



Venetian Republic

Venice, Palazzo Ducale, 2022.07.18

Prot.N.DPL202218070009

Recipients

Daniel Crouch, 4 Bury Street, St James's, London, SW1Y 6AB, UK / PO Box 329, Larchmont, NY 10538-2945, USA

UNESCO Culture Sector 7, Place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris CEDEX 07- France - CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE (1972)

ICCROM: The International Center for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property, Via di San Michele 13 I-00153 Rome, Italy

c / o

To Don Gianni Abate, Basilica of San Zeno Maggiore - Piazza San Zeno, 2 - 37123 Verona - VR

Foreign Minister Elisabeth Truss, King Charles Street, London SW1A 2AH, United Kingdom

Commonwealth Secretary General Patricia Scotland Marlborough, House Pall Mall London SW1Y 5HX United Kingdom (Commonwealth Charter)

Secretary General of the Interpol Organization, Jürgen Stock, 200, Quai Charles de Gaulle 69006 Lyon - France

Office of the Attorney General of the Venetian Republic

To His Exc. Mons. Fernando Vergez Alzaga President of the Pontifical Commission for the Vatican City State, Apostolic Almsgiving, Parchment Office - 00120 Vatican City

To the President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic Mario Draghi - Piazza Colonna 370 - 00187 Rome (RM)

To the President of the Veneto Region Luca Zaia, responsible for the legal and political functions of the Veneto Region Authority - Dorsoduro 3901 - 30123 Venice

To the President of the Italian Republic Sergio Mattarella - Quirinal Palace Piazza del Quirinale - 00187 Rome

To Your Excellency, Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. António Guterres, U.N. Office of Legal affairs, Mr. Miguel de Serpa Soares, 760 United Nations Plaza New York - N.Y. 10017 - USA

A U.N. - OHCHR, Ms. Michelle Bachelet Jeria, Palais Wilson - Rue de Paquis, 52 CH-1201 Genève - SUISSE

Haut Commissariat des Nations Unies pour les réfugiés (UNHCR) Rue de Montbrillant 94, 1201 Genève - SUISSE

International Committee of the Red Cross, 19 Avenue de la Paix 1202, Geneva - Switzerland

To the O.E.C.D. - Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) General Secretary, Mr. Angel Gurría 2, Rue André Pascal 75775 Paris Cedex 16 - FRANCE

To the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Mr. Josep Borrell c / o European Commission, Rue de la Loi - Weststraat 200 1049 Brussels - Belgium



COMITATO LIBERAZIONE NAZIONALE VENETO

(Art. 96.3 1° Protocollo Convenzione di Ginevra 1977 – legge n.762 del 11 dicembre 1985)



Secretary General of the Council of the European Union Jeppe Tranholm-Mikkelsen. c/o President of the European Council Charles Michel.

Senders

Veneto National Liberation Committee

Government of the Veneto Council of Ministers

National Parliamentary Council of the Veneto People

Legal Affairs Office of the Legislative Council of the Veneto People.

Object:

Restitution of the artefact belonging to the Veneto State. Inventory reference: 15438- The Astrolabe of San Zeno, of the Benedictine Monastery of San Zeno, Verona; which was sacked by Napoleonic troops in 1797.



https://www.crouchrarebooks.com/globes-and-planetaria/a-unique-late-medieval-early-renaissance-volvelle-astronomical-calendar?fbclid=IwAR33NwOM03N3d4iEhK0325TNuN-iBvcDbgLYri-Q7_QGx4v3v3

Against reply to the mail of the auction house Daniel Crouch, 4 Bury Street, St James's, London, SW1Y 6AB, UK (Reply attached 1), with a request to comply with what is written with documentary proof of the legality of origin of the Astrolabe artefact.

(Attached 2) Document international public legal act of 2022.07.10 Prot.N.DPL202213070008 (only for added addresses).

