ZuMUNESCO 2022 — Study Guide

Andrew Oakeshott

Political Science,
University of Zürich

Zvezdana Božović

Political Science
and International Relations,

University of Belgrade
and University of Konstanz

Alexander Zank

Computer Science,
ETH Zürich

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to UNESCO.

On behalf of the Organizing Committee of ZuMUN 2022, we, the chairs, would like to hereby welcome you to UNESCO.

To adequately understand our present, we must first address our past. And to step into the future, we must resolve the issues of the present. This was the main idea we had in mind when devising our topics for this year's conference.

With our first topic, ***Fighting illicit trafficking, return and restitution of cultural property***, we aimed to take a look at the long history of this issue, to give underrepresented States the chance to take a stand against centuries of injustice, simultaneously giving a chance to big political powers to right the wrongs of their ancestors. This topic stands at a crossroads between the past and the present – while illicit trafficking poses a serious threat to the integrity of cultural property and cultural heritage worldwide today, restitution and return concerns our distant and not-so-distant past, encompassing many underlying societal issues such as racism and colonialism in addition to questions of power imbalance and the Global North / Global South divide. This is by no means a simple topic to discuss, not least because it concerns an area that is in and of itself debatable and open to interpretation. What does culture mean to you, and what does it mean to me?

Our second topic, ***Fixing our portal to the world: Enabling an accessible, open internet for everyone around the globe***, is rooted in the present, but at the same time, its gaze is firmly fixed on the future. The self-evident statement that we live in a world of interconnectivity and a state of being which can only be described as perpetually online feels like a platitude. And yet, there are many very real and very dangerous underlying issues that must be addressed if we are to truly embrace this brave new world we are building – one that is democratic and accessible. While many of us take the Internet and the freedom it gives us for granted, we often forget that only a portion of the world actually has access to the open internet. In the age of misinformation tactics, data manipulation, and algorithms that seldom serve the interests of the many and rather serve those of the few, it is becoming increasingly clear that something must be done before it is too late.

We hope this study guide will prove to be a good jumping-off point in your research, and you will enjoy reading up on these fascinating topics as much as we enjoyed writing about them. In case you have any questions, please do not hesitate to reach out to us. Whether you are new to Model United Nations or an experienced delegate, we look forward to seeing you all in action. April can't come soon enough!

Zvezdana, Alexander, and Andrew

Your Chairs

Zvezdana.   Hello! My name is Zvezdana and together with Andrew and Alex I will be chairing UNESCO. I'm in my fourth and final year of my BA in International Relations. Originally from Belgrade, Serbia, I'm currently pursuing my exchange at the University of Konstanz in Germany. When I am not lying to myself about quitting MUN, I enjoy fencing and crossing films off of my ever-expanding watchlist. Despite UNESCO's (unjustified) reputation as a less dynamic committee, I sincerely hope you will find this year's topics equal parts provoking and exciting and that you will make the most of your time in Zurich. Looking forward to meeting you all in April!

Andrew.   Hi everyone! I'm Andrew, a political science student at the university of Zurich and I'm very much looking forward to being one of your chairs for UNESCO at this year's ZuMUN conference! I've been highly passionate about MUN ever since I first started back in 2018 and have attended many international conferences over the last few years, including SGMUN, SMUN, Harvard's WorldMUN and ZuMUN. When I'm not studying or working, I like to sing and play the guitar in a band, learn new languages, go to concerts or travel around the world. I hope this year's topics will give you a great platform to develop new and exciting ideas to help tackle the issues at hand. I hope you are all doing well and I look forward to meeting you all soon!

Alexander.   Hello, world! I'm Alex, a Computer Science student at ETH Zürich who (besides typing cryptic words on my computer, causing red exclamation marks to appear) loves to dance, dream, and deliberate. Although ZuMUN 2022 is my first time chairing a Model United Nations conference, do not foolishly underestimate my endurance in politely reminding people to refrain from using personal pronouns. My toxic trait is believing that everyone shares my level of excitement for certain things I love. (Pineapple on pizza, thankfully, isn't one of them.) I look forward to all extravaganza we'll cook up together, on- and off-session. See you in April!

This year's topics

A Fighting illicit trafficking, return and restitution of cultural property

> That's why the British Museum is so busy all the time, no British people go
> in there. It's for the people from abroad looking at their own stuff.
> *James Acaster (2019)*

An Introduction

While the topic of illicit trafficking, return and restitution of cultural property may seem quite broad upon first glance, the crux of the issue lies in much deeper and systemic structures of oppression used throughout history by those in power against states, groups, peoples and cultures perceived as ignorant, unworthy or incapable of understanding the real value of their respective cultural property[1]. Although return and restitution (the term "repatriation" is also commonly used in this context, but this will be clarified later on) are still seen as points of contention in the sphere of international cultural policy making, there seems to be a broader consensus regarding the threat of illicit trafficking. Thanks to persistent multilateral efforts to address this issue - most notably through the *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict* (1954) and the *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property* (1970), as well as the *UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects* (1995), there is a rise in the number of ongoing disputes between big cultural institutions, individuals and States asking for "their stuff back" (Acaster 2019). Some of these costly and lengthy diplomatic efforts have been successful (the case of some of the Benin Bronzes (Reuters 2022) and the Maori mokomokai (BBC 2012) come to mind), but the reality is that there is still a gaping hole in the international cultural property legal system – namely, the glaring lack of any accountability mechanism. On top of this, the current legal framework does not include any sort of special tribunal or other similar form of authority and oversight. This

