESLI ended and its individual partner states remain committed to carrying out its objectives. This Study, which ESLI initiated and financed using respective Israeli and U.S. grants, is an important legacy of ESLI, and ensures that its results and materials are available to all who are interested. May it be found as useful in our common striving for restored justice.

Ambassador Tomáš Kafka, Chair of the Administrative Board of the European Shoah Legacy Institute (2014–2018)

Acknowledgments

Preparation and publication of this Study was a four-year journey. Along the way, hundreds of people generously assisted us in many ways, big and small. We acknowledge their contributions with gratitude and appreciation.

There are individuals and organizations without whom the Study would not have been possible. First, the enthusiastic support and assistance of five major law firms, whose *pro bono* assistance was crucial to the success of the Study. The law firm attorneys who supervised these *pro bono* efforts are Lauren Schmidt at *Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck LLP*; Amber Fitzgerald at *Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP*; Seth Gerber at *Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP*; David Lash at *O'Melveny & Meyers LLP*; and Owen Pell at *White & Case LLP*. We give our heartfelt thanks to the dozens of lawyers throughout these law firms who contributed hundreds of *pro bono* hours to this effort and started us on our way. Each is named individually in the bibliography of the country chapter they worked on. We also thank Stan Levy at *Manatt, Phelps & Phillips LLP* for his support over the years. Stan, who has devoted years to obtaining a modicum of justice for Holocaust survivors, came up with the brilliant idea of getting *pro bono* assistance from law firms in the massive effort to compile restitution laws from the 47 countries that signed on to the Terezin Declaration.

The Study also benefited from the able work of numerous volunteer law student interns from the Fowler School of Law at Chapman University and the University of Houston Law Center: Ren Henry, Kirill Nielson, D'Andrea Sykes, Garrett Schiponi, and Elaine Turner.

The World Jewish Restitution Organization (WJRO) provided invaluable advice and assistance throughout this process. Their expertise in the field of Holocaust immovable property restitution, deep connections with local Jewish community groups, and keen understanding of governmental affairs helped us to better appreciate the context of current Holocaust-era property restitution efforts. In particular, Evan Hochberg and Gideon Taylor gave generously of their time and knowledge.

We also thank the Oxford University Press, our editor Blake Ratcliff, assistant editor David Lipp, and editor-in-chief John Louth for recognizing the valuable contribution the Study makes to the field of Holocaust property restitution, as well as wider developments in the international law of property restitution following mass atrocities.

Finally, we turn to those who conceived of and sponsored the Study: the European Shoah Legacy Institute (ESLI), which commissioned the Study; the Ministry of Foreign

Affairs of the Czech Republic, which established ESLI as a Prague-based NGO in 2010 following the issuance of the Terezin Declaration, and Czech Ambassador Tomáš Kafka, Chair of the Administrative Board of ESLI. They are all to be commended for their tireless and unwavering support in ensuring that this Study reached completion. The Study was their brainchild, and it forms a lasting part of their legacy. Publication of this Study will, we hope, help to ensure that states' compliance with the Terezin Declaration remains in the spotlight for years to come.

Table of Cases

ALBANIA

- Bushati v. Albania, ECHR, App no 6397/04, 8 December 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 3
Driza v. Albania, ECHR, App no 33771/02, 13 November 2007 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 3
Ramadhi v. Albania, ECHR, App no 38222/02, 13 November 2007 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 3

AUSTRIA

- Anderman v. Fed. Republic of Austria, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1098 (C.D. Cal. 2003) (U.S.) 23
Oberster Gerichtshof [OGH] [Supreme Court] Jan. 22, 2014, 15 Os 133/13t 22–23
Whiteman v. Dorotheum GmbH & Co. KG, 431 F.3d 57 (2d Cir. 2005) (U.S.) 23

BULGARIA

- Avramova v. United States, 354 F. Supp. 420 (S.D.N.Y. 1973) (U.S.) 73
Kehaya and ors v. Bulgaria, ECHR, App nos 47797/99 & 68698/01, 12 January 2006 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 72
Todorova and ors v. Bulgaria, ECHR, App no 48380/99, 24 July 2008 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 72
Velikovi and ors v. Bulgaria, ECHR, App no 43278/98, 9 July 2007 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 71

CROATIA

- Gottwald-Markušić v. Croatia, ECHR, App no 49049/06, 30 March 2010 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 92
Kolarić-Kišur v. Croatia, ECHR, App no 17129/05, 17 September 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 92
Pavlinović v. Croatia, ECHR, App nos 17124/05 and 17126/05, 3 September 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 92
Smoje v. Croatia, ECHR, App no 28074/03, 11 January 2007 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 92
Tomašić v. Croatia, ECHR, App no 39867/07, 19 November 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 92

CYPRUS

- Xenides-Arestis v. Turkey, ECHR, App no 46347/99, 22 December 2005 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 99

CZECH REPUBLIC

- Ústavní soud České republiky (ÚS-st.) (Constitutional Court), Nov. 1, 2005, Sp.zn. Pl.ÚS-st. 21/05 #1,
Sdělení č. 477/2005 Sb., ST 21/39 SbNU 493 [Kinsky case] 111

ESTONIA

- Shestjorkin v. Estonia, ECHR, App no 49450/99, 15 June 2000 128

FRANCE

Bodner v. Banque Paribas, Case No. 29 Civ. 7433 (E.D.N.Y. filed Dec. 7, 1997) (U.S.) 144

GERMANY

BGH, NJW 1956, 265 (1956) 160

Decision of the Board of Review of 29 April 1954, decisions of the Board of Review, BOR/53/623, part number 20, p. 41 159

Heir of Dr. Hans Sachs v. German Historical Museum (BGH NJW 2012, 1796) 163

Hugo Hertz v. Marie Louise Klein (Decision of the Wiedergutmachungskammer of 23 April 1952, WgALG HH, Z 10) 159

HUNGARY

Abelesz v. Magyar Nemzeti Bank, No. 10 C 1884, 2013 WL 4525435, (N.D. Ill. Aug. 20, 2013) (U.S.) 187

Alkotmánybíróság (AB) [Constitutional Court], Mar. 12, 1993 [Decision of the Constitutional Court of Hungary No. 15/1993. (III.12.). Magyar Közlöny (MK) 29/1993] 186

Alkotmánybíróság (AB) [Constitutional Court], Mar. 12, 1993 [Decision of the Constitutional Court of Hungary No. 16/1993. (III.12.). Magyar Közlöny (MK) 29/1993] 186

de Csepel v. Republic of Hungary, 169 F. Supp. 3d 143 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd in part, appeal dismissed in part and remanded*, 859 F.3d 1094 (D.C. Cir. 2017), *petition for cert docketed*, No. 17-1165 (U.S. Feb. 21, 2018) (U.S.) 187

Fischer v. Magyar Államvasutak Zrt., 777 F.3d 847 (7th Cir. 2015) *cert. denied*, 135 S. Ct. 2817 (2015) (mem.) (U.S.) 187

Kántor v. Hungary, ECHR, App no 458/03, 22 November 2005 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 187

Rosner v. United States, 231 F. Supp. 2d 1202 (S.D. Fla. 2002) (U.S.) 187

Simon v. Republic of Hungary, 812 F.3d 127 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (U.S.) 187

ISRAEL

Daniel Mayer v. Hashava, The State of Israel and the Administrator General, Israel Supreme Court, 24 Nov. 2014 197

Hashava v. Nahlat Yehuda Ltd., Jerusalem District Court, 26 May 2015 197

LATVIA

Kozlova v. Latvia, ECHR, App no 57381/00, 23 October 2001 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 218

LITHUANIA

Aleksa v. Lithuania, ECHR, App no 27576/05, 21 July 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 233

Igarienė v. Lithuania, ECHR, App no 26892/05, 21 July 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 234

Jasiūnienė v. Lithuania, ECHR, App no 41510/98, 6 March 2003 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 234

Jurevičius v. Lithuania, ECHR, App no 30165/02, 14 November 2006 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 229

On the Interpretation of the Provisions of the Constitutional Court's Rulings of 30 December 2003 and 13 November 2006 Related to Citizenship Issues, No. 40/03; 45/03-36/04, Constitutional Court of Republic of Lith., 13 March 2013 231

On the Restoration of the Ownership Rights of Citizens of Land, No. 12/93, Constitutional Court of Republic of Lith., 27 May 1994 229

On the Restoration of the Ownership Rights of Citizens to Residential Houses, No. 11-1993 & 9-1994, Constitutional Court of Republic of Lith., 15 June 1994 229

On the Restoration of the Ownership Rights of Citizens to Residential Houses, No. 10/94, Constitutional Court of Republic of Lith., 19 October 1994 229

Padalevičius v. Lithuania, ECHR, App no 12278/03, 7 July 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 234

Shub v. Lithuania, ECHR, App no 17064/06, 30 June 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 232

MACEDONIA

- Adži-Spirkoska v. former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, ECHR, App no 38914/05, 3 November 2011 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 259
- Brajevnik v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, ECHR, App no 58408/10, 18 September 2012 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 259
- Mitevska v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, ECHR, App no 6526/14, 6 October 2015 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 259
- Nelčeska v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, ECHR, App nos 20988/05, 20599/08, 29830/08, 57088/08, 60140/08, 43713/09, 57948/09, 19 March 2013 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 259
- Velevska v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, ECHR, App no 42886/07, 6 May 2014 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 259
- Veljanovski v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, ECHR, App no 11190/07, 13 March 2012 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 259

MOLDOVA

- Baibarac v. Moldova, ECHR, App no 31530/03, 15 November 2005 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 270
- Popov v. Moldova, ECHR, App no 19960/04, 6 December 2005 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 269
- Prepelitã v. Moldova, ECHR, App no 2914/02, 23 September 2008 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 270
- Prodan v. Moldova, ECHR, App no 49806/99, 25 April 2006 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 269
- Scutari v. Moldova, ECHR, App no 20864/03, 26 July 2005 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 270

MONTENEGRO

- Eparhija Budimljansko-Nikšićka v. Montenegro, ECHR, App no 26501/05, 9 October 2012 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 279
- Vuković v. Montenegro, ECHR, App no 18626/11, 27 November 2012 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 282

POLAND

- Broniowski v Poland, ECHR, App no 31443/96, 22 June 2004 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 339, 343
- Broniowski v. Poland, ECHR, App no 31443/96, 28 September 2005 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 344
- E.K. v. Poland (App no III CZP 82/05) Supreme Court of Poland, 24 November 2005 333
- Garb v. Republic of Poland, 207 F. Supp. 2d 16 (E.D.N.Y. 2002), *vacated*, 72 F. App'x 850 (2d Cir. 2003), *cert. granted, judgment vacated and remanded*, 542 U.S. 901 (2004), 440 F.3d 579 (2d Cir. 2006) (U.S.) 338
- Haven v. Polska, 215 F.3d 727 (7th Cir. 2000) (U.S.) 338
- Lubelska Fabryka Maszyn i Narzędzi Rolniczych "Plon" v. Poland (App no I CSK 273/07) Supreme Court of Poland, 5 December 2007 333
- Ogórek v. Poland, ECHR, App no 28490/03, 18 September 2012 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 331, 332
- P 46/13, Constitutional Tribunal, 12 May 2015 327
- Pikielny v. Poland, ECHR, App no 3524/05, 18 September 2012 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 331, 334
- Plechanow v. Poland, ECHR, App no 22279/04, 7 July 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 331, 335
- Rutkowski v. Poland, ECHR, App nos 72287/10 and 46187/11 and 591 Other Applications, 7 July 2015 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 334
- Siermiński v. Poland, ECHR, App no 53339/09, 2 December 2014 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 331, 335
- Sierpiński v. Poland, ECHR, App no 38016/07, 3 November 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 331, 337
- Sierpiński v. Poland, ECHR, App no 38016/07, 27 July 2010 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 337
- SK 5/01, Constitutional Tribunal, 28 November 2001 329
- Wolkenberg v. Poland, ECHR, App no 50003/99, 4 December 2007 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 345

ROMANIA

- Atanasiu v. Romania, ECHR, App nos 30767/05 and 33800/06, 12 October 2010 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 359, 369

Preda v. Romania, ECHR, App nos 9584/02, 33514/02, 38052/02, 25821/03, 29652/03, 3736/03, 17750/03, 28688/04, 29 April 2014 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 360, 371
 Sukyas v. Romania, No. CV 15-1946, 2017 WL 6550588 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2017) (U.S.) 360, 372

SLOVAKIA

Brežný v. Slovakia, ECHR, App no 23131/93, 4 March 1996 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 407
 Jantner v. Slovakia, ECHR, App no 39050/97, 4 March 2003 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 407
 Rosival v. Slovakia, ECHR, App no 17684/02, 13 February 2007 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 408
 Rosival v. Slovakia, ECHR, App no 17684/02, 23 September 2008 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 408

SLOVENIA

Grzinčič v. Slovenia, ECHR, App no 26867/02, 3 May 2007 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 426
 Sirc v. Slovenia, ECHR, App no 44580/98, 8 April 2008 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 425
 Smiljanić v. Slovenia, ECHR, App no 481/04, 2 June 2009 (Eur. Ct. H.R.) 424

SWITZERLAND

In re Holocaust Victim Assets Litigation, No. 1:96-CV-04849 (E.D.N.Y.) (U.S.) 443

UNITED STATES

Abelesz v. Magyar Nemzeti Bank, No. 10 C 1884, 2013 WL 4525435 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 20, 2013) 472
 Altmann v. Republic of Austria, 317 F.3d 954 (9th Cir. 2002), *amending opinion on denial of rehearing*, 327 F.3d 1246 (9th Cir. 2003), *affirming on other grounds*, Altmann v. Rep. of Austria, 541 U.S. 677 (2004) 464, 472
 Anderman v. Federal Republic of Austria, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1098 (C.D. Cal. 2003) 23
 Avramova v. United States, 354 F. Supp. 420 (S.D.N.Y. 1973) 73
 Cassirer v. Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection Found., 153 F. Supp. 3d 1148 (C.D. Cal. 2015), *rev'd and remanded*, 862 F.3d 951 (9th Cir. 2017) 472
 de Csepel v. Republic of Hungary, 169 F. Supp. 3d 143 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd in part, appeal dismissed in part and remanded*, 859 F.3d 1094 (D.C. Cir. 2017), *petition for cert docketed*, No. 17-1165 (U.S. Feb. 21, 2018) 187
 Fischer v. Magyar Államvasutak Zrt., 777 F.3d 847 (7th Cir. 2015) *cert. denied*, 135 S. Ct. 2817 (2015) (mem.) 472
 Garb v. Republic of Poland, 207 F. Supp. 2d 16 (E.D.N.Y. 2002), *vacated*, 72 F. App'x 850 (2d Cir. 2003), *cert. granted, judgment vacated sub nom. Republic of Austria v. Whiteman*, 542 U.S. 901 (2004), and *cert. granted, judgment vacated and remanded*, 542 U.S. 901, (2004), 440 F.3d 579 (2d Cir. 2006) 338
 Haven v. Polska, 215 F.3d 727 (7th Cir. 2000) 338
 Holocaust Victim Assets Litigation, *In re* No. 1:96-CV-04849 (E.D.N.Y.) 443
 Rosner v. United States, 231 F. Supp. 2d 1202 (S.D. Fla. 2002) 187
 Simon v. Republic of Hungary, 812 F.3d 127 (D.C. Cir. 2016) 472
 Sukyas v. Romania, No. CV 15-1946, 2017 WL 6550588 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2017) 360, 372
 Victims of Hungarian Holocaust v. Hungarian State Rys., 798 F. Supp. 2d 934 (N.D. Ill. 2011), *vacated and remanded sub nom. Abelesz v. Magyar Nemzeti Bank*, 692 F.3d 661 (7th Cir. 2012), *aff'd sub nom. Fischer v. Magyar Allamvasutak Zrt.*, 777 F.3d 847 (7th Cir. 2015) 472
 Von Saher v. Norton Simon Museum of Art at Pasadena, No. 2:07-CV-02866 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2016), *appeal filed*, No. 16-56308 (9th Cir. Sept. 9, 2016) 472
 Whiteman v. Dorotheum GmbH & Co. KG, 431 F.3d 57 (2d Cir. 2005) 23

