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**АНОТАЦІЯ**

Стаття присвячена проблемі викраденого мистецтва, трофеїв війни, яка упродовж століть хвилювала і продовжує хвилювати людство. Її намагаються вирішити уряди і спеціальні комісії багатьох держав світу. Комплексний підхід до вирішення цього питання стикається з низкою перепон та має важливі особливості. Оскільки територія України протягом століть була поділена між різними імперіями, проблема повернення вивезених культурних цінностей видається набагато складнішою, а самі переговори часто заходять в глухий кут. Попри те, що Україна і Росія мають спільні трагічні сторінки, пов’язані з історією Другої світової війни, їх тлумачення є різними. Між Україною і Росією – країнами-спадкоємицями колишнього СРСР, точаться запеклі дискусії і виникають непорозуміння через культурні цінності, вивезені нацистами під час окупації України, які пізніше були реституйовані, але так і не були повернуті Україні, а потрапили до Росії. Голокост і його наслідки в СРСР взагалі було «вилучено» з пам'яті про Другу світову війну. Якою є доля творів мистецтва, можна ще розшукати і повернути, що залишилося на території Росії, України, а що лише у пам’яті? Цe питання, які потребують виваженої наукової оцінки і подальшого опрацювання. Вагоме значення мають дорогоцінні пам’ятні речі, пов’язані з історіями родин, які були знищені. Музеї, архіви та бібліотеки є носіями інформації про пам'ять у науковому та повсякденному дискурсі. Підкреслено, що культурні цінності з музеїв України вивозилися урядом ще у 20-х рр., їх вилучали і відправляли у державне бюро Ленінграду, потім продавали закордон.

Війна на Сході України змушує вести переговори вже про нові трофеї. Україна досі вимагає від Росії повернення культурних скарбів, які знаходилися в експозиціях музеїв півострова Крим.
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**SUMMARY**

The article is dedicated to the problem of the plundered art and the spoils of war. Mentioned problem has been bothering humanity for centuries and it is still actual. The governments and special commissions of many countries seek to solve this problem. An integrated approach to addressing the issue faces a number of obstacles and has significant features. Since the territory of Ukraine was shared over the centuries between various different empires, negotiating the restitution of Ukrainian looted art is a much more complicated and arduous issue than in the case of other countries. Ukraine and Russia have common pages of tragic history during World War II, but these countries interpret it in different ways. As successor states of the Soviet Union, Ukraine and Russia have a heated debate about the return of cultural artifacts which, after being looted from Ukraine under German occupation and subsequently restored to the USSR, ended up in Russia rather than Ukraine. The Holocaust and its consequences were excluded from the commemoration of World War II by the USSR. Still awaiting scholarly attention are the questions of which objects can still be found and returned, which controversial artworks are still on Russian soil, and which objects survive only in memory. The sentimental objects and valuables connected with family histories, which were extinguished, have a great importance. Museums, archives, libraries become the sources of information about the memory in academic and everyday discourse. The researcher underlines that Soviet government even in 1920s exported cultural property from Ukrainian museums: at first, it was brought to the State Office of Antiquities in Leningrad, later it was sold abroad.

The War in the Eastern Ukraine yielded negotiations about the new booty. Ukraine still calls for Russia to return Ukrainian cultural property that belonged to the museums of the Crimean Peninsula.
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**Introduction**

Plundered or looted art has been a recurrent phenomenon in human history for centuries. It is an issue that affects not only the population of Europe but also many other parts of the world. Historically, a cultural identity of the society is shaped by people, events, places, and memories. Individual memories allow historians to reconstruct a complete picture of past events and to research the collective memory. Ukrainians, Russians, Poles, and Germans have many shared memories that are closely bound up with the aftermath of World War II and are interpreted differently in the cultures of remembrance of each nation.

Since the territory of Ukraine was shared over the centuries between various different empires (the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Greater Romania, Austria-Hungary, and the Russian and Ottoman Empires), negotiating the restitution of Ukrainian looted art is a much more complicated and arduous issue than in the case of other countries.

What is the full scope of the problem? Poland desires the return of cultural artifacts that were removed as a consequence of the war and is demanding numerous artifacts from former Polish territories that are part of Ukraine today. Germany is demanding the return of Soviet looted art. Ukraine and Russia agree that Germany should not simply make demands for restitution but is also under an obligation to make reparations for the immense destruction of the war. At the same time, Kyiv is involved in a dispute with Moscow about the return of cultural artifacts which, after being looted from Ukraine under German occupation and subsequently restored to the USSR, ended up in Russia rather than Ukraine [1].

