

Conference Report: **Imperial Artefacts:
History, Law and the Looting of Cultural Property**
Date & location: **28-29 January 2021, Leiden University**
Organised by: **Dr Diana M. Natermann & Dr Inge Van Hulle**
Sponsored by: **History Department Leiden University
LUF Leiden University Fund
MA International Relations Programme, Leiden University
African Studies Centre Leiden**

This interdisciplinary online conference brought together (post-)colonial historians, legal historians, curators, international lawyers, art historians, anthropologists, and others engaged with the field of restitution to establish research collaborations by critically investigating stories of colonial looting, the framing of colonial history within museums, the origins of the legal framework concerning European laws of war and restitution, as well as a way forward for restitution claims. Throughout the two-day online event from 28-29 January 2021, an array of topics was presented and discussed that crossed borders, continents, as well as legal and cultural battles linked to repatriation and/or restitution debates.

Everything was kicked off with a warm welcome to the speakers and audience by the two organisers Inge Van Hulle and Diana M. Natermann. They expressed their delight of the conference taking place despite or in spite of our ongoing global health crisis and by the fact, that the speakers offered an international and diverse collection of contributions in terms of professional, national, and topical backgrounds.

The two conference days evolved around the following keynotes and panels:

- **DAY 1** (keynote by Jürgen Zimmerer, followed by four panels):
 1. *Diplomacy, Identity, and Restitution* (Chair: Diana M. Natermann)
 2. *Multi-disciplinary Perspectives on Colonial Violence and Restitution* (Chair: Raphael Schäfer)
 3. *Law and Restitution: Past & Present* (Chair: Inge Van Hulle)
 4. *Heritage, Discourse and the Representation of Cultural Artefacts* (Chair: Walter Nkwi Gam)

- **DAY 2** (keynote by Matthias Goldmann, followed by three panels)
 1. *Enduring Coloniality and Cultural Heritage* (Chair: Alexandra Ortolja-Baird)
 2. *International Legal History and Restitution Debates* (Chair: Inge Van Hulle)
 3. *Restitution, Heritage, and Human Rights* (Chair: Anne-Isabelle Richard)

During the closing remarks at the end of day 2, the organisers Inge Van Hulle and Diana M. Natermann voiced their gratitude for an amazing array of papers given, discussions had, and active audience as well as functioning technology. Overall, both keynotes had around 120-140 listeners, and all panels between 75-100 people attending. The online format allowed a degree of participation from Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe, and the USA that otherwise would

never have been impossible. Both speakers and audience alike dealt graciously with different global time zones to attend this event. Further events are planned as well as a publication.

DAY 1

Following the welcoming words, the event's first keynote was held by **JÜRGEN ZIMMERER** and chaired by Diana M. Natermann. Zimmerer's talk was entitled *Looting, restitution, reconciliation* and dealt in particular with current restitution debates within Germany in relation to (mainly) former colonial territories in central Africa. During his presentation, Zimmerer also touched upon historical but especially current trends in national and global restitution debates as well as on the importance of not only including so-called cultural heritage objects to the debates but also human remains and other natural objects such as dinosaur fossils.

The first panel began with **LUCAS LIXINSKI** and his paper entitled *Beyond UNESCO: Regional International Legal Approaches to Post-Colonial Restitution*. Therein he explored tensions between regionalism and universalism, and argued for the need to look at regional solutions more closely for promoting post-colonial heritage for the benefit of communities, rather than states of origin. (Keywords: 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property; Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation (ICPRCP))

SAHRA RAUSCH engaged with matters of colonial amnesia with special regards to French and German cases linked to Algeria and Namibia. Her paper *An Affective De-Memorization? Debates over Colonial Amnesia regarding the Repatriation of Human Remains from Colonial Contexts in France and Germany* thus informed about the concept of collective memory à la Maurice Halbwachs and how provenance research, (de-)memorisation, and human remains all come together in the 21st century. She argued that the declaration of colonial amnesia regarding repatriation politics serves as a discursively produced emotional order by which the remembering and/or forgetting of colonial pasts are negotiated. Albeit colonial amnesia upholds an affective culture of forgetting, its very denomination also enables its transformation and puts in question the established emotional orders.

