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The topic of restitution, returning cultural objects to a museum in a country of origin, has produced a complicated debate. The factors concerning restitution are political, ethical, and emotionally charged. Leading this controversy is Dr. Zahi Hawass. He is concerned with both the return of artifacts and the protection of artifacts in Egypt. Hawass has developed a ‘wish list’ for the return of Egyptian artifacts from market nations. The museums currently housing the items feel they serve the purpose of allowing a global audience to view these artifacts. Hawass has made tremendous strides in retrieving other antiquities and making discoveries in Egypt. This study will show how Hawass’ actions will have a profound impact on cultural objects, the museum community, and how future debates over cultural heritage will be handled.
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MUSEUMS AND RESTITUTION:
THE ACTIONS AND EFFECTS OF DR. ZAHI HAWASS

Introduction
The topic of restitution, the return of cultural objects to a museum in a country of origin, has produced a complicated debate. Factors of concern in the restitution debate are political, ethical, and emotionally charged. Artifacts “are monuments of human culture, an essential part of our common past. They tell us who we are and where we come from, give us cultural identity. … [W]e enjoy them as great art. Like literature and music, they enrich our lives” (Merryman, *Thinking about the Elgin Marbles* 35). This is not a debate that can be settled by one universal law. Each case needs to be looked at separately, and each artifact’s provenance developed. “The provenance of a work of art is a historical record of its ownership… [and] is an archaeological term referring to an artifact’s excavation site or findspot” (Provenance Guide). Museums that are deciding to acquire an artifact should base the decision on the documentation of ownership, the ability to share the object with the public, and the means to protect and care for the object in question.

The Egyptian government, represented by Dr. Zahi Hawass, Egypt’s General Secretary of Antiquities, demonstrates a current example of a nation requesting that its cultural artifacts leave the museums that currently house them and be returned to Egypt. This study will show how Hawass’ actions will have a profound impact on cultural objects, the museum community, and how future debates over cultural heritage will be handled. I will suggest that Hawass’ position is justified in certain cases where the item is unlawfully obtained or has not yet become part of the history of its new home nation. For example, Hawass has given the U.S. Department of Homeland Security documents to prove that a mummy mask (fig. 1) purchased in 1998 by the St. Louis Art Museum was stolen. The St. Louis Art Museum claims the mask was obtained lawfully, but since
Hawass has documentation proving the object was stolen, the mask should be returned to Egypt. However, in other less clear-cut cases, return is not the best option. Other factors, such as the protection of the object and its historical ties to its new location, may outweigh its original ownership, for example in the case of the Rosetta Stone. This artifact was taken during colonial rule, and has been housed in the British Museum for the last two hundred years. Throughout the paper I will discuss the consequences of and impact of Dr. Zahi Hawass’ actions upon museums and their Egyptian antiquities collections. I will then argue that each case needs to be looked at separately, and that certain cultural objects Hawass is currently requesting should not be returned to Egypt.

The issue of theft concerning art and cultural objects has been ongoing throughout history. Cultural objects were removed throughout Europe during the Napoleonic wars and taken back to Paris to create the “new Rome”. This was the first time since antiquity that art was being plundered on such a large scale. It was at the end of Napoleon’s rule when people began questioning the moral correctness of these actions. “For the first time in early modern history… the Duke of Wellington [and others] made the decision that the art plundered by Napoleon in Italy ought to be returned to its previous owners” (Miles 329). The Duke felt that keeping the artifacts was morally wrong. It was, then, the case of the Elgin Marbles that caused the controversy to grow.

Many historians cite the Elgin Marbles (fig. 2) as a starting point in the historical debate concerning the topic of restitution. William St. Clair states, “the case of the Elgin Marbles offers an excellent paradigm for issues of imperialism, art and restitution” (Clair, “Imperial Appropriations of the Parthenon” 65). The Elgin Marbles, named after their salvager, Scottish nobleman, Thomas Bruce, the seventh earl of Elgin, are classical Greek
marble sculptures originally created for the Parthenon. The collection also includes other architectural pieces from the Acropolis.