Table of Legislation

ALBANIA

Ligj Nr. 7501, 19.7.1991 [Law No. 7501, 19 July 1991] Për Tokën [On Land]. GAZETA ZYRTARE [Official Gazette] No. 5, August 1991 3

Ligj Nr. 7512, 10.8.1991 [Law No. 7512, 10 August 1991] Për sanksionimin dhe mbrojtjen e pronës private, të nismës së lirë, të veprimtarive private të pavarura dhe privatizimit [On Sanctioning and Protecting Private Property and Free Initiative, Private Independent Activities, and Privatization] GAZETA ZYRTARE [Official Gazette] No. 6, August 1991 3

Ligj Nr. 7652, 23.12.1992 [Law No. 7652, 23 December 1992] Për privatizimin e banesave shtetërore [On Privatization of State Housing] FLETORJA ZYRTARE [Official Gazette] No. 10, December 1992 3

Ligj Nr. 7698, 15.4.1993 [Law No. 7698, 15 April 1993] Për kthimin dhe kompesimin e pronave ish-pronarëve [On Restitution and Compensation of Property to the Former Owners] FLETORJA ZYRTARE [Official Gazette] No. 5, April 1993 3

Ligj Nr. 9235, 29.7.2004 [Law No. 9235, 29 July 2004] Për kthimin dhe kompensimin e pronës [On Restitution and Compensation of Property, as amended] FLETORJA ZYRTARE [Official Gazette] No. 61, August 2004 3

ARGENTINA

Law No. 24.488, 31 May 1995, B.O. 28.173, Inmunidad Jurisdiccional de Los Estados Extranjeros Ante Los Tribunales Argentinos [Jurisdictional Immunity of the Foreign States before the Argentinian Courts] 7

AUSTRALIA

Foreign States Immunities Act 1985 9

AUSTRIA

Erfassung arisierter und anderer im Zusammenhange mit der nationalsozialistischen Machtübernahme entzogenen Vermögensschaften [Law on the Recording of Aryanized and Other Property Confiscated in Connection with National Socialist Seizure of Power], STAATSGESETZBLATT [StGBI] No. 10/1945, as amended, [19/1945, 23/1945, 135/1945, 201/1945, 150/1946] 15, 16

Auffangorganisationengesetz [Federal Act of 13 March 1957 on the Creation of Receiving Organizations Pursuant to Article 26 section 2 of the State Treaty, Federal Law Gazette No. 152/1955] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 73/1957 25–26

- Drittes Rückstellungsgesetz [Third Restitution Act] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 54/1947 16
- Aufteilung der Mittel der "Sammelstellen" [Distribution of Funds of "Collection Agencies"] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 108/1962 26
- Entschädigungsfondsgesetz [Compensation Fund Act] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl I] No. 12/2001, as amended 20
- Einrichtung des Fonds zur Instandsetzung der jüdischen Friedhöfe in Österreich sowie Änderung des Nationalfondsgesetzes [Establishment of a Fund for the Restoration of the Jewish Cemeteries in Austria] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl I] No. 99/2010, as amended 25
- Erstes Rückstellungsgesetz [First Restitution Act] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 156/1946 15
- Finanzielle Leistungen an die israelitische Religionsgesellschaft [Federal Act for the Financial Support of the Israelite Religious Community] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 222/1960 24
- Kundmachung des Reichsstatthalters in Österreich, wodurch die Verordnung über die Anmeldung des Vermögens von Juden vom 26. April 1938 bekanntgemacht wird [Ordinance on the Registration of Jewish Property] GESETZBLATT FÜR DAS LAND ÖSTERREICH [GBlÖ] No. 102/1938, § 3 14
- Nationalfonds der Republik Österreich für Opfer des Nationalsozialismus [Federal Law on the National Fund of the Republic of Austria for Victims of National Socialism] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 432/1995 18
- Nichtigerklärung von Rechtsgeschäften und sonstigen Rechtshandlungen, die während der deutschen Besetzung Österreichs erfolgt sind [Annulment Law] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 106/1946 15
- Rückstellungsanspruchsgesetz [Federal Law of 17 May 1961 Law Concerning Registration of Claims by Receiving Organizations for the Restitution of Property under the Restitution Acts] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 133/1961 15, 16, 17, 26
- Sammelstellen-Abgeltungsgesetz [Collection Agencies Settlement Act] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 150/1966 26
- Verfügungstellung von Bundesmitteln zur Bildung eines Fonds zur Abgeltung von Vermögensverlusten politisch Verfolgter [Compensation Fund Law] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 100/1961 18
- Zweites Rückstellungsgesetz [Second Restitution Act] BUNDESGESETZBLATT [BGBl] No. 53/1947 15, 16, 24

BELARUS

- Об утверждении Положения о порядке восстановления прав граждан, пострадавших от репрессий в 20 - 80-х годах [Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Belarus On Enactment of the Regulation on the Procedure for Restoration of Rights of Citizens Affected by the Repressions in 1920s–1980s] No. 479-XII of 21 December 1990. Nat'l Reg. No. 4/1880. VEDAMASTSI VIARKHOUNANA SAVETA RESPUBLIKI BELARUS [Official Gazette of Belarus] No. 1(3) of 1991 31–32
- О свободе совести и религиозных организациях [On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations] No. 2054-XII of 17 December 1992, as amended. Nat'l Reg. No. 2/366 32
- О практике разрешения судами споров, связанных с правом частной собственности на жилой дом [Resolution of the Plenum of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Belarus On Practice of Adjudication of Disputes Related to the Private Property on Residential Buildings] No. 5 of 4 June 1993. Nat'l Reg. No. 6/146. Судовы веснік [Judicial Gazette] No. 3 of 1993 31

BELGIUM

- Loi relative au dédommagement des membres de la Communauté juive de Belgique pour les biens dont ils ont été spoliés ou qu'ils ont de laissés pendant la guerre 1940-1945 [Indemnification of Belgian Jewish Community Assets Plundered or Abandoned During the War 1940-45] of 20 December 2001, MONITEUR BELGE [M.B.] [Official Gazette of Belgium], 24 January 2002, at 2402 40

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA, REPUBLIC OF, & SRPSKA, REPUBLIC OF

See also Yugoslavia

Republic of Srpska

- Закон о враћању одузетих непокретности & Закон о враћању одузетог земљишта [1996 Law on Return of Seized Property & Law on Return of Seized Land] SLUŽBENI GLASNIK RS [Official Gazette of the Republic of Srpska] No. 21/96 [23 September 1996] 46, 52, 82

Закон о враћању одузете имовине и обештећењу [2000 Law on the Return of Confiscated Property and Confiscation] SLUŽBENI GLASNIK RS [Official Gazette of the Republic of Srpska] No. 13/00 [25 May 2000] 46, 53

BiH

Закон о Продаји Станова На Кojима Постоји Станарско Право [1998 Law on Sale of Apartments with Occupancy Right] SLUŽBENE NOVINE FEDERACIJE BiH [Official Gazette of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina] No. 27/97, as amended, 11/98, 22/99, 27/99, 7/00, 32/01 53

Закон о Слободи Вjере I Правном Положају Црква I Вjерских Заједница У Bosни I Hercegovini [Law on Religious Freedom and Legal Position of Churches and Religious Communities] SLUŽBENI GLASNIK BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE [Official Gazette of Bosnia and Herzegovina] No. 5/04 46

BULGARIA

See also Macedonia

Закон за възстановяване собствеността върху одържавени недвижими ИМОТИ [Law on the Compensation of Owners of Nationalized Assets, as amended] State Gazette No. 107 of 18 November 1997 62, 70

Закон за собствеността и ползването на земеделските земи [Law on Ownership and Use of Agricultural Land] State Gazette No. 17 of 1 March 1991 62, 67

Закон за възстановяване на собствеността върху горите и земите от горския фонд [Law on Restitution of Property over Forests and the Lands from the Forest Fund] State Gazette No. 110 of 25 November 1997 62, 69

Закон за възстановяване собствеността върху одържавени недвижими имоти [Law on the Restitution of Nationalized Immovable (Real) Property] State Gazette No. 15 of 21 February 1992 62, 69

CANADA

State Immunity Act, R.S.C., 1985, c S-18 79

CROATIA

See also Yugoslavia

Закон о измjenама i допунaма Закона о накнади за имовину одузету за vrijeme jugoslavenske комунистичке владавине [Amendment to Law No. 92/96 on Restitution/Compensation of Property Taken under the Yugoslav Communist Rule] NARODNE NOVINE [Official Gazette of Croatia] 80/2002 No. 1292, 5 July 2002 89

Закон о накнади за имовину одузету за vrijeme jugoslavenske комунистичке владавине [Law No. 92/96 on Restitution/Compensation of Property Taken under the Yugoslav Communist Rule] NARODNE NOVINE [Official Gazette of Croatia] 92/1996, No. 1600, 11 October 1996, as amended 82

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

See also Czech Republic; Slovakia

Декрет президента републики о неплатности нeктерых мајетковe-правних једнанi з добы несвободы а о народни спрaвe мајетковых hodnot Нeмцy, Мађарy, зрадцy а колaборантy а нeктерых организациj а yставy [Decree No. 5/1945 Concerning the Invalidity of Transactions Involving Property Rights from the Time of the Oppression and Concerning the National Administration of Property Assets of Germans, Magyars, Traitors and Collaborationists and of Certain Organizations and Associations]. Декрет ч. 5/1945 Sb. 107

Закон о неплатности нeктерых мајетковe-правних једнанi з добы несвободы а о нарoцих з тeто неплатности а з јиных засахy до мајетку вzhајeјицих [Law No. 128/1946 on the Invalidity of Certain Property-Related Legal Acts Taken in the Period of Non-Freedom and on Claims Arising from Such Invalidity and Other Interference with Property]. Zаkон ч. 128/1946 Sb. 107–108

CZECH REPUBLIC

See also Czechoslovakia; Slovakia

- Dekret presidenta republiky o neplatnosti některých majetkově-právních jednání z doby nesvobody a o národní správě majetkových hodnot Němců, Maďarů, zrádců a kolaborantů a některých organizací a ústavů [Decree No. 5/1945 Concerning the Invalidity of Transactions Involving Property Rights from the Time of the Oppression and Concerning the National Administration of Property Assets of Germans, Magyars, Traitors and Collaborationists and of Certain Organizations and Associations]. Dekret č. 5/1945 Sb. 107
- Nález Ústavního soudu ze dne 3. června 1998 ve věci návrhu na zrušení části ustanovení § 13 odst. 3 zákona č. 87/1991 Sb., o mimosoudních rehabilitacích, ve slovech "ode dne účinnosti tohoto zákona" [Constitutional Law No. 153/1998]. Nález č. 153/1998 Sb. 109, 406
- Zákon České národní rady o působnosti orgánů České republiky v mimosoudních rehabilitacích [Czech National Council Law No. 231/1991 on the Competence of the Czech Republic in Restitution]. Zákon č. 231/1991 Sb. 108
- Zákon České národní rady, kterým se upravují některé otázky související se zákonem č. 229/1991 Sb., o úpravě vlastnických vztahů k půdě a jinému zemědělskému majetku, ve znění zákona č. 93/1992 Sb. [Act No. 243/1992 on Restitution]. Zákon č. 243/1992 Sb. 109, 110, 407
- Zákon o mimosoudních rehabilitacích [Act No. 87/1991 Rehabilitation Law, as amended]. Zákon č. 87/1991 Sb. 108, 109
- Zákon o neplatnosti některých majetkově-právních jednání z doby nesvobody a o nárocích z této neplatnosti a z jiných zásahů do majetku vzcházejících [Law No. 128/1946 on the Invalidity of Certain Property-Related Legal Acts Taken in the Period of Non-Freedom and on Claims Arising from such Invalidity and Other Interference with Property]. Zákon č. 128/1946 Sb. 107–108
- Zákon o poskytnutí jednorázové peněžní částky některým obětem nacistické perzekuce [Act No. 217/1994 Concerning Lump-Sum Payments to Certain Victims of Nazi Persecution]. Zákon č. 217/1994 Sb. 114
- Zákon o úpravě vlastnických vztahů k půdě a jinému zemědělskému majetku [Act No. 229/1991 as amended on Ownership Rights of Land and Other Agricultural Property]. Zákon č. 229/1991 Sb. 109, 407
- Zákon o zmírnění některých majetkových křivd způsobených holocaustem a o změně zákona č. 243/1992 Sb., kterým se upravují některé otázky související se zákonem č. 229/1991 Sb., o úpravě vlastnických vztahů k půdě a jinému zemědělskému majetku, ve znění zákona č. 93/1992 Sb., ve znění pozdějších předpisů [Act No. 212/2000 on Alleviating Holocaust Injustices]. Zákon č. 212/2000 Sb. 104, 109, 112, 407
- Zákon o poskytnutí jednorázové peněžní částky příslušníkům československých zahraničních armád a spojeneckých armád v letech 1939 až 1945 [Act No. 39/2000 Concerning Lump-Sum Payments to Members of Czechoslovak Armies Formed Abroad and of Allied Armies in 1939–1945]. Zákon č. 39/2000 Sb. 114
- Zákon o ocenění účastníků národního boje za vznik a osvobození Československa a některých pozůstalých po nich, o zvláštním příspěvku k důchodu některých osobám, o jednorázové peněžní částce některým účastníkům národního boje za osvobození v letech 1939 až 1945 a o změně některých zákonů [Act No. 357/2005 Concerning the Recognition of Participants in the National Struggle for the Establishment and Liberation of Czechoslovakia and Certain Categories of Their Survivors, a Special Contribution to Supplement Pensions of Certain Persons, a Lump-Sum Payment to Certain Participants in the 1939–1945 National Struggle for Liberation, and Amending Certain Laws]. Zákon č. 357/2005 Sb. 114
- Zákon o poskytnutí jednorázové peněžní částky účastníkům národního boje za osvobození, politickým vězňům a osobám z rasových nebo náboženských důvodů soustředěných do vojenských pracovních táborů a o změně zákona č. 39/2000 Sb., o poskytnutí jednorázové peněžní částky příslušníkům československých zahraničních armád a spojeneckých armád v letech 1939 až 1945 [Act No. 261/2001 Concerning Lump-Sum Payments to Participants in the National Struggle for Liberation, Political Prisoners and Persons Concentrated in Military Labor Camps Because of Their Race or Religion, and Amending Act No. 39/2000]. Zákon č. 261/2001 Sb. 114

DENMARK

- Bekendtgørelse af lov om erstatning til besættelsestidens ofre [Law of Compensation to the Victims of the Occupation], lovbekendtgørelse nr 279 [LBK No. 279] 13 March 2013, as amended. 119

ESTONIA

- Eesti Vabariigi omandireformi aluste seadus [Republic of Estonia Principles of Ownership Reform Act] RIIGI TEATAJA [RT] 1991, 21, 257, in force 20 June 1991 123, 126
- Maareformi seadus [Land Reform Act] RIIGI TEATAJA [RT] 1991, 34, 426, in force 1 November 1991 126
- Õigusvastaselt võõrandatud vara maksumuse määramise ja kompenseerimise seadus [Unlawfully Expropriated Property Valuation and Compensation Act] RIIGI TEATAJA [RT] 1993, 30, 509, in force 15 June 1993 127

