

Oliver Rathkolb

## From 'Legacy of Shame' to the Auction of 'Heirless' Art in Vienna: Coming to Terms 'Austrian Style' with Nazi Artistic War Booty

### 1) *International Debates 1984/1985*

A few years before the Waldheim-Debate - in 1984 - Andrew Decker criticized the "Austrian Style" of restitution of art work stolen by the National Socialists after 1938, and he primarily focused on items stored in a monastery outside Vienna (Mauerbach), which had been turned over by the US authorities in Germany after they passed on the supervision over the Central Art Collecting Point in Munich to the Germans in 1951.[1] These remaining 8,500 pictures, drawings and books have still not been restituted partly due to the rather unprofessional and reluctant handling by low level Austrian authorities to trace down the owners (e.g., limiting the publishing of the list in the Austrian government newspaper "Wiener Zeitung" in 1969, which is barely read outside Austrian government circles) and the unwillingness of politicians to solve the issue by passing a law in the parliament until July 1995 (in 1969 the Austrian parliament only agreed to enlarge the acceptance of claims until the end of 1972).[2] On Christmas Eve 1997, however, the international media began to respond to a new debate. This time it focused on specific individual Nazi era art claims by two families concerning two paintings from the Austrian expressionist Schiele. The paintings were on display in the Museum of Modern Art in New York on loan from the private (state subsidized) Leopold Foundation.[3] On January 7, 1998, the Manhattan District Attorney confiscated the two paintings ("Portrait of Wally" and "Dead City") starting a criminal investigation into the ownership of the paintings and providing evidence for a possible trial before a grand jury.[4]

It should be noted that this incident was not only a side show of the "Swiss Nazi Gold Bank" discussion but became part of a much broader debate in the US dealing with the sometimes dubious ownership of alleged Nazi loot on display in several museums in the US and Canada - paintings claimed by heirs of Holocaust victims.[5] Before the "Austrian incident" the "Holocaust Art Restitution Project" was established in Washington, D.C. and the World Jewish Congress established a "Commission for Art Recovery." This commission is chaired by former US Ambassador to Austria, Ronald Lauder, who also happens to be the chairman of the MOMA.

In order to place the various events into a broader perspective I shall try to analyze some of the historical reasons for the most recent discussions. These discussions culminated in an international media debate and a new - much more concerned - political debate in Austria with an unexpected outcome. I cannot go into more details, why it took nearly 10 years to solve the issue, although on the level of the key decisionmakers like then Chancellor Fred Sinowatz and Minister of Finance Franz Vranitzky, who in 1986 became Chancellor, the option of an auction in favor of the Jewish community in Vienna and Jewish organizations has been already agreed upon. The original idea along these lines have been proposed in early 1980 by then Chancellor Bruno Kreisky and Minister of Science and Research Hertha Firnberg.[6] In the following article I shall try to analyze briefly some of the 1945 ff. roots of these public debates of the 1980s and early 1990s.

### 2) *National Restitution First - US Art Restitution Policies after 1945*

One of the central problems of postwar art restitution certainly is the policy question of how to administer the return of stolen art in Austria. On May 8, 1945, US troops took over authority over the greatest collection of Nazi loot in Austria in the Alt Aussee salt mine (and other repositories

Quelle: This presentation is based on a paper, presented at the German Studies Association Conference (September 26, 1997), Washington DC

---

nearby like the Lauffen mine in Bad Ischl) which contained works of art (7,000 paintings and drawings, and approximately 3,000 other items)[7] - stolen and sometimes bought from all Nazi occupied Europe to become part of the "Führermuseum" in Linz - a project close to the heart of Hitler himself.[8] Austrian resistance fighters and Austrian museum experts had already taken care of the art treasures and prevented the destruction by National Socialist and SS hard-liners.[9]