Lord Elgin was the British ambassador to the Ottoman Empire. In 1802, while in Athens, he had these sculptures removed after allegedly receiving permission from the Ottoman government. It is unclear if he was granted the permission, since the original papers have been lost. Greenfield notes that “[b]y 1803 hundreds of pieces of sculptured marble, including a column from the Erechtheion, seventeen figures from the Parthenon pediments and fifteen metopes, were boxed and shipped to Scotland” (53-54). “In the course of this he caused serious damage to the building by sawing through the frieze slabs, removing the cornice in order to detach the metopes, …[and] removing marble slabs from the pavement” (Browning 11). In 1816, Elgin sold his collection to the House of Commons, which gave the marbles to the British Museum.

Elgin’s actions may be questionable, but he claims his actions were intended to “make his embassy ‘beneficial to the progress of the Fine Arts in Great Britain’, to bestow ‘some benefit on the progress of taste in England, [and] to improve ‘the circumstances towards the advancement of literature and the arts’” (Clair, Lord Elgin and the Marbles 6). In addition to saving the marbles from further damage by the Turks, he also aided in the renewal of interest in classical Greek sculpture in Western Europe and America.

People were thrilled with the statues. However, there were some who disagreed with Elgin’s action, such as the poet Lord Byron. The words of Byron, and his overall influence, caused people to question Elgin’s intentions. “With lacerating clarity, Byron gave voice to the unprecedented idea that culture was an intrinsic thread in the fabric of a
people’s identity and that the object gave form and life to that identity” (Atwood 137). Overall, Byron affected the way in which the public viewed cultural heritage. His views were expressed through his poetry, such as *The Curse of Minerva*, written in 1811. The marbles currently reside in the British Museum. However, on numerous occasions the government of Greece has requested that the marbles be returned to Athens. Still, the British Museum has a number of reasons why they believe the marbles should stay in their current location. These include the belief that the actions of Elgin saved the marbles and also that the British Museum believes in the concept of the universal museum. The universal museum is the idea that museums should exhibit objects from all cultures to provide education and awareness. Thus the museum has no intention of returning the sculptures.

Atwood points out that “[i]n selling the marbles to the British nation, Elgin began a long tradition of collectors getting the state to finance, directly or indirectly, their plunder of antiquities” (141). Museums and private collectors from around the world now collect objects that don’t have a provenance history, meaning that the history of the object and where it came from is unknown. “Separated from its context, “decontextualized,” the object and the context both lose significance. At the extreme the objects becomes anonymous, an orphan without reliable indication of its origin, its significance, its place and function as a part of something else” (Merryman, “The Public Interest in Cultural Property” 356). Therefore, if objects are separated from their context the value is reduced, and the knowledge is lost.

Legal advances have been taken to resolve the issue. The first major international law was established in 1954, with the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural
Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. This law was established after the destruction of cultural heritage during the Second World War and now protects cultural property during times of war. However, it was not until the 1970s that museums stopped collecting objects without a provenance history. In 1970, the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, established a goal for controlling the export of cultural property. The discussion of this topic continued in 1978 at the Unidroit Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects.

“The growing number of museums has fueled demand for works of art, their rivalry has led to public curators and private collectors to broaden the temporal and spatial scope of their collections… All this has helped to transform the art market into a global market” (Pomian 82). Art crime is a global problem with a long history, and with the growth and wealth of western nations, the art market has grown as well. “A popular notion is that art theft generally ranks just behind drug trafficking and arms smuggling as leading international crimes and that sales of this stolen property accounts for billions in dollars annually” (Bazley 106). Theft and looting of cultural objects has presented and continues to present problems and creates a hindrance to understanding the past.

There are multiple types of art crime, such as art theft, forgeries and fakes, vandalism, and the looting of cultural heritage objects. In the introduction of Art and Crime: Exploring the Dark Side of the Art World, Noah Charney states that “[p]erhaps comprising as much as 75% of all art crime, antiquities looting is the most difficult to catch” (110). This is because objects looted are unknown, and in most cases these objects were stolen from archaeological sites, whereas objects that were stolen from a
museum or a collector can be put onto the Art Loss Register. The Art Loss Register is a way for someone who is purchasing antiquities to check to make sure they were not stolen. Antiquities that were looted, however, are harder to catch.

Archaeology is the study of a human society and as people become more aware of archaeological issues they become more aware of the potential value of ancient artifacts. Atwood states, “when ancient sites are excavated carefully and methodically by trained archaeologists, all humanity can gain an understanding into how those societies lived” (9). An object that is taken from an archaeological site creates problems. Derek Fincham’s essay, “The Fundamental Importance of Archaeological Context,” begins by explaining that there are many laws to help prevent looting. He says there are a variety of reasons for the number of laws, but the main reasons are that these crimes destroy archaeological context and there is a great deal of knowledge lost about the object (Fincham 3). It can also be harmful, because the objects looted might not always be saved.