Considered:

Veneto Legal Commission

European Parliament

Resolution approved:

- having regard to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its second protocol of March 1999,

Sede del Governo: Palazzo Ducale -Venezia

Sede Operativa - Via Julia Augusta, 89 - 33010 Magnano in Riviera (UD) - Territori Veneti Occupati

segreteria@clnveneto.net - www.clnveneto.net

pag. 2



- having regard to its resolutions of 14 December 1995 on the restitution of plundered property to the Jewish community [1] and of 16 July 1998 on the restitution of property belonging to the victims of the Holocaust [2],
- having regard to the package of measures adopted in December 2016 to strengthen the EU's capacity to combat the financing of terrorism and organized crime, by honoring the commitments made under the action plan to strengthen the fight against terrorist financing, of 2 February 2016 (COM (2016) 0050), and the proposal for a regulation on the import of cultural goods (COM (2017) 0375),
- having regard to its resolution of 30 April 2015 on the destruction of cultural sites by ISIS / Daesh [3],
- having regard to the UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Property of 24 June 1995,
- having regard to Directive 2014/60 / EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 on the return of cultural property unlawfully removed from the territory of a Member State [4],
- having regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights,
- having regard to Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union,
- having regard to Regulation (EC) no. 116/2009 of the Council, of 18 December 2008, relating to the export of cultural goods [5],
- having regard to Regulation (EU) no. 1215/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2012 on jurisdiction, recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters [6], in particular Article 7, paragraph 4,
- having regard to its resolution of 17 December 2003 on a legal framework for the free movement in the internal market of goods whose ownership is liable to be contested [7],
- having regard to the study published in 2016 by its Directorate-General for Internal Policies, entitled "Cross-border restitution claims of art looted in armed conflicts and wars and alternatives to court litigation". armed and wars and alternatives to litigation),
- having regard to Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data, as well as on the free circulation of such data and which repeals Directive 95 / 46 / EC (General Data Protection Regulation) [8],
- having regard to the UNESCO Convention concerning the measures to be adopted to prohibit and prevent the illegal import, export and transfer of ownership of cultural property, of 14 November 1970,
- having regard to Council resolution 14232/12 of 4 October 2012 on the creation of an informal network of law enforcement authorities and competent experts in the field of cultural heritage (EU CULTNET),
- having regard to Article 52 of its Rules of Procedure,
- having regard to the report of the Committee on Legal Affairs and the opinion of the Committee on Culture and Education (A8-0465 / 2018),



A. whereas, according to Interpol, the black market in works of art is becoming just as lucrative as that of drugs, weapons and counterfeit goods;

B. whereas, according to the impact assessment of the Commission's proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the import of cultural goods (COM (2017) 0375), goods of illicit origin represent a percentage between '80 and 90% of the antiques sold worldwide;

C. whereas cultural heritage is one of the fundamental elements of civilization, for example because of its symbolic value and its function as a cultural memory of humanity which unites peoples; whereas, in recent years, numerous crimes against World Cultural Heritage have been perpetrated by warring factions and terrorist groups around the world, that valuable works of art, sculptures and archaeological finds have been sold and imported into the EU by some third countries and that the profits from such transactions could be used to finance terrorist activities; whereas it is essential to make a firm commitment to tackling the illicit trafficking of cultural goods, such as in the case of works of art looted during armed conflicts and wars in Libya, Syria and Iraq; that cultural heritage is of great cultural, artistic, historical and scientific importance and must be protected from illicit appropriation and looting;

D. whereas shortly after the Second World War, attempts were made to find and return looted property to the respective country of origin;

E. whereas the return of items traded and / or excavated or illegally obtained must be ensured in compliance with the EU's commitment to fair trials and compensation for victims, as well as in line with the Convention on the establishment of the 'UNESCO and the conventions on the protection of heritage;

F. whereas the Washington Conference Principles on Nazi-Confiscated Works of Art, the Vilnius Forum and the Terezin Declaration on Holocaust-Era Assets and related issues all underlined the importance of providing for restitution individual real estate; whereas the number of works of art returned following the Washington conference is estimated to be between 1 000 and 2 000 [9]; that there is no complete list of works of art returned in recent years;

G. whereas some works of art are still unobtainable and are waiting to be returned to their legitimate owners or their respective heirs; that, at the 1998 Washington conference, Jonathan Petropoulos estimated that around 650,000 works of art would be stolen across Europe, while Ronald Lauder claimed that 11,000 works, worth between 10 and 30 billion dollars at the time (1998), were still missing; whereas Claims Conference and the WJRO generally state that there are no precise estimates; whereas, of the approximately 650,000 works of art stolen, 100,000 may still be missing;

H. whereas the plaintiffs continue to encounter legal problems due, on the one hand, to the often very specific nature of their requests and, on the other hand, to the obsolete post-conflict restitution laws, the non-retroactivity of treaty rules, the lack of a definition of "looted work of art", the statute of limitations for applications or the provisions on usucapion and good faith;