A considerable portion of the Alt Aussee loot was of "Austrian" origin - some 700 paintings belonging to the Rothschild family and 500 paintings belonging to other Jewish families. Although the Rothschilds and the other collectors and/or their heirs had been brutally forced out of Austria by 1938 by the Nazi regime thereby taking their art treasures, these properties still were considered Austrian property and therefore turned over to the Austrian government and subordinate administrative institutions to carry out the restitution (e.g., Finanzlandesdirektionen, in charge of the legal matters, and the Bundesdenkmalamt acting as the overall art custodian). Due to criminal activities of individual art experts (many of them active in the white-washing and expropriation machinery of the Nazi regime) the Provisional government under State Chancellor Karl Renner decided as early as 22 August 1945 to establish a "Vermögenssicherungsamt" under the control of the Ministry of the Interior.[10] According to experts art objects worth 200,000.000 "Reichsmark" have "changed" owners during April and August 1945.

### 3) *The "ransom" cases of the Rothschilds' and Lederer's restitution claim:*

After the so-called "Anschluss" of Austria in 1938 "Reichsdeutsche" officials especially - both from the Gestapo and the cultural administration (including Austrian museum experts) confiscated a large number of art collections from Jewish owners (among them well known collections like the collections of Alfons Rothschild, Louis Rothschild, Rudolf Gutmann, Oskar Pick, T. Goldmann, Felix Haas, etc.), which were stored in the "Zentraldepot" in the Vienna Hofburg and were reserved for the "Führermuseum" in Linz. In 1941 this depot was transferred to Kremsmünster and parts of Hohenfurth were moved to Alt Aussee in February 1944.

When the Austrian Bundesdenkmalamt was authorized by US authorities and the Allied Commission to take over the individual restitution responsibilities the prewar legal framework again began to influence the transfers. Since 1918 a special Export Control Law ("Ausfuhrverbotsgesetz"), amended in 1923, enabled the Bundesdenkmalamt to decide which art treasures were allowed to leave the country, ignoring the nationality of the owners. This meant, however, that after 1945 - despite the fact that Jewish owners with Austrian nationality who had been persecuted and many of them killed in the Shoa (nearly one third of the Jewish Segment of Austrian society) have lost their citizenship automatically(!)- suddenly the traditional Austrian legal order began to overrule the National Socialist atrocities and individual pains and material losses as if nothing has happened. These treasures again were considered "Austrian" and an integrate part of the Austrian cultural heritage. In the pragmatic restitution procedure this meant that the original owners had first to prove their ownership - which under the circumstances of exile, imprisonment and the Second World War was very difficult to fulfil.

In the case of large collections like the collections of the Rothschilds this was a relatively easy task, since the "curators" have even produced a printed catalogue in 1939 (classified top secret and printed in a very limited number). It became difficult when the "legal owners" wanted to export their property because only a very few wanted to return at this stage (as most of the Austrian authorities and many Austrians were eager to keep the surviving Austrian Jews out of the country). In a "Restitution Compromise" (Rückstellungsvergleich) the lawyer of Clarice de Rothschild for example agreed that from 16 art objects, held by the Ferdinandeum in Innsbruck

Quelle: This presentation is based on a paper, presented at the German Studies Association Conference (September 26, 1997), Washington DC

---

14 will be restituted (including an export license), 2 will be turned over by Ms. Rothschild (1 to the Albertina and 1 to the Ferdinandeum).[11] The same procedure was used when dealing with old music instruments of the Rothschild collections although here most of the instruments stayed with the Kunsthistorisches Museum as a permanent loan.[12]