It is important for objects to be saved because they are part of a culture’s heritage. In the book Heritage: Identification, Conservation, and Management, Graeme Aplin describes heritage as “things that represent ideals. Heritage therefore says a lot about who we think we are, as the things we save from change make certain ideals real and reinforce our identity” (Aplin 15). He later goes on to define cultural heritage as the “results from human processes and activities. It reflects both productive or material activities, and non-material activities and values, which are more difficult to define and can include social, religious, artistic, traditional, and iconic values” (Aplin 113). Therefore, objects from our past come to mean a great deal to a culture’s identity. It is
then the responsibility of the museums to preserve these cherished objects to educate future generations. The museums, which sometimes preserve objects from other cultures, find themselves in difficult situations where a country of origin requests an object back.

The topic of restitution is one with many sides and views. Instead of focusing on local history, museums now provide international history. Eighteen of the largest museums, including the British Museum, signed a declaration in 2002 “identifying themselves as ‘universal museums’ and stating that the universal admiration of ancient civilizations would not be so deeply established today were it not for the influences exercised by the artifacts of these cultures, widely available to an international public” (Muller 3). The concept of a global culture is rooted in the idea that museums have the ability to promote a greater knowledge of other cultures.

The concepts of nationalist principles are founded on the idea that objects from source nations build on their cultural heritage. Ambrose states in Museum Basics, “[t]his has become of increasing importance in recent years, particularly as countries have recognized the significance of their cultural property to national identity” (160). Each nation has particular items that represent the country’s identity, and many people agree with this line of thought.

Many scholars have approached the subject, and there are many books and articles concerning the debate over cultural heritage. Some, such as art historian James Cuno, stress the importance of specific principles. In his book, Whose Culture? The Promise of Museums and the Debate Over Antiquities, he defends what is called the universal principle, which he calls encyclopedic museums. He feels that “[n]ational governments claim that they are of great importance to the identity and esteem of the
modern nation – that they are of the modern nation and thus that the nation is incomplete without them” (Cuno, Whose Culture? 12). Cuno explains that this view turns the debate into a political matter by making it a national issue, rather than concentrating on the importance of the object.

Another method is to focus on politics, ignoring the ethical and emotional problems that coincide with the debate. Other scholars, such as Patti Gerstenblith, focus primarily on art law. Gerstenblith has written a number of law books to help people understand the issue from a legal standpoint. There have been multiple acts created to protect people’s cultural heritage, but there is still not a resolution. Gerstenblith believes the growth and wealth of western nations has increased the art market, and that if museums had stronger regulations and clearly defined laws, disputes among museums would be minimized.

Anthologies have been created to demonstrate the challenges of the debate by including a wide range of works from a variety of scholars. In 2009 The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization published a compendium, Witnesses to History: A Compendium of Documents and Writings on the Return of Cultural Objects. This book is very detailed and gives a number of reasons why this is not a debate that can be solved with one blanket law.

Currently, no extensive scholarship has been done regarding how the removal of Egyptian artifacts will affect museums’ collections. In April 2010 Hawass held a conference on International Cooperation for the Protection and Repatriation of Cultural Heritage. He was quoted after the conference as saying:

There is a moral imperative for museums around the world to return
certain artefacts to the countries they came from, and we are going to identify how we can help each other to increase the pressure on the keepers of those artefacts. … Greece was fighting alone, and Italy was fighting alone, now for the first time we are united. We will fight together… I will tell you: Some of us will make the life of those museums that have our artefacts miserable (Al-Shalchi).

Hawass is determined that the ancient antiquities of Egypt be returned to their homeland. One example is that he has gone as far as terminating the Louvre’s excavations in Egypt until the museum returns artifacts to Egypt. Hawass’ actions are extreme. He criticizes the way museums operate, and he is attempting to change the way the world views museums.

The study of how Hawass’ actions have affected and will affect museums and their collections is imperative, because he is challenging traditional methods. This study will analyze Egypt’s cultural heritage debate. It will look at the prior attempts, victories, and failures in retrieving Egypt’s antiquities. The study will discuss Hawass and his position as Egypt’s General Secretary of Antiquities. The following restitution cases, which have yet to be resolved, will be analyzed: the British Museum and the Rosetta Stone, the Neues Museums and the bust of Nefertiti, and several other cases.