Germany bears the responsibility for the looting, plundering, and destruction of significant Ukrainian cultural artifacts. As successor states of the Soviet Union, Ukraine and Russia are negotiating the restitution of Ukrainian objects that were brought to the USSR – either to Russia itself or to other Soviet republics – after the war. These objects include cultural artifacts that were stolen during the German occupation and returned to Russia instead of Ukraine [1].

As successor states of the Soviet Union, Russia and Ukraine have been obliged to coordinate their efforts to locate and restore looted cultural property. The dispute about ownership rights is still in progress. Cultural artifacts have always been, and continue to represent, the desirable spoils of war. And the undeclared war in Ukraine yielded new booty in 2014. Ukraine calls for Russia to return Ukrainian cultural property that belonged to the Crimean Peninsula. In many cases, restitution is impossible. However, there are cases where cooperative efforts resulted in the location and return of national cultural artifacts [2].

More and more often, Ukrainian and German cultural goods are appearing in Russian museums, exhibitions, and catalogues, London auctions, and further afield in America. The restitution of stolen and looted art is a sensitive subject and one of the main questions occupying the attention of scholars [3].

What happened to the stolen objects, and what was their subsequent fate? There are still many cultural artifacts whose origins remain unknown. The fundamental issues concern the provenance of the objects and their current whereabouts. Still awaiting scholarly attention are the questions of which objects can still be returned, which controversial artworks are still on Ukrainian or Russian soil, and which objects survive only in memory.

According to the Ukrainian historian Serhij Kot, 250,000 cultural artifacts and approximately fifty million books were lost from twenty-one Ukrainian museums during World War II. Kot stresses that the objects looted by the Germans in Ukraine account for approximately 55 percent of all the Soviet Union’s cultural goods [4].

The cultural policy of Nazi Germany was closely linked to the themes of Nazi plunder, «degenerate art», and looted art. The term «Nazi plunder» refers to the large-scale illegal expropriation of private property as part of the policy of discrimination, disenfranchisement, persecution, and ultimately extermination pursued by the Nazi regime. This type of looted art refers exclusively to cultural losses caused by the Nazi persecution of private collectors, who were blackmailed, dispossessed, and in many cases murdered. In the case of «looted art», the interventions and consequences are of a different nature, since this phenomenon primarily affected public institutions [5]. To provide for their daily needs or to cover the costs of emigration, collectors sold a great number of paintings, graphics, sculptures, books, and antiques.

For many years, memory and remembrance have been the subject not only of various academic disciplines but also of broader everyday discourse. The conventional media such as pictures, museums, monuments and memorial sites, archives, and libraries figure in both scholarly and informal debates about memory and remembrance. Life consists of millions of moments and memories, but there is a special poignancy in the memories of plundered and looted art and in the recollected feeling that the present is lost and fading [6]. What is at issue here is often not the financial value of the objects but the history and mementoes of a life that no longer exists and of families that were extinguished.

It must be stressed that public and private remembrance in Ukraine is characterized by the experience of the dual dictatorship and occupation by Stalinism and National Socialism. Ukrainian and Russian scholars have analyzed and placed into a historical context the experiences and memories of the Ukrainian population whose property was confiscated before and during World War II [7].

Thomas Sandkühler [8], Dieter Pohl [9], Eliyahu Yones [10], Jakub Honigsmann [11] and Janna Kovba [12] are only some of the researchers who are studying the persecution of the Jewish people during the war. The looting of Jewish property in the Soviet Union and Ukraine has been researched in detail by Yitzhak Arad [13]. Martin Dean has focused on confiscations by military strike forces [14]. It is important to note that the plundering and confiscation of Jewish private property in Ukraine during World War II has been very sketchily studied to date.

**Plundered and Looted Art during the Dual Occupation of Ukraine**

After World War I, the Soviet government robbed the Jewish and non-Jewish population of Ukraine as well as the country’s museums, exhibitions, and private collections. The October Revolution triggered the most extensive expropriations of cultural artifacts the world had ever seen, with nationalizations primarily affecting the court, the nobility, the bourgeoisie, and the Church. The army, the militia, and museum experts confiscated privately owned art, antiques, jewelry, and furniture and fittings [15].

