



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Master's Thesis

A good international citizen?

Examining the cause of the Netherlands' willingness to
repatriate colonial heritages

Nisfi Roisatul Mubarakah

Abstract

Many former colonial powers have been reluctant to return cultural heritages acquired during colonial context for various reasons. The Netherlands is a unique example where it is willing to repatriate cultural heritages acquired in colonial context back to its original country unconditionally. This thesis examines the causes of the Netherlands willingness to repatriate cultural heritages by using example of its repatriation efforts with Indonesia. The analysis employs the good international citizen theory by the English school of international relation. By elaborating each characteristic of a good international citizen, I try to unpack whether or not the Netherlands fulfil the criteria and if it does what is the consequences. The result shows that the Netherlands fulfils several criteria in order to be a good international citizen, such as compliance with international law, support for multilateralism, and leadership or improving international standard. There is a room for improvement in international good deed criteria where I draw from an example of apology. By being a good international citizen, the Netherlands holds a role as a civilizing agent and guarantee its position in international society. Being a good international citizen is also in line with the Netherlands foreign policy vision to promote international rule of law and peace promotion

Key words: repatriation, good international citizen, cultural heritages, colonialism, English school

Words: 16.658

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Problem statement	3
1.2	Research question and aim	6
1.3	Relevance	6
2	Literature review	8
2.1	The good international citizen in practice	8
2.2	Discourse of repatriation across disciplines	9
2.3	Repatriation discourse on former colonial powers.....	10
2.4	The Netherlands-Indonesia repatriation	11
3	Theoretical framework.....	13
3.1	The good international citizen	14
4	Methodology	17
4.1	Research philosophy	17
4.2	Research type	18
4.3	Research strategy.....	19
4.4	Data collection Method	19
4.5	Data analysis	20
4.6	Limitation	20
4.7	Ethics and positionality	21
5	Analysis.....	22
5.1	The Netherlands-Indonesia social and historical context.....	23
5.2	The Netherlands foreign policy orientation	25
5.3	How Indonesian heritages ended up in the Netherlands	27
5.4	Repatriation as a matter of human rights	30
5.5	Repatriation, national interest or greater good?	31
5.6	Compliance with international law	35
5.7	Support for multilateralism	38
5.8	Morality or ethics – “international good deeds”	40
5.9	Leadership – improving international standard.....	44

5.10	Implication and the way forward with the good international citizen.....	47
6	Conclusion	49
7	References.....	52

1 Introduction

Today's world is a compromise of traditional nation states and global interconnectedness. While we live in entities called nation states, boundaries are increasingly blurry. This process is referred to as globalization and has become a buzzword in the 21st century. While some people associated globalization with progress, prosperity and peace, for others the word has conjured deprivation, disaster and doom (Scholte, 2005, p.14).

Globalization is not only the principal subject of global studies but also a conceptual framework where scholars investigate contemporary and historical dynamics of thickening interdependence (Steger & Wahrab, 2017, p.115). Therefore, the study of global studies does not only examine globalization as a process or phenomena but also how past historical dynamics shape the current world. The belief that past events influenced contemporary life is also strongly voiced by postcolonial scholars. For them the inequality between Global North and South is a result of unequal power that has been manifested since times of colonization.

Globalization involves the intensification and acceleration of social exchanges and activities (Steger & Wahrab, 2017, p.122). It touches every aspect of life such as economy, culture, politics, or health. Globalization intensifies together with technological development. Technology has the power to mainstream an issue in one part of the world and bring it to the other part in just a matter of seconds and make it 'a common issue'. With the help of technology, globalization can echo the spirit of global justice.

When theorizing about global justice, academics mostly focus on global distributive justice. This includes but is not limited to a more equal distribution of resources globally or that every person have enough to meet her basic needs, more global equality of opportunity, universal promotion of human rights, promotion of the autonomy of peoples who stand in relations of equality with one another, ...

and how to improve management of the global affairs including globalization (Brock, 2009, p.10-11). Groups which represent the global justice movement mostly have common grievance or points of resistance such as the way globalization is unfolding in the world today. Examples are the dominance of multinational corporations or economic interests throughout the globe with a feared withering away of local cultures, devastation for local economies, intensified destruction of the environment, deepening exploitation, and the apparent unconcern with the most vulnerable and marginalized (Brock, 2009, p.10). Global justice brings globalization beyond the dominant realm of the global North.

The movement depicts two dominant contesting concepts in global studies and/or international relations that is *cosmopolitanism* and *communitarianism*. Cosmopolitanism and communitarianism have a very different way of perceiving justice. Cosmopolitan believes that being cosmopolitan means to think of oneself as a citizen of the entire world. The implicit claim is that one's loyalty should be to a larger 'we' than that of one's local city-state, ethos, nation, or even empire (Mendieta, 2009, p.242). In addition, David Held (2009) argues that human well-being is not defined by geographical or cultural locations. He stresses that national or ethnic or gendered boundaries should not determine the limits of rights or responsibilities for the satisfaction of basic human needs and that all human beings require equal moral respect and concern (p.537). According to cosmopolitanism, human solidarity should not be restrained by national borders - especially in an era in which global problem cannot be viewed in isolation. One example is the refugee crisis that calls for a higher loyalty to humanity rather than an arbitrary limit called nation state.

For communitarian, however, there is a limit to justice based on geographical or cultural terms (Zürn & de Wilde, 2016, p.286). John Rawl and Nagel add that issues, such as justice and legitimacy essentially remain relevant within states. It is because in the state there is a close and clear relationship between rights and duties, an important determinant for justice (Zürn & de Wilde, 2016, pp.286).

These two contesting ideas demonstrate how complex it is to address matters that reach beyond national borders. Not only does every country have a different view

regarding the communitarian-cosmopolitan dichotomy, but certain issues can also be more sensitive for a specific country than it is for others. Regardless of differences, we cannot deny that many issues require global collaboration, such as environmental issues or global pandemics, thus calling for a cosmopolitan view.

Cultural heritage is an issue which can be examined both from a cosmopolitan and communitarian perspective. From a cosmopolitan perspective, important cultural objects representing our shared humanity should be able to traverse national borders (Breske, 2018, p.348). Accordingly, important objects should belong to anyone regardless of their origin. So, it does not matter where it is located, as long as it can be enjoyed by everyone. Meanwhile, according to the communitarian perspective, the object location matters, as there is national identity in connection to cultural heritage (Breske, 2018, p.348). Therefore, it calls for repatriation of cultural heritages.

1.1 Problem statement

Colonialism to some extent contributes to scattering cultural heritages from the previous colony to former colonial power. For some countries, cultural heritage is important to rebuild their new nation-states. It is a powerful signifier for national identity (Clark, 2021, p.178). Therefore, it is common that former colonies insist on having their heritage back. In a newly formed nation, especially developing countries, cultural heritage is important for strengthening the national unity lost during the colonial era (Klesmith, 2013, p.50).

However, many former colonial powers have been reluctant to return cultural heritages, such as the United Kingdom, causing tensions with its former colony India. Especially the early years after the colony's independence are critical. In the case of Indonesia, the Netherlands still wanted to take control over while the young country needed to start a process of nation building. The difficult relationship between two parties resulted in cooperation difficulties, including matters of returning colonial heritages that were scattered between two countries.

In the today's world, artifacts in museums are perceived in a more critical way. Communities from where those artifacts originate want to have them back for being able to connect with their past. Plundering is deemed as wrong. Therefore, the demand for repatriation surges in country's post-colonies. According to Merriam Webster repatriation is the act or process of restoring or returning someone or something to the country of origin, allegiance, or citizenship ("Repatriation", n.d.). By demanding repatriation, a country wants to have their cultural heritages back to their own country.

During the early period of Indonesian independence, cultural heritage was a big issue. As a newly formed nation, these artifacts were important to tell narratives of nationalism: the story of a nation's past and confirm its present importance (Cuno, 2011, p.ixi). Efforts to ask for repatriation started as early as 1949 (van Beurden, 2017, p.126). In 1963, a demand for repatriation was voiced again, when a representative of the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture argued that the Netherlands should return the authentic antiquities of which there was no second specimen and many of which were very valuable (van Beurden, 2017, p.129). Indonesia's constant demands for repatriation shows the importance of cultural heritage for Indonesia.

Amid a bad historical relationship and initial Dutch reluctance, repatriation efforts yielded a positive result in 1975 with the "Joint Recommendations by the Dutch and Indonesian Team of Experts, Concerning Cultural Cooperation in the Field of Museums and Archives Including Transfer of Objects". The Dutch Government declared that it was ready to intensify the cooperation to build up archives and museums in Indonesia. In reply, the Indonesian Government proposed that both sides set up a team of experts to work on cultural relations and the return of objects which was then accepted by the Netherlands, (van Beurden, 2017, p.137).

The 1975 Joint Agreement is not the only nor the last instrument which governs transfer of cultural heritages from the Netherlands. An independent body called *Raad voor Culture* or Council for Culture which focuses on providing the government recommendation regarding the cultural policy regardless of whether it is requested or not, published a report in 2020 with the title "Colonial Collection A Recognition of Injustice". It suggests to return colonial cultural heritages the Netherlands acquired during colonial context unconditionally.

A more concrete response to the Council for Culture report is through the formulation of “Policy Vision on Collections from a Colonial Context in 2021” (next referred as “Policy Vision”). In this document, Minister Ingrid van Engelshoven acknowledges how colonialism is an issue that is still felt on a daily basis therefore there is a need to address these injustices. Due to the complexities of colonial context, this policy distinguish three categories of colonial object: cultural objects involuntarily taken away from a former colony, cultural objects with special significance for the country of origin, and cultural objects from former colonies of other colonial power (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science^b, 2021, my translation). In this vision, Engelshoven also notes that elaboration, implementation, and cooperation may take some time.

Both the report and the policy vision reflect how awareness to return colonial heritages in the Netherlands is relatively big at this moment. Repatriation is always a discourse in the Netherlands from time to time and at some point it is followed by a concrete action. This position is quite different from other former colonial powers such as the United Kingdom or France where even though repatriation of colonial loot is a big discourse, it can hardly be realized due to various reasons from law to destination museum preparedness. In contrast, in the Netherlands, the legislation doesn't oppose repatriation (Council for Culture, 2020, p.5). It also does not wait for the destination country's museum preparedness (not anymore now). For example, out of 196.000 objects in the Indonesian National Museum, only around 20% are well documented (BBC, 2020). Very far for the so-called 'ready'.

The Netherlands' different approach to handle transfer or return of colonial objects which ended up in the Netherlands requires a different academic analysis to complement law, history or archaeological analysis. It calls for political analysis where ethical behaviour and colonial past are taken into account.

Departing from this, the research objective of this thesis is to explore the causes of the Netherlands willingness to return colonial heritages to its former colony, Indonesia. By elaborating each characteristics of a good international citizen, I intend to unpack whether or not the Netherlands fulfil criteria of a good international citizen and if it does what is the implication of it.

1.2 Research question and aim

This research aims to examine the cause which underlies the Netherlands' willingness to return cultural heritages to Indonesia, which it appropriated during times of colonization. For doing so, I am going to employ the good international citizen theory which will be elaborated in the theory chapter of this work. By doing so, the thesis will answer the following research question:

What is the cause that underlies the Netherlands' willingness to return colonial cultural heritage to Indonesia which it obtained in a colonial context (under colonial rule)?

Since the cultural heritages discussed were obtained in a colonial context, colonial heritage and cultural heritage will be used interchangeably throughout this research.

To answer the main question, the following two sub questions are of relevance:

Sub questions:

- *How does the Netherlands fulfil the criteria of a good international citizen?*
- *What is the implication of being a good international citizen?*

1.3 Relevance

Repatriation of cultural heritages is a relatively new issue in international politics. Objects in the museum are mostly about art and aesthetics, it is not common to see historic objects that are displayed as something political. However, major art museums today are an institution that is heavily political, often involved with or implicated in international relations, and savvy about power (Sylvester, 2016,

p.3). The ethnographic collections of modern museums were largely collected during times of colonial occupation, when salvage collecting was deemed necessary to preserve evidence of cultures that appear to be disappearing (Simpson, 2009, p.128).