Some museums do not agree with Hawass’ goal, and believe Egyptian artifacts should remain in their current locations. The museums that feel this way believe artifacts should be spread around the world. Keeping Egyptian objects in the current museums will allow for a greater understanding of cultural objects around the world. However, others feel that when nations ask for objects to be returned, museums should honor the
request and return the objects. In each view there are considerations, such as a legal or moral right to return, and the political issue of national identity and ownership versus cultural value and preservation. These opposing views will be considered in the first chapter.

The debate over restitution in the museum world has caused great controversy in the world of art and politics. It is not a new controversy, but has gained a great deal of attention within the last few years. The purpose of this study is to expand on the discourse of cultural heritage and the restitution debate. It will specifically look at Dr. Zahi Hawass and his mission to remove ancient Egyptian artifacts from museums across the world to be placed in Egyptian museums.
Chapter One:

Views on Restitution
The topic of restitution and how it should be handled has created many views, and each case has unique attributes that make it a challenge to resolve. The two main principles in this debate are nationalism and internationalism. People who feel artifacts should be returned to their originating culture believe in nationalist principles. They feel are part of their nation’s cultural heritage. Each nation has particular items that represent the country’s identity, and many people agree with this line of thinking. The other line of thought is internationalism, a view based on educational values. Some feel museums serve a global audience; therefore, their collections should include objects from other cultures. In most cases it is a challenge to choose a stance, and therefore it is important to understand the different viewpoints in the debate. In this section these two different views will be examined and discussed in depth.

In cases of restitution a nation is requesting an object be returned. The country requesting the return may want the object returned for a number of different reasons. John Henry Merryman discusses the importance of cultural objects in his article, “The Public Interest in Cultural Property”. He says there are five qualities that objects bring to a public: truth, memory, pathos, identity, and community (Merryman, “The Public Interest in Cultural Property” 346-349). For some nations, objects may be sacred to their way of life. In other situations objects were removed from their country of origin in an illegal or ethically questionable fashion. UNESCO Director- General A-M M’Bow states, “[t]he peoples who were victims of this plunder… have not only been despoiled of irreplaceable masterpieces but also robbed of a memory which would doubtless have helped them to greater self-knowledge and would certainly have enabled others to understand them better” (M’Bow 30). The plea made by M’Bow “became part of a wider
push for cultural renewal and the (re)claiming of cultural memory by formerly colonized peoples” (Vrgoljak 217). The beliefs of M’Bow have paved the way for the nationalist view towards restitution.

The most convincing reasons are founded on the belief that objects can build on a culture’s heritage and its national identity. “The need for cultural identity, for a sense of significance, for reassurance about one’s place in the scheme of things, for a “legible” past, for answers to the great existential questions about our nature and our fate – for all these things, cultural objects provide partial answers” (Merryman, “The Public Interest in Cultural Property” 349). Every nation has objects that it considers part of its cultural property. The term “cultural property” can mean different things to different people. Jeanette Greenfield provides a clear definition in the book, The Return of Cultural Treasures. She quotes the director of Museum Studies at Leicester University, Geoffrey Lewis, as saying:

Cultural property represents in tangible form some of the evidence of man’s origin and development, his traditions, artistic and scientific achievements and generally the milieu of which he is a part. The fact that this material has the ability to communicate, either directly or by association, and aspect of reality which transcends time or space gives it special significance and is therefore something to be sought after and protected (Greenfield 364).

For example, if the Declaration of Independence resided in another country’s museum, the United States would not be pleased about another country displaying the original
Declaration, because it is viewed as one of the building blocks in the creation of this country.

John Henry Merryman, an expert in the field of cultural property and art law, writes about the problems facing restitution in his book, *Thinking about the Elgin Marbles: Critical Essays on Cultural Property, Art and Law*. He describes the conflict as being between source nations and market nations. Source nations, such as Egypt, are typically poor nations, but full of cultural artifacts. Market nations are usually wealthy and want more cultural objects. This is not always the case, but more often than not, that is the scenario.