#### 4) 'Other' Restitutions of Art Objects and Export Control

Another case illustrating the rather shabby habit of restitution after 1945 in the field of arts is the equestrian painting of Bellini from the Sarah Lederer Collection. Ernst Lederer, a well known art historian, has been "dazu bewogen" (induced) to "donate" this valuable painting to the Republic of Austria in return for an export license for a fragment of the large Lederer collection which was destroyed at the end of the war by SS troops at Schloß Immendorf (including famous paintings by Klimt and Schiele) or like the textiles and drawings disappeared during 1938-1940.[13] In such a case Austrian courts would refuse to accept any claims for compensation. The famous Klimt Fries in the Lederer collection was, however, not included in the export license, and it took until the 1970s when Chancellor Bruno Kreisky himself started negotiations for the Republic of Austria to buy the Klimt Fries from Lederer.[14] When Erich Lederer had tried to get back the Bellini painting in the 1950s the Austrian Ministry for Education refused, although a confidential internal evaluation of the Ministry opposed to the use of the Export Control Law for such deals ("Vorgang immerhin im Ausfuhrverbotsgesetz nicht gedeckt"). The Minister, Heinrich Drimmel, himself decided not to retribute, but at least admitted that the Export Control law should be changed.

This rather strange - and from my point of view both immoral and illegal procedure - has been developed before 1938 and accepted by the collectors (e.g., in the case of the Rothschilds), but after the Holocaust, exile and emigration and the Second World War restitution issues should not be effected by such "deals" since the State of Austria has lost the right to decide about the fate of properties of the Jewish minority so brutally persecuted both by fellow citizens and German Nazis and even after 1945 were deprived of their citizenship (they had to apply again for Austrian citizenship and needed a permanent residence in Austria, a procedure which however has been changed in the recent years as one of the positive consequences of the Waldheim debate).

It would be a falsification to state that the Republic of Austria after 1945 did not retribute property to former citizens in exile, but by doing so used a rather complicated legal procedure, executed sometimes by a highly passive or even resenting bureaucracy.[15] The main reason, however, why restitution issues and "Jewish claims" (concerning heirless property, advocated by Jewish organizations) became such sensitive issues both within the Austrian political debate and in the concrete handling of individual cases can be traced down in the political perceptions of some of the "fathers" of the Second Republic like the Chancellor Karl Renner, who in his first political memorandum in April 1945 pleaded for restitution of the Jewish property ("Rückgabe des geraubten Judengutes"[16]) not in favor of the individuals, but in favor of a restitution fund, which would distribute shares to the individuals in order to hinder a massive return of the exiles ("um ein massenhaftes, plötzliches Zurückfluten der Vertriebenen zu verhindern"). The legal Department of the Austrian Foreign Office refused to accept a legal obligation with regard to Jewish claims since the Austrian state was not considered being the legal successor of the Nazi regime; only due to "political reasons" restitution should be granted under the presumption that National Socialist Germany alone was considered responsible for the Holocaust and World War II and seen as "the" perpetrator.

Quelle: This presentation is based on a paper, presented at the German Studies Association Conference (September 26, 1997), Washington DC

---

"Aryanized" property was secured as early as May 1945, but it took until 1946 and the following 6 restitution laws to provide the legal framework for this ambivalent approach of "restitution" due to political reasons. The state of Austria until very recently considered herself a victim of National Socialism and Germany, a myth which began to erode during the Waldheim debate in 1986 and was buried at least officially by Chancellor Franz Vranitzky in 1993.

To come back to the return of stolen art, it is correct to say that the large and famous collections have been restituted to their owners if they were found in 1945 in one of the repositories. The right to export could be "organized" as shown above, although in some cases in the first months after the end of the war and before Austrian bureaucracy took over restitution responsibilities, direct restitution was executed. A good example is the Gutmann collection: Rudolf Gutmann, a Canadian citizen, identified his property in 1946 in Alt Aussee and his Austrian lawyer needed only an export permission from the Ministry of Finance, which was granted.

## 5) *The Problem of lost art*

### 5a) *The "Eastern" Problem*

But even in the case of Gutmann he ran into trouble when he tried to seek restitution of 41 Rembrandt engravings which were transferred to Germany by one of Hitler's art experts, Posse, and in 1945 were confiscated by the Red Army. Official applications were not successful, so then he tried to bribe Eastern German officials with \$20,000 since the engravings have shown up in the Soviet Zone of Occupation in Germany. It could not yet be clarified whether he was successful - in 1957 they were still missing - but his problem is a typical one in the postwar era. Thousands of art objects were at first confiscated in Austria and then transferred to "Reichsdeutschland," both for party functionaries and private individuals.