FRANCE

- Loi 3086 du 22 juillet 1941 relative aux entreprises, biens et valeurs appartenant aux juifs [Law 3086 of July 22, 1941, on Businesses, Property, and Securities Belonging to Jews], JOURNAL OFFICIEL DE L'ÉTAT FRANÇAIS [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], Aug. 26, 1941, p. 3594 141
- Ordonnance du 19 août 1944 relative au rétablissement de la légalité républicaine sur le territoire continental [Order of August 19, 1944, on the Restoration of Republican Law in the Continental Territory], JOURNAL OFFICIEL DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE (ALGER) [OFFICIAL GAZETTE OF FRANCE (ALGERIA)], Aug. 10, 1944, p. 688 141
- Ordonnance du 16 octobre 1944 relative a la restitution par l'administration des domaines de certains biens mis sous séquestre [Order of October 16, 1944, Relating to Restitution by the Administration of Certain Property Under Sequestration], JOURNAL OFFICIEL DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], Oct. 16–17, 1944, p. 964 141
- Loi 46-2389 du 28 octobre 1946 sur les dommages de guerre [Law 46-2389 of October 28, 1946, on War Damages], JOURNAL OFFICIEL DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], Oct. 29, 1946, p. 9191 138, 142
- Ordonnance du 14 novembre 1944 portant application de l'ordonnance du 12 novembre 1943 sur la nullité des actes de spoliation accomplis par l'ennemi et sous son contrôle [Order of November 14, 1944, on the Application of the Order of November 12, 1943 on the Nullity of Acts of Spoliation Carried Out by the Enemy Under Its Control], JOURNAL OFFICIEL DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], Nov. 15, 1944, p. 1310 141–142
- Ordonnance 45-770 du 21 avril 1945 portant deuxième application de l'ordonnance du 12 novembre 1943 sur la nullité des actes de spoliation accomplis par l'ennemi ou sous son contrôle et édictant la restitution aux victimes de ces actes de ceux de leur biens qui ont fait l'objet d'actes de disposition [Order 45-770 of April 21, 1945, on the Second Application of the Order of November 12, 1943, on the Nullity of Acts of Spoliation Carried Out by the Enemy or Under Its Control and Decreeing the Restitution to the Victims of These Acts Those of Their Property Which Have Been the Object of Acts of Disposition], JOURNAL OFFICIEL DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], Apr. 22, 1945, p. 2283 142
- Loi 46-2389 du 28 octobre 1946 sur les dommages de guerre [Law 46-2389 of October 28, 1946, on War Damages], JOURNAL OFFICIEL DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], Oct. 29, 1946, p. 9191 142
- Loi 50-1568 du 26 décembre 1950 modifie les art. 14, 22, 23 de l'ordonnance du 21-04-1945: opposition des actionnaires spoliés, nomination d'administrateur provisoire, action en nullité de l'administration des domaines [Law 50-1568 of December 26, 1950, modifying Articles 14, 22, and 23 of the April 21, 1945, Order: Opposition of Despoiled Shareholders, Appointment of Provisional Director, Action in Nullity of the Administration of Domains], JOURNAL OFFICIEL DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], Dec. 27, 1950, p. 13193 147
- Décret 99-778 du 10 septembre 1999 instituant une commission pour l'indemnisation des victimes de spoliations intervenues du fait des législations antisémites en vigueur pendant l'Occupation [Decree 99-778 of September 10, 1999, establishing a commission for the compensation of the victims of spoliations occurring as a result of anti-Semitic legislation in force during the Occupation], JOURNAL OFFICIEL DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], Sept. 11, 1999, p. 13633 138

Décret 2014-555 du 28 mai 2014 relatif à certaines commissions administratives à caractère consultatif relevant du Premier ministre [Decree 2014-555 of May 28, 2014, on certain advisory committees of the Prime Minister], JOURNAL OFFICIEL DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], May 31, 2014, p. 9059 144

GERMANY

Bundesgesetz zur Entschädigung für Opfer der nationalsozialistischen Verfolgung [Bundesentschädigungsgesetz] [BEG] [Federal Compensation Act], 18 September 1953, as amended 152

Bundesgesetz zur Regelung der rückerstattungsrechtlichen Geldverbindlichkeiten des Deutschen Reichs und gleichgestellter Rechtsträger [Bundesrückerstattungsgesetz] [BRüG] [Federal Restitution Law], 19 July 1957, as amended 152

BÜRGERLICHES GESETZBUCH [BGB] [Civil Code], § 985 [Claim for Restitution] 163

Gesetz über die Entschädigung nach dem Gesetz zur Regelung offener Vermögensfragen und über staatliche Ausgleichsleistungen für Enteignungen auf besatzungsrechtlicher oder besatzungshoheitlicher Grundlage [Entschädigungs- und Ausgleichsleistungsgesetz] [EALG] [Compensation and Adjustment Payments Act], 27 September 1994, as amended 161

Gesetz zur Regelung offener Vermögensfragen [Vermögensgesetz] [VermG] [Act on the Settlement of Open Property], 23 September 1990, as amended 152

NS-Verfolgtenentschädigungsgesetz [NS-VEntschG] [Nazi Persecution Compensation Act], 27 September 1994, as amended 152

GREECE

Diatagma (1949) [Royal Decree of 1949 for the Establishment of the Organization for the Relief and Rehabilitation of the Israelites of Greece], EPHEMERIS TES KYVERNESEOS [Government Gazette], 29 March 1949, A:79 175

Nomos (1943:205) [Occupation Law 205/1943] [Service of Administration of Jewish Properties] [YDIP], EPHEMERIS TES KYVERNESEOS [Government Gazette], 1 June 1943, A:160 173

Nomos (1944: 1180) [Occupation Law 1180/1944] [Service of Administration of Jewish Properties] [YDIP], EPHEMERIS TES KYVERNESEOS [Government Gazette], 12 February 1944, A:26 173

Nomos (1944: 1977) [1977/1944 Annulment of Law 1180/1944], EPHEMERIS TES KYVERNESEOS [Government Gazette], 10 October 1944, A:241 173

Nomos (1944: 2) [2/1944 Annulment of Laws 1977/1944 and 1180/1944 and the Return-Restitution of Jewish Properties & Possessions (to their rightful owners)], EPHEMERIS TES KYVERNESEOS [Government Gazette], 27 October 1944, A:6 173

Nomos (1945:337) [337/1945 Concerning the Annulment of Law 205/1944 Regarding the Administration of Jewish Properties Impounded by the Occupation Authorities or Abandoned], EPHEMERIS TES KYVERNESEOS [Government Gazette], 23 May 1945, A:121 173

Nomos (1945: 808) [Compulsory Law 808/1945], EPHEMERIS TES KYVERNESEOS [Government Gazette], 31 December 1945, A:324 173

Nomos (1946:846) [Emergency Law 846/1946] [Abolition of the Rights of the Greek State to Inherit Jewish Property], EPHEMERIS TES KYVERNESEOS [Government Gazette], 22 January 1946, A:17 175

Nomos (2011:3943) [Cemetery Compensation 3943/2011], EPHEMERIS TES KYVERNESEOS [Government Gazette] 31 March 2011, A:66, art. 45, para. 10 174

HUNGARY

1991. évi XXV. törvény a tulajdonviszonyok rendezése érdekében, az állam által az állampolgárok tulajdonában igazságtalanul okozott károk részleges kárpótlásáról (Act XXV of 1991 on the Partial Compensation of Damages Wrongfully Caused by the State to the Property of Citizens, for the Purpose of the Settlement of Ownership Relations) 179, 185

1991. évi XXXII. törvény a volt egyházi ingatlanok tulajdoni helyzetének rendezéséről (Act XXXII of 1991 on the settlement of the ownership status of former church owned real properties) 179

1992. évi XXIV. törvény a tulajdonviszonyok rendezése érdekében, az állam által az állampolgárok tulajdonában az 1939. május 1-jétől 1949. június 8-ig terjedő időben alkotott jogszabályok alkalmazásával igazságtalanul okozott károk részleges kárpótlásáról (Act XXIV of 1992 on the Partial Compensation of Damages Wrongfully Caused by the State to the Property of Citizens by Application of Legal Regulations Adopted between 1 May 1939 and 8 June 1949, for the Purpose of the Settlement of Ownership Relations) 179, 185
1997. évi X. törvény a Párizsi Békeszerződésről szóló 1947. évi XVIII. törvény 27. Cikke 2. pontjában foglaltak végrehajtásáról (Act X of 1997 on the implementation of provisions included in Article 27, Item No. 2, of Act XVIII of 1947, related to the Peace Treaty of Paris) 189
- 104/1991. (VIII. 3.) Korm. Rendelet a tulajdonviszonyok rendezése érdekében, az állam által igazságtalanul okozott károk részleges kárpótlásáról szóló 1991. évi XXV. törvény végrehajtásáról (Governmental Decree No. 104/1991 (VII. 3) on the Implementation of Act XXV of 1991 on the Partial Compensation of Damages Wrongfully Caused by the State to the Property of Citizens, for the Purpose of the Settlement of Ownership Relations) 185

ISRAEL

- Law No. 5766-2006 [2006 Assets of Holocaust Victims Law—Restitution to Heirs and Dedication to Aid and Commemoration] 196

ITALY

- Regio Decreto Legge 20 gennaio 1944, n.25, G.U. 9 February 1944, n.5 [Royal Law Decree (RDL) 25/1944] 204
- Regio Decreto Legge 20 gennaio 1944, n.26 [Royal Law Decree (RDL) 26/1944], *see* Decreto Legislativo Luogotenenziale 5 ottobre 1944, n.252, G.U. 20 October 1944, n.71. 204, 205
- Decreto Legislativo Luogotenenziale 5 ottobre 1944, n.249, G.U. 18 October 1944, n.70 [Lieutenant Legislative Decree (DLLGT) 249/1944] 204
- Decreto Legislativo Luogotenenziale 12 aprile 1945, n.222, G.U. 22 May 1945, n.61 [RDL 222/1945] 205
- Decreto Legislativo Presidenziale 27 giugno 1946, n.35, G.U. 2 August 1946, n.172 [Legislative Decree (DLG) 35/1946] 209
- Decreto Legislativo Luogotenenziale 5 maggio 1946, n.393, G.U. 4 June 1946, n.128 [DLLGT 393/1946] 205
- Decreto Legislativo del capo Provvisorio dello Stato, 11 maggio 1947, n.364, G.U. 27 May 1947, n.119 [DLCPS 364/1947] 201, 205, 210
- Decreto Legislativo del capo Provvisorio dello Stato 31 luglio 1947, n.801 [DLCPS 801/1947] 205
- Decreto Legislativo 17 aprile 1948, n.736, G.U. 22 June 1948, n.143 [Legislative Decree (DLG) 736/1948] 201, 209
- Legge 18 luglio 1997, n.233, G.U. 24 July 1997, n.171 [Law 233/1997] 201, 210
- Decreto del Presidente della Repubblica 8 giugno 2001, n.327, G.U. 16 August 2001, n.189 *supp.* n.211 [Decree of the President of the Republic No. 327/2001] 209

LATVIA

- Par īpašumu atdošanu reliģiskajām organizācijām [12 May 1992 Law of Restitution of Property to Religious Organizations] ZIŅOTĀJS 1992: 22/23 of 4 June 1992 214, 219
- Grozījumi likumā “Par nekustamā īpašuma nodošanu sabiedriskajai organizācijai “Rīgas Ebreju kopiena” [Amendment Concerning the Transfer of Real Property in Riga to the Council of Jewish Communities in Latvia] LATVIJAS VESTNESIS [OFFICIAL GAZETTE OF LATVIA] No. 48 (48.5) (5620) of 9 March 2016. *See also* LATVIJAS VESTNESIS [OFFICIAL GAZETTE OF LATVIA] No. 48 (5620) of 9 March 2016, numbers 48.11 (Jūrmalā, Kļāvu), 48.12 (Kandavā, Lielā), 48.13 (Rīgā, Abrenes), 48.14 (Rīgā, Ernesta Birznieka-Upīša), and 48.15 (Rīgā, Ludzas) 221

LITHUANIA

- Pilietybės [1991 Law on Citizenship, 5 December 1991, Law No. I-2072, VALSTYBĖS ŽINIOS [Official Gazette of Lithuania] No. 36-977, 31 December 1991 229

- Dėl Lietuvos Respublikos Pilietybės Įstatymo Pakeitimo Ir Papildymo [1995 Law Amending the Act on Citizenship of the Republic of Lithuania, 3 October 1995, Law, No. I-1053], VALSTYBĖS ŽINIOS [Official Gazette of Lithuania] No. 86-194, 20 October 1995 230
- Dėl Piliečių Nuosavybės Teisių Į Išlikusį Nekilnojamąjį Turtą Atstatymo Tvarkos Ir Sąlygų [1991 Law on the Procedure and Conditions of Restoration of the Rights of Ownership to Existing Real Property, 18 June 1991, Law No. I-1454], VALSTYBĖS ŽINIOS [Official Gazette of Lithuania] No. 21-545, 31 July 1991 228
- Geros Valios Kompensacijos Už Žydų Religinių Bendruomenių Nekilnojamąjį Turtą [2011 Law on Good Will Compensation for the Real Estate of Jewish Communities, 21 June 2011, Law No. XI-1470], VALSTYBĖS ŽINIOS [Official Gazette of Lithuania] No. 80-3897, 2 July 2011 235
- Piliečių Nuosavybės Teisių Į Išlikusį Nekilnojamąjį Turtą Atkūrimo [1997 Law on the Restoration of the Rights of Ownership of Citizens to the Existing Real Property, 27 July 1997, Law No. VIII-359, as amended], VALSTYBĖS ŽINIOS [Official Gazette of Lithuania] No. 65-1558, 9 July 1997 228
- Pilietybės Įstatymas [2010 Law on Citizenship, 2 December 2010, Law No. XI-1196], VALSTYBĖS ŽINIOS [Official Gazette of Lithuania] No. 144-7361, 9 December 2010 231
- Piliečių Nuosavybės Teisių Į Išlikusį Nekilnojamąjį Turtą Atkūrimo Įstatymo 10 Straipsnio Pakeitimo [2004 Act Amending the Law on Restoration of the Rights of Ownership of Citizens to the Existing Real Property, 12 October 2004, Law No. IX-2490], VALSTYBĖS ŽINIOS [Official Gazette of Lithuania] No. 156-5695, 26 October 2004 231
- Religinių Bendrijų Teisės Į Išlikusį Nekilnojamąjį Turtą Atkūrimo Tvarkos [1995 Law on the Procedure for the Restoration of the Rights of Ownership of Religious Associations to Existing Real Property, 21 March 1995, Law No. I-822], VALSTYBĖS ŽINIOS [Official Gazette of Lithuania] No. 27-600, 29 March 1995 234

LUXEMBOURG

- Arrêté grand-ducal du 22 avril 1941, relatif aux mesures de dépossession effectuées par l'ennemi [22 April 1941 Decree Relating to the Measures of Dispossession Effected by the Enemy] MEMORIAL A [Official Gazette of Luxembourg] No. 3 of 1944 241, 244
- Arrêté grand-ducal du 7 juillet 1944 modifiant l'arrêté grand-ducal du 22 avril 1941 relatif aux mesures de dépossession effectuées par l'ennemi [7 July 1944 Amending the 1941 Decree] MEMORIAL A [Official Gazette of Luxembourg] No. 3 of 1944 244
- Arrêté grand-ducal du 17 août 1944 concernant la mise sous séquestre de la propriété ennemie [17 August 1944 Decree Concerning Sequestration of the Enemy] MEMORIAL A [Official Gazette of Luxembourg] No. 4 of 1944 244
- Loi du 25 février 1950 concernant l'indemnisation des dommages de guerre [25 February 1950 Law for War Damages] MEMORIAL A [Official Gazette of Luxembourg] No. 21 of 1950 244
- Code Civil [Civil Code] arts. 811-813 246

MACEDONIA

See also Bulgaria; Yugoslavia

- Закон за денационализација [1998 Law on Denationalization] SLUZHBN VESNIK [Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia] No. 20/1998 of 29 April 1998 250, 256
- Закон за денационализација [2000 Law on Denationalization, as amended] SLUZHBN VESNIK [Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia] No. 43/2000 of 30 May 2000 250, 256