Merryman writes about the object as a form of a nation’s cultural heritage and its identity. He says, “[a] people deprived of its artifacts is culturally impoverished” (*Thinking about the Elgin Marbles*, 53). Objects have the ability to teach people about their history and who they are. When objects are in their originating countries, the nation can become united in its common shared history. This allows for nations to build on their history. In addition to building on the nation’s history, objects can have other values for the nation that holds them. For example, “[r]elics excite a special emotion, even when they have no religious significance. There is pathos in objects. They evoke nostalgia for the people, events, and cultures that produce them” (Merryman, “The Public Interest in Cultural Property” 348). If objects that are requested back by source nations are returned, there is potential for the nation to grow economically. Tourism will be increased in that country, because people want to see the real object rather than a replica.

Another argument for the nationalist view is the idea that objects are better understood when viewed in their original context. The thought is that if similar objects
surround an artifact, the overall grasp of the importance of the object will be better understood. One reason museums may not want to return an object is the source nation’s inability to care for and protect the object. Today many nations have the means to care for their collections. “Museums in Africa are becoming platforms for expressing living communities’ feelings and expectations; … communities are beginning to regard museums as alternative spaces for cultural activities and community performance” (Abungu 390). Returning objects to a source country that has the resources to protect the object can form international relationships. Museums establishing positive relationships can work together to find solutions to educate the people of both nations.

Restitution cases have a long history of debate. The Elgin Marbles dispute is one that has been going on for nearly two hundred years. Greece requested that the marbles be sent back in 1832, when it achieved independence and began restoring the Acropolis. “The Parthenon marbles have been one of the most celebrated and valuable parts of the symbolic capital of antiquities. They are seen as unique, singular and sacred” (Hamilakis 313). Source nations often argue that the object is part of who they are as a country. Each country has objects that it holds close and wants displayed internally.

The Elgin Marbles dispute between Greece and Britain continued through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In 1983, when Melina Mercouri, Greek Minister of Culture, asked for the Parthenon Marbles to be returned home, this was the first time the Greek government officially made the request. Mercouri said, “[t]his is our history, this is our soul. … [T]hey are the symbol and the blood and the soul of the Greek people” (Merryman, Thinking about the Elgin Marbles 25). Mercouri was one of strongest advocates for the return of the marbles. She made it her goal in life to get all the pieces
of the Parthenon returned. The Greeks view the Acropolis as part of their national identity. With half of the sculptures from the Parthenon sitting in another museum, a part of Greece’s cultural heritage is missing. The Greeks believe this is morally wrong, and that the British Museum has a moral obligation to return the marbles.

The British Museum does not feel that keeping the Marbles in their collection is a national issue. Rather, museum officials think it is the duty of their museum to serve and educate on a global scale. “Their basis lies in ‘cultural property internationalism’: the idea that everyone has an interest in the preservation and enjoyment of cultural property wherever it is situated, from whatever cultural or geographic source it derives” (Merryman 12). Although there are large portions of the British public who are convinced that the sculptures should be returned, the British Museum believes the marbles should stay in London.

The British Museum argues that there are a number of reasons why the actions of Elgin were for the best. First, most agree that the acts of Elgin were done with conservation in mind. At the time, the Turks were destroying the buildings of the Acropolis, and Elgin rescued half of the sculptures. His actions ended up preserving the statues in a proper environment. The British Museum considers the sculptures had an important effect on the European public, reviving interest in ancient Greek culture and influencing contemporary artistic trends (British Museum). The sculptures have, consequently, become a part of Britain’s history, as well.

The final and strongest reason the museum offers is that the Elgin Marbles should be a shared global experience. In the book, *The Parthenon Sculptures*, British Museum curator Ian Jenkins describes why the marbles deserve to remain where they are. In the
preface he states, “in the British Museum, where many cultures are gathered…the sculptures serve as bearers of many meanings for a world audience and participate in the telling of a world history of human civilization” (Jenkins 9). Jenkins’ view is shared with many who feel that the history of Ancient Greece should be seen on a universal stage, rather than all of the marbles being kept only in Athens.

The view of a museum working towards the enlightenment of many cultures is not a new idea; it began during the eighteenth century with the age of enlightenment. Museums were considered to be enlightened institutions, which should contain objects in their collections from around the world. In recent years, this idea of what museums represent has been revamped and unified. Instead of focusing on local history, it now serves international history. This view is part of the idea of internationalism and the universal museum. The universal museum is the view that museums’ collections should contain objects from around the world. Many of the market nations that hold many source nations’ objects argue that a great deal of knowledge can be gained from these objects.