---

[1]It is also important to note that even what exactly falls under the term „cultural property" is up for debate, especially in academia.

is why the only current option for States is either political/diplomatic action or regular means of dispute settlement (Chechi 2014). One notable advancement was made in 1976 with the establishment of the UNESCO Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation (ICPRCP), but its role is limited only to mediation and conciliation.

Relevant Terms

In order to understand the above-mentioned issues, it is important to clearly define and identify the relevant terminology:

Cultural property as defined in Article I of the 1970 Convention means "property which, on religious or secular grounds, is specifically designated by each State as being of importance for archaeology, prehistory, history, literature, art or science" and includes a string of subcategories ranging from archaeological sites to musical instruments. However, some authors argue that this view is too limited and that the term "cultural property" in itself is a paradox since culture signifies something fluid and ever-changing, whereas property signifies something fixed. This means that we end up framing culture as a predetermined and monolithic category which it is not. The second theoretical argument against this term claims that it fundamentally results in "conceptual poverty" of the term itself – it offers a simplified and materialistic perspective of culture as a "collection of things that we identify superficially with a group of people" (Mezey 2007). Cultural property can also be perceived more widely as part of a state's "national cultural heritage" thus legitimizing the need for repatriation, should that property somehow end beyond a state's national borders i.e. its rightful home (Merryman 1986). Theoretical debates aside and for the sake of practicality, the definition offered in the 1970 Convention is the most comprehensive to date, but it is also worth asking if there are certain forms of cultural property which have emerged in the last few decades which merit their inclusion in the above-mentioned classification.

Another important perspective to consider when examining cultural property disputes is whether or how cultural property (material property) can be tied to human rights, more specifically as a result of, or proceeding from, instances of crimes against humanity (Paterson 2006). This is particularly relevant in the context of the Holocaust and the crimes

committed against indigenous peoples. Two interesting examples of national governments establishing bodies to address this emerge in this respect – the Spoliation Advisory Panel in the United Kingdom and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Review Committee in the United States (Paterson 2006).

Illicit trafficking, looting and theft.   According to the UNODC (n.d.) "trafficking in cultural property involves several acts that may ultimately result in the loss, destruction, removal or theft of irreplaceable items." Illicit trafficking of cultural property (especially art) has become one of the most lucrative illegal trades of today, surpassed in profit only by arms and narcotics trafficking (Borodkin 1995). This does not come as a surprise if we take into consideration the long and somewhat bloody history of these activities, but here the focus will be more on post-World War II and contemporary perspectives on this issue with special emphasis on the Holocaust and Cambodia as good case studies of the phenomenon.

In terms of the Holocaust, most Jewish cultural property of significant artistic and religious value was either destroyed or "systematically plundered" and gathered up in various concentration points, the most famous being the city of Prague where the Nazis aimed to establish a "museum of an extinct race" (Blum 2000). The size and scope of the plunder is still felt today with some experts even going so far as to claim that "virtually every major museum in Europe and in North America now possesses plundered paintings and Judaica artifacts of dubious provenance" (Blum 2000). And while cases such as Republic of *Austria v Altmann* (Kaye 2006) show that with enough resources and willpower it is possible to restitute Jewish cultural property, the reality is that most cultural property pillaged during the Second World War remains to this day scattered around the world, either in shiny displays in museums or under lock and key in private collections, waiting to be auctioned off to the highest bidder or to be marveled at during dinner parties, entirely stripped of their contextual weight and dignity. While the Holocaust illustrates the issue of cultural property restitution largely based in North America and Europe i.e. the Global North, for a Global South perspective it is worth looking at Cambodia. During the outbreak of the Cambodian Civil War and Khmer Rouge rule, many Hindu and Buddhist temples were pillaged by the Khmer Rouge itself, paramilitary groups and individual soldiers, causing irreparable damage to the cultural property of Cambodia and its cultural heritage. While some efforts to mitigate this have been made

(the United States for example stepped in and stopped a Sotheby's auction of the Duryo-dhana statue in 2012, kick-starting an arduous legal battle with the auction giant, raising questions about retroactive application of international legal norms and patrimony laws) (Snyder 2019), this case goes to show the extent to which pillaging and looting has impeded restitution and repatriation efforts and the decisive role government action or lack thereof can play in these scenarios. More importantly, this case also highlights another major player and third party whose role will be examined further in this study guide – massive auction houses such as Sotheby's and Christie's with their elusive practices which can only be described as a "Pecunia non olet" approach in acquisition and appraisal (Rea 2018, Kinsella 2018).