MOLDOVA

- Privind reabilitarea victimelor represiunilor politice [Law Concerning the Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repressions] Law No. 1225-XII of 8 December 1992 as amended by Law No. 295-XIII of 23 November 1994, Law No. 84-XIV of 8 July 1998, Law No. 133-134/656 of 2 December 1999, Law No. 520-XV of 11 November 2001, Law No. 186-XVI of 29 June 2006 268

MONTENEGRO

See also Yugoslavia

- Zakon o pravednoj restituciji [Just Restitution Act] SLUŽBENI LIST REPUBLIKE CRNE GORE [Official Gazette of Montenegro] broj 34/2002, 262 274

- Zakon o povraćaju oduzetih imovinskih prava i obeštećenju [Law on Restitution of Property and Compensation/Restitution of Expropriated Property Rights and Compensation Act] SLUŽBENI LIST REPUBLIKE CRNE GORE [Official Gazette of Montenegro] broj 21/2004, 178 274
- Zakon o opštem upravnom postupku [General Administrative Proceedings Act] SLUŽBENI LIST REPUBLIKE CRNE GORE [Official Gazette of Montenegro] broj 60/2003, 462 281–282
- Zakon o upravnom sporu [Administrative Disputes Act] SLUŽBENI LIST REPUBLIKE CRNE GORE [Official Gazette of Montenegro] broj 60/2003, 463 281–282

NETHERLANDS

- VO 145/1940, 20 September 1940, Verordnung des Reichskommissars für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete über die Erfassung nichtwirtschaftlicher Personenvereinigungen und Stiftungen, in *Verordnungsblatt für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete*, Stück 27, 21 September 1940, 445, *reprinted in VERORDNUNGSBLATT FÜR DIE BESETZTEN NIEDERLÄNDISCHEN GEBIETE: JAHR 1940* 298–299
- VO 189/1940, 22 October 1940, Verordnung des Reichskommissars für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete über die Anmeldung von Unternehmen, in *Verordnungsblatt für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete*, Stück 33, 26 October 1940, 546, *reprinted in VERORDNUNGSBLATT FÜR DIE BESETZTEN NIEDERLÄNDISCHEN GEBIETE: JAHR 1940* 294
- VO 41/1941, 28 February 1941, Verordnung des Reichskommissars für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete zur Neuordnung auf dem Gebiete der nichtwirtschaftlichen Personenvereinigungen und Stiftungen, in *Verordnungsblatt für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete*, Stück 8, 3 March 1941, 148, *VERORDNUNGSBLATT FÜR DIE BESETZTEN NIEDERLÄNDISCHEN GEBIETE: JAHR 1940* 298–299
- VO 48/1941, 12 March 1941, Verordnung des Reichskommissars für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete über die Behandlung anmeldepflichtiger Unternehmen in *Verordnungsblatt für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete*, Stück 10, 13 March 1941, 164, *VERORDNUNGSBLATT FÜR DIE BESETZTEN NIEDERLÄNDISCHEN GEBIETE: JAHR 1940* 294
- VO 102/1941, 27 May 1941, Verordnung des Reichskommissars für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete über die Anmeldung und Behandlung landwirtschaftlicher Grundstücke in jüdischen Händen, in *Verordnungsblatt für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete*, Stück 24, 31 May 1941, 388, *VERORDNUNGSBLATT FÜR DIE BESETZTEN NIEDERLÄNDISCHEN GEBIETE: JAHR 1940* 294
- VO 154/1941, 11 August 1941, Verordnung des Reichskommissars für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete über den jüdischen Grundbesitz, in *Verordnungsblatt für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete*, Stück 34, 16 August 1941, 655, *VERORDNUNGSBLATT FÜR DIE BESETZTEN NIEDERLÄNDISCHEN GEBIETE: JAHR 1940* 294
- Besluit van 17 September 1944, houdende vaststelling van het Besluit bezettingsmaatregelen [Besluit Bezettingsmaatregelen] [Occupation Measures Decree], 17 September 1944, STAATSBLAD VAN HET KONINKRIJK DER NEDERLANDED [Stb.] [Official Gazette], E93 295
- Besluit van 17 September 1944, houdende vaststelling van het Besluit herstel rechtsverkeer [Besluit Herstel Rechtsverkeer] [Decree for the Restoration of the Rule of Law], 17 September 1944, STAATSBLAD VAN HET KONINKRIJK DER NEDERLANDED [Stb.] [Official Gazette], E100 295
- Besluit van 20 October 1944, houdende vaststelling van het Besluit Vijandelijk Vermogen [Besluit Vijandelijk Vermogen] [Enemy Property Decree], 20 October 1944, STAATSBLAD VAN HET KONINKRIJK DER NEDERLANDED [Stb.] [Official Gazette], E133 295

NORWAY

- Lov om inndraging av formue som tilhører jøder [Law on the Confiscation of Property Belonging to Jews] NORSK LOVTIDEND 2 Avd. 1942, No. 55 [Gazette of Norway], Oct. 26, 1942, p. 737. 305

POLAND

- Dekret Polskiego Komitetu Wyzwolenia Narodowego z dnia 6 września 1944 r. o przeprowadzeniu reformy rolnej [6 September 1944 Decree on Agrarian Reform] DZIENNIK USTAW [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1944 Nr. 4 poz. 17 [1944 No. 4, item 17] 326
- Dekret Polskiego Komitetu Wyzwolenia Narodowego z dnia 12 grudnia 1944 r. o przejęciu niektórych lasów na własność Skarbu Państwa [12 December 1944 Decree on Takeover by the State Treasury of

- Ownership of Certain Forests] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1944 nr. 15 poz. 82 [1944 No. 15, item 82] 326
- Rozporządzenie Ministra Sprawiedliwości z dnia 21 stycznia 1946 r. w sprawie wykonania dekretu z dnia 6 czerwca 1945 r. o mocy obowiązującej orzeczeń sądowych wydanych w okresie okupacji niemieckiej na terenie Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej [6 June 1945 Decree on Judicial Decisions Made During the German Occupation] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1946 nr. 6 poz. 56 [1946 No. 6, item 56] 324
- Dekret z dnia 26 października 1945 r. o własności i użytkowaniu gruntów na obszarze m. st. Warszawy [26 October 1945 Decree on Ownership and Usufruct of Land in the Area of the Capital of Warsaw] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1945 nr. 50 poz. 279 [1945 No. 50, item 279] 327
- Ustawa z dnia 3 stycznia 1946 r. o przejęciu na własność Państwa podstawowych gałęzi gospodarki narodowej [3 January 1946 Act on the Nationalization of Basic Branches of the State Economy] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1946 nr. 3 poz. 17 [1946 No. 3, item 17] 328
- Dekret z dnia 8 marca 1946 r. o majątkach opuszczonych i ponemieckich [8 March 1946 Decree Regarding Post-German and Deserted Properties] 325
- Ustawa z dnia 29 kwietnia 1985 r. o gospodarce gruntami i wywłaszczeniu nieruchomości [29 April 1985 Land Administration and Expropriation Act] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1985 nr. 22 poz. 99 [1985 No. 22, Item 99] *as repealed by* Ustawa z dnia 21 sierpnia 1997 r. o gospodarce nieruchomościami [21 August 1997 Land Administration and Expropriation Act] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1997 nr. 115 poz. 741 [1997 No. 115, Item 741] 339, 340
- Ustawa z dnia 10 maja 1990 r. Przepisy wprowadzające ustawę o samorządzie terytorialnym i ustawę o pracownikach samorządowych [10 May 1990 Local Self-Government Act] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1990 nr. 32 poz. 191 [1990 No. 32, Item 191] 340
- Ustawa z dnia 10 czerwca 1994 r. o zagospodarowaniu nieruchomości Skarbu Państwa przejętych od wojsk Federacji Rosyjskiej [10 June 1994 Law on the Administration of Real Property Taken Over by the State Treasury From the Army of the Russian Federation] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1994 nr. 79 poz. 363 [1994 No. 79, Item 363] 340
- Ustawa z dnia 30 maja 1996 r. o gospodarowaniu niektórymi składnikami mienia Skarbu Państwa oraz o Agencji Mienia Wojskowego [30 May 1996 Law on the Administration of Certain Portions of the State Treasury's Property and the Military Property Agency] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1996 nr. 90 poz. 405 [1996 No. 90, Item 405] *repealed* Ustawa z dnia 10 lipca 2015 r. o Agencji Mienia Wojskowego *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 2015 poz. 1322 [2015 Item 1322] 340
- Ustawa z dnia 20 lutego 1997 r. o stosunku Państwa do gmin wyznaniowych żydowskich w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej [20 February 1997 Law on the Relationship Between the State and Jewish Communities] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 1997 nr. 41 poz. 251 [1997 No. 41, Item 251] 313
- Ustawa z dnia 8 lipca 2005 r. o realizacji prawa do rekompensaty z tytułu pozostawienia nieruchomości poza obecnymi granicami Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej [8 July 2005 Law on Exercising the Right to Compensation for Immovable Property Left Outside the Borders of the Republic of Poland] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 2005 nr. 169 poz. 1418 [2005 No. 169, Item 1418] 344
- Ustawa z dnia 25 czerwca 2015 r. o zmianie ustawy o gospodarce nieruchomościami oraz ustawy - Kodeks rodzinny i opiekuńczy [25 June 2015 Act Amending the Law on Real Estate Management and the Law—the Family and Guardianship Code] *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 2016 poz. 1271 [2016 item 1271] 327
- Kodeks postępowania administracyjnego [Code of Administrative Procedure]. For a uniform text of the Act as of 27 June 2017, *see* *DZIENNIK USTAW* [Dz. U.] [Journal of Laws] 2017 poz. 1257 [2017 item 1257] 330

ROMANIA

- L. nr. 187/23-03-1945 [Decree No. 187/1945] [pentru înfăptuirea reformei agrare] *MONITORUL OFICIAL* [Official Gazette of Romania] nr.38/23 March 1945 366
- L. nr. 119/11-06-1948 [Law No. 119/1948 of 11 June 1948] [pentru naționalizarea întreprinderilor industriale, bancare, de asigurări, miniere și de transporturi] *MONITORUL OFICIAL* [Official Gazette of Romania] nr. 133 bis/11 June 1948 366

- D. nr. 113/29-06-1948 [Decree No. 113/1948 of 29 June 1948] [cu privire la bunurile rămase de pe urma evreilor, victime ale unor măsuri de persecuție, decedați fără moștenitori] MONITORUL OFICIAL [Official Gazette of Romania] nr. 140/30 June 1948 360, 374
- D. nr. 92/19-04-1950 [Decree No. 92/1950 of 19 April 1950] [pentru nationalizarea unor imobile (prin care se nationalizeaza imobilele cladite ale fostilor industriasi, fostilor bancheri, fostilor mari comercianti și celorlalte elemente ale marii burghezii, imobile cladite ale exploatatorilor de locuinte, hoteluri și alte asemenea)] BULETINUL OFICIAL [Official Gazette of Romania] nr. 36/20 April 1950 367
- L. nr. 112/25-11-1995 [Law No. 112/1995 of 25 November 1995] [pentru reglementarea situației juridice a unor imobile cu destin ația de locuințe, trecute în proprietatea statului] MONITORUL OFICIAL [Official Gazette of Romania] nr. 279/29 November 1995 359, 367, 370
- L. nr. 10/08-02-2001 [Law No. 10/2001 of 8 February 2001] [privind regimul juridic al unor imobile preluate în mod abuziv în perioada 6 martie 1945 - 22 decembrie 1989] MONITORUL OFICIAL [Official Gazette of Romania] nr. 75/14 February 2001 359
- L. nr. 247/19-07-2005 [Law No. 247/2005 of 19 July 2005] [privind reforma în domeniile proprietății și justiției, precum și unele măsuri adiacente] 359, 368
- L. nr. 165/16-05-2013 [Law No. 165/2013 of 16 May 2013] [privind măsurile pentru finalizarea procesului de restituire, în natură sau prin echivalent, a imobilelor preluate în mod abuziv în perioada regimului comunist în România] MONITORUL OFICIAL [Official Gazette of Romania] nr. 278/17 May 2013 360, 370

SERBIA

See also Yugoslavia

- Zakon o prijavljivanju i evidentiranju oduzete imovine [2005 Law on Reporting and Recording of Nationalized Property]. SLUŽBENI GLASNIK REPUBLIKE SRBIJE [SR] [Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia] No. 45/2005 392
- Nacrt zakona o denacionalizaciji [2007 Draft Law on Denationalization], *reprinted in Hereticus* 1/2008 (VI) (2008) 386
- Zakon o vraćanju oduzete imovine i obeštećenju [Law on Property Restitution and Compensation]. SLUŽBENI GLASNIK REPUBLIKE SRBIJE [SR] [Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia] No. 72/2011 386
- Zakon o otklanjanju posledica oduzimanja imovine žrtvama holokausta koje nemaju živih zakonskih naslednika [Law on the Elimination of Consequences of Property Confiscation of Heirless Holocaust Victims]. SLUŽBENI GLASNIK REPUBLIKE SRBIJE [SR] [Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia] No. 13/2016 386

SLOVAKIA

See also Czechoslovakia; Czech Republic

- Dekret presidenta republiky o neplatnosti některých majetkově-právních jednání z doby nesvobody a o národní správě majetkových hodnot Němců, Maďarů, zrádců a kolaborantů a některých organizací a ústavů [Decree No. 5/1945 Concerning the Invalidity of Transactions Involving Property Rights from the Time of the Oppression and Concerning the National Administration of Property Assets of Germans, Magyars, Traitors and Collaborationists and of Certain Organizations and Associations]. Dekret č. 5/1945 Sb 104, 401, 405
- Zákon o neplatnosti některých majetkově-právních jednání z doby nesvobody a o nárocích z této neplatnosti a z jiných zásahů do majetku vzcházejících [Law No. 128/1946 on the Invalidity of Certain Property-Related Legal Acts Taken in the Period of Non-Freedom and on Claims Arising from Such Invalidity and Other Interference with Property]. Zákon č. 128/1946 Sb 401, 405
- Zákon o Likvidačním fondu měnovém [Currency Liquidation Fund]. Zákon č. 141/1947 Sb 410
- Zákon o mimosúdnych rehabilitáciách [Act No. 87/1991 Rehabilitation Law, as amended]. Zákon 87/1991 Zb 103, 401, 406, 407
- Zákon o súdnej rehabilitácii [Law No. 119/1990 on Judicial Rehabilitation]. Zákon 119/1990 Zb 407
- Zákon o úpravě vlastnických vztahů k půdě a jinému zemědělskému majetku [Act No. 229/1991 as amended on Ownership Rights of Land and Other Agricultural Property]. Zákon 229/1991 Zb 103, 109, 401, 407

- Zákon Slovenskej národnej rady o zmiernení niektorých majetkových a iných krívd a o pôsobnosti orgánov štátnej správy Slovenskej republiky v oblasti mimosúdnych rehabilitácií [Law No. 319/1991 on Redressing Certain Property Injustices, as amended]. Zákon 319/1991 Zb 407
- Zákon o úprave majetkových vzťahov a vyporiadaní majetkových nárokov v družstvách [Law No. 42/1992 on Adjustment of Ownership Relations Concerning Agricultural Property, as amended]. Zákon 42/1992 Zb 407
- Zákon Národnej rady Slovenskej republiky o zmiernení niektorých majetkových krívd spôsobených cirkvám a náboženským spoločnostiam [Act No. 282/1993 on the Mitigation of Certain Injustices Caused to Churches and Religious Communities, as amended]. Zákon 282/1993 Z.z 402
- Zákon o navrátení vlastníctva k nehnuteľným veciam cirkvám a náboženským spoločnostiam a prechode vlastníctva k niektorým nehnuteľnostiam [Law No. 161/2005 on Restitution]. Zákon 161/2005 Z.z 409