The treatment of art treasures in the Soviet Union was highly atypical. As early as 1918, a large number of world-famous paintings were removed from the Bohdan and Varvara Khanenko Museum of Arts in Kyiv and taken to Russia. They were brought to the State Office of Antiquities in Leningrad by a representative of a state-owned import–export agency, or Gostorg. Many years later, after World War II, the paintings were sold in the US. One such painting was the diptych *Adam and Eve* by the great German painter Lukas Cranach the Elder (1472–1553). It was identified by chance by Sergei Gilyarov, the assistant director of the Khanenko Museum, on June 11, 1928, in one of the churches in the Kyiv Monastery of the Caves, which is where all the cultural goods confiscated from private citizens and churches were brought. As late as 1929, Cranach’s diptych showing Adam and Eve, which was painted in 1530, was held by the Khanenko Museum in Kyiv. During restoration work, which took over a year, it became clear that Adam and Eve had originally been two separate paintings, which were later put together to form a diptych. The further the restoration work progressed, the more beautiful the painting turned out to be, even as the moment of its irrecoverable loss came ever nearer. It was destined to be expunged from memory [16]. The diptych was taken to Leningrad (as mentioned above); where the authorities stressed that the proceeds of the sale of the painting were needed for the industrialization of the country. The work was sold at auction in Berlin in 1931, where the Dutch collector Jacques Goudstikker bought it for $10,000; subsequently it came into the possession of Hermann Göring. The painting was eventually sold to the Norton Simon Museum in Pasadena. *Eve* has been in the US since 1970 and Adam since 1971. The current value of the work is approximately $30 million. Jacques Goudstikker’s heirs fought a court battle against the Norton Simon Museum for the restitution of the diptych. The diptych’s provenance is not yet fully established. It is still an open question of how it came to Kyiv, as well as its ownership before 1919. The director of the Kyiv Monastery of the Caves Museum, Mr. Kurinnoy, surmises that the painting could have been brought here together with other Church property in the course of the dissolution of the so-called regimental churches that existed on Galician soil during World War I. Unfortunately, however, there is no evidence that might corroborate this hypothesis [16]. Nor can a Jewish provenance be ruled out.

During the Soviet era, many Ukrainian cultural artifacts were removed to Russian museums. For example, the thirteenth-century Water-Carrier of Shirvan was taken from the Khanenko Museum in Kyiv and taken to the State Office of Antiquities in Leningrad in 1929 with the intention of selling the work to the West. In 1932, however, this unique work from the collection of Bohdan and Varvara Khanenko was acquired by the Hermitage Museum. One typical method of stealing art has been for works lent out for an exhibition to be held and never returned. One of the works that was lost to Ukraine in this way is the valuable mosaic St. Demetrius of Salonica, stolen in 1934–1935 [17]. One of the best-preserved mosaics of the Cathedral of St. Michael in Kyiv, it is currently held by the Tretyakov Gallery in Moscow. Some pieces were subsequently sold by the Russian museums, while the Water-Carrier of Shirvan found its way into the Hermitage Museum.

For Ukraine, all these objects primarily symbolize determination and independence. Museums in Russia still hold many cultural artifacts from the Scythian burial mounds in Ukraine – for example, the Hermitage Museum currently holds a golden comb from Soloha, a silver amphora from Chertomlyk, various Cossack documents, club hammers, and other objects – but the places where they were found are never acknowledged.

Ukraine has sufficient documentary evidence to bring about the restitution of many Ukrainian objects from Russia, but many other items are irretrievably lost, such as a large collection of over seven hundred icons from various Ukrainian churches and museums [17]. These icons are officially presumed to have been destroyed by fire, but experts believe that they remain hidden somewhere or were dispersed to other countries.

The fate of many cultural artifacts that were either sold without their owners’ permission or confiscated in Germany between 1933 and 1945 has not yet been sufficiently studied either in Germany or in the rest of the world. There are many different reasons why this is the case. Whether deliberately or unconsciously, German historians, art historians, and museum experts paid very little attention in the postwar decades to the problem of the identification, provenance, and restitution of cultural artifacts misappropriated during the Nazi era.

It is not possible to give an accurate assessment of how many artworks have still not been returned to their rightful owners, but remain scattered all over the world, in the possession of public collections, museums, art galleries, and private owners. As for the looted cultural artifacts that were destroyed, taken to unknown locations, or privately appropriated, we can only guess.

For example, Evgeniya Denisova argues that, in most cases, the restitution of cultural artifacts was spontaneous and unsystematic in character, which makes it difficult to identify and document the restituted items. As a result, cultural artifacts from occupied Germany that did not appear on the lists of looted art, which found their way to other countries and were then often regarded as lost [18].

