

CCGRS Lecture Series: Protecting World Treasures from War

SPEAKER 1: Good evening. Thanks for coming. It's a great turnout and it's such a pressing topic that it's very encouraging to me to see how many people are interested in it. Particularly the upcoming generation of Scholars who will be responsible for looking after the world that, so far, my generation has perhaps not done as well as we might have to take care of.

I'd just want to start this evening by thanking the people who have supported this event and Doctor Joris Kila's visit as a whole. I'd like to thank the College of Arts and Sciences, The Department of history's George and Bernadine Converse historical endowment, The Foley Institute, The Department of English, The Graduate Student Association of the school of politics, philosophy, and public affairs, in particular Brenden Higashi for all the work that you have done to bring this together, and the Office of multicultural services.

I'd also like to thank Zach Mazur, curator of education and collections at the WSU Museum Of Art, the department of critical culture, gender, and race studies, and by many other colleagues, including colleagues who come to us from the military today, who have spread the word and advertised this event. But most of all, I just want to thank you guys who have showed up here today to hear our distinguished speaker, Doctor Joris Kila. And I would be totally remiss if I did not thank Stephanie Ficca, who is the administrative support in the School of Politics, Philosophy, And Public Affairs, who put the reception together, who organized so many things and without whom this would have been impossible.

And also Adriana Aumen from the College of Arts and Sciences communications office, who did a lot of the advertising for us. So thank you so much for what you've done to put this together for us.

[APPLAUSE]

Now I'd just like to tell you a few things about Joris Kila and these are perhaps some of the stories that you won't tell you himself while he's talking. So keep them in mind when he tells you about the issues that have preoccupied him for at least the last 15 years of his life. Doctor Joris Kila has been carrying out scientific research on the subject of cultural property protection, also known and CPP, in the event of conflict for more than 15 years.

He's done field research during armed conflicts. I'll say that again, during armed conflicts. In

Macedonia, in Iraq, Egypt, Molly, and Libya. To get access to military sources for research he enlisted as lieutenant colonel in the Dutch armed forces.

In his first tour of Iraq, he was with the Dutch forces in South Iraq. In 2004, during his second tour in Iraq, he was with the American forces in Baghdad. Because of the insignia on his epaulettes-- and for those of you who are not military and don't wear those kinds of clothes, epaulettes are those shoulder things. Because of the insignia on the epaulettes of what he-- his uniform, his American colleagues in Iraq believed him to be a general in the Ukrainian army. So he was treated extremely well. At some point, however, he wanted to have a drink that was not just Coca Cola. He was therefore obliged to admit to his American colleagues that, in fact, he was not a general in order that he could get access to an adult beverage that was being drunk slightly on the sly.

He's done many military, as well as undercover, missions. So for example, he's traveled extensively with Karl von Habsburg-Lothringen, grandson of the last emperor of the Austro-Hungarian empire. During the Egyptian revolution, they worked with no official title, no official role, and no support to do the work that the official institutions charged with responsibility for protecting cultural heritage are in fact not doing. So instead, Joris and Karl went undercover, pretending just to be tourists, to assess damage; if possible, to stop looting; and to collect evidence for later prosecution of perpetrators of cultural crimes. Cultural crimes, excuse me.

They did the same thing in Mali, where they themselves were able to obtain support for an apparently horrendous drive that he says he'll never do again, through Mali from about Bamako, the capital city, to Timbuktu. They had the army to support them during that dangerous drive, and you will hear more about that in the talk that is to come tonight. They've done similar emergency assessment missions to Benghazi, Tripoli and Cyrene in Libya. Their goal, other than rescuing and preventing further damage to artifacts, is to demonstrate to local peoples that they are not alone, that someone is there to help them resist against the feelings of helplessness and psychological damage from witnessing their heritage and their cultural identity under attack and being, in some cases, destroyed.

Doctor Kila is also editor-in-chief of the *Heritage and Identity* series at Brill Publishing in Leiden and Boston that was actually founded in Leiden in the Netherlands in 1683. So that's one of the oldest publishing-houses in the world that I'm aware of. Please join me in welcoming Doctor Joris Kila. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

JORIS KILA:

Good evening to everybody, and thank you for the invitation of having me here to give you this talk. I have to see if everything works. Where do I have to point the-- oh, it's here. Yeah.

OK. Sorry. Technical. The next slide-- oh, this is not a-- yep. Problem solved. Thank you. Thank you.

Well, I'm going to talk about the protection and destruction of cultural heritage in contemporary conflicts. And I will demonstrate later that contemporary conflicts are different than the way they used to be. We are talking now about asymmetric conflicts that are sometimes better-known as civil wars, as opposed to symmetric conflicts like Second World War and things like that.

Everybody can see in today's newspapers and everything that there's an increase of abuse and destruction of cultural property during today's conflicts. Cultural property stands for cultural heritage. Cultural property actually is the legal term that is used in the international treaties and stuff. It's a complicated topic, and it's impossible in one lecture to explain everything. So I had to choose some cases and pick out some of the aspects to tell you tonight about.

It's a multi-disciplinary topic. You know it involves archaeology, art history, but also political aspects, cultural diplomacy, military aspects, legal aspects, sociology-- you name it, it's in there. Even philosophy, as I will show later. You see here a picture that was during the revolution in Libya. I'm standing there with a-- [INAUDIBLE] pointer? Sorry. I'm standing there in the corner with the books. Oh, this is the pointer. Now I have to get back and-- sorry.

OK. Some of the causes of the fact that cultural property is not protected as it should be and there is a lot of destruction going on, they vary. One of the reasons is the awareness. Nobody knows what cultural property protection is. Therefore, it has a low priority, it's not much known. Consequently, there's not much research and education about the topic, both practically and theoretical level.