SLOVENIA

See also Yugoslavia

- Zakon o denacionalizaciji [1991 Denationalization Act] URADNI LIST REPUBLIKE SLOVENIJE [RS] [Official Gazette of Slovenia] št. 27/1991 [No. 27/1991], 29 November 1991 416

SPAIN

- Ley Orgánica 16/2015, de 27 de octubre, sobre privilegios e inmunidades de los Estados extranjeros, las Organizaciones Internacionales con sede u oficina en España y las Conferencias y Reuniones internacionales celebradas en España [Law 16/2015 on Privileges and Immunity of Foreign States, International Organizations and Conferences], B.O.E. 2015, 258 431

TURKEY

- Varlık Vergisi hakkında Kanun No. 4305 [Wealth Tax Law No. 4305] 11 November 1942, T.C. RESMÎ GAZETE [Official Gazette of Turkey], 12.11.1942, No. 5255 447

UKRAINE

Laws

- Про порядок введення в дію Закону Української РСР “Про реабілітацію жертв політичних репресій на [...] Верховна Рада УРСР”; Постанова від 17.04.1991 No. 963-XII [The Law of Ukraine from 17 April 1991 “On rehabilitation of victims of political reprisals”] 452
- Про свободу совісті та релігійні організації Верховна Рада УРСР; Закон від 23.04.1991 No. 987-XII [The Law of Ukraine from 23 April 1991 “On freedom of worship and religious organizations” (with amendments and appendices) (Article 17 in particular)] 452

Presidential Decrees

- Про заходи щодо повернення релігійним організаціям культового майна Президент України; Указ від 04.03.1992 No. 125 [The Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 125 from 4 March 1992 “On measures for restitution of iconic property to religious organizations”] 452
- Про повернення релігійним організаціям культового майна Президент України; Розпорядження від 22.06.1994 No. 53/94-рп [Ordinance of the President of Ukraine No. 53/94-rp from 22 June 1994 “On restitution of iconic property to religious organizations”] 452

Cabinet of Ministers Orders

- Про внесення змін і доповнень до Положення про порядок виплати компенсацій, повернення майна або [...] Кабінет Міністрів України; Постанова від 18.02.1993 No. 112 [Decree of the Cabinet of the Ministers Ukraine No. 112 from 18 February 1993 “Regulations on the indemnification payment order, restitution of property or indemnification of its costs to rehabilitated people”] 452
- Про передачу релігійним організаціям культових будівель, в яких розміщуються державні архіви Кабінет Міністрів України; Розпорядження від 16.06.1995 No. 357-p [Order of the Cabinet of

Ministers Ukraine No. 357-p from 16 June 1995 “On passage of iconic constructions where the states archives are, to religious organizations”] 452

Про умови передачі культових будівель - визначних пам'яток архітектури релігійним організаціям Кабінет Міністрів України; Постанова від 14.02.2002 No. 137 [Order of the Cabinet of Ministers Ukraine No. 137 from 14 February 2002 “On conditions of passage of iconic constructions—out-standing monuments of architecture to religious organizations”] 452

UNITED KINGDOM

Trading with the Enemy Act 1939, 15 & 16 Geo. 5 c.89 455

UNITED STATES

International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, Pub. L. No. 81-455, 64 Stat. 12 (1950) (codified as amended in scattered sections of 22 U.S.C.) 471

Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976, Pub. L. No. 94-583, 90 Stat. 2891 (codified as amended in scattered sections of 28 U.S.C.) 464, 471

YUGOSLAVIA

See also Macedonia; Serbia

Zakon o postupanju sa imovinom koju su vlasnici morali napustiti u toku okupacije i imovinom koja im je oduzeta od strane okupatora i njegovih pomagača, SLUŽBENI LIST DFJ [Gazette of Yugoslavia] broj 36/45 [Law No. 36/45 on Handling Property Abandoned by Its Owner During the Occupation and Property Seized by the Occupier and Collaborators] 45, 50, 81, 249, 254, 273, 278, 385, 390

Zakon o potvrđi i izmenama i dopunama Zakona o postupanju sa imovinom koju su sopstvenici morali napustiti u toku okupacije i imovinom koja im je oduzeta od strane okupatora i njegovih pomagača, SLUŽBENI LIST DFJ [Gazette of Yugoslavia] broj 64/46) [Law No. 64/46 on Confirmation and Changes to the Law on Handling Property Abandoned by Its Owners During the Occupation and Property Seized by the Occupier and Collaborators, as amended] 50–51, 278, 390

Zakon o nacionalizaciji privatnih privrednih preduzeća SLUŽBENI LIST FNRJ [Gazette of Yugoslavia] broj 98/46 and 35/48 [Law No. 98/46 and 34/48 on Nationalization of Private Commercial Enterprises] 52, 255, 279

Osnovni zakon o eksproprijaciji SLUŽBENI LIST FNRJ [Gazette of Yugoslavia] broj 28/47 [Law No. 28/47 Fundamental Law on Expropriation] 52, 255

Introduction

The Nazis and their state-sponsored cohorts stole mercilessly from the Jews of Europe. Civilian and government bystanders became beneficiaries of this mass looting. As summarized in a best-selling study:

The plunder of Jewish property during the war had taken place in every country, and at every level of society. The comprehensive nature of this plundering was sometimes quite astounding. In the old Jewish quarter of Amsterdam, for example, the houses were stripped of everything right down to the wooden window and door frames. In Hungary, Slovakia and Romania, Jewish land and property was often divided up amongst the poor. Sometimes people did not even wait until the Jews had gone. There are examples in Poland of acquaintances approaching Jews during the war with the words, “Since you are going to die anyway, why should someone else get your boots? Why not give them to me so I will remember you?”

When handfuls of Jews began to come home after the war, their property was sometimes returned to them without any fuss—but this tended to be the exception rather than the rule. The historiography of this period in Europe is littered with stories of Jews trying, and failing, to get back what was rightfully theirs. Neighbors and friends who had promised to look after valuable items for Jews while they were away frequently refused to return them: in the intervening years they had come to regard them as their own. Villagers who had farmed Jewish land during the war saw no reason why returning Jews should benefit from the fruits of their labours. Christians who had been granted empty apartments by the wartime authorities considered those apartments rightfully theirs, and they had papers to prove it. All these people tended to regard Jews with varying degrees of resentment, and cursed their luck that, of all of the Jews that had “disappeared” during the war, *theirs* had to be the ones who came back.¹

In the aftermath of the Holocaust, returning victims—not only surviving European Jews but also Roma, political dissidents, homosexuals, persons with disabilities, Jehovah’s

¹ Keith Lowe, *Savage Continent: Europe in the Aftermath of World War II* (New York, St. Martin’s Press, 2012), at 197–198 (emphasis in original).

Witnesses, and others—were forced to navigate a frequently unclear and cumbersome legal path to recover their property from governments and neighbors who had failed to protect them, and often, who were complicit in their persecution. Many survivors persevered for years, attempting to recover their family’s property with little evidence or hope that they would succeed. Many others never knew recovering their stolen property was an option. Law was not the survivors’ ally; more often it was their enemy, providing impunity for thieves and those who held stolen property.

While the return of Nazi-looted art starting in the 1990s, and well-publicized settlements involving dormant Swiss bank accounts and unpaid insurance policies, have garnered media attention,² most legal mechanisms available in domestic courts and international tribunals for survivors and their heirs to recover real property stolen during the largest theft in history have not been addressed. Specifically, a significant amount of immovable property confiscated from European Jews remains unrestituted.

This book is about the less publicized, less well-known area of restitution: immovable property confiscated during World War II, and specifically the restitution efforts of the 47 countries that endorsed the Terezin Declaration. The success of such efforts is mixed. Countries across the European continent have passed an array of legal and diplomatic restitution or compensation measures. Some were enacted even before the war ended (e.g., the 1943 Inter-Allied Declaration against Acts of Dispossession committed in Territories under Enemy Occupation and Control, the “London Declaration” endorsed by 18 governments). Others have come into force more than 70 years later (e.g., Serbia’s 2016 Law on Elimination of Consequence of Property Confiscation of Heirless Holocaust Victims). Some measures resulted in at least partial restoration of the victims’ losses. Others existed in name only. In Eastern Europe, many property restitution laws were in effect for only a few years and were overturned as soon as the Communist authorities took power. Jews caught behind the Iron Curtain became double victims: first losing their assets to the Nazis, and then to the Communists. Much has still not been returned.

Against this backdrop of what U.S. Ambassador Stuart Eizenstat has termed “the unfinished business of World War II,”³ 47 countries⁴ in June 2009 issued the Terezin Declaration on the site of the Terezin concentration camp in the Czech Republic. By endorsing the Terezin Declaration, these nations agreed to continue and enhance their efforts to right the economic wrongs that accompanied the genocide committed against European Jews and other groups persecuted during the Holocaust (“Shoah,” in Hebrew).

The Terezin Declaration (and its companion document, the 2010 Guidelines and Best Practices,⁵ endorsed by 43 countries⁶) focuses in substantial part on the treatment of

² For Swiss bank deposits, see, e.g., *In re: Holocaust Victim Assets Litigation*, United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, Case No. CV-96-4849; see also <http://swissbankclaims.com> (official website of the *Swiss Banks Settlement*). For insurance proceeds, see, e.g., <http://icheic.ushmm.org> (official website of the International Commission on Holocaust Era Insurance Claims).

³ See, e.g., Stuart Eizenstat, *Imperfect Justice: Looted Assets, Slave Labor, and the Unfinished Business of World War II* (New York: PublicAffairs 2003). Ambassador Eizenstat served as Special Representative of the President and Secretary of State on Holocaust Issues during the Bill Clinton presidency and as Special Adviser on Holocaust issues during the George W. Bush and Barack Obama presidencies.

⁴ Serbia attended the 2009 Prague Conference on Holocaust Era Assets as an observer but later became the 47th country to endorse the Terezin Declaration.

⁵ The complete title of the 2010 Guidelines and Best Practices is: 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 1933–145, Including the Period of World War II.

⁶ Of the 47 countries that endorsed the Terezin Declaration, only Belarus, Malta, Poland, and Russia did not endorse the Best Practices.

immovable (real) property restitution: private, communal, and heirless property.⁷ Private property includes both prewar Jewish private property currently in the hands of the state and private individuals or entities. Immovable property also includes large amounts of Jewish communal property such as synagogues, clubs, social service organizations, and cemeteries, that have never been returned to the local Jewish community or the Jewish people at large. Finally, because 6 million European Jews were murdered between 1933 and 1945, including up to 90 percent of the Jewish population in some countries, such as Poland and the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, much of this lost property remains heirless, with the state becoming the legal successor to such heirless property. In the Terezin Declaration, countries agreed that the heirless property instead should be used to benefit needy Holocaust survivors, and for commemoration of destroyed communities and Holocaust education.

ESLI AND THE HOLOCAUST (SHOAH) IMMOVABLE PROPERTY RESTITUTION STUDY

Beginning with the so-called London Gold Conference in 1997, states have held numerous international conferences focusing on the restitution of various forms of Jewish property stolen during the Shoah. At the conclusion of each of these multinational conferences, the government delegates issued pronouncements to implement measures to finally confront Holocaust-era thievery. These pronouncements led to little action and actual implementation. The 2009 Prague Holocaust Era Assets Conference leading to the issuance of the Terezin Declaration aimed to change this pattern by creating the European Shoah Legacy Institute (ESLI).

ESLI was established in 2010 to monitor the signatory states' progress and advocate for the principles enshrined in the Terezin Declaration.⁸ In 2014, in fulfillment of its mission, ESLI commissioned the Holocaust (Shoah) Immovable Property Restitution Study (the "Study"), published in full in this book. Completed in January 2017, the Study is the first-ever comprehensive compilation of significant legislation passed by the 47 endorsing states since 1945, dealing with the return or compensation of land and businesses confiscated or otherwise misappropriated during the Holocaust era. It applies both to states where the Holocaust took place and states to which the proceeds of such misappropriated land and businesses had been moved.

The Study's comprehensiveness and methodology aims to break new ground in research and analysis of immovable property restitution following the Holocaust. It captures historical trends and reflects current gaps in law. It seeks to inspire answers, and raise new questions, to the intractable problems of property restitution—for example, with respect to heirless property that has been sparsely addressed. It aims to promote thoughtful discourse on the rationale behind immovable property restitution in general, who should benefit from it and who should pay for it. It is our hope that the Study will promote an ongoing, multilateral dialogue amongst states, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and domestic and international lawyers and jurists, and will lead to progress on the outstanding issues related to Holocaust-era immovable property restitution.

⁷ See also Elazar Barkan, *The Guilt of Nations: Restitution and Negotiating Historical Injustices* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2000), at 4 (describing the importance of restitution of all three types of property).

⁸ After eight years as a supporting platform for post-Holocaust issues, ESLI closed its doors in August 2017.

The Study also fulfills a practical purpose. Jewish and non-Jewish claimants, heirs, governments, NGOs, and other stakeholders will now have a one-stop resource where all significant Holocaust restitution legislation and case law dealing with immovable property over the last 70 years has been compiled and analyzed.

No such resource, in print or online, in any language, is available elsewhere. The Study is composed of 47 individual country reports, each of which is contained in a separate chapter in this book. The success of the restitution experience varies from country to country, depending largely on how each state has addressed some of the following challenges to devising a property restitution regime:

- The time frame for enacting restitution legislation—was restitution immediate or stalled until the 1990s or the present day?
- The nature and scope of nominal ownership for property to be restituted—was property in both public and private hands subject to restitution?
- The effectiveness of the claims process—do existing judicial and/or administrative structures have the capacity to adequately, efficiently, and transparently resolve property claims?
- The eligibility of claimants—is the claims process available to citizens only or open to persons of any nationality?
- Who keeps restituted property—does the state require foreign claimants to sell property back to a national?
- The rate of compensation—are claimants symbolically, partially, or fully compensated for property (in cash or bonds) when restitution *in rem* is not practicable?
- Former owners versus subsequent good faith purchasers—do restitution laws fairly protect those whose property was stolen as well as subsequent good faith purchasers?
- The treatment of heirless property—are the country’s usual inheritance rules overridden so that heirless property can be used for the benefit of Holocaust survivors and their heirs most in need?

In one form or another, these challenges track the benchmarks set forth in the 2010 Guidelines and Best Practices. They present a roadmap to carrying out restitution schemes in countries where there is still, in the words of Ambassador Eizenstat, “unfinished business.”

METHODOLOGY

Work on the Study began in the winter of 2014. The resulting country reports published in this book are the product of multilayer research and involved four stages.

In the first stage, *pro bono* attorneys from several top-tier international law firms conducted initial independent country research. Five leading multinational law firms contributed *pro bono* resources: Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck LLP; Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP; Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP; O’Melveny & Meyers LLP; and White & Case LLP.

A supervising attorney in each firm coordinated the *pro bono* work of each firm. Many of the participating lawyers were physically located in the country they researched and/or were licensed to practice there. These *pro bono* attorneys contributed hundreds of hours of their time toward gathering primary restitution legislation and case law.

The next stage involved contacting the Terezin Declaration governments directly. Government consultation is one of the unique features of the Study that sets its content apart from shorter, less comprehensive (yet still valuable) reports on immovable property prepared by other organizations. During summer 2015, all Terezin countries received

questionnaires and preliminary research findings. Nearly half the governments responded, some with just a few sentences and others with comprehensive information and statistics, for example, Austria and Israel.⁹

In the third stage, the ESLI research team (the authors herein) then conducted its own independent research, to verify, synthesize, and analyze the information provided by the law firms and governments to create a comprehensive report for each of the 47 Terezin Declaration countries. The length of each country report varies, depending on that country's connection to the Holocaust. For the European countries occupied by Nazi Germany, and especially those with a large prewar Jewish population such as Poland and the Baltic countries, the reports are more detailed than for those that remained neutral during the war, for example, Sweden, Spain, and Turkey—with the exception of neutral Switzerland, which disproportionately benefited from Nazi theft of Jewish property, or those countries outside the European theater of war (North and South America, Australia) that nevertheless endorsed the Terezin Declaration.