This research will contribute to the study of the good international citizen theory by analysing repatriation of cultural heritage practices as done by the Netherlands. Repatriation of cultural heritage, especially when the objects belong to the national museum, is part of a political process, undertaken by politicians, and thus represents a form of political action. The international dimension of colonial heritages underlines the need to approach this issue from the perspective of international politics, whereby the good international citizen theory embodies a useful tool. Hence, this research seeks to complement the study of repatriation from a perspective that unites political and cultural matters.

As the Netherlands stance on repatriation of cultural heritage is relatively unique compared to other former colonial powers. The case study can provide valuable insights for modern repatriation policies that could pose an example for other former colonial powers on how to handle repatriation and for addressing their colonial past in more general terms. Moreover, this research has the power to demonstrate that repatriation is not only about returning objects to their original owner but also about maintaining good cooperation with the former colonies in acknowledging that injustices were done in the past.

2 Literature review

This section will provide an overview of the previous research which has been conducted addressing repatriation and the good international citizen. The chapter is divided into different topics, starting with previous research about the good international citizen, followed by discourse on repatriation from various academic disciplines and repatriation by former colonial powers. The section closes with existing research on reparation proceedings within the chosen case study of Indonesia and the Netherlands.

2.1 The good international citizen in practice

The good international citizen is mostly employed to depict law abiding and cooperative nations (Abbondanza, 2021, p.178-179). This is because there is no common definition regarding what a good international citizen is. Some definition includes a country's ability to restrain the pursuing of domestic self-interest for a greater good and some other refer to humanitarian intervention beyond borders. Previous research has exposed that only very few countries fulfil these criteria or parts of them.

In their work "Good International Citizenship: A Third Way for British Foreign Policy" Wheeler and Dunne (1998) analyse how the UK's domestic and foreign policies change from time to time under different administrations. For doing so, they use the two criteria of i) sacrificing narrow economic and political interest to promote international standard of human rights and ii) the duty to use force when needed, checking their applicability in UK policies .

Similar research was done by Abbondanza in 2021 examining how Australia damaged its reputation as a good international citizen due to various policies such as its hard-line policies against seaborne asylum seekers, budget cut for foreign aid and controversial attitude toward climate change mitigation. In her

research, she defines the good international citizen with the criteria of i) the respect of the international law; ii) multilateralism; iii) the pursuing of humanitarian and idealist objectives; iv) an active support for the rules-based order; and v) a congruous identity matched by consistent domestic policies. Moving to the global South, Suzane Graham (2023) examines South Africa and compares it with Sweden, showing that even though the two states stand on different levels in their effort and commitment, both demonstrate characteristics of a good international citizen.

Previous research had mostly focused on countries of the Global North and their policies towards the Global South, using examples of high political issues, such as arm trade or military intervention. For shedding light on the other side of the coin, this thesis' analysis focuses on low political issues, employing the example of repatriation policies.

2.2 Discourse of repatriation across disciplines

Many researchers have examined repatriation from across disciplines such as archaeology, law, and museum study. Some support repatriation as a way to amend the past wrong and the other object repatriation and suggest moving on instead. This debate is mirrored in cultural property internationalism/nationalism dichotomy. According to cultural property internationalism, important cultural objects represent our shared humanity and our collective past and should thus be able to traverse national borders. In contrast, cultural property nationalism attempts to create a national identity in connection to the ownership of cultural heritage (Breske, 2018, p.348).

Richard Vernon (2012) argues that focusing on the past injustices will distract us from attending the present ones since our attention and resources are limited. This is in line with Tiffany Jenkins' (2016) idea that repatriation tries to make museums solve the problem of the present. It will just preserve the fatalistic view that people today are forever imprisoned by the past. However, not all calls for repatriation are made equal (Clark, 2021, p.177). Moira Simpson for example shows how repatriation has deeper significance than amending the past wrong. It

can also strengthen or renew traditional cultural and spiritual value which can help alleviate some of the problem which affects health and wellbeing (2008, p.124). According to Stutz (2013) cultural heritage and human remains become necessary steps toward post-colonial liberation since it is through the revision of histories and a release control over those things that such freedom and liberation from the colonial past can be achieved (p.13).

By examining how repatriation is being understood across disciplines, we can see which position a country chooses on repatriation and why it acts the way it is.

2.3 Repatriation discourse on former colonial powers

Previous research regarding repatriation mostly discusses colonial heritages in the British museum and how it resists repatriation. Elgin Marble, Benin Bronze, and Rosetta Stone to name a few who spark the most controversy. Klesmith (2013) argues that young African countries, such as Mali or Nigeria, with little funds and even less international influence find it difficult to retain their cultural heritages that ended up in the West. Musonda (2013) discusses how the Broken Hill Skull from Zambia was donated to the British Museum without export permit and how London's Natural History Museum refuses to return it . Even though international law regarding illicit property transfer exists, it cannot be applied retroactively. Therefore, former colonies and other victims of imperialism have no choice but to hope for domestic change in colonizing states (Lucyshyn, 2022, p.121).

Paquette (2020) investigates another former colonial power, France , whose president Emanuel Macron in 2017 pledged a promise to return African heritages to respective countries within the next five years by focusing on the "Report on the Restitution of African Cultural Heritage". In another research, Bellisari (2017) examined the case of Algeria's art in French museums. Regardless of the existing Evian Accords which is supposed to guarantee that Algeria's property belongs to Algeria, the negotiation to return Algerian art from the French museum resulted in a dead end. Up until this thesis was written, only 28 of the artifacts had been

returned by France (Noce, 2022). No fewer than 90,000 objects belonging to Africa are still held by French public museums (Mohamed, 2022).

The presented research on this topic provides a preliminary understanding on the dynamics of repatriation from former colonial countries and how the reality does not always follow the ethical ideal.

2.4 The Netherlands-Indonesia repatriation

In the discourse of repatriation between the Netherlands and Indonesia, several publications can be identified. . Cynthia Scott (2017) underlines how the return of cultural heritages from the Netherlands to Indonesia embodies a positive example of post-colonial redress. The return was influenced by the determination of the Netherlands' officials to maintain and secure a cultural role in Indonesia in the future. In her paper Scott uses the example of the return of Prajnaparamitha statue which is equal to Elgin Marble in the British Museum and the dynamics in that process. In another paper of hers, Scott (2014) notes how heritage negotiation can help the states involved to deal with their colonial past when they put aside their interest to achieve common consensus. The author shows how Indonesians positively see the Netherlands' scholars' interest and effort to take care of their heritages instead of expressing rage with an assumption of thievery. Drieënhuizen and Sysling (2021) examines how fossils of Java Man or *Pithecanthropus erectus* ended up in the Netherlands and remained in the country, even though they were historically significant for the original country and its discovery cannot be separated from a Dutch colonial context. Van Beurden (2017) discussed the 1975 sheds a light on the joint recommendation between Indonesia-the Netherlands by examining negotiations across stakeholders to return some of Indonesia's cultural heritages from the Netherlands. In his book, he argues that colonialism is a form of unresolved conflict with many lost colonial cultural objects being part of it (van Beurden, 2017, p.29).

It has become apparent how the topic of repatriation is a multidisciplinary subject. Existing studies have investigated the issue from a cultural, historical, perspective as well as with a focus on law or museum study.

However, since repatriation is a political process, power imbalances that result from the colonial past can be involved, thus highlighting the need to complement this discourse with a global studies perspective. Due to its political status, high level state representatives are likely to play a role in reparation processes. It was president Emanuel Macron who promised to return African heritages. It was the King of the Netherlands, Willem Alexander, who symbolically returned an important dagger to Indonesian President Joko Widodo (CNN, 2020, my translation).

This thesis, therefore, aims to contribute to the field of repatriation by applying the lens of international relations to the matter. Even though numerous publications are already discussing former colonial powers and their position on restitution of postcolonial heritages, the colonial power of the Netherlands are barely addressed.

3 Theoretical framework

English school is a one of the major schools in international relations, combining elements of realism, liberalism and constructivism. It emphasizes the concept of so-called international society. In the international society, states are the agents who, through their interaction, constitute the practice of the society of states. Since the state is an abstract concept, talking about *the states* usually refers to the individual within which bears the responsibility to act on behalf of the state, such as president, prime minister or minister (Wheeler, 2000, p.22). This actor then takes certain policies to accommodate its domestic and international needs.

The growing global interdependence creates increased capacities for interstate harm as well as awareness of the sources and impacts of those harms (Shapcott, 2020, p.247). As members of international society, states are faced with two options when it comes to issues which involve justice abroad, such as human rights violation. The first is to follow solidarist arguments which believe there is solidarity or potential solidarity in international society. The second is to follow pluralist arguments which believe there is no solidarity of certain kind among states (Bain, 2018, p.2). The choice is then reflected in the state's policy, for example whether or not a state will do humanitarian intervention to prevent suffering of distant others.

The solidarist idea is in line with the cosmopolitan belief of justice. According to Linklater, cosmopolitan conventions have arguably been the defining characteristic of contemporary international society which has placed greater emphasis than previous periods on reducing unjustifiable suffering. This works together with a solidarist international society where states accept certain common purposes beyond coexistence (Shapcott, 2020, p.248). Responsibility to protect is an example of the ideal practice of solidarist and cosmopolitanism.

The concept of good international citizenship has been strongly associated with 'solidarist' English School theory. By stressing principles of justice and human

rights rather than only international order and state sovereignty, it recognizes cosmopolitan duties to outsiders (Shapcott, 2013, 140). According to Lawler (2013) and Shapcott (2013), good international citizenship is a conservative form of cosmopolitanism (Edyvane & Souther, 2019, p.42). Being a good international citizen is about self-restraint (Shapcott, 2020, p.248). It can explain a country's policy that goes beyond domestic self-interest.

Repatriation of cultural heritages that is done by the Netherlands is a rare example of post-colonial redress being compared to other former colonial powers. Due to its rarity, its action can be considered as one step ahead. The Netherlands' different approach to handle transfer or return of colonial objects which ended up in the Netherlands requires a different academic analysis to complement law, history or archaeological analysis. It calls for political analysis where ethical behavior and colonial past are taken into account.

The good international citizen theory will be used to analyse this case since it considers dimensions such as solidarity beyond borders and morality in international society. It can also explain how a country can take a leadership role and lift international moral standards. Ethical policy beyond borders can be better explained by using the framework of cosmopolitanism that is inherent in the good international citizen discourse.

3.1 The good international citizen

As a citizen of a particular nation, the individual has a clear checklist of what their duties and rights are. There is a binding framework of law which needs to be followed by the citizens. Moreover, there are judicial bodies to enforce violation of agreed laws. To be a good citizen means to obey the so-called social contract and the constitution. However, what does it mean to be a good *international* citizen?

Linklater (2007) stresses that very little attention is paid to the question of how citizenship is developed in international relations (p.64). The discourse on citizenship focuses on the following aspects: Firstly, citizenship refers to the primary legal rights that all persons have as members of a particular state.

Secondly, citizenship refers to the right of participation in the political life of the community as a whole. Thirdly, citizenship not only refers to rights but to fundamental duties as well (Linklater, 2007, p.65). Realist thinkers try to apply the concept of citizenship to the international community. According to Wright (1990), the next stage of citizenship development involves going 'higher in our search for citizenship, but also lower and wider. Higher to the world, lower to the locality (Linklater, 2007, p.67-68).

Buzan (1993) understands that international society traditionally requires states to conceive themselves as bound by shared norms and collective institutions. Following that logic, therefore if a state's society consists of citizens, each with formal rights and duties, then it follows that an international society comprises international citizens, whose membership can be defined in a comparable manner (Buzan cited after Abbondanza, 2021, p.178). Hence, good international citizens here refer to individual nations states as a member of international society and not an individual citizen with a global cosmopolitan view.

There is no consensus on what the definition of a good international citizen is. It is argued that the concept does not lend itself to exhaustive definition and that an understanding of what is meant by "good international citizenship" can only be reached by a different method of analysis (Pert, 2012, p.95). Publications on good international citizenship mostly examines a country based on several criteria. Bull's (1977) criteria on good international citizenship are respective of states' sovereignty, international law, and the necessity to rely on diplomacy and wide consensus (Abbondanza, 2021, p.180). Pert (2012) summarizes the attributes of a good international citizen as follows:

(1) Compliance with international law; (2) Support for multilateralism; (3) Willingness to "pitch in" to international tasks; (4) Morality or ethics - "international good deeds"; and (5) Leadership - improving or raising international standards (p.96). Both of them support multilateralism and respect to international law.