In his talk on *Delaying, Evading, Rejecting. Western Reactions to Sri Lankan Demands for Restitution around 1980*, **LARS MÜLLER** introduced us to the establishment of the "Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property" by the UNESCO which provided a framework for the negotiation of postcolonial restitution. His case study was that of how Sri Lanka was one of the first countries that demanded "significant cultural objects" via the above in 1980. Despite its lack of success, the Sri Lankan case allows for a comparison between the UK, Germany, and Switzerland and how these countries dealt with the demands and how the respective ministries and museums negotiated a position that they could present on the international level as well as in bilateral talks. Finally, he also asked what voice individual museums had in this debate and showed some Western museums'/countries' strategies for later situations to prevent repatriation.

ROTEM GILADI started the second panel by offering the audience a critical reading of contemporary categories: 'cultural property/artefact' and 'mortal/human remains', 'looting' and 'restitution' through the prism furnished by a long view of human corpora—human skulls, in particular—and the cultural practice consisting of the removal, preservation, collection, private or museal display, medical or anthropological study, ritualisation, and signification of human heads of colonial (and European) 'others'. His paper, *Reading Between Categories: Corpora, Culture, Property and the Laws of War*, explored in particular the possibility that contemporary categorisations still work to efface the cultural significance and identity markers of human/mortal remains while at the same time, paradoxically, re-inscribes them with cultural significance that attests—again, if more subtly than before—to cultural differences.

In *The Enemy on Display – Suits of Armour in Military Museums*, **JAN HÜSGEN** directed the audience's attention towards the less discussed topic in restitution and provenance debates with regards to the plundering of an enemy's armour. The latter, aka *spolia opima*, used to be regarded as the most prestigious booty of war. The tradition to plunder the suit of armour of the enemy has been continued into the 20th century. His paper focussed on the provenance and presentation of captured suits of armour in military museums in Germany, France, and Britain. By doing so he not only recontextualised museum objects, but also argued that such objects were used to establish racial stereotypes in military museums.

The joint paper by **IVAN OBADIC**, **ROBERT MRLIJC**, and **MIRAN MARELJA** drew our attention to *War, spoils and return of cultural property: framing of restitution law at the Congress of Vienna in 1815*. This paper examined how the right of the victor to obtain spoils of war was abandoned in the law of warfare (*ius in bello*) through legal and historical evolution of warfare regulation regarding the cultural property in the late 18th and early 19th centuries and how the first rules on the restitution of the cultural property were developed. This paper looked into the contribution and motives of the most important actors at the Congress of Vienna in relation to the restitution question (eg. Castlereagh and Wellington), into the framing of the restitution principles in the Second Treaty of Paris, and how it also set up different categories of states varying in its rights in relation to the restitution claims: winner states, defeated states and destroyed/excluded states. Their analysis showed that the hierarchies and different categories established by this legal framework were not changed *grosso modo* until the emergence of the modern international law regulating restitution in the last century.

In her talk titled *Does Utilitarianism Merge the Dichotomy Between the Nationalist and Internationalist Conception of Cultural Property in the Quest for Restitution?*, **AFOLASADE A. ADEWUMI** opened up the third panel. She argued that the sluggishness of restitution processes lies in the simultaneous operation of two diametrically opposed conceptions of cultural property – the nationalist and internationalist schools of thought (eg. 1954 Hague Convention and 1970 Convention). Since utilitarianism supports the maximisation of the overall happiness of a collective group, nationalists can predicate the protection of their cultural heritage on the need to secure this happiness just like the internationalists. This paper examined if the common theoretical foundation which both schools of thought share can serve as a reconciliatory tool that bridges the gap between them and promote an interest within the international community to protect cultural heritage.

ARIANNA VISCONTI engaged with the specific Italian approach to restitution in her talk *A Paradox in Law: Italy's Ambivalent Approach to Restitution Claims*. She introduced the audience to why Italy is historically speaking one of the front runners in tackling cultural heritage debates legally and its self-portrayal as a victim state that has often been plundered by outsiders (Napoleonic Wars, WWII). Yet, despite fighting for its own restitutions, Italy has developed a selective blindness towards its own colonial heritage and colonial objects based in Italy. One exception being the investigative cooperation, where specialised police units score well in the recovery and restitution of cultural objects stolen or looted abroad, illegally exported, and found within Italy: but such a criminally-centred approach only works with recent depredations. However, some faint signals of change are appearing, starting with import controls, and the hope is that, thanks to a growing interest of the public, a more structured change of mentality will also come to affect questions of reparation of historical depredations.