I. whereas requests for the return of looted works of art and cultural property are mainly dealt with through the instruments of public international law; whereas these regulatory arrangements should be supplemented with stricter rules of private international law;

J. whereas the insufficiently developed dimension of private law at both international and European level contributes to legal uncertainty in cases of cross-border restitution of looted



works of art and cultural property, not only in relation to transactions completed concerning works of art looted by the Nazis, but also with regard to future cases;

K. whereas EU legislation exists which explicitly and comprehensively regulates requests for the return of works of art and cultural property looted during armed conflicts by private individuals;

L. whereas UNESCO, in collaboration with large auction houses, museums and renowned collectors from all over Europe, conducts extensive research into the provenance of these works so that they can be returned to their owners;

M. whereas, in order to complete the Interpol database on stolen goods, the International Council of Museums (ICOM) has been publishing red lists for more than ten years listing the categories of objects vulnerable to illicit trafficking;

regrets that to date virtually no follow-up has been given to its resolution on a legal framework for the free movement in the internal market of goods whose ownership is likely to be contested, in which Parliament has asked the Commission to work on a study concerning a series of aspects related to the rules of civil and procedural law, the search for provenance, cataloging systems, alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and the opportunity to create a coordinating cross-border administrative authority; considers that Article 81 (2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) could serve as a legal basis for empowering the Union to act in this area;

2. Stresses that the looting of works of art and other cultural goods during armed conflicts and wars, as well as in peacetime, is a matter of great common concern and must be addressed in terms of both the prevention and return of stolen cultural goods, in order to protect and guarantee the integrity of the cultural heritage and identity of societies, communities, groups and individuals;

3. Notes that insufficient attention has been paid at EU level to the return of looted, stolen or illegally obtained works of art and cultural property, for example during armed conflicts, in particular in the area of private law, private international law and civil procedural law; Calls on the Commission to protect, support and encourage cross-border restitution requests for cultural property lost and stolen as a result of acts of raid punished by the state or looted in armed conflicts; calls on the Commission and the Member States to develop recommendations and guidelines to raise awareness of the need to support the national institutions of the Member States with regard to refund applications;

4. Stresses that institutions such as UNESCO and Interpol are calling for a strengthening of the protection of cultural heritage and for states to be made responsible for the introduction of provisions facilitating restitution;

5. Deplores the lack of reliable statistics on the exact extent of the looting and illicit trade in cultural goods; calls on the Commission and the Member States to produce reliable statistics in this regard;

6. Expresses concern that most of the ongoing political and legislative initiatives focus exclusively on public, administrative and / or criminal law; stresses that, in order to establish a comprehensive regulatory framework, private law needs to be given greater consideration; calls on the competent authorities to take all necessary measures and initiatives to achieve this goal;



7. Believes that a more in-depth investigation is needed in order to shed light on the gray areas of the illicit trade in cultural goods and to obtain better information on its scope, structure and size, such as in the case of the ILLICID project underway in Germany;
8. Welcomes the fact that some Member States have recognized that the specific problems associated with requests for the return of works of art and cultural property looted, stolen or illegally obtained during armed conflicts and wars need to be addressed in order to arrive at legal solutions that safeguard the property rights of private individuals, state and local institutions and religious associations that have been unjustly deprived of their works of art during armed conflicts or wars;
9. Insists on the importance of promoting collective awareness to denounce such illegal practices and recalls that each object stolen from the owner represents a historical and scientific value lost forever;
10. Notes that the most efficient way to tackle the illicit trafficking of cultural goods and the expansion of the illegal art market, as well as to assist in the return of such objects, is to promote the development of fair practices in trade in works art and the restitution of the same in a transnational and global perspective, with an impact in terms of both prevention, coercion or punishment;
11. Considers that, in order to have rules genuinely capable of preventing the looting and smuggling of works of art and cultural property, as well as to achieve a fully transparent, responsible and ethical global art market, the Commission should seek to cooperate with third countries with a view to establishing fruitful partnerships, taking into account, to this end, the principles enshrined in the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illicitly Exported Cultural Property;
12. Believes that EU legislative action, including the dimension of private international law, will only be adequate for future transactions;
13. Is of the opinion that, in order to establish a responsible and ethical European art market, the time has come to put an end to years of convolutions and nuances; in this regard, calls on the Commission to identify civil law measures to help overcome the complexities problems encountered by private entities requesting the return of works of art of which they are the legitimate owners; at the same time calls on the Commission to develop a new discussion framework in order to identify best practices and solutions for the present and the future;
14. Welcomes the Commission's proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2017 on the import of cultural goods (COM (2017) 0375), as well as the amendments to the proposal approved by Parliament on 25 October 2018; reiterates, in view of the global reach of the art market and the quantity of objects held by private individuals, the need to step up efforts regarding the cross-border restitution of works of art and cultural property stolen during armed conflicts and wars; Stresses that the tracing of the provenance of goods and European cooperation have proved useful in identifying stolen objects and their subsequent return and, in some cases, have helped prevent the financing of terrorist groups or wars;
15. Regrets that, due to the absence or laxity of provenance and due diligence rules, or the differences between Member States, numerous cross-border return applications cannot be processed in an efficient and coordinated manner , which can consequently fuel looting and illicit trafficking as well as incentivize smuggling; notes that, due to the lack of common rules, the applicable procedure is often not clear to any of the interested parties, including museums,