When it comes to the world of illicit trafficking of today, the COVID-19 pandemic has unfortunately only exacerbated the problem (Interpol 2021). Existing national legal frameworks only serve to further enable the flourishing of black markets and illicit trade, with some researchers also linking the "percentage of under-recording exports of cultural objects . . . to the exporting country's level of corruption" (Fisman & Wei 2009). Furthermore, due to the diversity of national legal systems worldwide, something that may be considered "illicit" in one state, may well be considered "licit" in another (Roodt 2013). There is also a lack of data on the intricate logistics of the journey a single stolen or looted object takes from its looter/thief, then to dealers, to a wide scope of intermediaries and finally to an "international market buyer" (Mackenzie & Davis 2014). Add in the fact that many of these objects were stolen so long ago (and this particularly holds true for colonial-era expeditions), it becomes seemingly impossible to track them down and prove that they were stolen in the first place. However, in some more famous and relatively recent thefts (such as the Isabella Stewart-Gardner Museum heist) or in cases of destruction and pillaging such as that of the ancient city of Palmyra in Syria by Daesh, it is considerably easier to determine cultural property as stolen or looted, but unfortunately not much easier to bring those responsible for the crimes to justice. The latter case also illustrates the difficulty in addressing the loss of cultural property and the destruction of cultural heritage in conflict zones.

Return, Restitution, Repatriation. The Congress of Vienna was a turning point in this respect, offering for the very first time in history "the first large-scale restitution of cultural property to its countries of origin" (Lewis 1981). Since then, there have been

big changes in the legal perception of this issue, mostly tied to decolonization and former colonies and indigenous peoples standing up against centuries of injustice and cultural erasure and theft. In this regard, it is also worth noting the common distinction in restitution discourse between "source nations" meaning those who are "rich" in artifacts and "purchaser" or "collector nations" meaning those who buy up (or take) these antiquities for themselves (Borodkin 1995).

Despite the fact that the terms return, restitution and repatriation are often used interchangeably, it is nevertheless good to distinguish them:

Return   refers to the return of cultural property to its original location. In some ways it can be regarded as a narrowing down of the term restitution. While restitution originally referred to the returning of cultural property taken during wars, occupations or colonial times, return was introduced in the UN lexicon recognizing the need for a more precise and clear-cut definition. As outlined in Point A.9 in the Guidelines for the Use of the Standard Form Concerning Request for Return or Restitution:

> The term 'return' should apply to cases where objects left their countries of origin prior to the crystallization of national and international law on the protection of cultural property. Such transfers of ownership were often made from a colonized territory to the territory of the colonial power or from a territory under foreign occupation. In many cases, they were the result of an exchange, gift or sale and did not therefore infringe any laws existing at the time. In some cases, however, the legitimacy of the transfer can be questioned. Among the many variants of such a process is the removal of objects from a colonial territory by people who were not nationals of the colonial power. There may have also been cases of political or economic dependence which made it possible to effect transfers of ownership from one territory to another which would not be envisaged today.

This distinction is also highlighted in the UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects in two separate sections 'Restitution of Stolen Cultural Objects' and 'Return of Illegally Exported Cultural Objects' (Kowalski 2005).

Restitution. In order to understand what restitution means today, it is useful to take a moment to examine its history. Restitution as a legal concept goes back to Biblical times and Ancient Rome. In the Middle Ages, it fell under the right to unlimited spoils. This later evolved into the innate right to take loot, while the Church managed to set one of the first restrictions on this right by making objects of worship and religious significance off-limits. In Renaissance times, this restriction was also extended to works of art (Kowalski 2005). Fast forward to 1815 when at last the principle of unconditional restitution of cultural property looted in war is introduced. Then it enters the sphere of international customs, and then individual national laws, first in the Lieber Code in the US (Kowalski 2005). Restitution of cultural property also appears as a big talking point during the 1919-1920 Paris Peace Conference through general restitution provisions of Article 238 of the Versailles Treaty and the corresponding Article 184 of the Treaty of St. Germain and Article 168 of the Trianon Treaty. Here, restitution encompasses 'all records, documents, objects of antiquity and of art and all scientific and bibliographical material...' (Kowalski 2005).

World War II was in many ways a turning point for restitution, with the Jewish community spearheading what would become a decades long battle for the rightful return of stolen cultural property with the 1998 Principles on Nazi-Confiscated Art as a sample of these gargantuan efforts. The post-war period was also crucial given the establishment of UNESCO and the creation and adoption of important documents and treaties previously mentioned in this study guide. While the two are not necessarily always connected, the need for restitution can be considered as a byproduct/consequence of armed conflicts and has developed in conjunction with the law of war. The idea behind restitution is essentially to return things back to the way they were before i.e. "restoring the status quo." This then not only takes into account instances of looting in times of war, but in times of peace as well, showing just how broad this term really is (Kowalski 2005).