As proponents of the English school of international relation, Andrew Linklater and Hidemi Suganami have different criteria of what constitutes good international citizens with the power to guide foreign policies. Their list includes:

(1) The need for restraint in the pursuit of national objectives; (2) respect for the principle of reciprocity; (3) recognition of the existence of the security dilemma – specifically of how actions which are not intended to intimidate can generate fear and distrust; (4) the commitment to a fair balance between national security and insecurity in the knowledge that a high level of security for one state will mean insecurity for others in conditions of fear and distrust (Linklater & Suganami, 2006, p.237-238). This suggests that there is no consensus on what constitutes a good international citizen. It depends on which category or criteria is applied. .

In a different work of his, Linklater provides further dimensions of the good international citizen. The first is , collective responsibility for the maintenance of international order is the main foundation of good international citizens (2007, p.69). This is because in the international society each state has their fears and interests, therefore each party needs to respect each other and acknowledge their needs. Secondly, preserving the society of states because states possess the international equivalent of civic obligation to advance the more general good (Linklater, 2007, p.70). Thirdly, states should permit the development of multiple forms of citizenship. They should permit the growth of subnational and cosmopolitan loyalties (Linklater, 2007, p.71). Lastly, the right of self-determination, which includes the right to protest against actual or potential forms of harm (Linklater, 2007, p.73).

There is certainly a limit to this theory. The existence of good international citizens implies the presence of a bad citizen. Nonetheless, Pert (2012) argues that instead of applying a good versus bad dichotomy, a state can be a good, poor or neutral international citizen. In order to fall into the "good" category, a state must do more than merely fulfil its minimum international obligations (p.98). Therefore, a good international citizen is a status or label that can be earned after fulfilling certain criteria and showing ambition.

4 Methodology

This research tries to apply theory from the English school of international relation to analyse the practice of repatriation from a former colonial power. To operationalize it, I am going to conduct a document analysis in a qualitative fashion. A document is a product and it is produced by human kind in socially organized circumstances (Prior, 2003, p.5). In social settings, it is of particular interest how documents are produced and functioned. As the modern world is made through writing and documentation, documents are just as significant as other sources in social science (Prior, 2003, p.5). Especially documents like policy papers, legislation, or the government's vision is of great concern because of its power to influence people's lives and the future direction of an entire country.

It is important to note that the classical English school theories do not emphasize the methodology. For them, methodological concerns is positively harmful to the school's cognitive goal (Navari, 2009, p.1). Chris Reus-Smit argues that English school is merely concerned with 'practical reasoning' which has the same intent as the Weberian ideal type that is identifying motive for action (Navari, 2009, pp.3-5). Therefore, this results in methodological pluralism. For the sake of transparency, this methodology section will discuss various aspects of data gathering and processing.

4.1 Research philosophy

Research philosophy discusses the paradigm of how the social world is understood. For this research, an interpretivism paradigm will be used instead of positivist approach. For interpretivism, the role of the researcher in interpreting the phenomena is important. Knowledge and positionality towards certain issues do not appear from vacuum, it involves subjectivity. Wight in Navari (2009)

emphasizes that international society was the product of both subjective and intersubjective understandings, therefore, not capable of fulfilment in positivist terms (p.2).

This research acknowledges the uniqueness of social phenomena that cannot be reduced into statistics and occurrences. Social life is a distinctive human experience which may include choice, moral, political concerns, emotions, values, or the self (McLaughlin, 2007, p.6). The government, which is the focus on this research, can explain and justify their policies through a process of arguing and reasoning. The reason why certain action is taken depends on the social variables that surround the actors. The way the policies, statements, and stance are interpreted depend heavily on the researcher.

4.2 Research type

This research is deductive because it applies a theory into a particular case. While a deductive model is often associated with quantitative inquiry, it is widely used in politics research to test the application of theoretical models to new (often overseas) contexts (Pierce, 2008, p.16). The analysis will be descriptive, focusing on a more general expressions that are relevant to the investigated phenomena, rather than particular words.

Here, the theory of the good international citizen will be applied to the case study of the Netherlands to investigate its applicability. The analysis aims to uncover the motivation behind the repatriation action of the Netherlands' government. It is to be assumed that the practice is influenced by factors of social reality, the political system, and structures that cannot be viewed in isolation. This study does not aim to make generalizations of several cases, but rather tries to gain in depth understanding or observation of the selected case study. With its detailed, flexible, sensitive and naturalistic character, the qualitative study is suitable for producing adequate sociological accounts in cases where social life is intricate and depends on given circumstances (Payne & Payne, 2004, p.3).

As a qualitative research, it will focus on texts, concepts, and words that are relevant to the phenomena observed. Furthermore, a qualitative method enables a

shift in focus from the individual to the group and to learn how meanings are negotiated between members and group dynamics involved (Pierce, 2008, p.7). When researching political decisions, such as made by the Netherlands' government, it is helpful to explore how ideas are contested, debated and agreed, as well as the dynamics behind the process which can only be caught through a qualitative approach..

4.3 Research strategy

This is case study research. Case studies are a design of inquiry found in many fields, especially evaluation, in which the researcher develops an in-depth analysis of a case, often a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals (Creswell & Creswell, 2018, p.51). I have chosen to work with a case study design as it allows to examine the case of the Netherlands' repatriation to Indonesia beyond surface level.

4.4 Data collection Method

This research employs document analysis. Document is a product and it is produced by human kind in socially organized circumstances (Prior, 2003, p.5). In social settings, it is of particular interest how documents are produced and functioned. For a social scientist, documents such as policy papers, legislation, or the government's vision is a concern because of its power to influence people's lives and the future direction of a country.

As a document study, this research uses secondary data. Secondary data here including but not limited to government publication, news, interviews by other parties, and policy papers in English, Indonesian, or Dutch. This research will only use data that is publicly available. Modern world is made through writing and documentation (Prior, 2003, p.5). Therefore, documents are as significant as other sources in social research.

This research examines the Netherlands' repatriation policy. The policy referred here therefore are: "Joint Recommendations by the Dutch and Indonesian Team of Experts, Concerning Cultural Cooperation in the Field of Museums and Archives Including Transfer of Objects" signed in 1975, the 2020 report from Council for Culture with the title "Colonial Collection A Recognition of Injustice" and "Policy Vision on Collections from a Colonial Context" published by The Ministry of Education, Science and Culture in 2021. There was also several repatriation efforts that were done by the Netherlands' government prior and after the above documents which will also be referred as "policy" defined here.

4.5 Data analysis

The analysis will be descriptive since it tries to unpack the motive behind the Netherlands willingness to do repatriation. The analysis uses various data from sources such as news and governmental publication. Researcher plays a great role in interpreting and drawing conclusions of the studied phenomena. Analysis will start with operationalizing theories into several keywords. Since there is no agreement regarding what the definition of the good international citizen is, therefore it will use keywords that are shared by several theories regarding what constitutes a good international citizen such as priority to human rights beyond national borders or priority toward greater good instead of narrow national interest.

4.6 Limitation

The first limitation language. As I do not speak Dutch, the majority of information is gathered from English sources. When I employed Dutch sources, I made use of a translation tool or interpreter. I am aware of the dilemma to potentially lose information or context in translation, even if I have done it to the best of my knowledge and ability.

The next limitation is implementation of a policy takes time. Sources that are studied here are among other things publications from Council for Culture and the “Policy Vision on Collections from a Colonial Context”. A vision is not a law, therefore the implementation into concrete steps can take time. In the Policy Vision is also clearly written that implementation and international cooperation will take longer time. However, I still treat this vision as a good intention and political will regardless of how the implementation is.

4.7 Ethics and positionality

It is difficult to say that research can be neutral and value-free. Recognizing that there are ethical values embedded in these apparently taken-for-granted perspectives is an important part of an ethical practice (Mason, 2018, p.89). Researchers should not insert the interest of a particular group into their research. However, it needs to be noted that I am Indonesian myself, so an unconscious bias cannot be ruled out while writing this thesis. Besides that, the debate of the good international citizen is strongly shaped by a Western perspective, hence I need to be careful to not be too Western centric. In short, it is necessary to remain critical and transparent about decisions made in this study while embracing the different perspectives existing in the field of study.

5 Analysis

This thesis argues that the reason underlying the Netherlands' willingness to return colonial heritage is because it wants to play a role as a good international citizen. In order to qualify as a good international citizen, there are several qualifications that need to be fulfilled, as presented in the theory chapter. The analysis will therefore investigate how the Netherlands fulfil those criteria.

As laid out before, it is difficult to define what a good international citizen is. However, research on a good international citizen is mostly drawn from several criteria. Each theorist has their own indicators on what constitutes a good international citizen in international relations. For this thesis' analysis, I will mostly employ the criteria defined by Pert. This is due to its clarity and comprehensiveness. Pert's categories for the good international citizen sum up the main characters of different theorists and thus provide a common ground, suitable for qualitative document analysis. To provide a little call-back, Pert's, criteria for being a good international citizen consist of:

1. Compliance with international law
2. Support for multilateralism
3. Willingness to "pitch in" in international tasks
4. Morality or ethics - "international good deeds"
5. Leadership - raising international standard

The analysis will begin with a brief explanation of social and historical context of relationship between Indonesia and the Netherlands, followed by the Netherlands' foreign policy vision. This is followed by the application of Pert's good international citizen criteria to the Dutch case study, eventually I will conclude by showing the implication of being a good international citizen.

5.1 The Netherlands-Indonesia social and historical context

The English school of international relations stresses the importance of historical analysis in understanding international society. Therefore this section will begin with a brief history of Indonesia-Netherlands relationship. Indonesia is a former colony of the Netherlands. As a former colony, the relationship among those two is not always in a good condition.

Indonesia unilaterally declared its independence from the Netherlands in 1945 after World War II. The Netherlands did not accept it with a good reception considering it lost one of its biggest colonies. Until 1949 the Netherlands was reluctant to acknowledge Indonesian independence. By the end of 1949, under international political pressure, the Netherlands finally transferred sovereignty of East Indies, except West New Guinea, to the United States of Indonesia at the conclusion of a United Nations-sponsored Round Table Conference (Scott, 2017, p.650).

In the early period of independence, the relationship between Indonesia and the Netherlands was poor. The government's delay in returning certain objects from Dutch's museums had stemmed from animosities linked to history and in particular, the bitter fight between 1945 and 1949. It raised the question of whether the mutual post-war struggles were the only factors hampering the return of materials at that time (Scott, 2017, pp.649-650). At this time, the condition was not in favour of the Netherlands. After the Dutch military bombed the then capital of Indonesia in 1948, the Netherlands public image was severely damaged (Scott, 2017, p.651).

After many countries got independent right after World War II, the fight against colonialism was massive. Colonialism was condemned, especially in Asia and Africa. Under intense condemnation and the need to save their public image, returning crowns and trophies from the Netherlands' museum back to Indonesia was considered (Scott, 2017, pp.650-651). This 'goodwill gesture' would have

been a meaningful way to symbolize the transfer of sovereignty and appealing for Indonesian leaders (Scott, 2017, pp.651-652). Many African states struggled to find a sense of stability in their newfound independence from colonial masters are turning to a shared culture to unite them as a people (Klesmith, 2013, p.47). Returning cultural heritages back to a newly formed Indonesia was expected to have the same effect.

The idea to make a 'goodwill gesture' in the interest of foreign policy was strongly rejected by F.J Rutten, Minister of Education, Arts and Sciences at that time (Scott, 2017, p.652). As much as cultural heritage had a great significance to Indonesia, it also had significance to the Netherlands. For the Netherlands, unilaterally returning cultural heritages was not merely a political decision in diplomatic affairs because it contains memory that the Netherlands was a former colonial power in the East Indies (Scott, 2017, p.653). The Netherlands was still proud of their role as a colonial power and desire to continue to do so by displaying the artifacts which proves their past "greatness" in the museum.

The relationship remained in deadlock until the 1960s when conflict over who controls West Papua was finally resolved. In this period, the issue of returning cultural heritage to former colonies also became politically sensitive on an international level (Scott, 2017, p.655). There was a breakthrough in Paris in 1964 which resulted in the "Recommendation on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Export, Import and Transfer of Ownership" where the Netherlands was part of the drafting team (UNESCO, 1964). The Netherlands' participation in the forum which specifically focuses on this issue more or less influenced the Netherlands' future decision regarding repatriation. Even though the idea of returning cultural heritage in the 1960s was opposed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Education, there was still willingness from both parties to have cultural cooperation (Scott, 2017, p.655). This could only happen when their relationship had softened with the change of regime in Indonesia.