There does exist a list of losses concerning private (mostly Jewish) collections dated 1957 and Austrian museums and monasteries<sup>[17]</sup> since bureaucracy kept track of those cultural treasures which were borrowed for decoration in National Socialist offices or in private residences of party leaders like "Karinhall" of Hermann Göring (only few could traced down like two of these tapestries from Karinhall in Poland, which were restituted to the Kunsthistorisches Museum in 1976)<sup>[18]</sup>.

### 5b) *The whitewashing problem*

Not only the Cold War hindered the search for stolen art post 1945, but so did the fact that some Nazi party functionaries have been able to hide their - mostly - stolen art treasures (most of them did not show up in the postwar era). An illustrative case is Baldur von Schirach, the former Hitler Youth leader and later Reichsleiter and Gauleiter in Vienna. In 1942 he had bought from the Vugesta (Verwaltungsstelle für Umzugsgüter jüdischer Emigranten), an agency of the Gestapo, confiscated Jewish property to the value of Reichsmark 42,092<sup>[19]</sup> (obviously partly through the Dorotheum, the state owned Austrian auction house, which was heavily used for "whitewashing" and selling machinery for looted art objects which were not under "Führervorbehalt," being reserved for Adolf Hitler). Among other objects he "bought" was a Lucas Cranach, Madonna with Child, from the confiscated Gomperz collection - which is still missing. Was it taken by Schirach, who in 1948 declared that he did not know about the original owner, or was it stolen in 1945 from the Schirach Villa in Vienna - either by Austrians or by Russian soldiers or confiscated by the Red Army, or did he sell it through his family to a collector/art dealer overseas?

This "selling" constitutes one of the major problems for the location of stolen art post 1945 on an individual basis, since the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Section of the US occupation

forces both in Germany and Austria concentrated on the large collections which were deposited in several salt mines and castles throughout Austria to be protected against air-raids. By May 1948 nearly 2.5 million objects, including 468,000 paintings, drawings and sculptures had been restituted by US authorities in Germany.[20] The Alt Aussee art works have been secured and partly transferred to Munich and as far as Austrian property was concerned mostly brought to Vienna under the custody of the Bundesdenkmalamt. As referred to above US authorities did not deal with individual restitution cases. According to the Bundesdenkmalamt 10,000 works from different repositories have been restituted under the title of "Jewish property." [21]

## 6) *Heirless Property*

As documented on the basis of individual cases in the 1984 article by Andrew Decker the real long range political problem in the Austrian restitution story was the fact that in 1969 8,422 objects in Austrian care were still not restituted, and the deadline for the claims was extended to December 31, 1970 after public intervention by Simon Wiesenthal - but still was limited and due to rather poor public relation only 71 objects could be returned.

No active policy has been worked out to trace down at least the names of the owners of this "heirless property," although Sophie Lillie, one of the young experts consulted for the Christie's auction in 1996 clearly recognized the possibility to read "the inscriptions on the back of the canvases and frames. 'Aryanization' numbers, inventory numbers from secret Nazi depots and/or gallery labels chronicle a kind of unconscious history of Mauerbach, revealing or concealing in codified form the stations of theft ...". [22] I, however, do not agree with Hector Feliciano, that all, or most, owners and/or their heirs could have been traced down even in 1996 by active research. [23] The chances to identify the original owners would have been relatively high - especially by using the original lists gathered by US officials and experts after 1945 and material stored in German and Austrian archives. At the same time it is obvious that a large segment of these art objects did belong to people who did not survive the Holocaust.

The auction in 1996 was a financial success - due to well prepared sponsoring activities by the US Jewish Community on the first day - and a wise political decision, turning over the ownership of the Mauerbach collection to the Jewish Community of Vienna. The sale brought a total of ATS 155,166,810 and the net profit will go to people who suffered under National Socialism and/or their descendants in need of material assistance.