And one of the reasons that it sometimes has low priority-- thank you-- is that policymakers think that they have to give priority to humanitarian aid and sanitation, you know, roofing, food, and stuff. But of course, that is wrong, because one does not have to exclude the other. And I

will try to demonstrate the importance of this cultural heritage for the people, and that it's not of a lower priority than only humanitarian aid. It's part of it, even.

Then, there is not much awareness about the connection of cultural heritage, both material cultural heritage as well as intangible cultural heritage-- that can be music traditions, poetry, you know, that is also a form of cultural heritage-- it's connected with identity, you know? And I will demonstrate that the destruction of cultural heritage can be also a sort of destruction of identity of groups, individuals, nations, you name it. Another restraining factor are the legal aspects, including the prosecution of cultural war crimes.

Quite recently, the UN declared crimes against cultural property in the event of conflict war crimes, especially also in the so-called non-international conflicts. I will tell you some cases. The Strugar case is very famous. It's from the war in former Yugoslavia where, for the first time, a military general was prosecuted and convicted for crimes against cultural property. And then most recent-- this guy is now in prison in the Hague, not so far from where I live-- is one of the guys from Ansar Dine. That is the terrorist jihadi extremist group that attacked the monuments in Timbuktu. And they caught one of them, and he's now in prison. And he will be prosecuted by the International Criminal Court.

I will also try to tell you something about IS and their business model concerning cultural heritage. Also I want to tell you something, if I have time enough, about the new phenomena that are included in heritage studies. You know, like the return of iconoclasm, new developments like traumascapes that can be concentration camps, but also other things-- I will give you some examples-- cultural landscapes is a new trend, as well as the overlap between cultural and natural heritage. A small example that you maybe later can Google about is the so-called dugong case in which a sea mammal-- if that's the right word-- that is found in the vicinity of the Japanese island of Okinawa where there's a military naval base of the US has been declared under the National Preservation Act of the US into a cultural heritage to protect its-- because the breeding grounds were endangered by relocation of this naval base. So there's overlap, you know.

Another restrainer is the lack of funding. There's no funding for research, there's no funding for rescue operations because there's no awareness. Finally, there's no international cooperation and coordinations. And we all know that there are certain institutions tasked with cultural property protection, but they are more or less busy with themselves, and they are behaving very risk-avoiding and bureaucratic. We all know which organizations I mean.

UNESCO is one of them. So that is a bit the scenery.

Now, awareness. I heard that there's also a philosophy class here. The famous philosopher Rumsfeld, US philosopher, he pointed out exactly what is happening with cultural property. This was of course, in the beginning of the invasion of Iraq. This is what you get when you don't know anything about it, you know, and you don't have cultural advisers in your armed forces or in politics.

But the point is that the people that are stakeholders and players on the field of both destruction and protection of cultural heritage are also quite diverse, and they also have their own identities. So stakeholders, they have national identities, local identities, individual identities. I mean, lawyers don't want to work together with archaeologists. Military lawyers don't want to work with civilian lawyers. People from different countries don't want to work together. There are religious influences. Auctioneers, the antiquities lobby, they want antiquities to be on the market to be sold, and they have strong lobbyists which academics don't have to defend their stand on this. So there are a lot of parties and identities and cultures involved. So that is making it already, too, a complicated topic.

Now from the material approach to cultural heritage, so cultural heritage as objects, material objects that can be damaged or destroyed, I have to say that there are several external influences that are influencing the changing status and identity of cultural heritage. I have some examples. You see there on the left the-- everybody knows the Anne Frank house in Amsterdam. This is the famous case of the Anne Frank house tree.

Now I was, at the time, still working at University of Amsterdam. And some colleague needed more attention for his research about the Second World War, one of the main topics of the University of Amsterdam. And he decided to leak to the press the fact that an-- I think it was an oak tree that was mentioned in the book of Anne Frank was about to be cut down by the municipality of Amsterdam. And the reason that this oak tree that is mentioned once or twice in the book when Anne Frank looks out of her hole in the wall or something, you know, the reason that it was cut down is because it died, so it was dangerous. It was about to fall over, and could destroy a house or even kill people.

But when it was leaked to the press, from everywhere around the world protest groups appeared and began demonstrating. They want to cut down the Anne Frank tree, you know, and huge delegations from Israel and whatever, you know. And of course, our Dutch culture

that you all know became very apparent because the neighbor of the Anne Frank house made quite a fortune of selling chestnuts from the Anne Frank tree to rich people from the US and other countries, you know. So he was very happy with it, you know.

Finally, under big international pressure, it was decided by the mayor of Amsterdam to put a metal skeleton around the tree. Two years later, there was a huge storm and everything was blown to pieces anyhow. You still can buy on the Dutch internet pieces of the Anne Frank tree. I don't know if they are supplied by the neighbor or other entrepreneurs. But this is an example of an overlap between cultural and natural heritage, because it's a tree, and how it can be intrinsically loaded by some event with importance or relevance to certain groups that want to identify with it, whilst only mentioned in the book once or twice.

Another example, you see, next with the statues of Lenin. You know, when Moscow-- or, sorry, the Russian empire was disbanded, the Soviet Republic, everything ended up on the scrap heap, you know. And now I think it's-- now it's seen as conceptual art again, so it's again getting some value. But it changes due to political, environmental, sociological factors, you know, cultural heritage. So these are just a couple of examples.

You have more developments, you know. You have cultural landscapes. This is interesting to look up later. It's like the Loire castles in France is not one object of cultural heritage, but scenery, including buildings, that makes a cultural landscape that is looked upon as a cultural heritage for region or something.