Another breakthrough on cultural heritage protection happened in 1970 when the "Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property" was enacted in 1970. As the relationship between Indonesia and the Netherlands got better and the Netherlands

became a state party of that convention, discussion regarding repatriation continued. There was a power shift to the center-left in the Netherlands led by the Labor Prime Minister Joop den Uyl. Officials in the new coalition promptly responded to the question of returning cultural heritage under the hope of achieving diplomatic reconciliation (Scott, 2017, p.661).

The peak happened in 1975 when Indonesia and the Netherlands signed a “Joint Recommendations By The Dutch And Indonesian Team Of Experts, Concerning Cultural Cooperation In The Field Of Museums And Archives Including Transfer Of Objects”. There were fears on the Netherlands’ side that constant postponement of returns would make Indonesia lose interest in the return issue, which, in turn, would endanger the Dutch relationship with the country (van Beurden, 2017, p.137). Even before this joint recommendation was signed, partial return had already been done to diminish tension among both parties (van Beurden, 2017, pp.137-138). This was fresh air regarding repatriation of cultural heritage to the former colony.

Amid the ups and downs relationship between former colony and colonial power, they could eventually sit together and discuss the repatriation issue for both parties' sake. Transfer of cultural heritages were then conducted ever since. It was in 2020 when the repatriation issue was raised again and the Council for Culture published their recommendation to return cultural heritages unconditionally with the title “Colonial Collection A Recognition of Injustice”. The following year, a Policy Vision with a title “Policy Vision Collections from a Colonial Context” was published by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science.

5.2 The Netherlands foreign policy orientation

The Netherlands is a geographically small state in Europe. As a small state it needs to figure out its position in a changing world, not only as a part of the European Union but also in front of the big powers such as the US and China. Historically, the Netherlands foreign policy during the 19th and early 20th century mainly pursued a policy of passive neutrality. It was considered to be a matter of national self-interest not to side with any of the Great Powers and thus jeopardize

its extensive colonial empire (Schrijver, 2010, p.242). Their foreign policy is characterized by an approach that aims to balance trade interests, security interests, and idealism (van Willigen, 2021, p.205).

However, dynamics during the Cold War made the Netherlands rethink its position. The great power rivalries made neutrality no longer possible. Neutrality was abandoned when the Netherlands joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 (van Willigen, 2021, p.205). Joining NATO means the Netherlands is leaning more to the United States and in consequence neglect its relationship with the Soviet Union.

In the 20th century, the Netherlands gradually moved to a more active and constructive foreign policy. It pursued a policy of universal cooperation and collective security and became a member of all relevant world organizations (Schrijver, 2010, p.242). The choice for pursuing an active policy, often amounts to little more than an attitude of ‘if it fails to do some good, it won’t do any harm’ (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid & Knapen, 2011, p.25). However, as the time goes by, the Netherlands aim for a more ambitious foreign policy goal.

Being a small country does not stop the Netherlands from dreaming to make a bigger contribution to the world. The Netherlands was once referred to as a model country. Proponents of this notion of a ‘model country’ called on the Netherlands to take upon itself a leading role in changing the world (Kennedy, 1997, p.78, my translation). This is due to two reasons: First, it met with the full support and involvement of the government right from the word go (sic!) especially on the issue of human rights and democracy; and secondly, this idea matched with the shift from material prosperity to spiritual development that prevalent in the Netherlands which result on the prioritization of human rights, disarmament, and environmental protection (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid & Knapen, 2011, p.36). Foreign observers have often mentioned the Netherlands as a model of a state that often, though not always, has put human rights considerations before other concerns of foreign policy (Baehr, Castermans-Holleman, Grunfeld, 2002, p.992).

The Netherlands is among a few countries who put promotion of international legal order in its constitution (van Willigen, 2021, p.208). Nielsen (2008) stresses how The Hague in the Netherlands is bracketed with the Peace Palace. Over the past decade, not only many international institutions but also smaller knowledge centers have established themselves in The Hague, and the volume and scope of their activities is increasing (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid & Knapen, 2011, p.55). The active promotion of human rights and its relatively large footprint in development aid are two other characteristics of Dutch foreign policy that point toward internationalist idealism (van Willigen, 2021, p.206). The strong leaning towards international law in Dutch foreign policy derives in no small part from a considerably moralist, legalist and idealist, if not Calvinist tradition, which can be traced back to the works of Hugo Grotius (Schrijver, 2010, p.242).

It can be said that two very important Dutch's foreign policy issues are human rights and promotion of international legal order. The Netherlands commitment toward promotion of international legal order not only at home but also abroad shows the spirit of cosmopolitanism. It acknowledges the importance of human rights not only to fellow citizens but also those beyond the border. This shows a clear leaning to cosmopolitan values instead of communitarian belief that there is solidarity beyond the border of the state.

5.3 How Indonesian heritages ended up in the Netherlands

Colonialism is complex since it involves power imbalances. Some heritages may be gathered illegally and some are gathered legally. Even when things are gathered legally, the colonialism context must be kept in mind. For example, fossils of *homo erectus* were only able to be discovered by Eugene Dubois and Ernest von Koenigswald under colonial context because the Dutch colonial authority provided them with the opportunity to conduct scientific research and forced laborers to do the heavy work (Drieënhuizen and Sysling, 2021, p.294). Technically it was right gathered by the Dutch scientist but it would not be possible without the colonial authority's help.

Van Beurden classifies colonial cultural object into five categories (van Beurden, 2017, p.41). This classification helps us understand the complexity of the distribution of cultural heritage.

- a. Gifts to colonial administrators and institutions;
- b. Objects acquired during private expeditions;
- c. Objects acquired during military expeditions;
- d. Missionary collecting;
- e. Archives.

The first way cultural heritages acquired were through gift. Cultural objects which were acquired through gift need to be examined critically. Gift giving does not always mean equal position between the giver and the receiver. In Indonesian colonial context such as Java and Bali gifts by local rulers to colonial administration was an expression of subjugation (van Beurden, 2017, p.41). The artifacts may be acquired legally in the sense that the giver gave that voluntarily, however there was unequal power relation involved there which made the process could not be understood literally.

The next category is object which gathered during private expedition. Not all objects or artifacts were gathered directly under the colonial rule. There were private expeditions wandered to tropical countries for various reasons. For objects which were acquired through private expeditions, it is difficult to know how the objects were acquired or whether they faced difficulties in the custom (van Beurden, 2017, p.42). Antiquities fever drives people to hunt antiquities all over the world alongside with the desire to research on the flora and fauna. Scientists, missionaries as well as colonial administrators are collectors of cultural heritages - that's how objects were easily spread over public and private collections in Europe (van Beurden, 2017, p.42). When it comes to private collections, it is difficult to track its history and even more difficult to repatriate.

There were objects gathered during military expeditions. During this expeditions, it was common to take artifacts from the invaded region as spoils of war. For example, when the Roman Empire invaded Greece, they brought an extensive amount of object and paraded the Greek's artifacts through the street as spoils of war (Jenkins, 2016, p.38). Military confrontation during the colonial period also

resulted in the seizure of artifacts as spoils of war. Each of the major British wars and victories in the first half of the nineteenth century was brought home in the form of relics and trophies to be displayed by the company in its museum or by the crown in its armories in the tower (Cohn, 1996, p.104).

Missionaries also took part in separating cultural objects from their original land. From the start of colonialism, tens of thousands of European missionaries traveled to the colonies. They intentionally and massively destroyed and confiscated traditional religious objects. Some of them were sent to Europe (van Beurden, 2017, p.45). Missionaries considered local beliefs and icons to be deviant and therefore taking actions to address that - either by destroying or confiscating. The point is to isolate indigenous population from their beliefs.

The last category is archive. Archives have decisive power to direct history. Some books are so powerful that book banning happens all over the world. It had been “general practice” for British authorities to remove documents from colonies (Livsey, 2022, p.95). They regulated the circulation of information to preserve their own leading position, and excluded others from access to selected files, even elected ministers who would soon lead their countries (Livsey, 2022, p.97). This does not only happen in British colonies. Seizure of archives also happened in the Dutch colony, for example archives of *nagarakartagama* which describe Indonesian territory pre-colonialism was held in the Netherlands before eventually being returned to Indonesia.

There were various ways how other countries’ artifacts ended up in other countries’ museums. This shows how repatriation can be a complex issue. Sometimes things are gathered legally however its legality cannot be separated from colonial context. It can also be an issue that indigenous population did not know the value of those objects back then, it was Western knowledge that gave certain objects meaning and value. Therefore, it is important to not only focus on whether objects are acquired legally or illegally especially when it involves colonialism but also to also take into account the context of how the object was acquired.

5.4 Repatriation as a matter of human rights

Robertson (1999) in Chandler describes how the world post 1945 is an evolutionary process toward human rights law (Chandler, 2003, p.297). Many human rights declarations and charters born after this era. It is difficult for liberal states post 1945 to claim that human rights abroad are of no concern to them (Wheeler & Dunne, 1998, p.854). This inspires the emergence of ethical foreign policy. Ethical concerns, such as the human rights of others, seem to provide a moral framework which can project a sphere of agreement and consensus and point beyond the relativism and pessimism of our times (Chandler, 2003, p.299).

The belief that human rights knows no borders is one of the driving forces for cosmopolitanism. Human rights of distant others are equally important with human rights of fellow citizens - this is often the justification for foreign policy. Wheeler and Dunne (1998) in Shapcott recognizes that good states should either act or refrain from acting in any way that would jeopardize human rights at home or abroad (Shapcott, 2013, p.142).

Human rights is divided into several generations. It is not only limited to civil and political rights but also economics, social and cultural rights. Both categories are equally important. Universal Declaration of Human Rights article 27 guarantees the rights for everyone to participate in the cultural life of the community. So does the International Covenant on Economics, Social and Cultural rights.

In order to be able to participate in cultural life, a community needs to have access to their culture. Culture can refer to two things: way of life or art. It is in this twofold meaning that culture is essential for the identification and the recognition of a community, thanks to both its intangible and tangible expressions (Valentini, 2021, p.1759). Wangkeo (2003) in Klesmith defines cultural heritage as objects inherited from past generations that relate to a society's cultural development (Klesmith, 2013, p.48). Cultural heritage represents an essential part of the cultural identity of most indigenous peoples, who hold with their heritage a spiritual— more than material—relationship (Lenzerini, 2016, p.128).

Due to the importance of cultural heritage, depriving indigenous peoples of their cultural heritage does not simply mean stealing their material property but also

can involve mutilation of an element of their belief system essential to their existence (Lenzerini, 2016, p.128). Without it, the community could suffer identity loss which is essential for their existence. Separating a community from their important cultural aspect is a violation of human rights. Therefore, repatriation of their cultural artifacts is an essential prerequisite for preserving their identities and distinctiveness as cultural communities (Lenzerini, 2016, p.131).

Repatriation of cultural heritages should not only be seen as gain or loss in museum business. As something that is very important for a community where it originated, it should be seen from a human rights perspective. It is not just an expression of generosity when a country repatriates cultural heritage, but a fulfilment of human rights. When a country separates objects that are substantially important and connected to the identity of a possessor, therefore it is a violation of human rights.

5.5 Repatriation, national interest or greater good?

“If you say yes to one you suddenly find the British Museum will be empty.” David Cameron, ex UK Prime Minister once said when asked to return the Kah-i-noor diamond back to India (BBC, 2010). This comment at the very least shows how the UK is reluctant to repatriate colonial cultural heritages in its museums. The country/museum where the object is located at the moment will be the most affected party if not disadvantaged when it comes to repatriation. It can be said that it is not in the national interest of the UK to repatriate colonial heritages, especially when their collections are full of objects from across the world.

