

**Propositions pertaining to the dissertation**  
*Entrepreneurial mass litigation. Balancing the building blocks*  
by Ilja Tillema

1. Legislation should always explicitly address the objective(s) it strives for.
2. Pursuing an own (entrepreneurial) interest is inherent in litigation. Hence, the morality of such an interest should not be qualified separately.
3. In the debate on entrepreneurial mass litigation, oversimplified and/or lobbyist viewpoints should be valued as such. For instance, a reference to 'American situations' can only be accepted as an argument if this term is properly defined and sufficiently underpinned.
4. German, English and Dutch case law shows that courts are sufficiently equipped to assess entrepreneurial parties and that the courts' role – provided that they adhere to it – is pivotal in the development of entrepreneurial mass litigation.
5. German policy makers' hesitance towards mass litigation is outdated and risky as it fails to recognize the legal services market's creativity.
6. The English experience on the recoverability of success fees and ATE insurance premiums should serve as a warning signal to policy makers or courts that contemplate full costs shifting.
7. In the Dutch WCAM regulation, the court's duty to assess the reasonableness of a settlement includes assessing the remuneration awarded to a representative organization or an affiliated entrepreneurial party.
8. If the main objective of a collective redress instrument is deterrence, the assessment of an entrepreneurial party's remuneration can be applied with a broader brush than if the objective is compensation.
9. Security for costs is a relatively mild tool to avoid the risk of an insolvent or abusive entrepreneurial party, but should be set according to the specific circumstances and aim to avoid satellite litigation.
10. In matters of a delicate nature such as entrepreneurial mass litigation, it is of the utmost importance that both sides of the coin are thoroughly addressed and assessed. The challenging, yet indispensable key word is balance.
11. The literature on deconstructivism can broaden a legal scholar's horizon, whereas the architectural deconstruction of work spaces can benefit from a legal scholar's input.