Repatriation, while different from restitution, also aims to return objects or collections. Their final destination in this case is the ethnic group to which the objects have previously belonged, or more broadly to the country, region or place they came from. In terms of legal jurisdiction and the choice between applying national and international legal norms to repatriation disputes, national legislation applies in cases regarding native or indigenous peoples whereas international law can also apply depending on the case.

Guiding questions

1. Is the existing legal framework enough to adequately address the return, restitution and repatriation of cultural property?

2. What strategies should be employed to prevent and counter illicit trafficking of cultural property? Is there a need for more cross-agency cooperation?

3. How would you define cultural property within the context of the country you are representing? What does culture mean to you? How does it reflect in your country's policies? How does history play into all of this?

4. Is the argument of moral or ethical responsibility enough to hold individuals accountable? What about institutions?

5. Is there a need to establish new bodies or mechanisms which would efficiently address this issue? Is cultural property in conflict zones sufficiently protected?

Key players

As you will have realized, this is very much a multifaceted issue. As such, key players range from national governments to non-state actors such as museums, foundations and public and private advocacy groups.(Hicks 2022, Greenberger 2019) To go into extensive detail here would greatly exceed the scope of this study guide, nevertheless, here is a brief overview. Unsurprisingly, on the side of none-state actors we find firstly a great number of

North American and European museums   such as

- The Metropolitan Museum (New York, US)

- The National Gallery of Art (Washington DC, US)

- The Museum du Louvre (Paris, France)

- The British Museum (London, UK)

- The Royal Museums of Art and History (Brussels, Belgium)

- The Royal Museum for Central Africa (Tervuren, Belgium)

However, while the above-mentioned museums are present and relevant in the current debate on the repatriation, restitution and return of cultural property, it is also worth mentioning other non-state actors, such as

Civil associations, foundations and advocacy groups, with their influence and presence varying from country to country. Some notable examples here include

- The Zinsou Foundation

- The Open Society Foundations

- The African Foundation for Development

- The Monuments Men Foundation

- The German Lost Art Foundation

2006 also saw the creation of the UNCAC coalition, which brought together more than 350 civil society organizations in over 100 countries, all engaged in upholding (or rather monitoring) the UNCAC agreement, which besides its primary focus on fighting corruption also covers the recovery of international assets, including cultural property. On the other hand, national governments have of course played an important role, for instance by, to one extent or another, showing presence in the debate or by getting directly involved in negotiations.(Hicks 2022, DW 2021) In this regard it is worth highlighting the following:

France The publication of the Savoy/Sarr report on the restitution of African cultural heritage (commissioned by president Emmanuel Macron) and its list of recommendations lead to a series of objects being returned to the Republic of Benin. The report and subsequent proceedings, including the actions undertaken by the French government, have also given rise to a renewed debate on the decolonization of museums (and the related discussion of the repatriation, restitution and return of cultural property). Within the European context, France can be said to have been at the forefront of efforts to restore cultural property to its place of origin in an attempt to address a range of historic injustices committed in colonial times. (Herman 2021)

United Kingdom The country formerly at the centre of "the empire on which the sun never sets" is, unsurprisingly, deeply linked to the topic at hand through its colonial history. However, the British government has largely kept quiet on this particular issue and not has not been actively involved in any efforts to decolonize its museums or return cultural property, choosing instead to stay mostly out of the debate. There is also a whole other issue, linking into the complex subjects of structural racism, identity politics and discrimination, however, it does tend to suggest that the British government, as part of a larger political trend across Europe and North America, has engaged in a broader backlash to repeated calls by activists and civil associations for western nations to deal with their colonial past and to tackle the ongoing problems of racism and discrimination. (Afford-Institute 2020)

United States The issue of what to do with cultural property in the country's many museums has not ranked high on the list of the government's priorities, although Biden's first year in office did see New York's Metropolitan Museum and the National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC give back the Benin Bronzes to Nigeria. On top of that, the president has made several domestic commitments to address structural inequalities and injustices brought about by slavery, which has also sparked renewed discussion on the matter of cultural property. On the other hand, as is the case with the United Kingdom, there is the added political dynamic of the "culture war", which is further polarizing the country heavily along partisan and cultural lines, though in this case with a Democrat, that is to say "the left" (in the American context) currently in the oval office.

Belgium Like many other European countries, Belgium has, especially in recent times, been forced to grapple with its colonialist past. More recently, the Belgian government has made some tepid moves towards returning cultural property. It has, for instance, made a formal commitment to return potentially thousands of cultural objects to the Democratic Republic of Congo and set up a special parliamentary commission to investigate the country's colonial past. However, critics have been quick to point out the lack of a concrete action plan. (Brown 2021)

Germany Besides its many efforts to deal with the past and the atrocities committed in the 1930s and 1940s (which also included a great deal of looting and plundering),

the German government has more recently stepped up its attempts to address injustices committed in colonial times more generally. In this context, Germany agreed, amongst other things, to return important pieces from its art collections to Nigeria this year, with further transfers planned. The incoming government sees this as a wider strategy to rework the past and has made several commitments to further increase its efforts in this regard. (Hickley 2021)

Others   An array of national governments have made demands for and engaged in negotiations to move cultural property back to their home country, some of the most notable examples here being: Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Republic of Benin and Ethiopia. Others have made (largely unsuccessful) public requests for objects to be given back, including: Egypt, Greece, Mali, Namibia, India and Pakistan.