In the last stage, independent scholars, legal experts, and historians active in the Holocaust restitution field for that country reviewed each report for accuracy and provided valued input. The bibliography for each country report lists the outside experts who reviewed the reports prepared by the Study team.

CHAPTER OVERVIEWS

Each chapter of this book covers the restitution efforts of one of the 47 Terezin Declaration countries. Each chapter is therefore standardized. The chapters present the legal rubric for each country in the following order: (1) commitments made in post war armistice agreements, treaties, and claims settlement agreements following the immediate end of the Second World War; (2) private property restitution law and legislation, and restitution efforts undertaken from 1944 to the present time for such property; (3) communal property law and legislation, and restitution efforts undertaken from 1944 to the present time for such property; and (4) heirless property restitution law and legislation, and restitution efforts undertaken from 1944 to the present time for such property.¹⁰

For each country's restitution regime, either historical or current, the chapter:

- Catalogues the historical scope of restitution *in rem* and/or compensation legislation and its associated regulations;
- Identifies the time period covered by the legislation and what kind of property (private, communal, heirless) is covered;
- Ascertains whether eligibility is contingent upon citizenship in the legislating country;
- Clearly lists claim-filing deadlines;
- Describes how the claims process works, including who decides the claims, standards of proof, necessary documentation, associated costs, and appeals procedures;¹¹
- Describes notable judicial decisions interpreting the legislation, including national court decisions and decisions of the European Court of Human Rights; and

⁹ The government responses from the Study can be viewed in their entirety at <http://shoahlegacy.org>.

¹⁰ Some of the countries were liberated in 1944, and so began enacting restitution legislation immediately upon liberation.

¹¹ The Study team did not conduct on-the-ground archival research, but did review digitized archival material available (or accessible) online in English.

- Includes, where available, statistical information concerning, for example, the status of claims, value of restituted property, and length of claims process.

The chapters also place each country's legislation and restitution regime into its unique historical context. For example, the chapters include information regarding the so-called double confiscations—the widespread nationalization efforts by emerging postwar, Communist regimes which impacted the entire population, to elucidate why restitution efforts faltered or failed to come to fruition for decades following the end of the war. In addition, such context helps explain why restitution in these countries often involves more than returning or compensating for property confiscated during the Holocaust. It is also a matter of unwinding subsequent Communist nationalizations of that same property.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Study examined private, communal, and heirless property as discrete components of each country's restitution efforts from 1944 to 2016.

While the historical experiences of each country make its country report and the laws described therein wholly unique, certain patterns emerged as to how, when, and why the various restitution regimes have been or are still being carried out.

Broadly, countries in Western Europe initiated restitution measures almost immediately after the end of World War II. The work of national commissions and subsequent legislation of the 1990s and 2000s was therefore mainly focused on restitution completion efforts—gap-filling the restitution measures of the 1940s and 1950s. By contrast, for Eastern Europe, there was little time to create successful restitution schemes before Communist regimes came to power in each country and collectivized and nationalized private property. As a consequence, for Eastern European countries, legislation of the 1990s and 2000s required a more comprehensive approach—covering greater time periods and more property. Often, Holocaust-era confiscated property is specifically excluded from post-Communist restitution legislation.

More than 70 years after the conclusion of World War II, the “unfinished business”¹² of immovable property restitution remains unfinished. It remains to be seen whether there will be a future gap-filling period for restitution measures in Eastern Europe.

The Study examined restitution measures across the three main categories of immovable property: private, communal, and heirless. The findings are broken down into each category, and then grouped by region, Western Europe and Eastern Europe. While Terezin Declaration countries include many located outside of Europe, the cause and effect of World War II immovable property confiscation was contained within the continent—with certain exceptions, chiefly the United States and Israel.

Private Property

Private immovable (real) property is described in the Terezin Declaration Guidelines and Best Practices for the purpose of restitution as:

property owned by private individuals or legal persons, who either themselves or through their families owned homes, buildings, apartments or land, or who had other

¹² Stuart Eizenstat, *Imperfect Justice: Looted Assets, Slave Labor, and the Unfinished Business of World War II* (New York: PublicAffairs 2003). Much of the “unfinished business” identified by Ambassador Eizenstat concerned restitution or compensation of stolen property.

legal property rights, recognized by national law as of the last date before the commencement of persecution by the Nazis, Fascists and their collaborators, in such properties.

(Terezin Best Practices, para. b.)

For most Western European countries, including Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany (the then West Germany or Federal Republic of Germany), Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Norway, private property restitution measures were established immediately after the end of World War II and applied equally to citizens and noncitizens.¹³ The measures were relatively successful. This is, however, not to suggest that it was uniformly *easy* to get back what had been taken, that there was an absence of resistance to restitution, or that *all* property was restituted after the war. And in contrast to West Germany, in the former East Germany (German Democratic Republic), with few exceptions, no property restitution regime was established after the war. It was not until the unification of Germany in 1990 that property restitution measures in East Germany were established.

A resurgence of interest in Holocaust-era confiscations in the 1990s led to the creation of numerous national commissions of inquiry in Western Europe that examined the extent of property confiscation in each country and the degree to which property was returned—for example, the Austrian Historical Commission (Austria), The Study Mission on the Spoliation of Jews in France (France), and the Van Kemenade Commission (the Netherlands).

In general, the reports identified gaps in restitution or unfair or unreasonable consequences resulting from incomplete remedies for property restitution. Due to these commission findings, new national restitution mechanisms were established or lump-sum settlements reached with the domestic Jewish community.

For example, in 1999, the French government established the Commission for the Compensation for Victims of Spoliation (CIVS), to provide compensation to individual victims or their heirs who had not been previously compensated for damages resulting from legislation passed either by the Vichy government or by the occupying Germans.

In 1998, the government of Norway approved a comprehensive settlement with the Jewish community worth NOK 250 million (USD 33 million) that covered all claims—private, communal, and heirless—of the Jewish community. It has also been the case in some countries, such as Italy, that despite a historical commission's finding restitution gaps and making recommendations that further restitution be made, no additional measures have since been carried out.

Somewhat unique is private property restitution in the United Kingdom. While not occupied during World War II, the United Kingdom enacted legislation that confiscated property from “enemies” of the state. After the war, the United Kingdom set up a scheme to compensate victims of property confiscation. Around the time that other Western European national commissions were being set up in the late 1990s, the United Kingdom investigated the shortcomings of its initial restitution scheme and set up the Enemy Property Payment Scheme for victims of persecution under the confiscation law.

¹³ The exceptions included Denmark, whose restitution legislation applied only to Danish citizens, and France, where the immediate post-war restitution laws excluded both noncitizens and minors. This effectively excluded nearly half of the surviving Jews in France at the time. In addition, Luxembourg's 1950 Law for War Damages only applied to Luxembourg citizens.

The restitution experience of countries in Eastern Europe also began at the end of the war, but in the end followed a far more delayed and complicated path than that in most Western European countries.

Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia all passed some form of restitution legislation shortly after the end of World War II. Many of these states were compelled to do so by the terms of armistice agreements or a treaty of peace, for example, Article 5 of the 28 October 1944 Armistice Agreement with Bulgaria required that Bulgaria cancel all discriminatory legislation.

Shortly after early restitution measures were established, private industry, financial enterprises, and residential properties were nationalized by the newly installed Communist regimes throughout Eastern Europe. The outcome was that whatever property had been restituted was subject to a second round of confiscations, this time by Communist authorities. In Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, Soviet authorities nationalized private property twice, first upon their initial occupation during World War II and then a second time after expulsion of the Nazi German occupiers.

After emerging as transitional democratic states in the early 1990s, the post-Communist regimes passed private property restitution legislation. This legislation covered both Holocaust-era confiscations and Communist-era takings, when applicable. The amount of compensatory restitution and *in rem* restitution varied widely by country. Among them, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, and Slovakia limited eligible claimants to those who were citizens of their respective countries.¹⁴

Yugoslavia, which broke into the constituent states of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Slovenia after the fall of Communism, also enacted private property restitution legislation after World War II, for example, Law No. 36/45 (on Handling Property Abandoned by its Owner during the Occupation and Property Seized by the Occupier and his Collaborators) (Yugoslavia). However, like its Eastern European neighbors, restituted property was soon subject to Communist takings and nationalization.

The new democratic states of Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia, and Montenegro all passed denationalization legislation in the 1990s and 2000s, but the laws did *not* cover Holocaust-era takings (e.g., Law No. 92/96 on Restitution/Compensation of Property Taken under the Yugoslav Communist Rule (Croatia), Law No. 43/2000 (2000 Denationalization Law) (Macedonia)). Moreover, eligible claimants in Croatia, Slovenia, and Macedonia were limited to citizens of the respective countries.¹⁵ Serbia passed private property restitution legislation in 2011 (Law on Property Restitution and Compensation). Unlike many of the other Balkan countries, Serbia's legislation applies to both citizens and noncitizens. However, the text of the law is not clear whether it covers Holocaust-era property confiscations. Similarly, Moldova passed a law on restitution in 1992 and set up property commissions, such as the Law Concerning the Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repressions. But on its face, the law does not include Holocaust-era property confiscations.

¹⁴ A portion of a 2001 endowment fund set up by the Czech Republic later provided symbolic compensation for people unable to make restitution claims because of the citizenship requirement. In the case of Hungary, while the law did not strictly limit restitution to current citizens, it limited eligible claimants to those persons who were Hungarian citizens at the time of suffering the damage, suffered damage in conjunction with being deprived of their Hungarian citizenship, or were non-Hungarian citizens but were permanent residents in Hungary on December 31, 1990.

¹⁵ Contrary to the provisions of the existing laws in Croatia, the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia held in 2010 that a foreign national claimant *did* have a right to compensation.

Among Eastern European countries, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH), Poland, Russia, and Ukraine have all failed to establish a comprehensive private property restitution regime for property taken either during the Holocaust or Communist eras, or one that addresses both types of takings. A few of these countries established private property restitution legislation shortly after the war—for example, the 6 June 1945 Decree on the Binding Force of Judicial Decisions made during the German Occupation in the Territory of the Republic of Poland. But these measures were again short-lived due to the nationalization measures of the Communists who took over each country. In the mid- to late 1990s, one of the two autonomous entities that comprise BiH—the Republic of Srpska—also passed legislation on the denationalization of property, but not for Holocaust-era confiscations. The laws were later annulled and no new legislation has come into force at either the entity or national level.

Poland is the only member of the European Union (and a former Eastern European member of the Communist bloc) not to have passed comprehensive private property restitution legislation in the post-communist era. In the case of Poland, with the exception of so-called Bug River properties (property located in prewar Poland east of the Bug River that became part of the Soviet Union after the war), where legislation from 2005 has provided for a property compensation scheme that has withstood scrutiny from the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), Poland has no comprehensive private property restitution scheme for either Holocaust-era confiscations or Communist-era takings. The only recourse for rightful owners and heirs is to rely on long-standing provisions of generally applicable Polish law in the Polish Civil Code and the Polish Administrative Procedure Code, which are not tailored to address the experience of Holocaust victims and others who suffered massive personal and property losses in Poland during the war. Successful claimants before Polish courts appear to be only those who can demonstrate that their property was nationalized contrary to the letter of Communist legislation. This means that for property “legally” nationalized under then-existing Soviet-styled laws, there is no recourse.

The situation in Poland regarding restitution remains fluid, with proposals for a comprehensive restitution program still being hotly debated in the country.¹⁶

As the U.S. Department of State Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues explained in late 2015, “Jewish and non-Jewish Americans of former Polish citizenship have long complained that Polish laws governing property and the Polish court system are especially cumbersome, challenging, time consuming and expensive for claimants outside of Poland. The United States has consistently advocated for legislation or reforms to the court system that are fair, comprehensive, and nondiscriminatory and that are neither burdensome nor costly to the individual claimant.”¹⁷

¹⁶ For example, a special restitution regime was established in 1945 just for Warsaw under the so-called Bierut Decree (named after the first Communist leader of postwar Poland). The Communist authorities, however, failed to implement the law. Reprivatization of Warsaw properties only began taking place after 1989, but the process has lacked transparency. In 2016, city officials involved with the reprivatization process of Warsaw properties were forced to resign and the Anti-Corruption Bureau began an investigation, which is still ongoing. A law passed by the national parliament that came into effect on September 17, 2016, created a six-month deadline for pre-war owners of property in Warsaw to reactivate previous claims made under the Bierut Decree, although there are a number of exceptions and limitations on who may apply and what property is covered.

¹⁷ Letter from U.S. Dept. of State Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues to *Nowy Dziennik* (*Polish Daily News*), December 22, 2015, available at <http://wjro.org.il/cms/assets/uploads/2016/01/Nick-Dean-Response-to-Nowy-Dziennik-Letter-12.22.15.pdf>.

When asked about the situation in Poland during a visit to Israel in 2016, Polish Foreign Minister Witold Waszczykowski explained:

[P]roperty restitution has been underway in Poland for well over two decades now [...]. Property restitution is a process in which claimants' ethnic or religious background is irrelevant: the Polish law treats everyone in the same manner. As far as private property is concerned, the existing legal system in Poland makes it perfectly clear that any legal or natural person (or their heir) is entitled to recover prewar property unlawfully seized by either the Nazi German or the Soviet occupation authorities, or by the postwar communist regime.¹⁸

Finally, in Cyprus, Finland, Ireland, Malta, Portugal, Switzerland, Spain, and Sweden,¹⁹ private property of targeted groups was not confiscated as a cause or consequence of World War II and the Holocaust (Shoah). As a result, these countries do not have specifically applicable private property restitution legislation.

Communal Property

Communal property is described in the Terezin Declaration Guidelines and Best Practices for the purpose of restitution as:

property owned by religious or communal organizations and includes buildings and land used for religious purposes, e.g. synagogues, churches[,] cemeteries, and other immovable religious sites which should be restituted in proper order and protected from desecration or misuse, as well as buildings and land used for communal purposes, e.g. schools, hospitals, social institutions and youth camps, or for income generating purposes.

(Terezin Best Practices, para. b.)

In Western Europe, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Norway have all made provisions for communal property restitution. In many of the countries, communal property was restituted pursuant to the same laws as private property restitution. This contrasts with communal property legislation enacted in Eastern European countries, where communal property laws were often separate from private property laws.

For countries such as Austria, France, and Germany (West Germany), efforts were made shortly after World War II to return or pay compensation for communal property, for example, the First, Second, and Third Restitution Acts (Federal Law Gazette Nos. 156/1946, 53/1947, 148/1947) (Austria). Those initial measures have been supplemented by more recent legislation meant to gap-fill the return of communal property that was formerly missed or not included, for example, the Amendment to the General Social Security

¹⁸ Eldad Beck, "Polish Foreign Minister: There's more to us than the Holocaust," *ynetnews.com*, June 15, 2016 (last accessed August 1, 2016). The restitution of immovable property stolen during the Nazi and Communist eras remains a volatile issue in Poland. *See, e.g.*, Joanna Berendt, "Polish Court Limits World War II–Era Restitution Claims in Warsaw," *N.Y. Times*, July 27, 2016 (last accessed October 20, 2016).

¹⁹ In certain instances, German firms with Swedish subsidiaries used German Aryanization measures to their own advantage. However, Aryanization efforts in Sweden were largely unsuccessful. There is also evidence that some German Jewish property in Sweden was liquidated after the war.

Law and the Victims' Welfare Act (setting up the General Settlement Fund) (Federal Law Gazette No. 12/2001) (Austria).

Countries such as Greece and Italy relied upon laws passed immediately after the war for restitution and repair of communal property, for example, Law DLG 736/1948 (extending the provisions of DLG 35/1946 to non-Catholic buildings of worship, which were destroyed or damaged during the war) (Italy).