Then what is very important is memorial sites, which are now also regarded as cultural heritage. You all know in the US, of course, 9/11, there's now a monument to it. It's a memorial site, and that is-- especially in the event of conflict, that has to be protected because it's part of the identity of Americans or the New Yorkers or whatever. So these are new developments that make life even more complicated, you know.

Urbicide, probably nobody heard of it, but it's the killing of a city, literally, but it means that when, in wars and conflict, when stereotyped neighborhoods or groups or buildings of a town-- let's say Paris, the Eiffel Tower, when that is attacked and destroyed, you kill the identity of Paris, or France, on a larger scale, which can be, in wartime, an act of crime against humanity because you're trying to erase a part of the identity of a group from history. You know, first everybody will be very angry, but five generations later, the Eiffel Tower is no longer part of the identity anymore.

And then we go to the cultural value approach of damaging cultural heritage or identity in the context of conflict. I already gave a sort of introduction with urbicide on the individual level, the Nazis had a system of depersonalization. This is a famous book by an Italian writer, Primo Levi, who describes the system of depersonalization, which is, of course, a sort of identity destruction on the individual level. And they dismantle everything.

So first, they get people out of their environment, their houses. And then they remove their clothes. Finally, only a number remains, you know? And then the people can lose themselves finally. So that is the mechanism of depersonalization, which you can do on a bigger level with groups of people by destroying their identity, their cultural heritage. This is what the Nazis did, and it's a form of psychological warfare which is also happening now, for instance, by IS, but on a larger scale or another scale. It's just an example to think about.

Now, my hypothesis is CPP, cultural property protection, is such a complicated and serious topic that it cannot be handled by just a small number of archaeologists and heritage experts often acting on personal title. You need to engage all stakeholders, like the military. Because they are involved in conflict, and they are the first ones always on the scene, you know? And the organizations tasked with that, as I already said, are not doing that, you know? So that's why individuals like me and some others try to give the good example by just acting on our own-- paying for it ourselves on our own personal title to go to these war-stricken areas and try to save heritage or ask attention for it.

Unfortunately, this example is not very much followed until now. The worst case was that we went to Libya during the revolution, which was-- the first time that we went was quite a dangerous undertaking. And when we came back, UNESCO issued a press release that they sent us out, and appropriated the report and just acted like they did it. And they-- when we asked them before, they didn't want to help or pay anything.

This is also a characteristic, that cultural property, cultural heritage is always appropriated by parties to-- how can I say that in American-- to pimp their identity, you know? And on the other side, it's always contested or disputed. You can also have that on the micro level in the family. You know, when a grandfather dies suddenly, everybody wants part of the heritage, you know, or they want to have part of something. So it's always disputed. That's why cultural heritage and cultural property are strange terms, you know, because they already have-- in the semantic level, they already have a conflict in themselves.

You could speak about cultural resources, probably. That could be better. But this is something that research and conceptualization has to bring further, you know?

Now what we're talking about when we engage the military. We're talking about the militarization of CPP, cultural property protection, in the context of armed conflicts. Now don't confuse this as old British archaeologists do, with the militarization of archeology. We did presentations, sometimes with my American colleagues a couple of years ago about military involvement in CPP. And we had it that all the professors in Britain boycotted and forbid their students to come to the lecture because they didn't want to be in the same room with military.

That's kind of things that happen. And we are not talking about the militarization of archeology, but of cultural property protection. Because the military are one of the biggest stakeholders are playing in the field. I mean, we cannot set up a research project about firefighting without the participation of the fire brigade. You cannot do that. That's not realistic. And we are not living in the 1960s.

So this is something to consider and maybe to reflect upon. And of course, the military are very-- potentially they are good art historians, because they use a lot-- they work a lot with icons and costumes and medals and stuff, all the things that have a special meaning to also art historians and people who want to destroy icons. So potentially there's nothing wrong.

Now I talked about the new conflict types. I want to give you some examples. This will be also in the net, on the net, so you can look it up later, asymmetric warfare, it's a war with an equal parties. So it used to be that there were two or more official armies all with uniforms and stuff, and some takes, and they were shooting at each other. So the whole law of war and everything was very functional.

And you know, if you were not in a uniform, you were a non-combatant and there were other legal implications, et cetera, et cetera. But for many years, the situation changed and all the conflicts are asymmetric. To keep it simple, it's almost like civil wars. So the whole legal system has to adapt to that, including cultural property protection that is, for instance, taken care of in the Hague Convention of 1954.

Well, the dates is already, in 1954 we were still busy with symmetric conflicts with the aftermath of the Second World War. By the way, America, the United States, signed the Hague Convention of 1954 in 2008. So they were not very quick with that. And they didn't sign the protocols in which the penal sanctions are taken care of. But we come to that later. You also

have interstate conflict, this is some technical information.

Key topics, what is the relevance for military organizations to protect cultural property. That's what the generals ask, you know? And when I tell them, as I tried to, well, it's very ethical and very good for the people if you protect their-- they say, well yeah, what's in it for me? So you have to, in your research and in your implementation of the legal obligation to protect it, you have to be smarter and you have to translate it into military incentives, what they call force multipliers.

I will come to that later. Then as I already told, funding is a problem. So you have to try to raise external funding. Then you'll have to tell them about the relationship between cultural and natural resource, because environmental issues are very well being taken care of in military organizations and military doctrines and stuff. You have to tell them about the legal drivers.

An important treaty is the Rome Statute of 1998 that created the International Criminal Court. Now the United States is no party through the Rome Statute because they don't acknowledge the International Criminal Court, because they don't want to have US military end up in the prison of the International Criminal Court, which is close to my house and the beach of Scheveningen.

The United States went so far that your other famous philosopher Senator Jesse Helms created the Hague invasion act, which allowed the Americans to invade the beaches of the Hague if somebody would end up in the international prison there of the UN, and the International Criminal Court. I think President Obama got rid of the Hague invasion [INAUDIBLE]. We no longer have to fear about.