The handling of the Mauerbach case by Austrian bureaucrats and some politicians since the 1960s, however, reveals a strange mixture of ignorance and stubbornness to admit the Nazi policies and brutal Austrian collaboration on all levels and the postwar problems of restitution. Symbolic for this policy was the tendency to close Mauerbach like a fortress to the public, which in return increased the fantasy of American journalists and led to conflicts with the French Embassy by refusing French curators (e.g., Pierre Rosenberg, now director of the Louvre) in 1973 to see the Mauerbach collection when trying to locate lost French art objects. In 1987 at least 17 paintings were shown to members of a French claim commission, the rest kept closed by the Ministry of Finance. [24]

On the one hand Austrian politicians especially - already decades before the Waldheim debate - have feared a public debate about Austrians taking part in the Nazi machinery of the Holocaust, which means primarily that they feared negative press reports in the United States (overestimating the political interest in Jewish issues in the US in the 1960s, but obviously influenced by perceptions which came close to the "Jüdische Weltverschwörung" ("Jewish Conspiracy against the World") and the influence of Jewish journalists on the "Eastcoast,"

propagated by the Nazis. At the same time they feared an Austrian debate about Jewish property which would again reveal an even stronger Austrian contribution to the execution of the National Socialist persecutions and, on the side of the former members of the NSDAP, would lead to opposition to one of the two leading parties. Frankly put, politicians of the Great Coalition after 1945 (up to the early sixties) always tried to postpone the settlement of the Jewish claims and if they were not hard pressed by the Allies, especially the US, would even have postponed the restitution procedures. Highly sensitive issues like the return of rented (not owned) apartments, pensions, bank accounts, etc., were always excluded due to opposition from the voters. It should be noted here, that the Department of State, too, did not press the Austrians hard on the "Jewish Claims issue" (compared with claims of US oil firms), although the settlement of these claims was part of the Austrian State Treaty. The State Department even took over the negotiation initiative from the Jewish organizations in 1958/59 and settled the claims on a rather low financial level.[25]

This explains why since the 1960s this issue of "heirless property," too, did not move - no one wanted really to stir up the issue, because no one wanted a political debate which then would result in the unmasking of the myth of the Austrian victimization under National Socialism (although on an individual basis many non-Jewish Austrians, too have suffered under the Hitler regime or have been killed). In the field of the "stolen art" this certainly reveals the collaboration of art dealers, auction houses, museum experts and curators in the mostly organized plunder of art collections of their Jewish fellow citizens, as well as the fact that many fellow citizens - many of them not members of the NSDAP - stole art objects from Austrian Jews, and tried to hide the truth after 1945. Still today there is a tendency in self descriptions of museums and the Bundesdenkmalamt to hide the truth or to smoothen this brutal chapter of Austrian cultural history and again present the Germans as the overall Nazi perpetrators. Fortunately, the political debate has moved forward.

As an appendix, however, it must be noted that the "human factor" should be more important when analyzing the spoils of the war and talking about restitution. Still the value of forced labor and the human factor should be of much higher importance both in analytical and legal debates. Still the "thieves" are more guilty than the "middle men" who sold or bought stolen art. On the other hand the historical debate moved on also dealing with the post-1945 history of the Nazi war loots. Art objects are an important component of national memories and images. Therefore historical reflections concerning the cultural heritage of museum and private owners ought to be part of an open-minded democratic memory.

This new trend in 1998, certainly a positive result of the Waldheim-Debate and the increasing knowledge about the atrocities of the Nazi regime and the Austrian collaborators, is best exemplified by the debate following the seizure of the two Schiele paintings in the MOMA in January 1998. At first the public and political debate in Austria concentrated on the ownership of the two paintings - at least in the case of the "Wally-Portrait." This issue was cleared in favor of correct transactions leading up to Leopold.[26]