In December 2002, eighteen of the market nation museums signed a document entitled Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums. This declaration was created to address the number of requests for repatriated objects and to stress the importance of the universal museum. These museums believe strongly that “[m]useums serve not just the citizens of one nation but the people of every nation. … To narrow the focus of museums whose collections are diverse and multifaceted would therefore be a disservice to all visitors” (Gerthensblith, Art, Cultural Heritage, and the Law 695). The declaration acknowledges that the destruction and looting of cultural
objects is not encouraged, but objects that were taken decades ago should be handled differently.

A strong advocate of the universal museum is James Cuno, Director of the Art Institute of Chicago. In the preface of his book, *Who Owns Antiquity? Museums and the Battle over our Ancient Heritage*, Cuno describes the goal of a museum “as a repository of things and knowledge, dedicated … to the museum’s role as a force for understanding, tolerance, and the dissipation of ignorance and superstition, where the artifacts of one time and one culture can be seen next to those of other cultures without prejudice” (Cuno, *Who Owns Antiquity* xxxii). By teaching people about other cultures, museums will promote a greater appreciation for other cultures and its people.

In some situations there are a number of reasons why museums may be hesitant to repatriate objects. “The role of museums, therefore ranges from education facilities, platforms for dialogue, space of memory and common identity” (Abungu 389). Another function of museums is to collect and protect objects. If there is a danger that an object will not be taken care of properly, the housing museum may not want to release it back to its source nation. For example, environmental conditions may play a factor, as in the Elgin Marbles dispute. Before Greece built the new Acropolis Museum in 2009, the country did not have the facilities to protect the statues. Athenian’s polluted atmosphere was eating away at the Acropolis’s marble. The British Museum felt the marbles were safer in their museum.

Another reason why some market nations are hesitant to return objects to source nations is that the source museum may be located in a poorer region, and does not have the economic means for protecting the object. There are countries that are politically
unstable, where protests, civil wars, or extreme political uprisings are possible. The museums in these areas are at risk of being damaged or looted. The security of an object is just as important as its educational value. In addition to the objects being at risk, it is likely that tourism will be low, resulting in fewer people appreciating and learning from the object.

The restitution debate between museums poses a challenging question, and there is never a simple resolution. John Henry Merryman claims this to be a debate between source nations and market nations. The source nations believe objects should be located in their originating nation, because this helps establish national identity. Market nations argue that their collections should reach global audiences and educate others. There are, however, people who are trying to resolve the debate by making both views work. On February 5, 2007 UNESCO held a *Forum on Memory and Universality*, where there were a number of specialists discussing the restitution debate. One speaker, Juan Antonio Valdés, professor of archaeology at San Carlos University in Guatemala and former director of Guatemala Cultural Heritage, stated, “I believe that… we would do better to adopt a stance of ‘Let’s share our objects.’ It is a good thing for countries that produced the objects and it is also good that developed countries with major museums have objects” (Valdés 69). However, much as people would like to share, this is unrealistic. There is always something that makes people hesitate, such as the threat of objects getting stolen during transit or the concern that some objects are too fragile to travel. Whatever the reason may be, it is a challenge for people to compromise on the debate. To help resolve the issue there have been a number of laws created both at national and international levels.
Chapter Two:

Legal Advancements in Resolving the Debate
A number of national and international law have been passed throughout the years to help resolve the issues of cultural property. Wars, looting, and plundering are the main reasons these laws were created. O’Keefe identified another reason to develop solutions that “would represent all the interests at stake, except those of thieves and speculative looters, and encourage the co-operation of museums, private collectors, dealers administrators, and local populations” (O’Keefe, Commentary on the UNESCO 1970 Convention 166). This chapter will identify some of the key advancements that have made a difference in the protection of cultural heritage.

One of the first legal advancements made to protect cultural heritage during warfare was during the American Civil War. At the request of President Lincoln, Francis Lieber, law professor at Columbia University, wrote a code of conduct for the Union Army in 1863. “The result was the [Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field (The Lieber Code) which was the] first manual for the conduct of armies during war that explicitly acknowledged the need for a special status for charitable institutions, collections, and works of art” (Gerstenblith, Art, Cultural Heritage, and the Law 528). However, after the war, the conquering nation still had the power to take any objects from the other nation, and the peace treaty would later decide final ownership.