What is important is training in the military, I will come to that also later. And then how to embed CPP capabilities in the military organization. Well, one of the most important things that will save you a lot of time of convincing generals that's are about to retire when you convince them and then replace by somebody that needs even more convincing, is to put it in the operational planning doctrines.

With some success, I was asked by US AFRICOM, that's one of the big combat commands. Headquarters are in Stuttgart, Germany, to write an annex through their operational planning of civil military operation, about cultural property protection. This is the first time that the obligations are included in military operational planning. Actually, US AFRICOM was the first

military organization in the world, because the Europeans don't do it.

And that makes it easier, because when an operation is planned, even now, the recent air strikes in Libya, they automatically will consider cultural property protection, or to avoid bombing cultural sites. And you all know that a couple of days ago the US Air Force bombed Sabratha in Libya. And Sabratha, there is a very big archaeological Roman Phoenician site, port. And in the town of Sabratha, there's even a big amphitheater.

And last night I didn't sleep very well because the Libyans called me. We have contacts in Libya. That they were happy, the local population was happy, with the American bombings. And I asked the department that was attacked there by the American Air Force were all Tunisians that crossed the border and started their own IS thing. And no archaeological site was hit, which is already nice, but it's also nice because the no-strike list that we created for cultural objects is working to a certain extent. Touch wood.

So these are sort of new inventions that normally UNESCO or other organizations should do, because they are paid to do that. But they don't. They don't use their brains. So strange people like me have to do it. You have to share information and you have to establish cooperation with international civil experts. You know why? Because when the US is doing something internationally, a lot of countries will say, oh, there's a double agenda, it's not the US, it's the CIA, or whatever.

You can afford it by just creating a international platform or institute that advises that it is more difficult to politicize the issue, because you don't want it, because you want to save cultural heritage. Examples are the cultural no strike lists. Share aerial pictures with military that you can use to advise where cultural facilities that can be museums or archaeological sites, where they are.

You can also use drones to make aerial pictures if the situation is too dangerous to send in people to do assessments. And then it's better to have contacts with the military organizations, they have better drones than an archaeologist that buys a drone with his cheap camera or something because it's not usable. So you just have to use your brains for that.

Well, I was talking about the relationship between cultural resources and natural resources. This is Ayers Rock in Australia. For the Aboriginals, this is cultural heritage. It's a holy, sacred place. But it's also a natural resource. It's just not man-made. So there's overlap. You cannot

identify easily what it is, but in practice, this is a cultural resource as well as a natural environment.

The return of iconoclasm. I think iconoclasm is an English word as well. And it's also the destruction of memory. You see here a picture of the Netherlands in Utrecht, 1566, if I'm right, when the Protestants started to destroy and cut off heads of statues, what IS is doing now, in the Catholic churches and monasteries. Still there. You can still see it, you know?

It's aimed at historical obliteration. And this can lead to eradication of identity and memory, history, erasing from history. And literally, iconoclasm means breaking of images. But of course, it's the breaking of the character of something as well. The iconoclastic fury, you just saw this picture of it. Another famous example is the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas by the Taliban, 2001.

It took them three weeks to destroy these statues, because it was very difficult to destroy them. And they had to work really hard. The good thing is that they finally did the result is the opposite, because the anthropomorphic silhouettes of the Buddhas are now a strong statement of destruction, of trauma scape. So they didn't manage to erase this because it's now a sort of memorial site of destruction.

What they all have in common, ancient and modern cases, are accusations of idolatry. You are worshipping human figures and that kind of thing. IS is using that as well. Come to that later. Also, you have non-religious driven iconoclasm. For instance the old Egyptians and also the Romans, when a pharaoh or an emperor fell out of grace, they removed their names from the cartouches or statues. It's called *damnatio memoriae*, condemnation of memory. So it's not new.

Of course, there's also individual iconoclasm, when some guy order or woman enters a museum destroys a often modern conceptual painting, because they get angry on the painting. That is also a form of iconoclasm, of course. So you have to understand that there are different versions of iconoclasm. But it's back on the international agenda thanks to the extremist jihadist and the terrorist groups.

Here's some early examples, the Egyptians and the Romans what they did with *damnatio memoriae*. Now coming to IS, or DAESH, what they call it, and about their business model of how to handle cultural property. It's threefold. First, they destroy cultural heritage, cultural property as a demonstration for their own fans, public. Look how pious we are, how religious

we are, because this expression of hedonism or idolatry we destroyed for you.

They don't mention to their own public that before they start destroying, they remove the stuff that they can sell, and that is more handable, smaller or golden [INAUDIBLE], whatever. So the second part of their business model is generating financial means by looting and serving cultural property sites and monuments. Before they start in front of the whole world, they film it. You have seen it on television before the iconoclastic destruction.

Of course, what they also don't tell is that they work together with transnational or international organized crime that takeover, at a certain stage, the distribution and the illicit trafficking of things, because there is demand in the market. If there was no demand in the market, it would have ended already, years ago. There are still collectors in all kinds of strange kinds of countries, including the United States.

There were even-- I saw pictures of antiquities in Chicago in windows, and they were all financed using bitcoins, in London, but also in the new markets. Rich Arabs in the Gulf states, they want these antiquities to raise their status, because they are not collectors. But you have Chinese collectors. You have Russians, whatever. There is a demand. Unfortunately, there's still a demand.

And then the third aspect is the strategy of destruction for the eradication of opposing and minority groups. So taking cultural identities, psychological warfare, what we talked about. IS did with the Jews and the [INAUDIBLE], these people, these Christian people. And it's no different than what the Nazi did. So here you also have the legal question, is this a destruction of cultural property, which already qualifies as a war crime.