On January 14, 1998, the Austrian Minister of Education, Elisabeth Gehrler, asked for a comprehensive examination of all transactions in Austrian museums during 1938-1945, but it took until the end of February that the internal commission was set up. Since then the debate has shifted from the 2 Schiele cases to the broader debate about immoral treatment received by major collectors like the Rothschilds and their heirs post-1945 (unearthed by the author of this article and made public in an article in "Der Standard," January 14, 1998). But it took another month (until a series in the same newspaper appeared on looted art from the Nazi period) that

Quelle: This presentation is based on a paper, presented at the German Studies Association Conference (September 26, 1997), Washington DC

---

this fact really became an issue. Reluctantly even the director of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Winfried Seipel, now pleaded for the return of plundered art work.[27] In the 1960s, however, an inter-ministerial committee - against the recommendations of the Austrian Federal Office of the Preservation of Historical Monuments - turned down requests of the widow of Louis Rothschild, Hildegard Countess Auersperg, who tried to regain the 4 valuable oil paintings from her late husband's collection.[28] And still in 1974 Austrian bureaucracy blocked efforts to solve this problem of immoral trade-off.

There are still many smoking guns in Austria's Nazi past, but obviously a new generation of journalists, academics and politicians are prepared to face this past and unearth the truth - even if this hurts not only the national memory, but also means concrete efforts for restitution of material losses.

However, it took another month in 1998, when a series in the same newspaper appeared on looted art from the Nazi period, until this fact really became an issue. Even now the director of the Historical Museum of Vienna, Winfried Seipel, pleaded for the return of these immoral trade-off. In the 1960s, however, the Austrian Minister of Education turned down requests of the widow of Louis Rothschild, Hildegard Countess Auersperg, who tried to regain the 4 valuable oil paintings from her late husbands collection (the Ministry of Finance arguing against a compromise since no financial repercussions against the Republic of Austria were predicted). And still in 1974 Austrian bureaucracy blocked efforts to solve this problem of immoral trade-off.

On November 5, 1998, the National Council of the Austrian Parliament unanimously passed a law to retribute looted art from the Nazi period (including the immoral trade-off since the export prohibition law has been amended not to include these objects previously). Since this law is limited to state owned collections provincial and municipal authorities have established commissions to screen their collections after Nazi looted art (e.g. the Historical Museum of Vienna, or the City of Linz and the Province of Upper Austria etc.).[29]

Therefore it seems now important to focus on those art objects which never have been located by the Allied authorities immediately after the end of the war and which have only been partly destroyed. In order to document this future research focus which needs stronger international networking and cooperation of European (Central and Eastern plus Western European), American and Canadian museums, art dealers and collectors as well as a functioning internet data base, I shall present two concrete cases: One is based on the research of Oliver Kühschlem who just two weeks ago traced down three pieces of art which belonged to the collection of Philipp Gomperz in the Moravian Gallery in Brno, Czech Republic, which had been confiscated in 1942 (only 30 of the 85 art objects looted by the German Reich have been restituted after 1945). Another painting from this collection, a Lucas Cranach, Madonna with Child, was "bought" by the Vienna Reichsleiter Baldur von Schirach and seemed to have been sold by a New York art dealer after 1952, who refused to identify the buyer of this stolen object from the Gomperz collection. My own research on the Lederer Collection unearthed concrete evidence that 44 etchings by Rembrandt have been looted in 1938 and only 3 could be returned after 1945. 41 were taken by Hitler's special commissioner for the "Führer Museum" in Linz to the Dresdner Gallery in 1941, and seemed to have still existed in the first postwar years.

The Cold War hindered a European-wide research effort concerning looted art by the Nazi regime, a fact which can be documented in numerous cases. Therefore it seems to be of importance to include Eastern Central European and Russian national and provincial /municipal collections into a database approach of "lost looted art." In order to start with this approach

Quelle: This presentation is based on a paper, presented at the German Studies Association Conference (September 26, 1997), Washington DC

---

concerning "art objects" looted on the territory of Austria during 1938-945 (partly including the immediate postwar loot) I placed a 60 page list of more than one thousand missing art objects (both from public, but primarily private ownership) into the world wide web with a larger version of this presentation and with references to sources and literature (<http://members.vienna.at/kreisky/naziartloot/>). This list had been collected by the "Bundesdenkmalamt" and the Ministry of Education in 1957 - which means that a few of the objects may have been restituted in the meantime, but most are still missing.