Europe soon took interest in this code of conduct, and other nations began creating their own documents and treaties to protect their cultural property from aggressive nations. Theodor Meron expresses a concern that “[a]ll too often the destruction of cultural property is overshadowed by the other horrors of conflicts. These cultural monuments, however, represent a common and irreplaceable heritage of all
human kind” (Meron 41). In 1899, Czar Nicholas II of Russia held a conference in The Hague, Netherlands. Twenty-four countries attended and produced the 1899 Hague Convention with Respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land. In 1907, forty-one countries signed an updated Hague Convention with Respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land. Regulations included a protection of historic monuments and buildings devoted to the arts, religion, science and hospitals. “The Regulations annexed to the Hague Convention of 1907 provided for the protection of the enemy’s property both in war and during the occupation of the enemy’s territory. In both cases, the general principle is to respect the enemy’s property” (Kowalski 88).

“The Hague conventions 1899 and 1907 went only so far to introduce (Articles 27-28, 46-47, 56) a ban on the destruction and theft of cultural property” (Pomian, 72). As a result there was a desire for another international convention following the First World War. However, nothing happened until 1935 with the Roerich Pact and the Washington Pact for the Protection of Artistic and Scientific Institutions and of Historic Monuments. This was signed by twenty-one countries, but only ratified by eleven. Monuments, which were designated as artistic, scientific, or historical, were to be identified by a universally known flag. The purpose of the flag was to protect these monuments in times of jeopardy.

Also during the 1930’s, the study of illegally taken objects became a focus of interest among the museum community. “The Mouseion, the official journal of the Office International des Musées (OIM) published some 46 articles during this period” (O’Keefe, Commentary on the UNESCO 1970 Convention 156). Each of the articles dealt with the protection of historic sites. At the time of the Second World War, the 1907 Hague
Convention and the Roerich Pact were the only laws protecting countries’ cultural property. As a result, over four hundred museums, monuments, and historic landmarks were damaged and destroyed by the German Army and by the Allies also, and ten of thousands of cultural objects were taken (Gibbon 5). Thus, in 1945, the United Nations’ Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was created. The organization was founded on the belief “that would embody a genuine culture of peace. In their eyes, the new organization must establish the ‘intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind’” (UNESCO, “The Organization's history”).

The first international convention formed by UNESCO in 1954 was the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, which focused specifically on cultural property during armed conflict. The main sections in the Hague Convention of 1954 are: defining cultural property, special protection, protection of transport of cultural property, personnel ensuring protection, distinctive emblem, notion of conflict, and assessing the application. The preamble of the convention reads, “[d]amage to cultural property belonging to any people whatsoever means damage to the cultural heritage of all mankind, since each people makes its contribution to the culture of the world” (Gerstenblith, Art, Cultural Heritage, and the Law 530). This is an important statement because it acknowledges all people.

However, the growth of the illegal trade of cultural objects following the war was not predicted. As a response, UNESCO held the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property in 1970. There are twenty-six articles developed by the convention. Seventy-seven countries voted for the adoption on November 1970. Categories are
numerous for the protection of cultural properties. These include: property relating to history, archaeological excavations, monuments, antiquities more than one hundred years old, paintings, rare manuscripts and archives. Some of the key articles in the Convention are:

Article 2. 1. The States Parties to this Convention recognize that the illicit import, export and transfer of ownership of cultural property is one of the main causes of the impoverishment of the cultural heritage of the countries of origin of such property and that international co-operation constitutes one of the most efficient means of protecting each country's cultural property against all the dangers resulting there from.

Article 2. 2. To this end, the States Parties undertake to oppose such practices with the means at their disposal, and particularly by removing their causes, putting a stop to current practices, and by helping to make the necessary reparations.

Article 7. The States Parties to this Convention undertake: (a) To take the necessary measures, consistent with national legislation, to prevent museums and similar institutions within their territories from acquiring cultural property originating in another State Party which has been illegally exported after entry into force of this Convention, in the States concerned (“Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing”).

Currently 120 countries have signed and/ or ratified the 1970 Convention. The nations ratifying the law in 1970 were mostly source nations. Market nations did not ratify the law until much later. “By being non-parties… [they] abstained from any international

Museums in the United States use this 1970 Convention date as a defining point when dealing with restitution cases. The American Association of Museum Directors “2008 Report of the AAMD Subcommittee on the Acquisition of Archaeological Materials and Ancient Art” states that American Museums:

Recognizes the 1970 UNESCO Convention as providing the most pertinent threshold date for the application of more rigorous standards to the acquisition of archaeological material and ancient art. Widely accepted internationally, the 1970 UNESCO Convention helps create a unified set of expectations for museums, sellers, and donors (Association of Art Museum Directors).