In order to be a good international citizen, sometimes states are encountered with two choices: pursue narrow national interest or being a good international citizen by acting for the greater good. Good international citizen contains the belief that states and their citizens do not have the right to routinely pursue their interests at the expense of outsiders (Shapcott, 2013, p.142). Doing something for the sake of being a good international citizen is often seen as the opposite of doing something out of narrow national interest. However, being a good international citizen does

not mean that every policy taken is sterile from domestic interests. According to Linklater good international citizens are not required to sacrifice their vital security interests out of fidelity to the rules of international society, but they are required ‘to put the welfare of international society ahead of the relentless pursuit of [their] own national interests . . . to place the survival of order before the satisfaction of minimal national advantages’ (Wheeler & Dunne, 1998, p.855). Thus, national interest does not always have to conflict with the greater good.

If we use Cameroon’s argument for repatriation, therefore the Netherlands’ decision to return colonial heritages will sound as if it is for greater good. The Netherlands does not seem to be benefiting from the repatriation policy. Acknowledging past injustices and returning colonial heritages is mostly good for the destination country’s favour. However, even though it mostly favours the destination country, it does not mean that the Netherlands does not benefit at all. It is less likely that a policy is taken without domestic interest. In this section I will try to examine how the Netherlands may be benefitted through repatriation policy. I will then compare how Indonesia is benefitted by this policy. Comparison is meant to see whether this policy is taken for narrow Dutch interest or for the greater good.

Repatriation plan as manifested in the document “Policy Vision Collections from Colonial Context” that is produced by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science’s in 2021 may benefit the Netherlands in several ways. Firstly, it is financially beneficial for the Netherlands. Secondly, it is good for its international image. Thirdly, it can maintain a good relationship with its previous colony. Fourthly, it can benefit the Netherlands on a domestic level since the domestic public has positive sentiment toward repatriation and is thus likely to improve its legitimacy.

First, repatriation can be financially beneficial to the Dutch’s museums. Taking care of objects, especially the one that is old and fragile is costly. For example Banjarmasin diamond which is now located in the Rijksmuseum and labelled as ‘spoils of war’ requires extensive care. This diamond was seized during the Netherlands’ East Indies colonial era and it was first offered to King Willem III in 1862 but he rejected it because of the high processing cost. The diamond was eventually put in a warehouse until the carat level dropped before finally handed

to the Rijksmuseum to be taken care of in 1902 (Rachmawati, 2020, my translation). Furthermore, a lot of money is required to build and maintain a prestigious museum. That also explains why not all museums in the world have proper infrastructure.

The Dutch's museums already suffered from budget cuts. After 2012, the government no longer subsidizes the museums and the associated Royal Tropical Institute. The Ministry of Education, Science and Culture has already cut the culture budget previously, followed by the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs since they can no longer justify how development money is spent on a museum in Amsterdam rather than in developing countries abroad (Dutch Amsterdam, 2016). The Nusantara museum, a 100-years old institution in Delft, Netherland closed permanently in 2013 due to financial difficulties to mention a few examples. Its collections were then sent to Indonesia to find a "new" home (Dafoe, 2020). Reducing collections can be one way of minimizing the already limited budget that museums have.

Second, repatriation can boost the Netherlands' international image. This will be discussed more in the later course. The Netherlands vision plan - returning cultural heritages of previous colonies - is still rather unusual among former colonial powers therefore it can be seen as an example of international leadership in the matter. It is not only repatriation which will give the Netherlands a good international image and portray it as 'a good guy', but also how it acknowledges its colonial past and injustices.

Repatriation and apology can be two separate things, however in this case the Netherlands did both. When a country apologizes for its past injustices, the question which follows is reparation. According to the Merriam Webster, reparation is the act of making amends, offering expiation, or giving satisfaction for a wrong or injury ("Reparation", n.d.). Reparation can be costly, therefore it can be a reason why a country refuses to apologize. Repatriation can be a form of reparation. Doing both can put the Netherlands into a position where not all countries are brave enough to be.

Third, it is a good way to maintain good relationships with its previous colonies. This is a lesson which is taken prior to 1975 where the Netherlands' side kept

postponing negotiation to repatriation. The Dutch's government fears that the constant postponement of returns would make Indonesia lose interest in the return issue, which, in turn, would endanger the Dutch relationship with the country (van Beurden, 2017, p.137). As a previous colonizer, it cannot be said that the Netherlands and Indonesia's relationship post-independent had always been smooth. Even when it is respectful today, the shadow of past colonialism will always haunt and will affect the trust between two states.

Furthermore, repatriation can also be seen as an expression of goodwill. It is a sign of the Netherlands' ambition to move to a better direction in foreign affairs. How the Netherlands acknowledges their past mistakes - in their policy vision - and takes action to redress it is proof that what they do is not just rhetoric without action. With a shadow of the colonial past, expression of goodwill can improve the relationship between two parties for the better in the future.

Lastly, the Dutch public is positively leaning towards the country's repatriation effort. Museums' new policy to repatriate stolen heritages are positively welcomed by the public (Hickley, 2020). By doing so, it can improve the Netherlands' government domestic legitimacy because it acts ethically on the issue that is currently attracting wide international attention. This is due to values that are rooted in Dutch society. The Dutch society experienced a shift from material prosperity to spiritual development in the 1960s. This allows them to focus their enthusiasm and energy to post-material issues such as human rights, disarmament, and environmental protection (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid & Knapen, 2011, p.36).

Repatriation is not a negative sum game where one party benefits and the other loses. It is definitely not a zero sum game either where nobody wins. However, it can be a positive sum game where both parties are benefited. Just because this policy benefits the Netherlands in some way, it does not mean that Indonesia does not get anything. It is actually the opposite.

Repatriation discourse appears because of the importance of local or indigenous communities to unite with important objects from their past. Therefore it can be certainly said that repatriation is done for the sake of the original owner first and foremost. Repatriation of their cultural artifacts is an essential prerequisite for

preserving their identities and distinctiveness as cultural communities (Lenzerini, 2016, p.13). By reconnecting with their lost artifacts, Indonesia can rewrite history and educate the younger generation on the country's history.

Repatriation can also be an aid to recover from post-colonial trauma (Simpson, 2009, p.122). Artifacts returned will be historically and culturally significant for the destination country. It does not only mean adding a collection to the museum, but also a reminder of the painful past. Only by facing the pain can a country make peace and move on. It therefore benefits Indonesia significantly when they get back their collection since it is related to their national history and identity. In this case, both parties benefited. It cannot be said that repatriation is only for the sake of the Netherlands' narrow interest because it benefits Indonesia a great deal.

5.6 Compliance with international law

International law guarantees the protection of the international heritages. There are several international conventions which aim to protect cultural heritage of great importance such as “The Hague 1954 Convention On The Protection Of Cultural Property In The Event Of Armed Conflict”, “The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of 2003”, or UNESCO 1970 “Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property”. The Netherlands is bound to the three of them.

The Netherlands ratified the Hague 1954 convention on 14 October 1958 and entered into force on 14 January 1959 (UNESCO, 1954). It accepted the UNESCO 1970 convention on the means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit import, export and transfer of ownership in 2009 (UNESCO^a, 1970). The 2003 “Convention On Safeguarding The Intangible Cultural Heritage” came into acceptance in 2012 (UNESCO, 2003). Both acceptance and ratification of convention has the same legal effect, it shows willingness of the state party to be bound by the treaty. However, acceptance is used when a treaty is not required to be ratified at the national level according to the constitutional law (UN Treaty

Collection, n.d.). Until this point, the Netherlands has yet to ratify the “Convention On The Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage” 2001.

Not all of the above conventions talk about repatriation and restitution. The conventions which specifically discuss repatriation and restitution are UNESCO 1970 “Convention On The Means Of Prohibiting And Preventing The Illicit Import, Export And Transfer Ownership Of Cultural Property” and UNIDROIT “Convention On The Stolen Or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects” of 1995. The Netherlands signed the UNIDROIT convention by 1996 and has not ratified it yet (UNIDROIT, 1995). It then implemented a combination of the 1970 UNESCO Convention and the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention and the legislation focused on implementing article 3 of the 1970 UNESCO Convention, rather than Article 9 (Gerstenblith, 2011, p.257).

Article 3 states that import, export or transfer of ownership of cultural property effected contrary to the provisions adopted under this Convention by the States Parties thereto, shall be illicit. Meanwhile article 9 states that any state party to this convention whose cultural patrimony is in jeopardy from pillage of archaeological or ethnological materials may call upon other States Parties who are affected. The States Parties to this convention undertake, in this circumstances, to participate in a concerted international effort to determine and to carry out the necessary concrete measures, including the control of exports and imports and international commerce in the specific materials concerned. Pending agreement each State concerned shall take provisional measures to the extent feasible to prevent irremediable injury to the cultural heritage of the requesting State. The Government of the Netherlands chose not to ratify the 1995 Convention, but to become a party to the 1970 UNESCO Convention and to base its implementation in part on the positive elements of the UNIDROIT Convention (Schneider, 2016, p.157).

The legislation prohibits the import of cultural property that was illegally removed or unlawfully appropriated from a State Party. The primary enforcement mechanism is through a private right of action for the State Party that wishes to recover its cultural property. The Netherlands’ officials are also authorized to take such materials into custody when there is suspicion that this provision has been violated, pending the filing of a claim by the foreign nation (Gerstenblith, 2014,

p.7432). Although this section of the implementing legislation is based on Article 7(b)(i) of the UNESCO 1970 Convention, the explanatory memorandum clarifies that unlawful appropriation includes unlawful excavation at archaeological sites. The explanatory notes refer to the UNIDROIT 1995 Convention's equation of unlawful excavation at an archaeological site with theft in Article 3(2), which states that "a cultural object which has been unlawfully excavated or lawfully excavated but unlawfully retained shall be considered stolen, when consistent with the law of the State where the excavation took place" (Gerstenblith, 2011, p.258).

The Netherlands has ratified, accepted and signed several international laws regarding cultural heritages protection. By ratifying UNESCO 1970 convention and combining UNIDROIT 1995 convention in its implementation, it means that the Netherlands is bound to follow the regulation after 1970. This is because the UNESCO 1970 convention adopted a non-retroactivity principle. According to article 100 operational guidelines for the implementation of the convention, it said that the Law of Treaties does not provide for retroactive application of treaties. The provision of the 1970 convention entered into force on 24 April 1972, three months after the date of ratification, acceptance or accession (UNESCO^b, 1970). With this principle, accidents which happened before 1970 didn't subject to this legislation.

In addition, one of the Netherlands' niche foreign policy is international rule of law (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid & Knapen, 2011, p.54). Malcontent & Bauder (2003) in Knapen said that active membership of international organizations, stimulating the development of and promoting compliance with international law, protecting human rights, and disseminating the rule of law is a realization of the Netherlands commitment to international rule of law (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid & Knapen, 2011, p.55). As a country with a mission of promoting international rule of law, it should be a prerequisite that it has a proven credibility of compliance with law either domestic or international. It is not possible to be a proponent of international rule of law if the said country does not practice what it preaches.

5.7 Support for multilateralism

The next category of the good international citizen requires support for multilateralism. Multilateralism can be defined as the practice of coordinating national policies in groups of three or more states, through ad hoc arrangements or by means of institutions (Keohane, 1989, p.731). To connect multilateralism with repatriation, therefore I examine how the repatriation policy vision was formulated, planned and who were involved. In that way we can see whether it was only directed to fulfil the domestic agenda because it is done unilaterally or it involves several parties and takes into account their feedback.

Before going further, it is important to first understand why multilateralism is important for good international citizens. Linklater (2007) stresses the importance of commitment to the society of states because states have both more and fewer rights than the ordinary citizen - it has more because sovereignty allow a state to put national interest before the world's common good and fewer because the sovereign rights of small states can always be sacrificed to preserve equilibrium between the great powers (p.70).

Multilateralism defends the effort of inclusion in international politics. Good international citizenship entails sympathy for political efforts to overcome unjustified systems of exclusion (Linklater, 2007, p.70). Inclusion policy on the national level is applied by trying to involve everyone and taking into account as much voice as possible. Multilateralism is a concrete form of inclusion when it comes to international level. It tries to involve and engage with as many countries as possible when making a policy.

It is a little bit difficult to check this requirement's applicability by only examining Indonesia and the Netherlands' repatriation policy. This is due to the definition of multilateralism that requires at least three parties and this thesis limits it to only Indonesia and the Netherlands. However it is possible to test this criteria by using the concept of Keohane and Nye (1989) who defend 'multilateralism' and global policy coordination as opposed to unilateralist foreign policy (Linklater, 2007, p.70). With this idea, therefore, so long as the policy is formulated non-unilaterally it can be categorized as support for multilateralism.