1 Andrew Decker, "A Legacy of Shame," ARTnews 83 ( December 1984): 55-75; see also Andrew Decker, "How Things Work in Austria: Stolen Works of Art," ARTnews 92 (Summer 1993): 198-200 and Herbert Haupt, Das Kunsthistorische Museum. Die Geschichte des Hauses am Ring. Hundert Jahre im Spiegel der Ereignisse (Wien: 1991). More precisely Josephine Leistra, "The Mauerbach Case," Spoils of War. International Newsletter 3 (December 1996): 22-27.

2 Paul Grosz, "Introduction," in Christie's, The Mauerbach Benefit Sale, Vienna, October 29-30, 1996, Auction 5638.

3 New York Times, 24 December 1997.

4 New York Times, 8 January 1998.

5 Boston Globe, 24 July 1997.

6 Bruno Aigner, Information für Heinz Fischer, 20 June 1985 and Sinowatz to Vranitzky, 4 July 1985, Bruno Kreisky Archives Foundation, Vienna, Franz Vranitzky Archives, Mag. Krammer, Box Mauerbach.

7 United States Allied Commission Austria, The Rehabilitation of Austria, 1945-1947, Vol. III, Vienna (no publisher and no date, app. 1950) 67.

8 Charles de Jaeger, The Linz File. Hitler's Plunder of Europe's Art (Exeter: Webb and Bower, 1981), 19 and with more sophisticated analysis and academic research by Jonathan Petropoulos, Art as Politics in the Third Reich (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996). See also Lynn H. Nicholas, The Rape of Europe. The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War (New York: Knopf, 1994), 346-350.

9 Katharina Hammer, Glanz im Dunkel. Die Bergung von Kunstschätzen im Salzkammergut am Ende des 2. Weltkrieges (Wien: Bundesverlag, 1986), 119-166.

10 Staatsratsprotokoll, 22 August 1945, Archiv der Republik, Wien, Sammlung Staats- und Ministerratsprotokolle post 1945; the author owes this reference to Dr. Theodor Venus, Vienna. More details concerning the legal and political aspects of preserving art 1918-1945 in: Eva Frodl-Kraft, Gefährdetes Erbe. Österreichs Denkmalschutz und Denkmalpflege 1918-1945 im Prisma der Zeitgeschichte, Wien 1997.

11 GZ 29.036/47, Archiv der Republik, Wien, Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Box 99.

12 GZ 29.102/47, Archiv der Republik, Wien, Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Box 165.

13 Erich Lederer, Archiv der Republik, Wien, Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Sammelmappen, K 131.

14 Bruno Kreisky, Der Mensch im Mittelpunkt. Der Memoiren dritter Teil, ed. Oliver Rathkolb, Johannes Kunz und Margit Schmidt (Wien: Kremayr & Scheriau, 1996), 44f.

15 Compare for more details on this issue Brigitte Bailer, Wiedergutmachung - kein Thema. Österreich und die Opfer des Nationalsozialismus (Wien: Löcker), 1993.

16 Österreichisches Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Archiv - Nachlaß Karl Renner, NL 1-3, Do 721, Mappe 9

17 List of public property

Kunsthistorisches Museum, Wien

Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Wien

Historisches Museum der Stadt Wien

Stadt Salzburg

Mozarteum Salzburg

Österreichische Bergbaumuseen

Österreichisches Apothekermuseum, Wien

Zisterzienser Stift Heiligenkreuz, NÖ

List of private (mostly, but not exclusively) Jewish property

Nachlaß Rudolf von Alt

Dr. Biermann

Carl Blaas

Dr. Josef und Gusti Blauhorn

Ferdinand Bloch-Bauer

Oscar Bondy

Margarete Buchstab

Karoline Czechowiczka

Ernst Duschinsky



Quelle: This presentation is based on a paper, presented at the German Studies Association Conference (September 26, 1997), Washington DC