Further reading and other useful sources

- Sotheby's Institute of Art – video about repatriation

- Oxford Union – We Should NOT Repatriate Artefacts debate

- TEDx - Why museums are returning cultural treasures — Chip Colwell

- The National Stolen Art File (NSAF), a database of stolen art, cultural property, and stolen objects.

- The Art Loss Register, the leading due diligence provider for the art market, maintaining the world's largest private database of stolen art, antiques, and collectables

- British Museum - Contested Objects Collection

- Sotheby's Glossary of Auction Terminology

Bibliography

Acaster, J. (2019), *James Acaster On The Absurdity Of The British Empire*, Still Watching Netflix.
   URL: *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x73PkUvArJY*

Afford-Institute (2020), *Return of the Icons - Key issues and recommendations around the restitution of stolen African artefacts*, Africa Foundation for development.
   URL: *https://www.afford-uk.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/RoIPolicyBriefFinal.pdf*

BBC (2012), *France returns 20 mummified Maori heads to New Zealand*, BBC News.
   URL: *https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-16695330*

Blum, Y. Z. (2000), 'On the restitution of jewish cultural property looted in world war ii', *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law) 94* p. 90.
   URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/25659364*

Borodkin, L. J. (1995), 'The economics of antiquities looting and a proposed legal alternative', *Columbia Law Review* **95**(2), 377, 385.
   URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/1123233*

Brown, K. (2021), *Scholars in Belgium, Frustrated With the Government's Inertia on Restitution, Have Released Their Own Repatriation Guidelines*, argent.
   URL: *https://news.artnet.com/art-world/restitution-guidelines-belgium-1975986*

Chechi, A. (2014), *The Settlement of International Cultural Heritage Disputes*, Oxford University Press, pp. 1–2.

Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954), UNESCO.
   URL: *https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/1954_Convention_EN_2020.pdf*

Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970), UNESCO.
   URL: *http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13039&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION*

DW (2021), *Africa's lost heritage and Europe's restitution policies*, DW News.
   URL: *https://www.dw.com/en/africas-lost-heritage-and-europes-restitution-policies/a-59763966*

Fisman, R. & Wei, S.-J. (2009), 'The smuggling of art, and the art of smuggling: Uncovering the illicit trade in cultural property and antiques', *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **1**(3), 94.
   URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/25760172*

Greenberger, A. (2019), *Inspired by Landmark Report on Restitution, Foundation Puts 15 M. Toward Initiative Bringing Cultural Objects Back to Africa*, artnet.
   URL: *https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/open-society-foundations-repatriation-savoy-sarr-report-13569/*

Herman, A. (2021), *Restitution – what's really going on?*, Institute of Art and Law.
   URL: *https://ial.uk.com/restitution-whats-really-going-on/*

Hickley, C. (2021), *Germany's incoming government plans to improve Nazi-looted art restitution*, the art newspaper.
   URL: *https://news.artnet.com/art-world/restitution-guidelines-belgium-1975986*

Hicks, D. (2022), *What are the next challenges for cultural restitution?*, Artnet.
   URL: *https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2022/02/07/what-are-the-next-challenges-for-cultural-restitution*

Interpol (2021), *Cultural property crime thrives throughout pandemic says new INTERPOL survey*, Interpol News and Events.
   URL: *https://www.interpol.int/en/News-and-Events/News/2021/Cultural-property-crime-thrives-throughout-pandemic-says-new-INTERPOL-survey*

Kaye, L. M. (2006), 'Avoidance and resolution of cultural heritage disputes: Recovery of art looted during the holocaust', *Willamette Journal of International Law and Dispute Resolution 14* (2), 264–265.
   URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/26211230*

Kinsella, E. (2018), *Amid a Wave of Repatriation, Sotheby's Stands Its Ground Against Greece's Claim to an 8th-Century Bronze Horse*, Artnet.

URL: *https://news.artnet.com/art-world/sothebys-strikes-back-against-greekrepatriation-claim-1311500*

Kowalski, W. (2005), 'Types of claims for recovery of lost cultural property1', *Museum International* **57**(4), 85–102.
URL: *https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0033.2005.00543.x*

Lewis, G. (1981), 'The return of cultural property', *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* **129**(5299), 436.
URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/41372583*

Mackenzie, S. & Davis, T. (2014), 'Temple looting in cambodia: Anatomy of a statue trafficking network', *The British Journal of Criminology* **54**(5), 722.
URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/43819219*

Merryman, J. H. (1986), 'Two ways of thinking about cultural property', *The American Journal of International Law 80* (4), 833.
URL: *https://doi.org/10.2307/2202065*