Rights, wrongs and remedies - Working towards colonial heritage repatriation legislation for Belgium was the paper by **MARIE-SOPHIE de CLIPPELE** and **BERT DEMARSIN** which took stock of Belgium's current position on the repatriation of artefacts stolen/illegally exported under colonial rule as well as the current Belgian context of (legal) pitfalls and societal challenges that hinder the repatriation of colonial heritage to the Congo. The presenters informed us about their draft bill that is to (formally) streamline all repatriation efforts of colonial heritage from Belgian public collections and the strategic and operational choices made during the drafting process regarding aspects like the (geographical, material and temporal) scope of the proposed legislation, the interaction between the federation and the federated entities, the procedural flow, the heritage selection process, the political responsibility, the rights of third parties and museological and documentarist concerns (archives, digitisation). The talk ended with a preview on the parliamentary process that lies ahead of the draft bill and its likeliness to be signed into law.

Day One's last but not least panel commenced with **ANNALISA BOLIN's** research on the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz, based in Germany, which is also known for owning thousands of human remains from former colonies. In her talk *Power and Possibility: The Return of Rwanda's Stolen Bones*, Bolin analyses possible repatriation pathways to be taken in the German-Rwandan case. She presented the status-quo with Germany's economic power position and Rwanda coming to terms with including human remains to its own (public) engagement with its colonial past. This paper drew on long-term fieldwork with the Rwandan heritage sector, as well as more recent research into German museums, to focus on underexamined post-repatriation politics and possibilities.

Based on his research of primary sources in particular, **KOKOU AZAMEDE** used his talk *Acquisition methods of colonial objects and the traditional perception of the museum in German Togo* to show the methods by which German colonial officials, missionaries, and merchants came into possession of cultural property and human remains of the German Togo people. Moreover, he aimed to show the Togolese populations' gaps in their perception of the museum or their structures for the preservation of cultural objects whose acquisition circumstances were related to the interactive relations between German and local actors of colonisation.

An unexpected connection between Finland and Native American artefacts was offered by **JANNE LAHTI** in his paper on *Mesa Verde and Finland: Stolen Artefacts, Contested Discourses, and Nordic Colonial Legacies*. He discussed the legacies of colonial looting in transnational contexts through a Nordic lens and examined how Indigenous Anasazi objects travelled from the 1890s Mesa Verde to Finland, a country without formal colonies or a generally recognised colonial history/legacy, by the hands of former coloniser Gustaf Nordenskiöld. Lahti argued that the discussion of Finnish and Nordic colonial legacies needs to be connected to transnational framings, understandings, and entanglements, to the broader debates concerning museums and restitution of colonial loot in Europe and beyond. After all, today's largest Anasazi collection outside of North America lies in the Finnish National Museum in Helsinki still, despite attempts of repatriation by Hopi Indians in 2019.

DONNA YATES & BRIEANA GOUVEIA used their *Provenance narratives of colonial exploitation as value enhancers on the Oceanic art market* paper to inform us of how since the 18th century, non-European cultural heritage was not only removed and decontextualised but also how international museums used racist terminology like "Primitive Art" and "Tribal Art" to sell their goods. Provenance narratives exoticised Oceanic cultural material to appeal to the desires and prejudices of white buyers. Examples were offered to present this "white-washing" of conquest and colonial provenance among Oceanic heritage items offered for sale by Christie's and Sotheby's auction houses since the 1970s. A shared provenance mythology permeates this market thereby marginalising Indigenous knowledge about cultural heritage by perpetuating troubling ideas of consensual conquest, European cultural superiority, and the disregard of contemporary Indigenous voices/authority.

KAITLYN DeLONG's paper *Confronting the Past: The Provenance of Indigenous Objects on Display* concerned (half)truths as seen in museums today when concerned with difficult heritages that are linked to colonialism. Despite an increase in public activism demanding a more thorough if not honest way to address, for instance, looted objects, provenance research is at times used to in fact confront difficult heritage rather than solve it (eg. National Museum of Natural History and National Museum of Scotland). DeLong engaged with questions of how to adjust this by stating that we must prioritise the consistent inclusion of provenance when displaying indigenous material, and recognise that honesty really is the best policy. (The talk could not take place due to technical issues.)