---

Hortense Eissler  
Valerie Eissler  
David Goldmann  
Dr. Philipp von Gomperz  
Rudolf Gutmann  
Dr. Otto Habsburg-Lothringen  
Dr. Felix Haas  
Henriette Hainisch  
Bruno Jellinek  
Karpeles-Schenker  
Stephan Kerlin  
Dr. Norbert u. S. Klinger  
Nettie Königstein  
Dr. Felix Kornfeld  
Moriz von Kuffner  
Henriette Lainzer  
Graf Anton Lanckoronski  
Prinz Eduard Liechtenstein  
Margit Löffler  
Leidinger (Hanna Rhode)  
Fritz Mandl  
Franz Matsch  
Egger Möllwald  
Berta Morelli  
Benno Moser  
Kunsthandlung Nehammer-Prinz  
(Kunsthändler Oskar Hamel)  
Kunsthandlung Plobner  
Albert Pollak  
Ernst Pollak  
Frau Reichel  
Alphons Rothschild  
Louis Rothschild  
Schiff-Suvero  
Arthur Spitzer  
Dr. Alfons Thorsch  
Hedwig und Viktor Wimpfen  
Georg A. Wolf  
Kunsthandlung Wolfrum  
Paul und Andy Zsolnay  
Ing. Herbert Zucker-Hale

18 Gerhard Sailer, "Austria," Spoils of War, International Newsletter 3 (December 1996), 35; again published in Elisabeth Simpson, ed. "The Spoils of War. World War II and Its Aftermath: The Loss, Reappearance and Recovery of Cultural Property" (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997), 88-91. In a rather strange analysis Gerhard Sailer omits the theft of Jewish-owned artworks so that the editors had to refer to this immoral and shameful chapter of recent cultural history in a separate editorial remark.

19 Bernard B. Traper, Transcript of interrogation, National Archives, Record Group 260, ACA Austria, Box 365 Folder: R&R 51.

20 John Dornberg, "The Mounting Embarrassment of Germany's Nazi Treasures," ARTnews 87 (September 1988), 138.

21 Hammer, Glanz, 258.

22 Unpublished research proposal by Sophie Lillie, September 1996.

23 Hector Feliciano, Spoils of War 3 (December 1996), 25f

24 Hector Feliciano, Spoils of War 3 (December 1996), 25f.

25 Oliver Rathkolb, Washington ruft Wien. US Großmachtspolitik und Österreich, 1953-1963 (Wien: Böhlau, 1997), 212-232.

26 News 4/98, 140.

27 Boston Globe, 5 March 1998.

28 Archiv des Bundesdenkmalamtes, Wien, Karton 52.

29 For the "Kunsthistorisches Museum" see the unpublished Report by Herbert Haupt in cooperation with Lydia Göbl, Die Veränderungen im Inventarbestand des Kunsthistorischen Museums während der Nazizeit und in den Jahren bis

Quelle: This presentation is based on a paper, presented at the German Studies Association Conference (September 26, 1997), Washington DC

---

zum Staatsvertrag 1955 ("Widmungen"), Vienna, June 1998. This report is the first one of a series from the various "national museums" and seems to be intended to be published. Dr. Haupt takes a very different position on the postwar restitution issues than outlined in his previous book *Das Kunsthistorische Museum. Die Geschichte des Hauses am Ring. Hundert Jahre im Spiegel Historischer Ereignisse*, Wien 1991. Other forthcoming publications are a series of articles on the Nazi art loot in Austria from a research conference meeting before the Mauerbach sale, edited by Theodor Brückler (to be published by Böhlau Verlag Vienna in 1999) and an enlarged version of the articles by Hubertus Czernin (in cooperation with Gabriele Anderl and Thomas Trenkler) for "Der Standard" will appear with Molden Verlag in Vienna (January 1999).