Mezey, N. (2007), 'The paradoxes of cultural property', *Columbia Law Review 107* (8), 2006.
URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/40041756*

Paterson, R. K. (2006), 'Resolving material culture disputes: Human rights, property rights and crimes against humanity', *Willamette Journal of International Law and Dispute Resolution 14* (2), 158–159, 169.
URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/26211227*

Rea, N. (2018), *Christie's Sold This Swiss Dealer a Painting Likely Looted by the Nazis. Now He Wants His Money Back*, Artnet.
URL: *https://news.artnet.com/art-world/christies-nazi-restitution-1295141*

Reuters (2022), *Two of Nigeria's looted Benin bronzes returned to traditional palace*, The Guardian.
URL: *https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/feb/19/nigerias-looted-benin-bronzes-returned-to-traditional-palace*

Roodt, C. (2013), 'Restitution of art and cultural objects and its limits', *The Comparative and International Law Journal of Southern Africa* **46**(3), 286.
  URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/23644806*

Snyder, C. (2019), 'Out of context: Examining the role of context in active enforcement foreign patrimony law disputes', *Columbia Law Review* **119**(1), 205–206.
  URL: *https://www.jstor.org/stable/26559621*

UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects (1995), UNIDROIT.
  URL: *https://www.unidroit.org/instruments/cultural-property/1995-convention/*

UNODC (n.d.), *Trafficking in cultural property.*
  URL: *https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/organized-crime/intro/emerging-crimes/trafficking-in-cultural-property.html*

B Fixing our portal to the world: Enabling an accessible, open internet for everyone around the globe.

> The internet is becoming the town square for the global village of tomorrow.
> *Bill Gates (2013)*

Characterizing the internet so far

Undoubtedly, the internet has revolutionized how we learn, communicate, and work. It has taken root in most processes worldwide within less than a century and unleashed a social and industrial revolution, succeeding in speed everything that came before it.

When the internet was first being developed in the late 20th century, international institutions, for instance, the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), and the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA), were established as authorities to manage essential technical details. Consequently, its underlying technology has quickly converged to a set of standards that enabled interoperability on a global scale.

To date, > 4.9 billion people are actively using the internet (ITU 2021), which is $\approx 63\%$ of humanity. Having foreseen the global network's impact on society, the United Nations devised in 2006 the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) to enable policy dialogue between politicians, scientists, and industry experts. In its 2021 issue titled "Internet United," stakeholders ran sessions covering the topics Human Rights, Social Inclusion, Environmental Sustainability, Market Structure, Data Protection, Trust, Security, and more (IGF 2021). However, the IGF has not materialized its ideas into law proposals for worldwide adoption so far.

This session's trigger

In most languages, over 80% of online content is available on the websites of a few private companies (Haugen 2021). The danger this entails has been warned about by experts for many years now, though it was usually left unheard.

According to numerous industry experts, private companies cannot be trusted to put people before astronomical profits (Srinivasan 2020). They employ the same interaction-fueling algorithms in languages lacking human moderation. Consequently, hate, fearmon-

gering, and provocative yet false news spread quickly. The lack of infrastructure, digital literacy, and critical thinking accompanies these developments. It can cause cultural erasure, government coups, and — in the worst-case — a total disregard for human rights in an unregulated space.

Delegates are therefore tasked to devise a framework that combats these developments and helps individuals build their online presence, embracing critical thinking, extending digital literacy, and building upon their culture in the process. Entering the discussions, foundational laws regarding data protection and copyright could be tackled as well.

Current foci by region

Saturation in the global north. Given that an overwhelming majority of people in the global north have been using the internet for more than a decade (ITU 2021), extended awareness for the dangers of the internet has developed over time. Two areas of focus have consistently shown up in legislation: privacy and market power.

In 2016, the European Union decided upon comprehensive privacy laws in their General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) that have subsequently materialized into national law in most member states (*Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council* 2016). The document defines the relationship between customers, companies, and data processors, restricts trafficking of user data, and defines the now-famous 'right to be forgotten' (Article 17).

Several antitrust cases against big tech have been filed or are currently in a preparatory stage (Morton 2020). The United States take on a unique role since most companies in question have their headquarters there. To avoid being dissolved by the government, tech giants have slowly split their divisions into singular companies and connected them via umbrella companies, often of a different name. A prime example is Google, which became Alphabet.

Exploding usage in the global south. Considering that Africa still has the least fraction of internet users (ITU 2021), a race to connect its and other predominantly southern regions' people to the web has been going on for the last decade. To date, numerous operators have been building undersea connections, strengthening access to the internet's backbone.

Besides telecommunication providers, western tech giants have also researched ways to bring the necessary infrastructure to digitally remote areas. Take, for instance, Alphabet's (f.k.a. Google) Project Loon, which promised to bring wireless access to challenging territories using balloons geared by wind (Cassidy 2013) or Meta's (f.k.a. Facebook) Free Basics service which offers limited access to certain sites for free in developing markets.