DAY 2

The second keynote was given by **MATTHIAS GOLDMANN** and chaired by Inge Van Hulle. Goldmann enlightened us on *Imperial Law's Ambiguity: A Postcolonial Approach to Restitution and Reparation Claims*. Whilst many legal critics share the conventional view that imperial law is a monolithic, unequivocal, and impervious means for the defense of imperial interests, he challenged this on the basis of postcolonial theory. The latter arguing that 19th-century imperial law is fundamentally ambiguous. The conventional view eclipses the ambiguity by oscillating between the normative and the factual, by taking the brutality of imperial power as evidence of legal positions. Instead of exculpating imperial law from its role in facilitating European expansion, the keynote instead called for recognising the ambiguity of imperial law and for investigating the resultant gaps and contradictions in legal arguments establishing title to imperial artefacts in Western states, or the rejection of restitution claims.

The example of selected imperial artefacts situated in Germany demonstrated how legal ambiguities undermine legal title. This has repercussions for the role assigned to law in debates and negotiations about the restitution of imperial artefacts. It raises the question whether legal provenance research might help to rebalance structurally asymmetric negotiations.

A joint paper entitled *The Destruction of the Juukan Gorge Caves: A Study on the Role of International Law in Protecting Cultural Heritage in Times of Peace* was given by **IAIN SANDFORD** and **ADA SIQUIERA**. Together they elaborated upon the Juukan caves which were a site in Western Australia sacred to the Puutu, Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura people. The caves were destroyed in 2020 to facilitate mining, with authorisation granted under Western Australia's Aboriginal Heritage Act of 1972. Despite acting within Australian law, Rio Tinto, the company responsible, subsequently explained that "[t]he destruction ... should not have occurred". Australia's laws protecting Aboriginal heritage are now subject to a Parliamentary inquiry. In addition, the events at Juukan allow us to examine the potential for public international law (PIL) to protect cultural heritage. The paper highlights two existing lacunae in PIL. 1) the lack of a framework addressing the prohibition of destruction of cultural heritage in peacetime. 2) while international court decisions and conventions have incorporated human rights notions to deem harm to cultural heritage as an offence against people no PIL framework yet makes this explicit. The paper explored potential international legal risks for companies, possibilities of international claims regarding the destruction of cultural heritage, and potential international legal risks for states for failing to prevent the destruction of cultural sites.

A case study of changing heritages was highlighted by **NORMAN ASELMAYER** in his talk on *Intangible Heritage: The Man-Eaters of Tsavo and their Global (After)Lives*. The "Man-Eaters of Tsavo" were two notorious lions responsible for killing dozens of people during a British railway construction connecting Uganda with the Indian Ocean (1896-1903). After killing the Tsavo lions, the British railway engineer John H. Patterson kept the trophy rugs in his home for over 20 years before selling them to the Chicago Field Museum (1924). Kenya has been asking for the lions' repatriation since the 1990s as a part of the country's heritage. Aselmeyer explored the Tsavo lions' afterlives and argued that they developed a story of their own unrelated to their Kenyan origin. Hollywood movies, for instance, have spun a myth about Patterson and celebrated the adventure in imperialism associated with them. The paper added a new dimension to the restitution of imperial artefacts, showing that their cultural value is based not only on their original meaning but also on their (global) afterlives.

MARCELO MARQUES MIRANDA & JULY ACUÑA SUÁREZ were to present their paper *Repatriation as a means, not as an end*. They planned to address matters of decolonisation, repatriation, provenance, and representation of indigenous peoples' cultures in museums with a special focus on the Camëntsá people of Colombia. Rather than seeing repatriation as the final decolonising act, one shall take into account that those objects are still presented within national museums that follow colonial Western traditions. Instead, a decolonisation of objects is to empower indigenous peoples' heritage, thereby going beyond the mere recognition of provenance research. (The talk could not take place due to technical issues.)

TOMÁS IRISH highlighted in *“The Danger of Arbitrary Decisions”: The Paris Peace Conference and Cultural Reparations after the First World War* how post WWI the international society handled cultural claims from both the winners’ and losers’ sides. Irish’ paper examined the processes via which these treaties were negotiated by focusing on lobbyists like museum directors, writers, and politicians. Case studies in question were the treaties of Saint-Germain-en-Laye (with Austria) and Sèvres (with Turkey). This paper presented a valuable precedent for contemporary debates about museum restitution by examining how European museums and societies applied the right to retain cultural artefacts under the rubric of ‘civilization’. Lobbyists therefore often articulated the concern that if treaties promoted an allround restitution of museum collections, that that process could be repeated in other museums around the world, let alone in London, Paris, and New York.