In most cases, the numerous individuals who were dispossessed of their artworks and cultural artifacts in Western and Eastern Europe during the Nazi era suffered this in the context of racial and political persecution. Even in the twenty-first century, the consequences of these inhuman Nazi policies have not yet been resolved.

Cultural artifacts were taken to the West by Nazi organizations and divisions such as the Reichsleiter Rosenberg Task Force (ERR) and the «Gruppe Künsberg» battalion. The ERR was one of the most important Nazi organizations responsible for the systematic looting of cultural property [19]. With Hitler’s explicit approval, the ERR extended its operations to include «valuable cultural property» that had belonged to Jews. Initially in France, and later in all the occupied territories, the organization plundered art collections, archives, and libraries [20], eventually targeting not only Jewish property but also any «enemy» art collections; the damage to the cultural heritage of the affected regions was catastrophic. It should be stressed that a large number of valuable Ukrainian objects from museums, archives, and libraries remain lost to this day.

Attacks on Jewish property were very widespread in occupied Eastern Europe. Similarly, the assets of the victims of persecution were appropriated, their lives were threatened, and many artworks were sold far below their value. Since the looted objects were regarded as «belonging» to the Third Reich, they were not subsequently returned to their rightful owners, but became the property of the German state.

Between 1933 and 1945, privately and publicly owned artworks, books, and archival material were extorted, Aryanized, seized, and looted first in Germany, then throughout Europe. Special offices and organizations were formed for this purpose. The Jewish population was robbed with particular savagery. The Nazi occupation policy in Western Europe was significantly different from that in the East. The losses reported in France, Belgium, and the Netherlands after their liberation primarily concerned private art collections, frequently those owned by Jews. In Eastern Europe, the various German agencies also pillaged churches, museums, art galleries, and libraries, and transferred some of the looted property to Germany [20]. Museum holdings were plundered, and artworks from private collections were confiscated.

The looting of art in connection with World War II encompasses cultural property stolen by German organizations in the occupied areas during the war as well as the plundering of cultural property by Allied occupying forces after the end of the war. In point of fact, very few individual items can still be found in Germany today [21]. Working groups have been established here at the political level in connection with negotiations with Russia. There are also cultural encounters and museum dialogues between Germany and Russia [22].

Nazi plunder and looted art are parts of the national memory and constitute focal points of remembrance. The distinction between these two categories of stolen art cannot always be clearly applied to individual cultural artifacts. There is sometimes an overlap between Nazi appropriation and the work of Soviet trophy brigades and the Trophy Commission. As a cultural phenomenon, the looting of art in the aftermath of wars predates Nazism. It must be stressed that the concept of looted art is the more significant one in the context of Russia and Ukraine, where the term “Nazi plunder” plays a less prominent role in scholarly discourse than it does in Europe. Although the problem of Nazism and its consequences in the former Soviet Union states have been well researched, scholars have devoted most of their attention to the cultural consequences affecting their own countries – what objects were removed from Russia or Ukraine and by whom, and how they could be returned to their country of origin.

At the end of the war, most of the Nazi plunder from the various European countries was located in depots in the American-occupied zone. The objects had been looted primarily from German Jews and from those persecuted as Jews in all the areas occupied by the Wehrmacht during World War II [5].

**Excluding the Holocaust from World War II Remembrance**

The massacre of Babyn Yar remains in memory as the largest mass shooting of World War II. In September 1941, members of the SS (backed by Ukrainian police auxiliaries) murdered almost 34,000 Jews at the edge of a ravine near Kiev. The men, women, and children were carrying their valuables on their persons or in suitcases and bags. There was vicious hatred for the Jews, and the infringements on their property extended, from the very beginning, to artworks and art collections. It is necessary for these historical events to be known and understood, and therefore it is important for the events of September 29 and 30, 1941, to be commemorated worldwide. Social and historical remembrance from the 1930s to the present day has taken a variety of different forms at public places of remembrance (museums, memorial sites, and monuments) in the different countries and cultures of East-Central and Eastern Europe. This appears to be particularly true of the era of socialist dictatorship in Eastern Europe and, in particular, for these dictatorships’ attitudes to the Holocaust. They disapproved strongly of any mention of the Holocaust and took steps to silence the voices urging that its memory be kept alive. The deliberate purging of the Holocaust and other central aspects of the Nazi’s racist persecution and genocide from the public commemoration of World War II in the socialist societies of the Soviet Union is obvious. Like all other important ideological and political questions, the themes for the official remembrance of Nazi crimes in the socialist societies of East-Central and Eastern Europe after the war were largely specified by the Moscow regime.