In general, the Netherlands committed to multilateralism (van Willigen, 2021, p.206). Its active foreign policy also drives the Netherlands to participate in every forum and organization. The Netherlands is a member of the European Union (EU), North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and World Trade Organization (WTO) among other things. This has enabled the Netherlands to fulfil support for multiculturalism criteria of Pert's approach to the concept of the good international citizen. Departing from this, I will further examine the Netherlands' support for multilateralism specifically for the repatriation case.

When the Council for Culture gives recommendations to the government of the Netherlands regarding how to treat and move forward with colonial heritages through "Colonial Collection A Recognition of Injustice" document, it makes several acknowledgments. This council is composed of people from various origins, such as Surinamese, Indonesian, Antillean, Indo-European, Dutch, British and French. According to the document, they gather opinion from originating countries such as Caribbean, Suriname, and Indonesia as well as policy makers in Belgium, French, the United Kingdom, and Germany where colonial collections remains a live issue while composing their recommendation (Council for Culture, 2020, p.14). It can be said that the recommendation takes into account the perspective from various sides to avoid exclusivity.

In response to the report from the Council for Culture, the government agrees on the importance of collaboration with the source countries. According to them, redressing injustice is only possible through cooperation and dialogue with previously colonized countries. After the publication of the document, therefore they made contact with the representatives of the government of former colonies that is Indonesia and Suriname (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science^b, 2021, p.4). This dialogue involves government institutions. Even though it is an ad hoc event and not institutionalized just like formal organization, it still fulfils the multilateralism criteria.

The growing importance of new issues, such as the need for international ecological management, created the context in which states might forego their absolute sovereignty and embrace new obligations as 'local agents of a world common good' (Linklater, 2007, p.71). Repatriation can be a domestic policy or

foreign policy. As domestic policy, it does not require the said country to consult with any other country under the principle of sovereignty. As foreign policy, it may or may not require consultation with other countries since it involves other countries. This is where things get a little bit tricky as domestic politics can still involve other countries. Foreign policy is not a single-ministry matter, ministries all pursue their own foreign policy in those areas in which they have expertise and competencies (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid & Knapen, 2011, p.86).

Repatriation policy is a very good example which proves that foreign policy is beyond the scope of Foreign Ministry. The policy vision was not made by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs but the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. While formulating the document, it tries to involve related countries as much as necessary. Using the Keohane and Nye's definition of multilateralism where it involves global policy coordination as opposed to unilateral foreign policy be it ad hoc or institutionalized, therefore the Netherlands once again fulfils this requirement.

Should we stick to the definition of multilateralism as it is - namely cooperation between at least three countries, then the scope can be broaden a little bit. The Netherlands did not only try to include perspectives from Indonesia but also Suriname. It also held discussions with the governments and public bodies of the Caribbean part of the Kingdom (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science^b, 2021, p.4). The involvement of impacted countries as well as countries where the issue is relevant can be concluded as support for multilateralism.

5.8 Morality or ethics – “international good deeds”

In March 2020, the Dutch King Willem Alexander together with Queen Maxima visited Indonesia. The King used the occasion to apologize for the Dutch's excessive violence in the past and symbolically return three heritages that are historically important to Indonesia (Angga, 2020, my translation). These artifacts are the dagger, horse paddle, spear and heirloom stick, all of them belong to Prince Diponegoro (Pratiwi, 2020, my translation). Prince Diponegoro is a

national hero according to Indonesia and a rebel according to the Netherlands. His belongings were seized by the Netherlands as spoils of war. For Indonesians, his belongings clearly have cultural and historical significance since they witnessed the previous Indonesian struggle for Independence from the Netherlands.

Following the King and Queen's apology, Mark Rutte as Prime Minister (PM) of the Netherlands also apologized to Indonesia in February 2022 after a major historical study found systematic and excessive violence during the period of 1945 -1949. In this apology Rutte did not only deeply apologize for the violence but also how previous governments neglected it (DW, 2022). King Wilhelm and PM Rute used the same narration to apologize - excessive violence. Meanwhile both of them acknowledged the past mistakes and made no justification of it, the damage of colonialism is beyond excessive violence. PM Rutte acknowledges this in his apology for the Dutch's past slavery to Suriname, Curaçao, St. Marteen, Aruba, Bonaire, Saba, and St. Eustatius - that their slavery past continued to have negative effects today and still does (Government of the Netherlands, 2022).

The Dutch King and PM Rutte's apology was not the first one. Several apologies have been performed, however it was not directed to Indonesia as a whole or as a country but rather a response to partial events. In 2011 The Dutch Ambassador to Indonesia Jonkheer Tjeerd de Swan apologized for the Rawagede Massacre which happened in 1947 and in 2013 he apologized again for Westerling massacre which happened in 1945-1949 (Saptohutomo, 2022, my translation). If we look at the period of the events in which the Netherlands' apologized, they happened after 1945 - the year after Indonesia became independent. Independence means free from colonialism. If the Netherlands apologized for events which happened after the independence, therefore the Netherlands did not apologize for its past colonialism. For Indonesians, the Netherlands' colonialism lasted for hundreds of years and the consequences are still present - and this is not addressed in the apologies.

The next category of the good international citizen to be fulfilled is international good deeds. It is difficult to decide what action counts as a good deed. What is considered a good deed can be subjective, one good deed for the other party can be seen differently for the other party. It is especially difficult to assess good deeds that are performed by the Western countries due to the shadow of the

colonial past. Without careful examination, stating one action as good deeds can lead to Western bias or worse neo-colonialism.

Before examining moral action done by a country, it is necessary to understand different views regarding the place for morality in international politics. Liberal cosmopolitans like Thomas Pogge (1992) have integrated the issue of sovereignty and global justice. They show a Kantian influence insofar that they emphasize the idea of equal moral worth of human beings (Choudary, 2018, p.27). This view sees morality beyond the scope of merely individual nations and universal moral virtue is possible. It is under this idea that the good international citizen theory was constructed.

On the other spectrum, realists are known for their pessimistic view regarding morality in international politics. There are at least three reasons why morality and international relations don't work together according to realists. First, politics is immoral by nature because some parties are more powerful than the other. Second, the anarchy of the international system is a barrier to creating moral order on the global stage. Third, human self-interestedness precludes objectivity and therefore universal moral principle to guide policy is not possible (Wrightson, 1995, pp.356-357).

While it is very difficult to suggest one moral action that is without controversy, this thesis will give an example of state apology. Apologies are morally significant with regard to their form, function and freight. Apologies negotiate responsibility for moral harms, deflect blame, and shape the meaning of a particular perceived moral failure (Weaver, 2016, p.89). Apology may contain detailed accounts of the wrongdoing or there may only be an implied cursory narrative. Nevertheless, whether implicit or detailed, the apology conveys a narrative about the past, impregnates it with a legible normative meaning and self-assigns degrees of responsibility for the misdeed (Bentley, 2017, p.401).

In a short glimpse, an apology is often perceived as not only the right thing to do but also the expected thing to do when someone did wrong. However, academic discourse has critically examined state apology, especially when there is a colonialism dimension involved. For sceptics, state apology is perceived as defensive moves to protect hegemony (Friedrich, 2022, p.700). Further, through

state apology a privilege of the colonizing party is reproduced; the privilege of speaking, speaking for and representing. By the very format, the former colonizer is enabled a platform from which to craft a narrative and represent both the victim (the 'other') and the 'self' meanwhile the colonized listened and silent (Bentley, 2017, p.400).

Regardless of the critics, we should not disregard the importance of a state apology that is done correctly - a meaningful apology. Besides bringing about a shift in norms, a meaningful apology renews the social relationship between the perpetrator which is represented by the state and the victim group; the state asks for forgiveness and acknowledges (or reaffirms) the rights of the victim group (Schneider, 2014, p.71). The right narratives have the capacity for fostering reconciliation. When a violent wrongdoing is committed, beyond the physical anguish, one of the most painful aspects is that the wrongdoer revealed insufficient respect for the dignity of the inflicted (Bentley, 2017, p.401).

While apologies cannot undo the past, they can heal the wound of injustices, reaffirm the dignity of victims, and restore broken relationships. Apology, according to the optimists, opens a new chapter for all parties to the conflict to renegotiate their shared past and helps to underscore the possibility of peaceful co-existence based on mutual respect and understanding (Ugochukwu, 2023, p.2). It is outside the scope of this thesis to analyse whether the apologies are done correctly or not. Therefore it will only analyse apology more as an action and less on the narration.

It is necessary to apologize for every wrong that is done. The King and Queen as well as the prime minister apologize for the right reasons. Excessive violence definitely worth an apology, terrible events which happened even after independence require apology. The shortcoming of the Netherlands' government apologies was that they lacked a colonialism dimension. It is crucial to take into account the colonialism dimension because of its decisive effect. All the apologizes that the Netherlands' government done will not be required should there be no colonialism. Colonialism is the root cause and the Netherlands missed that.

The good international citizen does more than the average. Against the back of this criteria, I argue that the Netherlands' partially fulfilled it. It is not to dismiss the importance of the apologies that have been performed, however we cannot disregard how the Netherlands disregard the root cause that is colonialism. Should the Netherlands apologize for colonialism in general instead of just excessive violence in the past just like it apologizes for its former slavery then the Netherlands will fulfil the criteria of international good deeds. This is not to disregard how the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science effort to acknowledge their past injustices in this policy vision. However, acknowledgement is not equal to apology and the one who apologized - the King and the Prime Minister - did not acknowledge the root cause of the issue.

5.9 Leadership – improving international standard

The next criterion for good international citizenship is leadership or raising international standards. Leadership can take a variety of forms. In common parlance, leadership can mean: (1) to direct or command; (2) to go first; and (3) to induce. These definitions roughly correspond to three types of international leadership: hegemony, unilateralism, and multilateralism (Keohane & Nye, 2011, p.196). In this sense, leadership can mean to go first on something that has not been done before when other countries are reluctant to do. Through leadership, it can also induce other countries to do the same by giving the example. It is not possible to direct other countries in the international system.

One type of international leadership is unilateral initiative that sets an international example. A large state may not be able or willing to police the behavior of other states, but because of its size and importance, its actions may determine the regimes that govern situations of interdependence, both because of its direct effects and through imitation (Keohane & Nye, 2011, p.196). Only by giving an example can a country raise international standards. To examine the applicability of this requirement to the Netherlands, it can be done by comparing the international standard in repatriation.

Due to the vast amount of former colonial power, it is not possible to explain every country and list their repatriation effort. Therefore, this thesis will only focus on some former colonial powers or those which make significant effort instead of comparing the Netherlands with all former colonial powers. The Netherlands is not the only former colonial power that is willing to do repatriation. Museum of World Culture in Sweden for example returned a collection of elaborately embroidered textiles to Peru in 2014 after the Peruvian government asked for it (Jenkins, 2016, p.6). French has returned 28 objects to Africa after Macron's 2017 declaration that African heritages can't just be in European museums and collections (Harris, 2022).

I argue that the Netherlands fulfils the effort to increase international standards in repatriation. This is due to two reasons: First, the Netherlands has started to return Indonesian cultural heritages early on, albeit partially. Second, the recommendation from the council for culture advises that the Netherlands should return the cultural heritages unconditionally - which then being responded promptly by the Ministry Of Education, Culture And Technology through its policy vision.

The very first time the Netherlands returned cultural heritages to Indonesia took place in 1931 before Indonesian independence. In 1931, the East Indies government returned regalia heirlooms objects believed to have sacred power that confers authentic authority on a rule. This had been acquired as war booty in South Sulawesi in the middle of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth (Scott, 2014, p.650). This can be considered an uncommon initial step for a colonial power to return cultural heritages to a colony while still holding power.

After 30 years of negotiation post-independence, the first repatriation from the Netherlands to Indonesia happened in the 1970s (Scott, 2014, p.650). In 1970, when president of Indonesia Soeharto visited the Netherlands, Queen Juliana gave him two paintings of Raden Saleh - a famous Indonesian painter. In 1973 during Queen Juliana's visit to Indonesia she gave back the *Nagarakretagama* manuscript - a very important manuscript which depicts the extent of Indonesian territory before colonization. In 1973, Museum Volkenkunde handed over 380 ethnographic objects from Papua (van Beurden, 2017, p. 138). These events, although necessary, are not very common. Especially when there is no formal

agreement among both parties regarding repatriation of important artifacts. The Netherlands also hadn't ratified UNESCO 1970 convention back then.