In his paper *A German Excavation for the Ottoman Imperial Museum? The Scramble for Objects between Berlin and Istanbul at Tell Halaf, 1911–1914*, **SEBASTIAN WILLERT**, raised the issue of Ottoman protectionist measures (eg. 1906 Antiquity law) against Western access to antique sites and the exodus of cultural assets to foreign Museums. The paradox here lay within the close German-Ottoman archaeological relations and the prohibition of exporting goods from the Ottoman Empire to Germany. Despite restrictions, the famous German excavator Max von Oppenheim (1860–1946) managed to transport between 120-150 boxes with antiquities to the Royal Museums in Berlin by 1914. Thus, this paper analysed both German strategies to circumvent the Ottoman Antiquity Law in the interest of Berlin’s museums and Ottoman protective measures – both sides aiming to enrich their own respective national museums.

Colonialist Notions of Property: How European Lawyers Legitimized Dispossession (1880s-1950s) was the title of **FLORIAN WAGNER**’s presentation in which he analysed the notions of property developed by colonial administrators, anthropologists, and lawyers between the 1880s and the late colonial period. How did European lawyers in the colonies use concepts of property in European, Islamic, and so-called “customary” laws to justify expropriations and plunder? He showed how lawyers and anthropologists formed an epistemic community across empires and designed a colonial law along the needs of colonial administrations. The discussion about objects, then, is situated in the broader debate about landed property and dispossession in colonial law. Wagner argued that colonisers developed seemingly legal schemes of dispossession that allowed taking property away from colonised peoples. A crucial question was to what extent these legal schemes lived on in the postcolonial period and shaped debates about restitution and reparations.

EVELIEN CAMPFENS asked *Whose cultural objects? Introducing ‘heritage title’ in a human rights law approach*. Cultural objects enjoy a protected status due to their ‘heritage’ value, as symbols of an identity that can be changed into becoming an art object instead. This talk suggested that, irrespective of provenance, original owners or creators should be able to rely on a ‘heritage title’ if there is a continuing cultural link. This paper added a legal perspective to the restitution debate and proposed a human rights law approach to structure the normative framework for claims. Three core elements being: 1) a shift in focus from past events – the unlawfulness of the loss in the past that is decisive in an ownership approach – to present-day interests; 2) the rights involved are defined in terms of rights of access, control

or 'equitable solutions', as opposed to restitution of absolute ownership rights; 3) the *classification* of cultural objects depending on their specific social function and heritage value.

JIHANE CHEDOUKI's presentation had the title *From a moral function to a utilitarian function: the transformation of ancient objects and monuments in the Arab world in the 19-20th centuries*. Her talk elaborated upon how the notion of cultural heritage in the Arab world during colonialism in comparison to the meaning invested in ancient monuments and objects before colonisation had shown the transformation of their role from a moral function within the society to a commodity that allows their ownership by individuals, institutions, and states in the name of historic, archaeological, or artistic interest. She argued that the application of private and public ownership regimes to cultural heritage as a means of «protection» by the colonial administration encouraged the expropriation of ancient objects and the dismantlement of monuments to be placed in museums and private collections outside of their places of origin.

A European repatriation case was presented by **GRETCHEN ALLEN** in *A Way for the Giant's Cause: an examination of Irish indigenous rights in the case of Charles Byrne*. Despite calls for repatriation by the native Irish population of Northern Ireland, the 7'7" tall skeleton of the "Irish Giant" Charles Byrne has been on public display in the Royal College of Surgeons (RCS) museum in London for over 200 years. The RCS refuses to repatriate Byrne to Northern Ireland, or to remove him from display. This paper examined how the native Northern Irish population can claim kinship with Byrne in the same way other aboriginal populations have claimed their ancestral dead from the same collection. It utilised the repatriation criteria provided by the Department of Culture, Media, and Sport as well as the UN to draw a direct line from Byrne, an Irish Gaelic-speaking, Catholic man, to the County Tyrone communities who are calling for his return. This paper argues that the continued retention and display of Byrne's remains perpetuates the British oppression of Northern Ireland's native Irish population, and that Byrne's remains should be repatriated to the Irish people.