Starting in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the laying of wreaths with Jewish symbols was forbidden at the sites of massacres, including Babyn Yar, and was regarded as anti-Soviet agitation. Commemoration of Jewish victims originally began in the Baltic states where the anti-Soviet sentiments were always strong [23].

In Eastern Europe, 1945 also marked the beginning of a new dictatorship – that of Stalinism. The dual experience of Nazism and Stalinism shaped public and private remembrance in the Soviet Union. In the recent years, this remembrance has included the commemoration of Soviet crimes, which were not made public until after 1990.

**From a Shared Fate in World War II to Divergent Paths**

Ukraine and Russia shared the same tragic fate during World War II. The search for and restitution of cultural property lost as a result of the war is complicated by the fact that the Soviet state ignored the issue for many decades. Negotiations between the two countries are fraught with conflict as both sides attempt to secure the return of lost cultural property.

The majority of objects of Soviet provenance was returned to the USSR in nineteen railway cars. Unfortunately, the documentation of the subsequent fate of these museum items in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus have not been adequately studied to date. Ukrainian researchers suspect that the contents of Russian museum storage facilities may include cultural property from Ukraine. To reassemble the scattered museum collections, they suggest that German lists of items removed from Ukraine should be compared with surviving inventory books from the prewar years and that Ukrainian lists of special museum holdings in Russia be searched for Ukrainian property that may have remained there [2, 303-304].

The internationally renowned American researcher Patricia Kennedy Grimsted has made significant strides in the study of the documents, lists of the Kyiv archive, and the ERR photo library. In the Kyiv archive, she examined lists and images of Soviet cultural property that was taken from Germany to the Soviet Union in the postwar period. The ERR photo library is an important repository of photographs of exhibits in the museums of Kyiv in 1943 [24].

Russian-Ukrainian negotiations concerning cultural property are based on an agreement about cultural cooperation signed by the CIS states on February 15, 1992, and another such agreement dated March 25, 1994. The 1992 agreement calls for the formation of an international expert committee to deal with the restitution of cultural property. The governmental treaty of July 26, 1995, on cooperation in the fields of culture, science, and education is also important in this context.

In 1992, a national commission for the restitution of cultural property was established in Kyiv. The commission’s work culminated in the publication of catalogues of cultural goods lost from the art museums of Kyiv and the Simferopol Museum during World War II. The first volume of the complete catalogue of cultural goods of the Russian Federation looted or lost during World War II appeared in 1999. The catalogue of items lost from the Simferopol art museum (2002) turns out to contain a number of errors and inaccuracies, probably because of the poor quality of the sources [2, 303-304].

As an example of cooperation between Russian and Ukrainian experts, we can cite here the restitution of fresco fragments from St. Michael’s Cathedral in Kyiv, which had previously been held by the Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg. After the destruction of the cathedral in 1934, twenty-three frescoes and other cultural artifacts were taken to Germany during the occupation of Kyiv. After the war, some of these objects were returned to Novgorod. Based on the inventory numbers, experts were able to determine where the items had been stored before their removal to Germany. The eleven fresco fragments from Kyiv were identified as belonging to the Novgorod museum complex, and more specifically the Monastery of St. Anthony. With permission from the Russian Ministry of Culture, the Novgorod Museum transferred these frescoes to the Hermitage Museum in 1953 for permanent storage. The Ukrainian experts were able to show from archival documents that four of the fragments in the Hermitage Museum were works from St. Michael’s Cathedral in Kyiv. The frescoes were restored to Ukraine in 2001. The other seven fragments were returned in August 2004 after being studied by experts in detail [2, 303-304].

The dialogue about the restitution of Russian and Ukrainian cultural property cannot be described as particularly productive or positive. In 2002, the Russian Ministry of Culture handed over to Ukraine documents about paintings and drawings from the State Russian Museum, which had been brought to museums in Ukraine in the context of World War II.

It is unusual for lost artworks to be returned to Ukraine. More commonly, these artifacts turn up in London auctions [25]. These works were considered irretrievably lost for many decades. In this context, Alexander Feldman must be mentioned as one of the foremost Ukrainian arts patrons of our time. He purchased the painting Arcadian Landscape at his own expense at one of the auctions and returned it to the Khanenko Museum.