Or is it also a stronger thing, namely crimes against humanity, because you destroy identity or psychological warfare. The legal people, experts, are still not sure about it. And it is an ongoing discussion that takes too long. But it is important when you are prosecuting people like at the International Criminal Court. And you can compare this with the Nazi trials in Neuremberg, that was also people convicted or prosecuted for crimes against humanity, or stealing, or whatever.

So you have to develop a legal system for that, concerning this cultural heritage criminal offenses. OK, of course the question was, can we prove that IS has a whole system and business model for looting and trafficking. And this was important because I could only-- from my perspective, if there were more people busy with that-- prove to the military that it's

important to protect cultural heritage because IS, groups like IS, but also Boko Haram and stuff, they use the revenues of smuggling and looting of artifacts to finance the conflict.

And then it becomes interesting for military leaders, because denying the enemy financial resources to extend the battle is a military incentive. In military terms, called a force multiplier. And then the general will say, yeah, maybe you're right. Maybe we could invest in that. So what happened the last year may American delta forces, I think the marines, or something, I'm not sure.

But they did a raid in [INAUDIBLE], at the headquarters of this guy you see sitting there, Abu Sayyaf. And they discovered a whole administration and evidence of the system that IS is using to loot and sell antiquities. The proof they found was evidence of systematically trafficking in antiquities, via IS. It was well organized. And even IS sells to local populations licenses not to fish, but to loot archaeological sites. And they have to pay for that. And then they can go with even agricultural means dig up stuff and whatever.

And when they find something, they have to report it to IS, because they have to pay taxes over it. So the earning system is, you know, it's-- and the trafficking, it's all official now. And here are some things of the documents that the American special forces discovered. Of course, this was classified until a couple of months ago. So now I think the State Department made this sort of press conference about.

This was, of course, good. But I hope in the future that they will give an international presentation about these things, because now you have the same thing, oh, it's the Americas. No, then we don't believe it in the rest of the world. So it's better to have these presentations done, not by the US State department, but maybe an international organization busy with cultural things.

But you see that because IS is following the old Islamic tradition, so they have a Diwan, which is a sort of old form of government, or governor [INAUDIBLE] or whatever. And they have a whole system. And of course they already had a lot of experience from the time that the last Gulf war, when Baghdad was invaded and the rest of Iraq. Because that's where local criminals and people started to loot and to sell things.

And they sold their expertise, or even worked together with IS. So it's growing. And there's also letters found that this guy Abu Sayyaf took over from the normal criminals, because the

normal criminals that were still getting their experience during 15 years ago with the fall of Baghdad, 30-40 years, whatever, they were not religious enough. Now it's an administrative division. And this is typical.

It's a Diwan of natural resources, because they dig their cultural heritage, cultural property out of the soil. So they see it as natural resource. There you have this overlap, again, between natural and cultural. You see here that this guy was appointed. And you see a translation of the document that proves it. Of course, when the looters that bought permits did something against IS rule, they could also be punished. And that happened.

Some of these people that bought permits to loot, they made some mistakes or didn't report everything to pay tax to IS. And they were ever executed. There are pictures of that, especially with some objects from Palmyra. Here you see the real thing in Arabic, and a translation in English. And it's blacked-- yes, I think it's blacked out by the military. But it is proof. License to loot, not to kill. It's not James Bond, you can buy it.

And here is the book, recipe book, for people that bought stolen antiquities and the paid to IS. And they go a receipt here. You see the receipts. This is hard proof. And it's the tip of the iceberg, you know? Because if this is happening in IS in parts of Syria, you bet you that this will happen in Iraq. And it will also happen by some of the other extremist, jihadist group in Africa, or wherever, in Libya.

And it proves to police, international police, and to the military that it pays off to protect cultural heritage because you cut off the financing. So it's also important that people from universities in this multi-disciplinary topic include financial experts. It's called counter-threat financing, because you can follow the money to find the dealers, the looters, but also the buyers. So it's even more multi-disciplinary already as it was.

Here are some pictures of stuff that they found in Abu Sayyaf's possession. On the left you see stuff that was actually there, and also pictures of stuff on his computers that were already en route or hidden to be sold later. You have to take into account the fact that everything that is being looted, a lot of it is not on the market but is being hidden, that can be buried, or it can be [INAUDIBLE] even in Europe, tax free [INAUDIBLE] in Switzerland, or wherever, to enter the market 10 years from now, or even longer. That is also one of the strategies.

Something else to consider is that artifacts that are too hot to sell now are used by criminal organizations as a sort of guarantees, or bitcoins. When they are waiting to pay with actual

money, criminal transactions, they give as a guarantee, architects for instance. So that's also a function of these artifacts.

Evidence. I already explained this. Another thing which makes it more important as a topic, is that this demonstrates a connection between CPP and counterinsurgency or counterterrorism intelligence. Now we, or I say we, but cultural experts and academics now have to be careful because we want to stay ethical about it. You might have heard a couple of years ago there was big scandal with anthropologists with the American armed forces about a so-called human terrain teams, which was completely unethical.

Now concerning cultural property protection, the boundaries are to we found in the Hague Convention of 1954, what is ethical and what is not ethical. So you are covered. Of course you have to read the Hague Convention and everything. But there are ways to stay on the safe side of that. On the other hand, it might be more possible to get funding for research and activities because there's a connection with global safety.

Force multipliers. This is just for you to look up later what it is in military terms. This is some examples of the relevant international legal obligations. The Hague Convention is important. If you're interested in this topic, I encourage you to look it up. The Brits are still not party to it, because they don't have time in the Parliament to handle it.