Although supported by many, local critics have been calling some of these efforts "digital colonialism." According to them, Alphabet, Meta, and others have flooded their web with "western corporate content" and ignored basic rules of net neutrality by giving their services preferential treatment, harming the development of regional alternatives (Solon 2017). Legislators should balance the wish for connectivity and their people's online independence.

Guiding questions

Governance.

G1. What does the internet being open mean?

G2. Who should regulate user content?

G3. How would a less centralized internet look like? Which incentives could motivate people to move away from private platforms?

G4. How should policymakers tackle existing platforms?

Safety.

S1. How can the UN help make the internet a safer place?

S2. Which measures could be pursued to aid automated systems in moderation?

S3. What should a content selection algorithm be allowed to do?

Key players

The United States are the home of major international tech firms and therefore financially coupled to their success. The country's political culture of minimal involvement

in the markets is seen as a major catalyst of tech company growth with special legislation only now gaining relevance.

Historically, the safety of minors has played an important role when dealing with public media such as TV in the US. This focus clearly translates to the internet when watching recent Senate hearings (*Facebook Whistleblower Frances Haugen Testifies Before Senate* 2021).

In parallel to this, antitrust lawsuits are progressively becoming more radical and politicians more concerned about monopolies. Bipartisan efforts against social media giants, app store providers, and search engines, to name a few, have seen plentiful progress in the last three years, with the American Innovation and Choice Online Act and the Open App Markets Act reaching the final phases of the legislative process (Morrison & Ghaffary 2021).

India   with its 23 official languages and low internet penetration rate has been the focus of many online companies around the world for some time now. As wealth grows, the number of active online users sharing their thoughts and distributing content, both local and foreign, rises (ITU 2021).

Local politicians regularly abuse the lackluster human moderation on social networks to spread hate, sometimes even incite violence against minority groups, in several native languages (York 2021). Needless to say, India has an online hatred and misinformation problem. At the same time, digital literacy and education is heterogenously distributed, with urban regions being at the forefront, while inner India lacks behind. Indian legislation affects a large group of people and is therefore quite powerful.

Germany   is considered to be at the forefront of digital regulation because of its many legislative efforts going beyond those of the European Union.

To tackle online hate speech, illegal content, and the safety of minors, the country 2017 put the Network Enforcement Act (NetzDG) into place, forcing platforms to remove "clearly illegal" content within one day (*Gesetz zur Verbesserung der Rechtsdurchsetzung in sozialen Netzwerken (Netzwerkdurchsetzungsgesetz - NetzDG)* 2017). Potential adversary effects, for instance platforms restricting free speech in fear of penalties, have not been studied in-depth yet.

German data centers power a majority of cloud services in Europe. Consequently,

the country possesses expertise in online publishing and network companies eager to help build missing infrastructure around the globe.

Nigeria   has been plagued by the effects of online fake news for a couple of years now. Its citizens are becoming increasingly connected (ITU 2021) while digital literacy and critical thinking are lacking behind (Oladimeji 2021).

Journalists found that graphic pictures of violence spread like wildfire because social media platforms consistently fail to intervene. Even when unrelated to current events, many Nigerians believe the attached messages, leading to build up anger that can materialize in acts of violence, dividing tribes and religions who had previously lived in peace (Adegoke et al. 2018).

The People's Republic of China   is known for its enormous chip manufacturing industry and the 'Great Firewall,' a piece of infrastructure that blocks many foreign websites for Chinese users and vice-versa.

Internally, the government requires many foreign companies to store its citizens' data on closely monitored servers within the country, issues take-down requests to app stores (Wang 2020), and censors critical commentary online. The Chinese internet is a rich ecosystem powered by a few companies. Tencent and Alibaba operate apps essential for most citizens. For instance, WeChat- and Alipay, the de facto standard for payments, all stem from tech conglomerates.

Externally, China appears very powerful. Leading network equipment makers such as Huawei are responsible for a majority of key infrastructure.

Ethiopia   has been enduring a civil war since November of 2020 when the country's prime minister ordered military action against the Tigrayan ethnic group's Liberation Front, his number one enemy.

The conflicts escalated, in major part, because of hatred and misinformation spread online. Twitter, Facebook, and other social media platforms had, for instance, failed to remove several postings proposing the establishment of "concentration camps" to "bury the traitors" (Dahir 2021). At the moment, Ethiopia is also preparing to host this year's Internet Governance Forum.

Meta Platforms Ltd.   is the parent company of Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp. The conglomerate is the largest social networking firm on the planet, at least when measured by users, and has recently been under fire from multiple sides. For the first time in its history, the company has lost users, leading to enormous losses on the stock market.

Growing concerns about privacy, human rights violations, and the impact of Meta's 'Meaningful Social Interaction' (MSI) metric on negativity, coupled with Frances Haugen's bombshell revelations (Frenkel et al. 2021), have put Mark Zuckerberg's company under immense scrutiny.

In their newest Virtual Reality efforts advertised under the umbrella term 'Metaverse,' Meta hopes to shift the public's focus from its advertising business to their version of digital utopia, although the latter has not materialized so far. Meta's core business is still primarily advertising.