Arcadian Landscape, an oil-on-wood work painted by Cornelis van Poelenburgh (b. 1594/95 in Utrecht), was removed from the museum in August 1943 on the orders of the Nazi occupation authorities along with numerous other works and taken to Königsberg (modern Kaliningrad in Russia). These works were believed to have been destroyed by fire on February 17, 1945, in Vildenhoff Castle near Königsberg until the painting appeared in an auction in Europe in May 2011. It was originally part of the collection of the museum founders Bohdan and Varvara Khanenko. The Alexander Feldman Fund covered all the costs of returning the work to Ukraine. In a prewar exhibition, Arcadian Landscape had taken pride of place as a work signed with its creator’s authentic monogram [26].

**Ukrainian Cultural Property in the Present-Day War in Ukraine**

As Russia’s policies toward Ukraine are the subject to widely diverse interpretations, it must be unequivocally stated what these policies entail and the consequences attendant upon them: here we may include the annexation of the Crimean Peninsula and military interventions in Donbas, civilian collateral damage, anti-Ukrainian propaganda [27], a mass-media campaign against Ukraine, and the illegal removal of cultural property from the Crimean Peninsula [28]. The Minsk Agreements [29] are not respected. It should be noted that this is not the first example of a war in the history of Ukrainian-Russian relations – in fact, it is approximately the tenth war waged by Russia against Ukraine [30].

In the course of the undeclared war, Russia and Ukraine are also fighting a battle for cultural property. The disputed objects include Scythian gold [31], a collection of paintings from the Ivan Aivazovsky Gallery (Feodosia, The Crimean Peninsula, The Niagara Falls, Storm near Yevpatoriya on November 2, 1854, The Ship «The Twelve Apostles», Ice Mountains in Antarctica, Icebergs), the frescoes from St. Michael’s Cathedral in Kyiv, the palace of the Khans of Crimea in Bakhchysararai, the Sudak fortress, and many more. Elena Gagarina’s argument is simple but also courageous given the politically charged atmosphere: she holds that exhibits in state museums belong not to the museums but to the state. The Scythian gold was brought to Amsterdam from Ukraine, so it should be returned to Ukraine. If countries can no longer be certain that these rules and agreements will be honored, it would spell the end of all cultural exchange between nations [31]. According to the historian Serhij Kot, all the works in the Feodosia Museum are insured to the value of $2 million. In 2012, Evening in Cairo by Aivasovsky was sold at Sotheby’s £2.5 million on behalf of a private collector. Two years later, the painting View of Constantinople and the Bosporus was sold there for £3.2 million.

Russia should comply strictly with its obligations under international law and respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Ukraine. There is much in Russia’s policy and development that can be explained by the long shadow cast by a past that has yet to be processed. It is important to note that there are approximately 925,000 valuable artifacts on the Crimean Peninsula.

One example of good cooperation before 2014 and the start of the war in Ukraine is the compilation and publication of the catalogue of the Simferopol Museum titled Art in the Flames of War [32]. The catalogue lists 109 paintings, which have been identified as the works of eighty-six world-renowned artists from the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries from Germany, Holland, Flanders, France, Italy, and Spain. For many years after World War II these paintings were kept hidden in museum storage, and their public display was prohibited. Scholars have found that seventy-four of these paintings belonged to the Suermondt-Ludwig Museum in Aachen. Ukraine was one of the first of the former Soviet republics to set a good example in releasing and publicizing secret museum holdings.

**Conclusion**

One important historical fact to be borne in mindis that the issue of looted art remains live between Russia and the Ukraine because the war is still in progress. It must be stressed that the issue of Nazi plunder and art looted in Ukraine and Russia during and after World War II is in need of further thorough scholarly examination.

Although Ukraine sustained great losses of valuable cultural property in the Soviet era and during World War II, the Ukrainian authorities are paying little attention to this important issue. Doing so would require a long-term government program and the formation of a national commission (the last commission was dissolved) to search for looted art and help the country to recover its cultural property. The specific issues of the provenance and restitution of cultural property can only be solved through dialogue.

Russia and Ukraine must also accept the Washington Principles and draw conclusions from the new German Act on the Protection of Cultural Property. All these questions must be solved in cooperation with the museums, which should report the presence in their holdings of objects that do not belong to them and whose provenance and circumstances of acquisition are unknown.

We can keep the remembrance of plundered and looted art alive for as long as we continue to map out and discuss these issues.
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