The first agreement between The Netherlands and Indonesia took place in 1975. Both parties finally sat together and made a “Joint Statement Concerning Cultural Cooperation In The Field Of Museum And Archives Including Transfer Of Objects”. In this joint statement, it is written that certain objects should be available for exhibition and study in the other country to fill the gaps and promote mutual understanding as well as appreciation of each other’s cultural heritage and history (van Beurden, 2017, p.142). It does not directly imply repatriation of all cultural heritages but rather show willingness to develop understanding and appreciation as an equal counterpart. The joint statement was also agreed before the Netherlands signed the 1970 UNESCO “Convention On The Means Of Prohibiting And Preventing The Illicit Import, Export And Transfer Of Ownership”. The Netherlands prompt response can be seen as a leadership act which can give example to other former colonial powers regarding willingness to repatriate cultural heritages.

Second, the recommendation which the Council for Culture proposed suggests the government *unconditionally return* all cultural heritage objects which can be demonstrated with a reasonable degree of certainty that the source countries did indeed lose them involuntarily and that they then came into the possession of the Netherlands’ state - if the source country is willing to have it back. The most important part here is to return *unconditionally*. Other countries propose loans either temporary or permanent, but returning unconditionally is a new approach. The government wants to develop a framework of repatriation which is based on the willingness to redress past injustices (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science^b, 2021, p.4). Even when the objects come from other former European colonies and the injustice was committed by another European power, since the objects ended up in the Netherlands therefore the Netherlands should be the one to remedy these injustices (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science^b, 2021, pp.4-5).

The National Museum of World Culture Netherlands already worked on the guidance for colonial repatriation in 2017. Repatriation efforts had been done on a case to case basis and this guidance will make the repatriation process more

systematic (Hickley, 2020). Therefore, both the government and the museum are developing mechanisms to repatriate colonial artifacts. Public response was also positive: “To my relief, when we presented our position, there was not much opposition and no outcry from political groups or citizens saying we should keep everything,” Schoonderwoerd says (Hickley, 2020).

5.10 Implication and the way forward with the good international citizen

The main concern with being a good international citizen is inconsistency or hypocrisy. A country condemns human rights violations abroad while still experiencing human rights violations at home or maintaining relationships with a country with a bad human rights record. Indonesia is not a country free from human rights violations. According to the Amnesty International report, authorities continued to use excessive attacks to handle protests, journalists and human rights defenders were subject to physical and online attack, and the security forces committed unlawful killings in Papua and West Papua (Amnesty International, 2022). But so did the Netherlands.

As a former colony and colonial power, human rights violations committed by the Netherlands to Indonesia in the past can't be denied. I discussed in the section above how the Netherlands acknowledged and apologized for their past human rights violations. If a good international citizen can only promote human rights if it itself is clean, how long should we draw the timeline and make the cut off year? Both parties have track records of human rights violations. A country does not have to be perfect to be a good international citizen.

The Netherlands is praised as a model state with a dream to promote rule of law. It has a strong commitment to human rights both domestic and abroad, which is an important aspect of a good international citizen. Through the analysis above, the Netherlands has showcased how to some extent it fulfils criteria of a good international citizen. If promoting human rights is one of the foremost duties of a good international citizen, guided by solidarist values, individual states can

therefore in limited ways indeed be identified as potential civilizing agents in international society. Such good international citizens are civilizing agents because they practice self-restraint and harm minimisation in their foreign relations (Shapcott, 2020, p.248).

Shapcott argues that being a good international citizen means being a civilizing agent. To be more or less civilized is to have greater or fewer such restraints (Shapcott, 2020, p.249). It is not a judgment of morality. A civilizing process involves 'shifts in the standards of self-restraint that people have imposed on themselves and on each other in the course of responding to new potentials for organizing harm (Shapcott, 2020, p.247).

Being a civilizing agent is in line with model state claims as well as the Netherlands' foreign policy objectives. The existence of the Hague as well as the Netherlands' active participation in drafting or proposing human right conventions (see Schrijver, 2010) shows the Netherlands' strong commitment to world peace. Just like Norwegia which is known for the Nobel Peace Prize, the Netherlands as an almost equally small country also wants to hold a central role in peace and human rights. By being a civilizing agent, the Netherlands positions itself as a substantial actor in international society.

Being a good international citizen can bring a good image for the Netherlands which will contribute positively to its future international goal. A good image is a minimum guarantee before the Netherlands can further its plan to promote international rule of law and being an active agent for peace promotion efforts. For example, it can be a reliable mediator for conflict in the future due to its reputation as a good international citizen. Being a good international citizen is not only about ethical foreign policy for the sake of the destination country, but it can also be about exercising domestic interest for further international goals.

6 Conclusion

Global studies provide a framework to study various issues that have global consequences. It does not only treat globalization as a matter of fact but also as a framework of study. Globalization has influenced every aspect of our daily lives. Though some argue that it is a recent phenomenon, some argue that it has happened since a long time ago. Regardless of the disagreement, it is necessary to consider the importance of past events into the current world, especially when it comes to relationships among the Global North and the Global South.

A globalizing world is marked with a more interdependent relationship among states. What happened in one part of the world will be heard in another corner of the world in just a matter of minutes. Sometimes it can have a contagion effect such as #BlackLivesMatter movement which initially happened in the US but echoed all over the world. Even though globalization makes borders among states seem blurry, we still value institutions called the state while having a more globalized vision and understanding.

A more globalized point of view cannot be separated from a way to see the international world. It is the English school of international relations who believe that groups of states in the world work in a similar way as a society, they call it international society. As a 'society', they have norms and values they should consider when formulating a policy otherwise they will get sanctioned. A country who has a high standard in morality and obedience toward international norms and rules can be called as a good international citizen.

To see whether a country fulfilled criteria as a good international citizen or not, it needs to be examined based on certain criteria. This thesis employed the criteria of Alison Pert to see whether or not the Netherlands qualifies as a good international citizen by examining its repatriation policies and progress. As a result, there are criteria in which the Netherlands perform well and there are criteria where its performance can be improved.

In terms of compliance to international law, the Netherlands has ratified and accepted several international conventions regarding repatriation. Those conventions are UNESCO 1970 convention on the means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit import, export and transfer ownership of cultural property and UNIDROIT 1995 convention on the stolen or illegally exported cultural objects. The Netherlands is a country who is determined to promote rule of law on the international level. Taking into account that goal, it is certain that the Netherlands should provide evidence of its compliance toward rule of law on the domestic level before promoting on the international stage. It is nearly impossible that a country whose compliance toward international law is compromised even consider the idea of promoting international rule of law.

In defence of multilateralism, this is in line with the Netherlands foreign policy's vision that is active. Join every international organization and attend every international event. In terms of repatriation, the Netherlands actively gives space for destination countries to provide feedback toward the Netherlands repatriation policies. This is one step forward since repatriation can be a domestic policy which basically does not require consultation with other countries. However, the Netherlands proactively holds coordination with affected countries and further the Council for Culture consists of people from various backgrounds to ensure inclusivity.

The next category is morality or international good deeds. I used an example of apology to illustrate international good deeds. Transfer of Indonesia's cultural heritages were followed by apology, either from the King and the Queen or Prime Minister. This section sought to avoid discussion of word selection in their apologies but rather focus on the action itself. It becomes visible that there is room for improvement in their apology since they did not address past colonialism especially when the core of all of these problems are colonialism. They also apologized for events which happened *after* independence, which again did not address their actual past colonialism. Addressing past colonialism was done by the Minister of Science, Technology and Culture however it was not followed by apology.

The last category is raising international standards. The Netherlands is an example of a former colonial power which is at the forefront in repatriation. Return of

cultural heritage by the Netherlands has been done since before Indonesian independence. To improve the relationship and the trust between Indonesia and the Netherlands during 1975 joint recommendation discussion, the transfer of heritages gradually started. In essence, the Netherlands proved to be always open to returning cultural heritages to their former colony, especially when it has cultural significance or was collected under dubious circumstances, which distinguishes the case with other cases of former colonial power.

To conclude, the Netherlands to some extent has demonstrated various criteria of a good international citizen theory. By being a good international citizen, the Netherlands has the power and credibility to be a civilizing agent within the international community of states. It equipped the Netherlands with a positive reputation and brings it one step closer to its goal of being a considerable actor in international peace promotion and supporter of the rule of law. Having a positive image on the world stage can be a significant starting point for gaining the necessary power to pursue further ambitions in foreign policy and guarantee the Netherlands position in the international society.

7 References

- Abbondanza, G. (2021). Australia the “good international citizen”? The limits of a traditional middle power. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 75(2), 178–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10357718.2020.1831436>
- Amnesti International. (2022). *Indonesia* 2022. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/location/asia-and-the-pacific/south-east-asia-and-the-pacific/indonesia/report-indonesia/>
- Angga, D. (2020, March 11). Raja Belanda Kembalikan Keris Diponegoro dan Meminta Maaf. *Koran Sindo*. <https://nasional.sindonews.com/berita/1552444/15/raja-belanda-kembalikan-keris-diponegoro-dan-meminta-maaf>
- Baehr, P. R., Castermans-Holleman, M. C., & Grunfeld, F. (2002). Human Rights in the Foreign Policy of the Netherlands. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 24(4), 992–1010. <https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1353/hrq.2002.0043>
- Bain, W. (2018). The Pluralist–Solidarist Debate in the English School. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies. <https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.342>
- BBC. (2010, July 29). *Koh-i-Noor diamond 'staying put' in UK says Cameron*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-10802469>
- Bellisari, A. (2017). The Art of Decolonization: The Battle for Algeria’s French Art, 1962–70. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 52(3), 625–645.
- Bentley, T. (2018). Colonial apologies and the problem of the transgressor speaking. *Third World Quarterly*, 39:3, 399–417, DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2017.1401922
- Beurden, J. van. (2017). *Treasures in trusted hands. negotiating the future of colonial cultural objects*. Sidestone Press.
- Brock, Gillian. (2009). *Global Justice: A Cosmopolitan Account*. Oxford: Oxford Academic. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199230938.001.0001>
- Breske, A. (2018). Politics of Repatriation: Formalizing Indigenous Repatriation Policy. *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 25(3), 347–374.

- Chandler, D. (2003). Rhetoric without responsibility: the attraction of 'ethical' foreign policy. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 5(3), 295–316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-856X.00108>
- Choudhary, A. (2018). Justice, Morality, and International Relations: A Critical–Theoretical Reading. *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations*, 22(1), 22–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0973598418757818>
- Clark, L. (2021). Yours, Mine, and Ours: International Law and the Problem of Museum Repatriation. *Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems*, 31(1), 175–194.
- Cohn, B. S. (1996). *Colonialism and its forms of knowledge : the British in India*. Princeton University Press.
- Council for Culture. (2020). Colonial collection and a recognition of justice. Retrieved from: <https://www.raadvoorcultuur.nl/english/documenten/adviezen/2021/01/22/colonial-collection-and-a-recognition-of-injustice>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design : qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Fifth edition.). SAGE.
- Cuno, J. (2011). *Who Owns Antiquity?: Museums and the Battle over Our Ancient Heritage*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400839247>
- Dafoe, T. (2020, Jan8). For the First Time in Its History, the Netherlands Is Returning an Enormous Trove of Artifacts to Its Former Colonial Territory of Indonesia. *Artnet*. <https://news.artnet.com/art-world/netherlands-returns-indonesia-artifacts-1748376>
- Drieënhuizen, C., & Sysling, F. (2021). Java Man and the Politics of Natural History : An Object Biography. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde*, 177(2/3), 290–311.
- Dutch Amsterdam. (2016, May 21). *Survival of Amsterdam's Tropenmuseum uncertain after subsidy stop*. <https://www.dutchamsterdam.nl/2075-subsidy-stop-tropenmuseum-amsterdam>