For Belgium and Luxembourg, communal property confiscation and damage was more isolated, and the Jewish communities were compensated directly for damages after the war. For Norway, as a result of its national commission of inquiry established in the late 1990s, a comprehensive settlement with the Jewish community was made to compensate for the economic and physical liquidation of the community, and for the local preservation of Jewish culture and the Jewish community.

In Eastern Europe, communal property restitution legislation of some type—be it applicable to both Holocaust-era confiscations and denationalization, or just denationalization—has been passed in Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Serbia.

Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia all passed communal property restitution legislation in the early 1990s that covered property confiscated during the Holocaust era and during the Communist era, for example, Act No. 282/1993 (on the Mitigation of Certain Injustices Caused to Churches and Religious Communities) (Slovakia), and the 1997 Law on the Relationship Between the State and Jewish Communities (Poland). In Slovakia, the communal property restitution law applied generally to property seized *after* 1945, but a special provision permitted Jewish communities to file claims dating back to 1938.

For Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania, limitations written into their communal property restitution laws from the early 1990s—which addressed restitution of communal property confiscated during both the Holocaust era and Communist era—made it difficult for Jewish communities to receive restitution or compensation for communal property, for example, the 1992 Law of Restitution of Property to Religious Organizations (Latvia). However, between 2011 and 2016 each of these countries passed specific legislation facilitating the return of or compensation for formerly Jewish communal property to the Jewish community, for example, the 2011 Good Will Compensation Law (Lithuania), the 2016 laws returning five pieces of property to the Jewish community (Latvia), and 2016 legislation addressing community successorship and forced “donation” issues (Romania). For countries such as Latvia, recent communal property legislation is a positive development. But ownership over many other formerly Jewish communal properties in Latvia remains in dispute and the properties are not subject to current restitution legislation.

Regarding countries in the Balkans, Croatia, Macedonia, and Slovenia passed restitution laws in the early 1990s which covered only Communist-era property confiscations and excluded property that was taken during the Holocaust. And in the case of Croatia, its law also did not cover properties that were not directly owned by Jewish organizations, for example, Law No. 92/96 (on Restitution/Compensation of Property Taken under the Yugoslav Communist Rule) (Croatia), and the 1991 Denationalization Act (Official Gazette RS, No. 27/91) (Slovenia).²⁰ The laws addressed both private and communal property that had been confiscated during the Communist era. Similarly, Serbia's 2006 Law on the Restitution of Property to Churches and Religious Communities only covers property

²⁰ Note, however, that in 2002, the government and the Jewish Community of Macedonia settled all remaining Jewish communal property claims.

confiscated *after* 1945. Only Bosnia-Herzegovina and Montenegro have failed to enact communal property restitution legislation covering either Holocaust-era confiscations or Communist-era takings, or both.

In Belarus, Moldova, and Russia, property has been returned to Jewish communities only on an ad hoc basis. In Ukraine, there are a variety of regulations and decrees, but no specific law that governs communal property restitution. While some property is being returned to the Jewish community in Ukraine, it is being carried out at a much slower rate than property belonging to other religious institutions.

For Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Malta, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom, no communal property was confiscated during the Holocaust era. As a result, there is no specific communal property restitution legislation.

Heirless Property

Heirless property is described in the Terezin Declaration Guidelines and Best Practices for the purpose of restitution as:

property which was confiscated or otherwise taken from the original owners by the Nazis, Fascists and their collaborators and where the former owner died or dies intestate without leaving a spouse or relative entitled to his inheritances. . . . From these properties, special funds may be allocated for the benefit of needy Holocaust (Shoah) survivors from the local community, irrespective of their country of residence. From such funds, down payments should be allocated at once for needy Holocaust (Shoah) survivors. Such funds, among others, may also be allocated for purposes of commemoration of destroyed communities and Holocaust (Shoah) education.

(Terezin Best Practices, para. j.)

Heirless stolen property has received the least legislative attention, for the obvious reason that there are no direct claimants to the property. Heirless property restitution presents the most challenging problem in addressing the lingering injustice from the genocide of the Jews committed in Nazi-occupied Europe, where almost the entire Jewish community in certain countries of Europe was wiped out. In such instances, equity principles dictate that it would be inappropriate to apply the usual rule that heirless property simply reverts (escheats) to the state. As Elazar Barkan explains, using the example of Jewish communal property in Czechoslovakia:

By law, since the Hapsburg premodern period, heirless property reverts to the state. Yet since the genocide created heirless property to an unprecedented extent, the community has a strong moral claim for the property of its members who were murdered in the Holocaust. The notion that the state, rather than the community, would be the beneficiary of this property may have been legally correct but was viewed by Jews outside the Czech Republic as morally offensive. The moral justification for restitution has collided with the new realities of privatization. Pragmatically, rapid privatization severely limited possible restitution because much of the potential property for restitution has been transferred to private ownership.²¹

²¹ Elazar Barkan, *The Guilt of Nations: Restitution and Negotiating Historical Injustices* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2000), at 150–151.

There are more than a dozen European countries that have not enacted heirless property laws. To comply with what the Terezin Declaration required, and what certain provisions from the 1947 Peace Treaties demanded, states would have to break with established European laws: where there are no heirs to immovable property, the state becomes the owner of the property (known as escheat). In the instance of property made heirless as a consequence of the Holocaust, the Terezin Declaration urged that the property be used for the benefit of Holocaust survivors most in need. In countries where the overwhelming majority of Jews did not survive the Holocaust, such as Poland, a large amount of heirless property remains unreckoned.

Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Macedonia, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Serbia, and Slovakia have all technically enacted heirless property legislation. Yet, a list of enacting countries fails to capture whether the country has fulfilled the letter and spirit of the Terezin Declaration. For example, while Romania has an heirless property law on its books (Law No. 113/1948, passed in connection with obligations under the 1947 Paris Peace Treaty), the law was never meaningfully implemented. Likewise, Hungary has taken certain legislative measures with respect to heirless property since 1997, but the Jewish community views these measures as only a “down payment” by the government against the value of all heirless property. Conversely, while the Czech Republic does not technically have a special heirless property law—all heirless property, even Jewish property, escheats to the state—the Czech Republic has acknowledged and acted upon a moral duty to provide care for its survivors. The positive effect of those measures, for example, the establishment of the 2001 Czech Endowment Fund for Holocaust Victims, concretely demonstrates the principles underpinning the use of heirless property funds for the benefit of Holocaust survivors.

In general, Western European countries enacted heirless property legislation in the immediate postwar years, for example, the 1955 State Treaty (Austria), the 1947–1949 Allied Restitution Laws (West Germany), and Law DLCPS 364/1947 (Italy). For most Eastern European countries, which fell under Communist rule almost immediately after World War II, heirless property legislation, either partial or comprehensive, is a more recent construct, for example, Act X of 1997 (on the implementation of provisions included in Article 27, Item No. 2, of Act XVIII of 1947, related to the Peace Treaty of Paris) (Hungary), 2016 Law on Elimination of Consequences of Property Confiscation of Heirless Holocaust Victims (Serbia), and the 2002 Partial Financial Compensation of Holocaust Victims in the SR (Slovakia). It has also been the case that, following the work of historical inquiry commissions, some Western European countries have made provisions for heirless property, for example, Belgium and Norway.

Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Moldova, Montenegro, Russia, Poland, Slovenia, and Ukraine have not enacted heirless property legislation. The majority are Eastern European countries. Of particular note are the Baltic States and Poland, which had the highest percentage of deaths in their Jewish populations in all of Europe, and correspondingly, likely the largest percentage of heirless property due to the number of deaths. Two of the countries can also be deemed exceptions to the requirements of heirless property legislation: Denmark, where the heroic efforts of ordinary Danes resulted in few Danish Jews dying during the war or property stolen, and Luxembourg, where its historical commission in 2009 found only a few isolated instances of heirless property.

Finally, Cyprus, Finland, Ireland, Malta, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom were not occupied during the war. As a result, no property was confiscated that might have eventually become heirless.

WHY HOLOCAUST-ERA PROPERTY RESTITUTION STILL MATTERS

If fulfilled, the commitments in the Terezin Declaration made by countries more than 60 years after the fall of Nazism bring a measure of long-overdue justice to Holocaust victims and their heirs.²² Though far from perfect, the widespread adoption of at least some form of restitutionary legal regime in virtually all European countries in the last 70 years, and especially beginning in the 1990s, has resulted in far more property returning to its rightful owners than would have otherwise been the case.

The Study highlights another equally important development, that was a historical first in the international community. Countries took steps to provide “some measure of justice” through restitution to a group of victims solely because they were the targets of persecution and genocidal extermination. The Study and the chapters in this book chronicle in detail how these efforts contributed to a growing body of law on reparations, which has been supported by more than two decades of substantial state practice. Countries’ acceptance and implementation of the Terezin Declaration principles underscore a willingness to amend existing legislation or pass new legislation specifically in light of Terezin commitments. Such state practice acts as a model and continuing call for states to commit to and engage in post-atrocity property restitution.

Yet, as long as the proceeds of mass theft that accompany genocide remain in the hands of those not entitled to it, post-Holocaust justice demands that the stolen assets be returned to their rightful owners or heirs. The answer provided by international practice today to the question asked of the Polish Jew in 1939–1943, *Since you are going to die anyway, why should someone else get your boots? Why not give them to me so I will remember you?* is: *The boots do not belong to you. They rightfully belong to me and my own. Give them back.*

²² See Michael R. Marrus, *Some Measure of Justice: The Holocaust Era Campaign of the 1990s* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press 2009).

Albania

A. OVERVIEW

On April 7, 1939, on the eve of World War II, Italy invaded and annexed Albania. After the Axis powers (Germany, Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania) carved up Yugoslavia in 1941, Kosovo became part of Italian-occupied Albania. When Italy surrendered to the Allied powers in 1943, Germany occupied Albania and Kosovo.

The treatment of Jews varied greatly between Albania and Kosovo. In general, Albanian Jews were protected during the Italian occupation, but they did face certain restrictions on their liberty and in some instances were required to move from the coast to inland towns. Foreign Jews who had found temporary refuge in Albania were by law supposed to be repatriated, but in practice were not expelled. They were instead put into concentration camps in Albania's interior. When the Nazis occupied Albania after Italy's surrender in 1943, they attempted to implement their Final Solution. The first step was collecting lists of Jews in each town. Albanians and Jews alike would not turn over the lists. During this period, many Jews (refugees and nationals) went into hiding, and the Albanian population (comprising Muslims, Eastern Orthodox, and Catholics) protected them. Many scholars have attributed the compassion of numerous Albanians toward Jews as a display of religious tolerance and *besa*—a national belief that obliges Albanians to provide uncompromising assistance to anyone seeking protection. (See Norman H. Gershman, *Besa: Muslims Who Saved Jews in World II* (2008).) According to Yad Vashem, only one family from Albania was deported and died in Pristina in Kosovo. (See Yael Weinstock Mashbaum, "When Religious Prejudice and Hate Did Not Exist": Jews in Albania," Yad Vashem ("*Mashbaum*") (last accessed December 13, 2016).)

The Jewish population in Kosovo (attached to Albania in 1941) suffered comparatively more during World War II. Many Jewish refugees entering Kosovo were returned to places such as Belgrade, or were shot. In 1942, the Italians turned over lists of Jews in Kosovo to the Nazis, who then demanded they be handed over to German control. Some were turned over and murdered, and others went to camps in Albania or were taken to Albanian cities where locals protected them. In 1944, with the assistance of Albanian SS *Skanderbeg* troops, the Nazis deported Jews from Kosovo to the Bergen-Belson camp in Germany, where they were killed. Estimates of the number of Jews in Kosovo who were murdered during the Holocaust range from approximately 200 to more than 600.

Before World War II, approximately 200 Albanian Jews and 400 Jewish refugees (mainly from Germany and Austria) were in Albania. At the end of the war, there were

approximately 1,800 Jews in Albania. By 1946, most had returned to their home countries and approximately 157 Jews were left in Albania.

Albania was the only Nazi-occupied country where the Jewish population increased at the end of the war. After Albania was liberated at the end of World War II, the country fell under Communist rule and was first known as the People's Republic of Albania, then later, the People's Socialist Republic of Albania. During the subsequent half century of Communist rule in Albania, religion was outlawed. In 1991, as the end of Communism drew near, almost all of the 300-person Jewish community in Albania emigrated to Israel. Estimates of the size of the current Jewish population range from 40 to 200.

At the end of World War II, as an occupied country, Albania was not a party to an armistice agreement or any treaty of peace, which affected the return of property.

We are not aware of any settlement agreements between Albania and other countries for property belonging to their nationals confiscated during the Holocaust era. However, in 1995, Albania and the United States entered into a **U.S.-Albanian Claims Settlement Agreement**, which addressed claims of U.S. nationals against Albania arising from nationalization or expropriation of property.

The Republic of Albania was established in 1992 after the fall of Communism. Albania became a member of the Council of Europe in 1995 and ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1996. As a result, suits against Albania claiming violations of the Convention are subject to review by the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). Albania was granted European Union candidate status in 2004.

Albania endorsed the Terezin Declaration in 2009 and the Guidelines and Best Practices in 2010.

As part of the European Shoah Legacy Institute's Immovable Property Restitution Study, a questionnaire covering past and present restitution regimes for private, communal, and heirless property was sent to all 47 Terezin Declaration governments in 2015. No response was received from Albania.

1. Private Property Restitution

Private immovable (real) property, as defined in the Terezin Declaration 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 (“Terezin Best Practices”) for the purpose of restitution, is:

property owned by private individuals or legal persons, who either themselves or through their families owned homes, buildings, apartments or land, or who had other legal property rights, recognized by national law as of the last date before the commencement of persecution by the Nazis, Fascists and their collaborators, in such properties.

(Terezin Best Practices, para. b.)

Albania does not have any restitution and/or compensation laws relating to Holocaust-era confiscations. There is little information regarding the treatment of Jews in Albanian concentration camps and what happened to Jewish property in coastal towns during the Italian occupation, when Jewish families were required to move inland.

Immediately after World War II, all private property in Albania was nationalized under Communist authorities—irrespective of the owners' race, religion, or ethnicity. In 1992, as Albania shifted away from Communism, laws were enacted to protect property rights. They included legislation on restitution/compensation of private property confiscated during

the Communist period, such as **Law No. 7512 of 10 August 1991** (privatization law), **Law No. 7652 of 21 December 1992** (rights of tenants to buy/sell state-owned flats), and **Law No. 7501 of 19 July 1991** (privatization of agricultural land). The first property restitution law was passed in 1993, **Law No. 7698 of 15 April 1993**. The most recent immovable private property restitution law is **2004 Law No. 9235 on Restitution and Compensation of Property (and amendments)**. It provides for restitution or compensation (at current market value) of property expropriated since November 29, 1944 (and also for property taken pursuant to a 1944 war profits tax). With limited exception, claims had to be filed by **December 31, 2008**.

There has been considerable criticism about the implementation of **Law No. 9235**, including judicial and administrative deficiencies, inability to access relevant archives, and, at least initially, that much of Albania's land was not registered with the government. In addition, the Property Restitution and Compensation Agency has been unable to obtain adequate funds or lands to satisfy successful claims (according to a European Parliament study, as of 2010 no land fund for payment of claims with in-kind property had been established). (See European Parliament—Directorate-General for Internal Policies, "Private Properties Issues Following the Change of Political Regime in Former Socialist of Communist Countries—Study," April 2010, p. 46.)

Hundreds of cases concerning Albania's property restitution regime have been filed with the European Court of Human Rights. Many cases relate to allegations of violations of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention (regarding the right to fair trial) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (regarding the right to peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions). (See, e.g., *Driza v Albania*, EHCR, App no. 33771/02, Judgement of 13 November 2007; *Bushati and ors v Albania*, ECHR, App no. 6397/04, Judgement of 8 December 2009; and *Ramadhi v Albania*, ECHR, App no. 38222/02, Judgement of November 2007.) In 2007, the ECHR found that nonenforcement of domestic judgments and administrative decisions regarding restitution/compensation to former owners was a systemic problem in Albania. (*Ramadhi*, para. 90.) In 2015, the European Commission reported that Albania was finalizing a new law to set up a mechanism to enforce restitution/compensation decisions.