art dealers, collectors, tourists and travelers; therefore calls on the Commission to harmonize provenance rules and to integrate some of the fundamental principles of the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illicitly Exported Cultural Property;

16. Stresses the urgency of actively promoting the systematic use of independent and quality provenance searches to identify stolen works of art, facilitate their return to their legitimate owners, achieve a fully transparent, responsible and ethical art market, as well as effectively prevent and discourage looting and trafficking in works of art and cultural assets stolen during armed conflicts and wars; notes the possibilities offered in this regard by European financial instruments; Calls on the Commission and the Member States to promote and support, at EU and national level, special training programs on provenance research, in order to allow, in particular, those involved in the fight against illicit trade in cultural goods to develop and improve their own skills, including through cross-border projects;

17. Believes that the search for provenance is closely linked to the obligation of due diligence applicable at the time of the acquisition of a work of art and constitutes an important concern for all actors in the art market as the acquisition, intentional or negligent, of stolen works of art is punishable under certain national laws;

18. Is of the opinion that efforts should obviously be made to draw up a complete list of all cultural property, including those owned by Jews, which have been looted by the Nazis and their allies, from the date of their looting to the present; Urges the Commission to support the establishment of a cataloging system, which can also be used by public bodies and private collectors, to collect data on the situation of the cultural assets looted, stolen or illegally obtained and on the exact state of progress of existing restitution requests; urges the Commission to support digitization projects that establish digital databases or create links between existing ones in order to facilitate the exchange of such data and the search for provenance;

19. Considers that, in order to allow for an adequate search of provenance, it is necessary to proceed with the creation of a documentary archive or a register of transactions as detailed as possible; calls on the Commission to actively support the development of common guidelines for such registers and to take all appropriate measures to encourage Member States to impose a general obligation on art market professionals to maintain a register of transactions and, more in general, to accede to the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illicitly Exported Cultural Property;

20. Urges the Commission to encourage and financially support provenance research activities across the Union; suggests that the Commission organize a discussion space dedicated to the exchange of best practices and the search for the most effective solutions for the present and the future;

21. Calls on the Commission, in order to overcome existing legal obstacles, to consider establishing a specific dispute resolution mechanism to deal with cases of requests for the return of looted works of art and cultural property, such as a hybrid form of arbitration and mediation; stresses the importance of establishing clear rules and transparent and impartial procedures;

22. Notes that limitation periods often put complainants in difficulty in questions concerning refunds; Calls on the Commission to assess this issue and strike the right balance as regards the statute of limitations applicable to requests for the return of stolen works of art, including those looted by the Nazis, taking into account the protection of the interests of victims of looting and



theft as well as the interests of the market; believes that the US law on the recovery of works of art expropriated during the Holocaust could serve as an example;

23. Calls on the Commission to consider adopting legislative measures to strengthen the legal system for cross-border restitution claims for works of art and cultural property looted in armed conflicts and wars on the basis of instruments of private international law;

24. Calls on the relevant EU institutions to encourage Member States to share information on existing practices regarding the control of the provenance of cultural goods, as well as to intensify their cooperation in order to harmonize control measures and administrative procedures intended to determine the provenance of cultural assets;