The paper by **CAROLINE DRIEËNHUIZEN & FENNEKE SYSLING** – *Java Man: restitution claims at the natural history museum* – sketched the history of Indonesian restitution claims for 'Java Man', the fossilised remains of a homo erectus that were excavated in Dutch colonial Indonesia (1891/2). This talk focussed on Java Man's representation in The Netherlands and Indonesia. The speakers problematised the presence of thousands of colonial objects in Dutch natural history museums. As elsewhere, cultural objects and human remains collections have been the subject of repatriation debates, but natural history collections have not. They argued that this is because natural history museums have successfully depoliticised objects by insisting on a difference between cultural objects and objects from nature. Tracing its long contested political ownership, they showed how the Java Man fossils are sites of competing national and disciplinary histories and identities.

Conference Overview:

DAY 1

Keynote: Prof. Dr. Jürgen Zimmerer (Chair for Global History, Hamburg University)

Panel 1: Dr. Lucas Lixinski (Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, UNSW Sydney)

- Sahra Rausch** (PhD Researcher, Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen)
Dr. des. Lars Müller (Academic Project Coordinator PAESE, Landesmuseum Hannover)
- Panel 2:** **Dr. Rotem Giladi** (Teaching Fellow in International Law, University of Edinburgh)
Dr. Jan Hüsgen (Research Associate, German Lost Art Foundation, Department for Cultural Goods and Collections from Colonial Contexts)
Dr. Ivan Obadić (Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb), **Dr. Robert Mrljic** (Member of the Legal Service, European Commission, Brussels) & **Dr. Miran Marelja** (General History of Law and State, Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb)
- Panel 3:** **Dr. Afolasade A. Adewumi** (Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Law, University of Ibadan)
Dr. Arianna Visconti (Assistant Professor, Criminal Law in the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (UCSC) of Milan)
Dr. Marie-Sophie de Clippele (Postdoctoral Researcher, Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique of Belgium, Université Saint-Louis – Bruxelles & UC Louvain) & **Prof. Dr. Bert Demarsin** (Faculty of Law, KU Leuven)
- Panel 4:** **Dr. Annalisa Bolin** (Postdoctoral Fellow, UNESCO Chair on Heritage Futures, Department of Cultural Sciences, Linnaeus University)
Dr. Kokou Azamede (Senior Lecturer in German Studies, University of Lomé)
Dr. Janne Lahti (Academy of Finland Research Fellow, University of Helsinki)
Dr. Donna Yates (Associate Professor, Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Maastricht University) & **Brieanah Gouveia** (Program Specialist and Collections Manager at the Hawaii State Judiciary's King Kamehameha V Judiciary History Center)
Kaitlyn DeLong (Repatriation Research Specialist, National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution)

DAY 2

- Keynote:** **Dr. Matthias Goldmann** (Junior Professor, Public International and Finance Law Department, Goethe-University Frankfurt)
- Panel 1:** **Iain Sandford** (Partner, Sidley Austin LLP) & **Ada Siqueira** (Associate, Sidley Austin LLP)
Dr. Norman Aselmeyer (Lecturer & Research Associate, University of Bremen)
Marcelo Marques Miranda (PhD Researcher, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University) & **Jully Acuña Suárez** (PhD Researcher, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University)
- Panel 2:** **Dr. Tomás Irish** (Senior Lecturer in Modern History, Swansea University)
Sebastian Willert (PhD Researcher, TU Berlin)
Dr. Florian Wagner (Assistant Professor for Contemporary European History in Global Perspective)
- Panel 3:** **Dr. Evelien Campfens** (Postdoctoral Fellow at Research Group Museums, Collections and Society, Leiden University)
Dr. Jihane Chedouki (Postdoctoral Researcher, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique)

Gretchen Allen (Library Conservator, Maynooth University Special Collections)
Dr. Caroline Drieënhuizen (Assistant Professor, Cultural History, Open University of the Netherlands) & **Dr. Fenneke Sysling** (Assistant Professor, History Dept., Leiden University)

Panel Chairs: **Dr. Raphael Schäfer** (Research Fellow, Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law, Heidelberg)

Dr. Walter Nkwi Gam (Assistant Professor, History Department, Leiden University)

Dr. Alexandra Ortolja-Baird (Lecturer, Early Modern European History Department, King's College London)

Dr. Anne-Isabelle Richard (Assistant Professor, History Department, Leiden University)

Organisers: **Dr. Inge Van Hulle** (Assistant Professor, Legal History, Tilburg University)

Dr. Diana M. Natermann (Assistant Professor, History Department, Leiden University)