We are not aware whether any Albanian Jews filed claims under this law, and, if claims were filed, the number that have been successful.

2. Communal Property Restitution

Communal immovable (real) property, as defined in the Terezin Best Practices for the purpose of restitution, is:

property owned by religious or communal organizations and includes buildings and land used for religious purposes, e.g. synagogues, churches[,] cemeteries, and other immovable religious sites which should be restituted in proper order and protected from desecration or misuse, as well as buildings and land used for communal purposes, e.g. schools, hospitals, social institutions and youth camps, or for income generating purposes.

(Terezin Best Practices, para. b.)

During the Communist period after World War II, religion was banned in Albania. In 1991, as the country was transitioning from Communism to a market economy, nearly all of Albania's Jewish population left for Israel. Today there is little organized communal life. In 2010, Chabad opened a synagogue in Tirana and appointed an unofficial chief rabbi of Albania (who is based in Greece).

Under the **2004 Law No. 9235 on Restitution and Compensation of Property (and amendments)**, religious communities have the same restitution/compensation rights as natural/legal persons. In 2014, the U.S. Department of State reported some religious groups in Albania have entered into bilateral agreements with the government to address prioritized property restitution. The U.S. Department of State also reported in 2014 that notwithstanding the fact that the state restitution agency was required to give priority to properties owned by religious groups, hundreds of their claims remained unresolved. (See U.S. Department of State—Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, “Albania 2014 International Religious Freedom Report” (last accessed December 13, 2016).)

We are unaware whether any communal property was confiscated from the Jewish community during World War II or during the subsequent Communist period. We are also unaware as to whether any claims have been filed by Albania’s Jewish community for the return of property.

3. Heirless Property Restitution

The Terezin Declaration states “that in some states heirless property could serve as a basis for addressing the material necessities of needy Holocaust (Shoah) survivors and to ensure ongoing education about the Holocaust (Shoah), its causes and consequences.” (Terezin Declaration, Immovable (Real) Property, para. 3.) The Terezin Best Practices also “encourage[s] [states] to create solutions for the restitution and compensation of heirless or unclaimed property from victims of persecution by Nazis, Fascists and their collaborators.” Heirless immovable (real) property, as defined in the Terezin Best Practices for the purpose of restitution, is:

property which was confiscated or otherwise taken from the original owners by the Nazis, Fascists and their collaborators and where the former owner died or dies intestate without leaving a spouse or relative entitled to his inheritances. . . . From these properties, special funds may be allocated for the benefit of needy Holocaust (Shoah) survivors from the local community, irrespective of their country of residence. From such funds, down payments should be allocated at once for needy Holocaust (Shoah) survivors. Such funds, among others, may also be allocated for purposes of commemoration of destroyed communities and Holocaust (Shoah) education.

(Terezin Best Practices, para. j.)

According to Yad Vashem, only one Albanian Jewish family was deported to Pristina in Kosovo and murdered during World War II (a second Kosovar Albanian Jewish family was also deported from Albania to Kosovo but survived). (See *Mashbaum*.) Since becoming a signatory to the Terezin Declaration in 2009, Albania has not passed any laws dealing with restitution of heirless property.

B. BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARTICLES, BOOKS, AND PAPERS

Joseph Berger, “Casting Light on Little-Known Story of Albania Rescuing Jews from Nazis,” *N.Y. Times*, November 18, 2013 (<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/19/world/europe/casting-light-on-little-known-story-of-albania-rescuing-jews-from-nazis.html>).

Encyclopedia of the Holocaust (Robert Rozett & Shmuel Spector, eds., Routledge 2000).

- The Encyclopedia of Jewish Life Before and During the Holocaust, Vol. 1 A–J* (Shmuel Spector & Geoffrey Wigoder, eds., New York: New York University Press 2001).
- European Commission, “Commission Staff Working Document—Albania 2014 Report” (http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2015/20151110_report_albania.pdf).
- European Parliament—Directorate-General for Internal Policies, “Private Properties Issues Following the Change of Political Regime in Former Socialist of Communist Countries—Study,” April 2010.
- Bernd J. Fischer, “The Jews of Albania During the Zogist Period and the Second World War,” in *NATO Science for Peace and Security Series—Strengthening Religious Tolerance for a Secure Civil Society in Albania and the Southern Balkans* (James Pettifer & Mentor Nazarko, eds. 2007).
- Norman H. Gershman, *Besa: Muslims Who Saved Jews in World II* (New York: Syracuse University Press 2008).
- The Jewish Virtual Library, “Albania” (<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/vjw/albania.html>).
- Yael Weinstock Mashbaum, “When Religious Prejudice and Hate Did Not Exist: Jews in Albania,” *Yad Vashem*, http://www.yadvashem.org/yv/en/education/newsletter/22/main_article.asp#01.
- Paul Mojzes, *Balkan Genocides: Holocaust and Ethnic Cleansing in the Twentieth Century* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield 2011).
- Daniel Perez, “Our Conscience Is Clean: Albanian Elites and the Memory of the Holocaust in Postsocialist Albania,” in *Bringing the Dark Past to Light: The Reception of the Holocaust in Postcommunist Europe* (John-Paul Himka & Joanna Beata Michlic, eds., Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press 2013).
- The United States Department of Justice—Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, “Current Programs—Albania Claims Program” (<https://www.justice.gov/fcsc/current-programs>).
- U.S. Department of State—Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, “Albania 2014 International Religious Freedom Report” (<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/238560.pdf>).
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum—Holocaust Encyclopedia, “Axis Invasion of Yugoslavia” (<https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005456>).
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum—Holocaust Encyclopedia, “World War II: In Depth” (<https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007314>).
- World Bank—Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit Europe and Central Asia Region, “Governance in the Protection of Immovable Property Rights in Albania: A Continuing Challenge—A World Bank Issue Brief,” April 2012 (http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTALBANIA/Resources/WB_Property_Rights_Issue_Brief_Revised_April_2012.pdf).
- World Jewish Congress, “Communities: Albania” (<http://www.worldjewishcongress.org/en/about/communities/al>).

CASES

- Bushati and ors v Albania*, ECHR, App no. 6397/04, Judgement of 8 December 2009.
- Driza v Albania*, EHCR, App no. 33771/02, Judgement of 13 November 2007.
- Ramadhi v Albania*, ECHR, App no. 38222/02, Judgement of November 2007.

INDIVIDUALS

- Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP.
- Michael Dougherty, Associate, Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP, New York.

Argentina

A. OVERVIEW

Argentina was technically neutral for most of World War II but ended up providing substantial support to the Axis powers during the war. Even though the Allied powers constructed effective blockades off the coast of South America, Argentinian sympathizers smuggled precious metals, drugs, and other valuables to the Axis powers. Toward the end of World War II, Argentina changed its position and openly supported the Allied powers. However, at the end of the war, President Juan Perón went to great lengths to coordinate the rescue of many Nazis and provide them safe haven, money, and sometimes employment in Argentina.

In its contribution to the 2012 Green Paper on the Immovable Property Review Conference, Argentina stated that no immovable property was confiscated during World War II and that the Nazi regime never occupied the country. Thus, owing to its neutral status, no immovable property was confiscated from Jews or other targeted groups in Argentina during the Holocaust. Argentina also stated in the 2012 Green Paper that it remained committed to “education, remembrance and research on all aspects of the Holocaust.”

As best as we are aware, Argentina is not a party to any treaties or agreements with other countries that address restitution and/or compensation for immovable property confiscated or wrongfully taken during the Holocaust. However, Argentina entered into at least one lump-sum settlement agreement with Yugoslavia on March 21, 1964, which pertained to Argentinian property seized in the foreign state, by the foreign state during nationalization measures instituted after World War II.

As best as we are aware, there are no laws in Argentina that permit Argentinian citizens to file claims in domestic courts for the return of immovable property, which is located in another country. Argentina’s **1995 Inmunidad Jurisdiccional de Los Estados Extranjeros Ante Los Tribunales Argentinos, Law 24.488 (Judicial Immunity of Foreign States to Argentinian Courts)** provides that foreign states are immune from the jurisdiction of Argentinian courts. Certain exceptions to this general rule exist. For example, the law abrogates state immunity in Argentinian courts when the case relates to *property located in Argentina*. (See Article 2(f).) However, there is not similar abrogation of sovereign immunity where the case involves *property located in another country*.

Nearly **210,000** Jews immigrated to Argentina between 1901 and 1944. At the end of World War II, in 1947, there were approximately **250,000** Jews in Argentina. Today, Argentina’s Jewish community of **240,000** is the largest of any Latin American country and

is the sixth largest Jewish population in the world outside of Israel. As of 2004, there were also approximately 300,000 Roma in Argentina.

The umbrella Jewish organization in Argentina is **Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas (DAIA)**. DAIA was founded in 1933 and began operating under its current name in 1935. DAIA encompasses more than 125 Jewish institutions throughout Argentina. The organization endeavors to fight anti-Semitism, discrimination, and xenophobia, and also aims to ensure the security of the institutions and members of the Jewish community in Argentina.

Argentina endorsed the Terezin Declaration in 2009 and the Guidelines and Best Practices in 2010.

As part of the European Shoah Legacy Institute's Immovable Property Restitution Study, a questionnaire covering past and present restitution regimes for private, communal, and heirless property was sent to all 47 Terezin Declaration governments in 2015. Argentina sent a response in March 2016. (*See shoahlegacy.org.*)

B. BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARTICLES, BOOKS, AND PAPERS

"2012 Green Paper in the Immovable Property Review Conference" (<http://shoahlegacy.org>).

Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas (<http://www.daia.org.ar/2013/index.php>).

The Jewish Agency for Israel, "Argentina" (<http://www.jewishagency.org/jewish-community/content/24346>).

"Meeting of Special Envoys for Holocaust Issues—'Five years on,'" European Shoah Legacy Institute, September 26, 2014 (<http://shoahlegacy.org>).

"Orthodox Jew to head Argentina's Jewish umbrella group for first time," Haaretz.com, November 23, 2015 (<http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/1.687772>).

Raquel Rosenbloom, "Being Jewish in Buenos Aires," Berkley Center for Religion, Peace and World Affairs (<http://berkeleycenter.georgetown.edu/letters/being-jewish-in-buenos-aires>).

"The Statistics of Jews," in *The American Jewish Year Book (1946–47)* (Harry Schneiderman & Julius B. Maller, eds., Philadelphia: Press of the Jewish Publication Society 1946) (http://www.ajcarchives.org/AJC_DATA/Files/1946_1947_13_Statistics.pdf).

Druzhemira Tchileva, "Emerging Romani Voices from Latin America," European Roma Rights Centre, May 27, 2004 (<http://www.errc.org/article/emerging-romani-voices-from-latin-america/1847>).

World Jewish Congress, "Communities—Argentina" (<http://www.worldjewishcongress.org/en/about/communities/ar>).

THREE

Australia

A. OVERVIEW

Australia declared war on Germany on September 3, 1939 and supported the Allied powers during World War II. One million Australians participated in the war, with about 500,000 serving in the armed forces overseas in Germany, Italy, the Mediterranean region, North Africa, Japan, East Asia, and the Pacific.

There is no evidence that any immovable property was confiscated from Jews or other targeted groups in Australia during World War II by the Australian government or Nazi Germany.

As best as we are aware, Australia is not a party to any treaties or agreements with other countries that address restitution and/or compensation of immovable property, which was wrongfully taken during the Holocaust.

As best as we are aware, there are no laws in Australia that permit Australian citizens to file claims in domestic courts for the return of immovable property, which is located in another country. Australia's **Foreign States Immunities Act 1985** (Act No. 196 of 1985 as amended) (**FSIA**) provides that foreign states are immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of Australia. The law sets out certain exceptions to this general rule. For example, the **FSIA** abrogates state immunity in Australian courts when the case relates to damage or loss of tangible property that occurred *in Australia* (Article 13(b)) or related to a state's interest in, or possession or use by the state of, immovable property *in Australia* (Article 14(1)(a)). However, the law does not include any similar abrogation of sovereign immunity where the property in question is located *in another country* (in contrast to, e.g., the United States' **Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act**, 28 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(3), which abrogates sovereign immunity "when rights in property taken in violation of international law are in issue, and that property or any property exchanged for such property is present in the United States in connection with a commercial activity carried on in the United States by the foreign state; or that property or any property exchanged for such property is owned or operated by an agency or instrumentality of the foreign state and that agency or instrumentality is engaged in a commercial activity in the United States.").

Australia has been described as a "decaying Anglo-Jewish outpost" prior to World War II. (See Dan Goldberg, "Jews Down Under Are on the Rise, but for How Long?," *Haaretz*, July 3, 2012 (last accessed December 13, 2016).) However, in the late 1930s, Australia received approximately 7,000—mainly Germany and Austrian—Jewish refugees. After

World War II, Australia admitted tens of thousands more Holocaust survivors into the country. Australia's 2011 census put its Jewish population just under **100,000**.

The 2011 census recorded **776** Roma living in Australia. That number is considered low, and it is estimated that the Roma population may be far larger, between 20,000 and 25,000.

The **Executive Council of Australian Jewry** was established in 1944 and works as an advocate for the Jewish community in Australia. Its priorities include providing relief and rescue for persecuted Jews, combating anti-Semitism, and campaigning on behalf of the Jewish homeland.

Australia endorsed the Terezin Declaration in 2009 and the Guidelines and Best Practices in 2010.

As part of the European Shoah Legacy Institute's Immovable Property Restitution Study, a questionnaire covering past and present restitution regimes for private, communal, and heirless property was sent to all 47 Terezin Declaration governments in 2015. Australia sent a response in September 2015. (See shoahlegacy.org.)

B. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Department of Immigration and Border Protection, "The People of Australia: Statistics from the 2011 Census" (<http://www.border.gov.au/ReportsandPublications/Documents/research/people-australia-2013-statistics.pdf#search=2013%20Statistics>).
- Executive Council of Australian Jewry Inc. (<http://www.ecaj.org.au/>).
- Dan Goldberg, "Jews Down Under Are on the Rise, but for How Long?," *Haaretz*, July 3, 2012 (<http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/news/jews-down-under-are-on-the-rise-but-for-how-long-1.448465>).
- Jennifer Golub & Renae Cohen, *What Do Australians Know About the Holocaust?*, American Jewish Committee (1994).
- J-Wire: Digital Jewish news daily for Australia and New Zealand (<http://www.jwire.com.au/>).
- Jewish Sydney (<https://www.jewishsydney.com.au/>).
- Jews Down Under: An online magazine for Australian Jews (<http://jewsdownunder.com/>).
- Naomi Levin, "Federal Government's Shoah pledge," *The Australian Jewish News*, July 9, 2009 (<http://www.jewishnews.net.au/federal-government's-shoah-pledge/4720>) (last accessed March 10, 2016).
- The Memory of the Holocaust in Australia* (Tom Lawson & James Jordan, eds., London: Vallentine Mitchell 2008).
- Seth Mydans, "Australia Is Investigating 200 for Nazi Crimes," *N.Y. Times*, February 4, 1988, p. A5 (<http://www.nytimes.com/1988/02/04/world/australia-is-investigating-200-for-nazi-crimes.html>).
- Returned & Services League of Australia, "Australia's Military Heritage: The Second World War" (<http://rslnsw.org.au/commemoration/heritage/the-second-world-war>).
- Suzanne D. Rutland, "Jewish Immigration After the Second World War: 'The Transformation of a Community,'" *Israel & Judaism Studies* (www.ijs.org.au/Jewish-Immigration-after-the-Second-World-War/default.aspx).
- States Immunities Act 1985 (Act No. 196 of 1985 as amended) (<https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2010C00145>).