25. Highlights the lack of coordination at Member State level as regards the interpretation of the concept of "due diligence"; calls on the Commission to clarify the concept of due diligence in relation to good faith; points out, by way of example, Article 16 of the Swiss Federal Law on the International Transfer of Cultural Property, which prohibits dealers and auction sellers from carrying out a transaction relating to a work of art if they have doubts on the origin of the object; notes that this law partially transfers the burden of proof to the seller; stresses, however, that the owner of a work of art cannot rely on the principle of good faith if he is unable to demonstrate that he paid due attention at the time of acquisition; calls on the Commission to take measures to raise awareness in the art market as well as potential buyers of artefacts about the importance of provenance research, as such research is linked to the obligation of due diligence;

26. Urges the Commission to develop common principles on access to public or private archives containing information that make it possible to identify or locate an asset, as well as to draw up a detailed inventory of existing databases relating to cultural heritage and to provide for the creation of a bank central metadata which takes into account the available information, which is regularly updated and which is accessible to all interested parties; considers that, on the basis of this central metadata bank, it is appropriate to introduce a common cataloging system which could use standardized identifiers of works; therefore calls on the Commission to encourage the introduction of works identifiers developed and promoted by ICOM and other organizations as standards for the entire common market; notes that this database should be linked to the Interpol database of stolen works of art ("Stolen Works of Art Database") and be updated regularly;

27. Believes that the creation of a documentary register or a register of cultural property transactions aimed at allowing a more thorough and accurate search of the provenance could be a further useful tool to supplement the aforementioned database; calls on the Commission to take all appropriate measures to encourage Member States to impose a general obligation on art market operators to maintain such a documentary file or transaction register and, more generally, to accede to the UNIDROIT Convention 1995 on stolen or illicitly exported cultural assets;

28. argues that the central database should function on the basis of a common cataloging system in which objects are identified in a standardized way (taking into account characteristics such as materials, techniques, dimensions, inscriptions, title, subject, date or period, etc.);

29. Calls on the Commission to identify common principles on how to establish property or title as well as rules on limitation, proof requirements and the concepts of looting and work of art, taking into account the relevant regulations in the Member States;



30. Calls on the Member States and candidate countries to make every effort to take measures to ensure the creation of mechanisms that facilitate the return of the property covered by this resolution, and to bear in mind that the return to legitimate applicants of objects of art looted, stolen or illegally obtained in the context of a crime against humanity is a matter of general interest under Article 1 of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights;

31. highlights that, in order to have a set of rules capable of effectively preventing the looting and smuggling of works of art and cultural assets, as well as achieving a fully transparent, responsible global art market, and ethical, the Commission should seek to cooperate with third countries and establish fruitful partnerships that promote the return of the property covered by this resolution, while taking into account both the principles set out in the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen Cultural Property or illegally exported, both of Article 1 of the first protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights;

32. Recalls that education promotes respect for and appreciation of works of art and other cultural property as symbols of cultural heritage and therefore plays an important role in preventing and discouraging looting and illicit trade of cultural heritage; invites the Commission and Member States to encourage and support the implementation of awareness-raising and education activities in this regard, in particular in non-formal and informal settings;

33. Calls on the Commission and all competent authorities to take measures to raise awareness among the art market and potential buyers of artefacts about the importance of provenance research, since such research is linked to the obligation of due diligence;

34. Recalls that close cooperation between police services and customs at European and international level is essential to combat illicit trafficking in works of cultural heritage;

35. Supports the idea that cross-border restitution procedures involving looted, stolen or illegally obtained works of art and cultural property, as well as the active promotion of the search for provenance, should be addressed as part of the initiative of the year European Cultural Heritage 2018; calls therefore on the Commission and its working group to include this item in the work program describing the activities for the European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018;

[1] OJ C 17, 22.1.1996, p. 199.

[2] OJ C 292, 21.9.1998, p. 166.

[3] OJ C 346, 21.9.2016, p. 55.

[4] OJ L 159, 28.5.2014, p. 1.

[5] OJ L 39, 10.2.2009, p. 1.

[6] OJ L 351 of 20.12.2012, p. 1.

[7] OJ C 91E, 15.4.2004, p. 500.

[8] OJ L 119, 4.5.2016, p. 1.

[9] According to data from the initiative on looted works of art and cultural assets, set up by the Conference on the Material Claims of Jews against Germany (Claims Conference) and the World Jewish Organization for Restitutions (WJRO).