And the US is now a party to the Hague Convention, but not to protocols. Then you have the UNESCO convention for the means of prohibiting and preventing illicit traffic. You have the Rome Statute of the ICC. You have, in the US, the National Historic Preservation Act. Mind you, all these treaties, the fact that for instance US didn't sign things or-- does not mean that they are not dealing with these treaties, because the treaties are meant to be implemented by the countries first in their national legislations. And if they don't do that, or the national legislation is no longer working or out of duty, or due to political reasons, then the international treaties start to function.

So the whole criminal aspects of cultural heritage abuse are normally covered by your criminal national legislation. But this is legal talk. You have a military regulation NATO STANAG, just to give you an idea. What are new developments in these legal aspects? There's something like international criminal law, and that can be invoked when treaties are not working or countries refuse to prosecute, or whatever. Then there's something like international law that can be evoked and used to prosecute people.

Now for instance, with this ICC and Assad in Syria, who's committing a lot of war crimes, but also war crimes against cultural property, the ICC says we cannot prosecute Assad because Syria is not a signatory of this Rome Statute. Bullshit. Because I live in the Hague I could talk with the ICC. And then they said, yeah, well the problem is we don't have enough money.

This is always the big thing, overarching problem, no money. Because there are possibilities, also, to prosecute Assad under other international treaties, even like the Hague Convention of 1954. So legal people have to do research and be open for that interpretation. There are all kinds of things, individual criminal responsibility. If you cannot catch Assad or his general, or God knows who, under international law, as a country you can prosecute them on the individual criminal responsibility.

This is what's happening now with-- this is a famous case. The Pavle Strugar case, which was a general, a Yugoslav general. And he was accused of shelling the historical center of the town of Dubrovnik. Remember what I told you about urbicide. And there was no military necessity, which is a military way for under certain conditions to destroy cultural property. He couldn't prove that. So he was convicted and jailed in the Hague by the ICTY, the Yugoslav Tribunal, also an international tribune.

So which is very interesting for people like me, because it makes a precedent that military leaders can be prosecuted. It's not impossible. Of course, the guy was released because he was sick. And all these guys they get sick and then they're released. But anyhow, it was a legal precedent. Military necessity. If it's very necessary for a military operation to shorten the conflict under certain very strict conditions, cultural heritage can be attacked.

Also, if the party you're fighting against makes it into a military target, for instance, by putting anti-aircraft guns on it, or putting hostages, military, or snipers on it. This is legal stuff. But this, if you're interested, it can be important to take it into account. But this is very legal. This can be a discussion topic, war crimes of crimes against humanity.

This is the guy from Ansar Dine that was caught. That was one of the people responsible for the actions in Timbuktu, and in the other parts of Mali, destroying did the Sufi shrines and everything. What is not well known is that it is not a fairly important guy, so the case is not very strong. He's now jailed in the Hague and he's a prisoner of the ICC. The first ICC prisoner prosecuted for crimes against cultural heritage. That's an important precedent.

But they should have gone for a much higher persons. But it's always the problem that military or police force just don't want to arrest these people. This guy made the mistake in going to another country, a neighboring country, and he was there, caught by the police. So he's now in the Hague. Normally, he has a long beard and all kind of Arabic dresses. But now for the trial he dressed like me. He thinks it helps, maybe.

This becomes a famous case, because-- but we have to see what becomes of it. Now we have been too Mali, because the international organizations didn't want to go there, or they spread around strange information. We went there to see what really happened. And one of the things you see there, these two guys on the left up, one thing that the terrorists did was destroy the holy door of Sidi Yahya in Timbuktu.

Now you see bricks, and you see on the floor, some remnants of the wooden pieces. This was the holy door and it was already for hundreds and hundreds of years, the belief of the inhabitants of Timbuktu, if somebody goes through that door, Timbuktu will be struck by plagues and disaster. So the first thing that they destroyed, of course, Ansar Dine, was this door. And next to it we found, believe it or not, a very small Catholic church in Timbuktu.

And we found a statue of the Virgin Mary with the face cut off. Remember, in the beginning of presentation what the Protestants and the Catholics did to each other in 1566, this is what the jihadis do against Catholic statues. So nothing has changed. You see the other guy down? He's pointing-- this is the wall of the big mosque in Timbuktu. You see these tiny holes. Behind these holes are Sufi saints buried.

So what did the terrorists do? They put booby traps in it, human feces, everything, to desecrate it, which is the destruction or the attacking of identity. Next to that you see the Ali Baba Library where all these manuscripts were attacked and burned. Now the great thing about the Mali people was that they saw these jihadis coming already, months before, so they decided in this venue that you see there, to create a very nice looking small exhibition of the famous Timbuktu manuscripts for the jihadis to destroy.

These jihadis were very happy. And they burned 200 manuscripts, or something, and destroyed it. And they were so satisfied with that, that they didn't go into the cellars where everything was hidden. So this was very smart, you know, to sacrifice a couple of hundred manuscripts. And they have thousands and thousands. So this is a strategy. And of course, all kind of international organizations claimed that they saved the manuscripts because they just

wired money to Mali.

Of course, the people from Mali didn't say, no, we don't want the money. So they can put in their yearly reports that they saved the manuscripts, but that's not true. Here iconoclasm. You see these two pictures? When you enter Timbuktu you see the text, and you see it in small picture, Timbuktu, the city of the 333 saints. Well, the jihadis don't like that. That is paganism.

So they erase the 333 saints. It's a simple form of iconoclasm, and quite easy to restore again. But it's still iconoclasm, because now it's Welcome in Timbuktu, the city-- that's it. If you have the time look up traumascape. I also want to emphasize something different, the sensitivity, also political, of cultural heritage. What can happen if you don't use experts, even for political decision makers, or military, you need to experts.