- DW. (2022, Feb 17). *Netherlands Apologize to Indonesia Over War Crimes*. <https://www.dw.com/en/netherlands-apologizes-to-indonesia-over-war-crimes/a-60817847>
- Edyvane, D., & Souter, J. (2019). *Good International Citizenship and Cosmopolitan Responsibilities to Protect : Balancing Responsibilities and Dirty Hands*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1093/oso/9780198800613.003.0003>
- Friedrich, J. (2022). Settling Accounts at the End of History: A Nonideal Approach to State Apologies. *Political Theory*, 50(5), 700–722.
- Graham. S. (2023). South Africa, Sweden, and Good International Citizenship. *The Thinker*, 94, 44–52. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.36615/the_thinker.v94i1.2357
- Gerstenblith, P. (2011) 2010 cultural heritage legal summary, *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 36:3, 257-264, DOI: 10.1179/009346911X12991472411006
- Gerstenblith, P. (2014). UNESCO (1970) and UNIDROIT (1995) Conventions. In: Smith, C. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2_399
- Government of the Netherlands. (2022, Dec 19). Speech by Prime Minister Mark Rutte About the Role of the Netherlands in the History of Slavery. <https://www.government.nl/documents/speeches/2022/12/19/speech-by-prime-minister-mark-rutte-about-the-role-of-the-netherlands-in-the-history-of-slavery>
- Harris, G. (2022, June 1). What Has Happened to Frances Grand Plans to Return Africas Heritage. *The Art Newspaper*. <https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2022/06/01/what-has-happened-to-frances-grand-plans-to-return-africas-heritage>
- Held, D. (2009). Restructuring Global Governance: Cosmopolitanism, Democracy and the Global Order. *Millennium-journal of international studies*, 37(3), 535–547. <https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1177/0305829809103231>
- Hickley, C. (2020, October 8). The Netherlands: Museums confront the country’s colonial past. *UNESCO*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/netherlands-museums-confront-countrys-colonial-past-0>

- Jenkins, T. (2016). *Keeping their marbles : how the treasures of the past ended up in museums - and why they should stay there*. Oxford University Press.
- Kennedy, J.C. (1997) *Nieuw Babylon in aanbouw: Nederland in de jaren zestig*. Boom.
- Keohane, R. O. (1989). Multilateralism: An Agenda for Research. *International Journal*, 45(4), 731–764.
- Keohane, R. O. & Nye, J.S. 2011. *Power and interdependence*. Forth edition. Longman, New York.
- Klesmith, E. A. (2013-2014). Nigeria and Mali: The Case for Repatriation and Protection of Cultural Heritage in Post-Colonial Africa. *Notre Dame Journal of International & Comparative Law*, 4, 45-76.
- Lenzerini, F. (2016). Cultural Identity, Human Rights, and Repatriation of Cultural Heritage of Indigenous Peoples. *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 23(1), 127–142.
- Linklater, A., & Suganami, H. (2006). The good international citizen and the transformation of international society. In *The English School of International Relations: A Contemporary Reassessment* (Cambridge Studies in International Relations, pp. 223-258). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511491528.008
- Linklater, A. (2007). *Critical theory and world politics : citizenship, sovereignty and humanity*. Routledge.
- Livsey, T. (2022). Open secrets: the British ‘migrated archives’, colonial history, and postcolonial history. *History Workshop Journal*, 93(1), 95–116, <https://doi.org/10.1093/hwj/dbac002>
- Lucyshyn, M. (2021). Western art museums and the legacy of imperialism: the successes, shortcomings, and future of the art repatriation movement. *Temple International & Comparative Law Journal*, 36(1), 119-150.
- Mason, J. (2018). “Ethics”, in: *Qualitative researching*. Third edition. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 83-106.
- McLaughlin, H. (2007). *The philosophy of social research*. SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857024695>

- Mendieta, E. (2009). From imperial to dialogical cosmopolitanism. *Ethics & Global Politics*, 2(3), 241–258. <https://doi.org/10.3402/egp.v2i3.2044>
- Ministry of Education, Culture and Science^a. (2021, Jan 29). *Government: Redressing an injustice by returning cultural heritage objects to their country of origin*. Government of the Netherlands. <https://www.government.nl/latest/news/2021/01/29/government-redressing-an-injustice-by-returning-cultural-heritage-objects-to-their-country-of-origin>
- Ministry of Education, Culture and Science^b. (2021, Jan 29). *Beleidsvisie collecties uit een koloniale context*. <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/kamerstukken/2021/01/29/rapport-beleidsvisie-collecties-uit-een-koloniale-context>
- Mohamed, F. B. (2022, Nov 18). 5 years on, where are the objects looted from Africa that France's president promised to return? *AA Turkiye*. <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/africa/5-years-on-where-are-the-objects-looted-from-africa-that-frances-president-promised-to-return/2742087>
- Musonda, F. (2013). Decolonising the Broken Hill Skull: Cultural Loss and a Pathway to Zambian Archaeological Sovereignty. *African Archaeological Review*, 30(2), 195–220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10437-013-9134-3>
- Navari, C. (2009). *Introduction: Methods and Methodology in the English School*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1057/9780230234475_1
- Noce, V. (2022, Feb 3). Why Macron's radical promise to return African treasures has stalled. *The Art Newspaper*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2022/02/03/why-macrons-radical-promise-to-return-african-treasures-has-stalled>
- Paquette, J. (2020). France and the restitution of cultural goods: the Sarr-Savoy report and its reception. *Cultural Trends*, 29(4), 302–316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2020.1819773>
- Payne, G., & Payne, J. (2004). *Qualitative methods*. SAGE Publications, Ltd, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849209397>

- Pert, A. (2012). The Good International Citizenship of the Rudd Government. *Australian Year Book of International Law*, 30, 93-146.
- Pierce, R. (2008). *Qualitative versus quantitative methods: A relevant argument?* SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857024589>
- Pierce, R. (2008). *The philosophy and principles of research*. SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857024589>
- Pratiwi, P.S. (2020, March 10). Keris Diponegoro dan Pusaka Lain yang Dikembalikan Belanda. *CNN* Indonesia. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20200310190936-20-482245/keris-diponegoro-dan-pusaka-lain-yang-dikembalikan-belanda>
- Prior, L. (2003). *Basic themes: Use, production and content*. SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857020222>
- Rachmawati. (2020, March 13). Berlian Banjarmasin Disimpan di Belanda, Jarahan Perang 160 tahun lalu (1). *Kompas*. <https://regional.kompas.com/read/2020/03/13/06070071/berlian-banjarmasin-disimpan-di-belanda-jarahan-perang-160-tahun-lalu-1?page=all>
- Reparation. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reparation>
- Repatriation. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/repatriation>
- Saptohutomo, A.P. (2022, Feb 18). Deretan Permintaan Maaf Belanda Kepada Indonesia. *Kompas*. <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2022/02/18/18140711/deretan-permintaan-maaf-belanda-kepada-indonesia>
- Schneider, N. (2014). Waiting for a Meaningful State Apology: Has Brazil Apologized for Authoritarian Repression? *Journal of Human Rights*, 13:1, 69-84. DOI: 10.1080/14754835.2013.824275
- Schneider, M. (2016). The 1995 UNIDROIT Convention: An Indispensable Complement to the 1970 UNESCO Convention and an Inspiration for the 2014/60/EU Directive. *Santander Art and Culture Law Review*, 2 (2), 149-164.

- Schrijver, N. J. (2010). A Missionary Burden or Enlightened Self-Interest? International Law in Dutch Foreign Policy. *Netherlands International Law Review: International Law, Conflict of Laws*, 57(2), 209–244. [https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1017/s0165070x10200050](https://doi.org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1017/s0165070x10200050)
- Scholte, Jan Aart. (2005). *Globalization: a critical introduction* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scott, C. (2014). Sharing the divisions of the colonial past: An assessment of the Netherlands-Indonesia shared cultural heritage project, 2003-2006. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 20(2), 181-195–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2012.738239>
- Scott, C. (2017). Renewing the ‘Special Relationship’ and Rethinking the Return of Cultural Property: The Netherlands and Indonesia, 1949–79. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 52(3), 646–668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009416658698>
- Setyawan, F.A. (2020, March 11). Keris Diponegoro dan pusaka lain yang dikembalikan Belanda. *CNN Indonesia*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20200310190936-20-482245/keris-diponegoro-dan-pusaka-lain-yang-dikembalikan-belanda>
- Shapcott, R. (2013). From the good international citizen to the cosmopolitan political community: A constitutional path. *International Politics*, 50(1), 138-157–157. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ip.2012.32>
- Shapcott, R. (2020). Human rights, extraterritoriality and the good international citizen: a cosmopolitan perspective. *International Relations*, 34(2), 246–264. <https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1177/0047117819897310>
- Simpson, M. (2009). Museums and restorative justice: heritage, repatriation and cultural education. *Museum International*, 61(1/2), 121–129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0033.2009.01669.x>
- Steger, M.B., Wahrab, A. (2016). *What is global studies: theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Stutz, L. (2013). Claims to the Past. A Critical View of the Arguments Driving Repatriation of Cultural Heritage and Their Role in Contemporary Identity

- Politics. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*. 7. 170-195.
10.1080/17502977.2012.714243.
- Sylvester, C. (2009). *Art/museums: international relations where we least expect it*.
Paradigm Publishers.
- Ugochukwu, O.C. (2023). State apologies, postcolonial resistance and ontological
insecurity: the Matabeleland massacre. *Third World Quarterly*, 44(5). DOI:
10.1080/01436597.2023.2174847
- UNESCO. (1954). *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of
Armed Conflict with Regulations for the Execution of the Convention*.
[https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/convention-protection-cultural-property-
event-armed-conflict-regulations-execution-convention#item-3](https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/convention-protection-cultural-property-event-armed-conflict-regulations-execution-convention#item-3)
- UNESCO. (1964). Records of the General Conference.
[https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000114581/PDF/114581engb.pdf.multi.
page=149](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000114581/PDF/114581engb.pdf.multi.page=149)
- UNESCO^a. (1970). Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit
Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property.
[https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/convention-means-prohibiting-and-
preventing-illicit-import-export-and-transfer-ownership-cultural#item-2](https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/convention-means-prohibiting-and-preventing-illicit-import-export-and-transfer-ownership-cultural#item-2)
- UNESCO^b. (1970). Unidroit Convention On Stolen Or Illegally Exported Cultural
Objects (Rome, 1995) - States Parties.
[https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/operational_guidelines_en_final_final_1.p
df](https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/operational_guidelines_en_final_final_1.pdf)
- UNESCO. (2003). Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.
[https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/convention-safeguarding-intangible-
cultural-heritage#item-2](https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/convention-safeguarding-intangible-cultural-heritage#item-2)
- UNIDROIT. (1995). Unidroit Convention On Stolen Or Illegally Exported Cultural
Objects (Rome, 1995) - States Parties.
<https://www.unidroit.org/instruments/cultural-property/1995-convention/status/>
- UN Treaty Collection (n.d.). Glossary of terms relating to Treaty actions.
https://treaties.un.org/pages/overview.aspx?path=overview/glossary/page1_en.xml
[1](#)

- Valentini, A. P. (2021). Translating the concept of “cultural identity” in public policies: Between the international and the national, and the tangible and intangible dimension. *International Journal Of Constitutional Law*, 19(5). <https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1093/icon/moab126>
- van Willigen, N. (2021). *Dutch Foreign Policy: Staying the Course Amid a Changing World*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1007/978-3-030-68218-7_9
- Vernon R. (2012). *Historical redress : must we pay for the past?* Continuum.
- Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (Netherlands), & Knapen, B. (2011). *Attached to the World: On the Anchoring and Strategy of Dutch Foreign Policy*. [Elektronisk resurs]. Boom uitgevers Den Haag.
- Wheeler, N. J., & Dunne, T. (1998). Good International Citizenship: A Third Way for British Foreign Policy. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 74(4), 847–870.
- Wheeler, N.J. (2000). *Saving Strangers : Humanitarian Intervention in International Society*. OUP Oxford.
- Weaver, D. F. (2016). Apologies and Their Import for the Moral Identity of Offenders. *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, 36(1), 87–105. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44504810>
- Wijaya, C. (2020, March 13). Indonesia-Belanda: Ratusan ribu benda bersejarah Indonesia dimiliki Belanda, akankah segera dikembalikan? *BBC*. <https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/indonesia-51749544>
- Wrightson, P.S. (1995) Morality, realism, and foreign affairs: A normative realist approach. *Security Studies*, 5:2, 354-386, DOI: 10.1080/09636419508429271
- Zürn, M., & de Wilde, P. (2016). Debating globalization: cosmopolitanism and communitarianism as political ideologies. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 21(3), 280–301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2016.1207741>