Looting and theft that occurred in a historical era, for example in the era of colonization.



In recent years, the question of looted works of art and the restitution of cultural assets has assumed a leading role in historical research and also in the public consciousness. The problem of cultural assets looted in wartime through acts of violence, confiscation or seemingly legal transactions or auctions remains part of human history. Raids during the colonial era and looting in Syria and Iraq are still a major problem.

One of the largest organized and institutionalized thefts of works of art in history took place during World War II. The Nazis confiscated or stole millions of objects of cultural significance; today, more than seventy years after the end of the war, thousands of works of art are still missing and are waiting to be returned to their rightful owners or their respective heirs. Courts are often unable to judge claims on the merits.

Under international law, such looting took place illegally. During the war, the United Nations explicitly stated that plundered properties recovered by the states had to be returned to their country of origin in order to return to their original owner. These looted properties were then given a special status by the Nuremberg court, which explicitly ruled that under Article 6 (b) of the Nuremberg Charter, the looting of private property during the war could constitute a crime under the international law. In the final ruling, the court specifically ruled that certain looting perpetrated after 1 September 1939 constituted a crime against humanity. National laws adopted after the war in Switzerland, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy and the Netherlands recognized this concept, creating a presumption in favor of the original owner of the plundered property during that period. The cessation of the effectiveness of post-conflict restitution laws, the non-retroactivity of conventional rules and various legal institutions such as statute of limitations, usucapione, good faith and the absence of a definition of looted works of art, they are at the basis of the existence of international norms relating to requests for the return of works of art looted by the Nazis.

Following the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict [1], the 1970 UNESCO Convention concerning measures to be taken to prohibit and prevent illegal import, export and transfer of property of Cultural Property [2] and the UNIDROIT Convention of 1995 on Stolen or Illicitly Exported Cultural Property [3], the Washington conference brought the question of provenance research and restitution back to the international agenda. of art to those who were their legitimate owners before the war or to their respective heirs. International practices today are characterized by a lack of transparency: disputes are often resolved and works "liquidated" through confidential agreements without a legal argument. Nonetheless, Austria, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Germany have set up committees to assist the institutions in restitution cases. In September 2018, the Moderna Museet and the Nationalmuseum in Stockholm submitted a proposal to the Swedish government asking, among other things, for the creation of an independent committee to assist in the management of cases concerning works of art looted by Nazis.

May 14, 1954, 249 UNTS 240.

November 17, 1970, 823 UNTS 231.

June 24, 1995, 34 ILM 1322.

In this regard, see the study, commissioned by the Legal Affairs Committee from the thematic department of Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs, entitled "Cross-border restitution claims of art looted in armed conflicts and wars and alternatives to court litigation". works of art looted during armed conflicts and wars and alternatives to litigation).

The Minister for Cultural and Environmental Heritage of the Venetian Nation:



COMITATO LIBERAZIONE NAZIONALE VENETO

(Art. 96.3 1° Protocollo Convenzione di Ginevra 1977 – legge n.762 del 11 dicembre 1985)



recalls that education promotes respect for and appreciation of works of art and other cultural property as symbols of cultural heritage and identity and, therefore, plays an important role in preventing and discouraging looting and illegal trade in cultural goods; calls on the Commission and the Member States to promote and support dedicated educational and awareness-raising and education activities, including in non-formal and informal settings;

2. Stresses that, due to the cross-border nature of most refund applications, a clear and coherent cross-border approach must be adopted which can overcome existing difficulties and facilitate the achievement of just and equitable solutions; Calls on the Commission to consider setting up an advisory body at Union level to assist Member States and other actors in their efforts to trace and identify stolen works of art and other cultural goods and to speed up their return to legitimate owners;

3. Stresses that the looting of works of art and other cultural assets during armed conflicts and wars, as well as in peacetime, is a matter of great common concern and must be addressed in terms of both prevention and restitution of stolen property, to aim to protect and guarantee the integrity of the cultural heritage and identity of societies, communities, groups and individuals;

He invites all international authorities to return the illegally stolen "Astrolabe" artifact in question to its original residence in the Benedictine Abbey of San Zeno di Verona - VR.

Failure is not contemplated, the coordinated action of all the virtuous minds of men of good faith leads to success.

Venice, Palazzo Ducale, 2022.07.18

Minister for Culture, Sport and Religion

Mattea Barbirato