This is a nice case of a Swedish minister that wanted to do good for the people. And invited African artists to create art. So what the guy did, it was an African artist. How do you say that here in America? He had colored skin. And he made this cake. Now the body is the body, but the head is the art under the table sticking out his head. So it looks like it's a--

So this Swedish minister and everybody was laughing because, you know, she was cutting the cake and just like-- but these pictures, they appeared in the international press. And of course, were completely interpreted another way. And I think that even the minister had to resign. So cultural heritage, that includes art, as you all know, is a sensitive aspect, also for politicians. So you need to have advice on that, or research. It can create conflicts, or maintain conflicts. This is just an example.

Traumascapes, I will just show you what they are. These are traumascape. The killing fields in Cambodia on the left, traumascape. Ground zero, traumascape. But also what you have in Europe, the concentration camps, traumascape. But with, and not only mentioned, because most of the concentration camps are rebuilt, because the Nazis destroyed everything. And they are now, I think the American term is Disneyfication.

They are changes into something in between memorial sites, traumascape, cultural heritage, and tourism attractions. And still it's a sensitive topic. So this is something to look into in your academic research, how this is exploited, cultural identity, via traumascape or whatever. Overlap between cultural and natural heritage, we already discussed it.

But don't forget that the cultural heritage of Africa is also ivory artifacts and raw ivory. Boko

Haram is using the looting and smuggling of these products to finance their conflicts, as well as Joseph Koy with his Lord's Resistance Army. Many of these things are also smuggled via Libya to be distributed via transnational crime over the rest of the world.

Reuse of antique defense works. This is Krak des Chevaliers in Syria that is now used in battle, because of its strategic position in the terrain. So you can put guns on it and stuff. This is not allowed by international law. They're still doing it. Archives and libraries, they can be military targets because they can contain strategic information as well as cultural information.

So there's an overlap, you know, what to do with archives, historical archives, that also contain modern information. These are things that have to be looked into. Military training. What we did, this is me and Carl [INAUDIBLE] lectures, US Africa Command. But also in Timbuktu we trained the military about these things. This is in Timbuktu.

Operational planning doctrines. This has to do with USAFRICOM. These are some texts you can see what is in the actual texts of the operational planning annexes. Here it says in an official-- this is not the official document because with logos I'm not allowed to use it, but the text is the US is no party to the Rome Statute. Still the US military can supply evidence or testify in the prosecution against crimes against cultural property. That's an important thing, you know?

Publications. Don't buy my books because they're too expensive, but maybe you can find them in your library here. It's not that I'm earning money with that, but it's the Brill publishing company is very expensive. International cooperation. With academia, military, NGOs, important to consider. Some conclusions, I'm almost finished. CPP has to be part of the military operational planning process. We discussed that.

There has to be an understanding, internationally, about the different terms. You know, when the US COIN, counter insurgency, is a completely normal term, and even cultural property protection is part of COIN. Whereas European thinks when they hear the word counter insurgency, that people are being tortured in dark alleys and stuff. It's just a semantic difference.

So research about semantic interpretation of terms that we use in heritage protection is important. And site assessments, you saw that we went to Libya and everything. Global safety issues, funding, international criminal court has to do more. The creation of an academic CPP Institute. There is no chair in the world for CPP. There's no academic chair. They just don't

create it.

And then this technical thing about military necessity. This is the end. If you have any questions, I think is there a microphone or something? Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

SPEAKER 2: Line up over here.

JORIS KILA: I don't think there are any questions. OK.

SPEAKER 3: If you don't mind, I'd like to ask you a quick question about, I think we have something like a catch-22 with the situations [INAUDIBLE], with the CPP and involving the military and the plan. It seems like you are-- you have this need to make public your plans in order to receive funding, in order to get support for this type of CPP, militarization of CPP. Yet if you make this a little bit too public, this type of plan can also be something of a liability, right?

Because these groups can find out, oh, well there's these no-strike zones. We can go to the ruins Palmyra. They won't engage in air strikes there. We can use that as a base. How do you plan on balancing those two needs, right? The need for publicity and also the need for secrecy.

JORIS KILA: Well, you might know throughout history this is an old problem. Even Saddam Hussein used hostages on cultural sites and stuff. Gaddafi, for instance, didn't do it because he didn't like cultural heritage, so he didn't see the relevance. Of course, some things have to stay secret. And the military are very alert on that, you know, believe me. But you have to weight the interests.

If you introduce these things, at the end you gain more, you save more cultural heritage than when you don't do it. And of course, criminals as well as terrorist groups are completely aware, anyhow, already, because you can find it in the literature of many wars that the abuse of cultural heritage can also be-- how do you say it-- taking objects or people in hostage in or at cultural sites, or whatever. So it's a known problem.

But if it's in a particular conflict, it can be quite sensitive, then you probably won't publish too much in advance.

SPEAKER 4: Thank you. I have a question that's at an angle. One of my semi-heroes, having worked on

history of the atomic bombing of Japan in World War II, is apparently there was an initial effort to reserve cities so that you could demonstrate or wipe out in very intense ways. But my understanding is that there were also list of cities drawn up for using the first atomic weapons on Japan. And that Secretary of War Stimson, apparently from some prior acquaintance with the city where the Japanese emperor house is, Kyoto? In effect, struck it off, saying don't do this.

I'm curious, do you have other examples, besides yourself to a certain extent, of individuals in history that have actually intervened in, as it were, military conflicts and prevented the destruction of cultural property.

JORIS KILA:

Well, the strange thing is that in antiquity it was a completely legal thing, because also the military got paid in looting and burning cities and objects. So this changed not so long ago. And in the time of the Second World War, we still did not have the Hague Convention of 1954 where these things were addressed. And so there is new development in these things.

But people that stopped it, throughout history there were not so many people. Because the people that could stop it, then would have to pay the military with money instead of with arming and looting. So this changed only 100 years ago.