The Electronic Frontier Foundation   is a leading non-profit organization defending civil rights worldwide. They are known for their motions supporting the right to repair, opposing algorithmic bias, and raising awareness for free speech and safety issues.

Bibliography

Adegoke, Y., Northcott, C., Leroy, A., Jari, A., Strick, M. T. S. C. F. B., Adamson, D. & Perkins, M. (2018), *Like. Share. Kill.*, BBC.
URL: *https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/resources/idt-sh/nigeria_fake_news*

Cassidy, M. (2013), *Introducing Project Loon: Balloon-powered Internet access*, Alphabet.
URL: *https://blog.google/alphabet/introducing-project-loon/*

Dahir, A. L. (2021), *Mass Detentions of Civilians Fan 'Climate of Fear' in Ethiopia*, The New York Times.
URL: *https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/17/world/africa/ethiopia-tigrayan-detention.html*

Facebook Whistleblower Frances Haugen Testifies Before Senate (2021), Wall Street Journal.
URL: *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GoSPmqqKams*

Frenkel, S., Isaac, M., Mec, R., Kang, C., Alba, D. & Satariano, A. (2021), *The facebook papers and their fallout*, The New York Times.
URL: *https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/25/business/facebook-papers-takeaways.html*

Gates, B. (2013), *The internet is becoming the town square for the global village of tomorrow*, Cyber Insights Magazine.
URL: *https://www.cyber-insights.org/the-internet-is-becoming-the-town-square-for-the-global-village-of-tomorrow2/*

Gesetz zur Verbesserung der Rechtsdurchsetzung in sozialen Netzwerken (Netzwerkdurchsetzungsgesetz - NetzDG) (2017), Bundesministerium für Justiz.
URL: *https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/netzdg/BJNR335210017.html*

Haugen, F. (2021), *Facebook Whistleblowerin Frances Haugen im Talk über die Facebook Papers*, ZDF Magazin Royale.
URL: *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ws06adOKNUk*

IGF (2021), *IGF 2021 Summary — Sixteenth Meeting of Internet Governance Forum 6–10 December 2021 Katowice, Poland*, Internet Governance Forum.
URL: *https://www.intgovforum.org/en/filedepot_download/223/20706*

ITU (2021), *Measuring digital development — Facts and figures 2021*, International Telecommunication Union.
URL: *https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Documents/facts/FactsFigures2021.pdf*

Morrison, S. & Ghaffary, S. (2021), *The case against Big Tech*, Vox Media.
URL: *https://www.vox.com/recode/22822916/big-tech-antitrust-monopoly-regulation*

Morton, F. M. S. (2020), *The Antitrust Case against Google*, Yale School of Management.
URL: *https://insights.som.yale.edu/insights/the-antitrust-case-against-google*

Oladimeji, O. (2021), *Digital Literacy and Adult Learning in Nigeria*, pp. 385–395.

Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council (2016), Official Journal of the European Union.
URL: *https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679&from=E*

Solon, O. (2017), *'It's digital colonialism': how Facebook's free internet service has failed its users*, The Guardian.
URL: *https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/jul/27/facebook-free-basics-developing-markets*

Srinivasan, R. (2020), *Beyond the valley: How innovators around the world are overcoming inequality and creating the technologies of Tomorrow*, MIT Press.

Wang, M. (2020), *Apple, Tell Us More About Your App Store Takedowns*, Electronic Frontier Foundation.
URL: *https://www.eff.org/ko/deeplinks/2020/02/apple-tell-us-more-about-your-app-store-takedowns*

York, J. C. (2021), *Twitter and India play tug-of-war with democracy*, The New Arab.
URL: *https://english.alaraby.co.uk/opinion/twitter-and-india-play-tug-war-democracy*

Proposed Players

For a fruitful discussion, we recommend as countries

- The United Kingdom (A)

- Germany (A,B)

- India (B)

- The People's Republic of China (A,B)

- Switzerland (A)

- The United States of America (A,B)

- France (A)

- Belgium (A)

- The United Arab Emirates (A,B)

- South Africa (A,B)

- Australia (A,B)

- Estonia (B)

- Ethiopia (A,B)

- Israel (A,B)

- The Democratic Republic of Congo (A)

- Egypt (A)

- Benin (A)

- Cambodia (A)

- Nigeria (A,B)

- Myanmar (B)

- Brazil (B)

- Mexico (B)

- The Netherlands (A,B)

- Greece (A)

- Côte d'Ivoire

The lobbyism concept could be realized using

- The British Museum (A)

- Sotheby's (A)

- The Open Society Foundations (A)

- Humboldt Forum (A)

- Meta Platforms Ltd. (B)

- The Electronic Frontier Foundation (B)

- Space Exploration Technologies Corporation (a.k.a. SpaceX, Starlink) (B)

- Tencent Holdings Ltd. (B)

- African Freedom of Expression Exchange (B)

- Alphabet Inc. (B)

- Mobile Telephone Networks Group (B)