SPEAKER 4:

Interesting. Look, a quick question about-- Paris in World War II, I seem to recall that there were moments where, in fact, potentially in Italy, there could have been quite massive destruction from allied bombing of areas that were occupied by German forces. The decisions not to do that, do you have a sense of who made those decisions?

JORIS KILA:

Eisenhower, Eisenhower under pressure from several countries, and also under pressure from the [INAUDIBLE], decided to exclude certain areas where there was much cultural heritage from aerial bombings.

SPEAKER 4:

Interesting.

JORIS KILA:

So you know, the sense of this whole thing started there a little bit. And it's all international treaties. And then of course, they don't follow-- they don't implement the treaties. Like Assad is a member of several treaties, but he's abusing everything. And all the parties in Syria, and the conflicts in Iraq are doing it. It's not only IS, but it's also the Kurds. It's also Assad. A lot of parties are doing it. This is the strange thing.

And they're all in breach of international law. But when you don't implement or prosecute then nothing will happen.

SPEAKER 5:

Hi, if you consider the Library of Alexandria and how that entire reservoir of information was demolished at one point, and how one society kind of overwrote what was remembered as history, do you feel like we've already reached a point where we can't go back? Or if there's a way that we can kind of decide who gets to play in this decision of what becomes history and what we're trying to false right as our past?

JORIS KILA:

Well, when you refer to the destruction of the Library of Alexandria, at that time it was completely normal for the victors to destroy everything. It was normal. It was accepted in warfare and everything. And the only thing that has changed now is that it is illegal to do it, do that. And there are still some parties that stick to the international treaties, and so parties that don't. So there is a slow movement that this is less possible. But this movement is in the legal system, not in the ethical things or something.

Because when there's a war, they tend to-- but if military from all countries, or the generals, are afraid of being punished later, then they are more careful with these things.

SPEAKER 5:

Additionally, do you think that involving more people, since antiquities are a subjective subject, not everybody's interested in them, do you think that involving more people could cause a larger problem and more of a complex issue that your already have described?

JORIS KILA:

Yeah, first you have to raise awareness, because a lot of people don't know anything about the topic. So they don't even can estimate themselves if it's important or not. The other thing is that because the conflicts nowadays become more complicated with much more parties, some are official, some are not, and much more stakeholders, from antique dealers, to international crime, to military politicians, strategic communication, PR. It's more and more necessary to really study this topic on both the practical as well as the theoretical level.

And that is not happening, for some reason. It's only individual initiatives that are doing things now. But the institutions are not, there's no movement in this, for some reason. Bureaucracy, it's over-politicized and it's over-bureaucr-- what's the word, [INAUDIBLE] or something. So that is stopping it, you know. And if decision makers and policy makers get convinced, and they will only get convinced of the importance if they can gain something with it, so researchers and people like me have to demonstrate the perks.

Then they might move over. And if you can also say that, for instance, in Europe we have this big way for fugitives now. And a lot of these fugitives don't want to go back to Syria because they used to work in the tourism industry or in museums, and everything is destroyed. So if you protect that, it can also be a part of the very trendy subject where there's much more money for reconstruction after conflict and post conflict.

So you have to-- and that's a task, also, for academics. Do your research and make it clear what the situation is of this whole process.

SPEAKER 5: Thank you.

JORIS KILA: That's-- you have to demonstrate to the people in charge that they can gain from it.

SPEAKER 5: Thank you.

JORIS KILA: You're welcome.

SPEAKER 6: Um, so my question is, when antiquities are trafficked and are able to be recovered, do you think it's preferential to return them to a country that is perhaps still in conflict, or should they be held somewhere and preserved?

JORIS KILA: I'm in favor of, when the conflict is still going on, to safe keep the objects. But also in that problem there are different shades. For instance, the Russians invaded Crimea. At same time, there was a big traveling exhibition off the gold and treasures of the [INAUDIBLE], some old tribe of to Crimea. And at the time that Russia occupied Crimea, the exhibition was in Amsterdam, in the University of Amsterdam museum.

What's happening now, Russia wants these collections to be given back to the Crimea, because Russian was created in the Crimea. The Ukraine wants it back. So it's contested. So now waiting for a legal decision, it's stored somewhere. But sometimes you cannot give it back because of legal issues. Sometimes you cannot give it back because you're afraid it is being destroyed. You also cannot keep it to when a certain country wants it back. And there also-- I was with the American military at time, in Iraq in Baghdad, and somebody found an old officer's club of Saddam Hussein that was bombed.

And there was a pool of mud water. And they were driving all kind of Jewish cultural objects, Torah scrolls, all kinds of things. What did the American military lady do? When paperwork and documents are damaged, you deep freeze them. Because then the deterioration and the mold

is not proceeding, and you can defrost it somewhere where they can restore it.

But she used a military plane to freeze the stuff and bring it straight to the United States, somewhere in the Bible Belt. And then the Iraqis, they were full in war, and were completely uninterested in Jewish. But suddenly when it was taken out of the country, they started to claim it. Of course then, Israel started to claim it, and God knows who. Everybody-- and suddenly these Torah scrolls and stuff became very important cultural heritage, contested and claimed by everybody.

So you have to watch out what you do. And you have to prepare for these events. The military called lessons learned in peacetime. So you have to come up with solutions for that, because it's sensitive stuff. And when you want to help somebody, and you do it the wrong way, you are accused of stealing their identity. So it has different layers. And also legal consequences. So you have to study them as well.

SPEAKER 1: OK, well, I think we need to wrap it up now. So thanks for the great questions. Thank you for being here. And thank you, Doctor Kila, for a fascinating presentation. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

JORIS KILA: Thank you very much.