The report is a set of guidelines for how museums should collect artifacts. It is thought that if an object was found outside its country of origin before 1970 or was exported legally after the 1970 date, then the object is considered acceptable to acquire.

To help balance the 1970 Convention, the 1995 Unidroit Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects was created. “Unidroit provides that stolen and illegally exported objects should, in most circumstances, be returned to the original owner” (Gerstenblith, *Art, Cultural Heritage, and the Law* 621). However, the use of the term “in most circumstances” can be broadly or narrowly interpreted. According to the UNESCO website, “[t]he UNIDROIT Convention prevents the traffickers from taking advantage of the variety of the current laws in the various countries, while effectively
reinforcing the statements of principles of the UNESCO Convention” (“What is The Difference”). In the book *Trade in Antiquities: Reducing Destruction and Theft*, Patrick O’Keefe identifies that the “market demand leads to breaches of the law designed to protect the rights of individuals and the public. Failure by collectors to respect these laws and adequately investigate the origin of the antiquities they buy has grave consequences for the survival of the history those antiquities can impart” (*Trade in Antiquities* 13). Therefore stolen or illegally exported cultural objects should be returned to their country of origin.

The creation of the United Nations and programs such as UNESCO are significant developments. They have produced a number of conventions specifically focused on resolving conflicts and protecting cultural heritage. However, in regards to the restitution of antiquities, both The Hague and UNESCO convention are non retroactive, meaning that antiquities taken before 1970 fall out of the scope of agreements. Vrgoljak pointed out that “UNESCO demonstrated a marked preference for bilateral negotiations between State members or their institutions to resolve claims for the restitution of cultural objects removed prior to the operation of the 1970 UNESCO Convention” (215). As a result, restitution of antiquities is difficult to resolve. “The primary reason for this bias was the belief that each claim was unique and could only be dealt with on a case-by-case basis” (Vrgoljak 215). Today “[t]he problems of illicit traffic still exist, perhaps on a larger scale than in 1970. Civil conflict, commodification of antiquities and faster communication in their myriad of forms have all played a part in this” (O’Keefe, *Commentary on the UNESCO 1970* 166). However, the acts made to protect and return
stolen cultural objects have continued to advance, and it is with these incentives the integrity and the protection of cultural objects will continue.
Chapter Three:

The Protection of Egypt’s Antiquities
Numerous examples of restitution cases exist around the world, and each one has different circumstances that make it a challenge to resolve. Most of the cases never reach the general public’s attention. However, this was not the case when Dr. Zahi Hawass took his position as Egypt’s Secretary General of the Supreme Council of Antiquities in 2002. His main focus in this role is to look after and protect Egypt’s antiquities. This chapter will discuss the history of past and current Egyptian laws to preserve Egypt’s cultural heritage. This will also include an introduction to Dr. Zahi Hawass, and his career as an Egyptologist and an archaeologist.

The protection of Egypt’s antiquities did not begin until the middle of the nineteenth century. Before this time numerous artifacts had been removed from their originating context and sent to collections all over the world. The Napoleonic Expedition, from 1798 to 1801, increased Western interest in ancient Egypt. People became fascinated with Egypt and its antiquities. Napoleon arrived in Egypt accompanied by his Scientific and Artistic Commission. “The commission’s work was the most lasting result of one of Napoleon’s most unsuccessful military campaigns” (Fagan, 49). The members of the commission were prepared and provided him with the cultural background and technology to aid the colonization of the Nile Valley. Napoleon was quick to establish the Institut de l’Égypte in Cairo, where the commission members researched and shared ideas. However, this was short lived; Napoleon’s army surrendered to the British forces in 1801. The Treaty of Alexandria allowed the British Army to receive the spoils of war, in essence the rewards gained through military victory, and to take many of Egypt’s cultural artifacts.
To stop the non-permitted trade of Egypt’s antiquities, ruler Mohamed Ali banned unauthorized removal of antiquities from the country and set up a warehouse for the objects in August 1835. “Unfortunately, these antiquities were often given by Egyptian rulers to foreign dignitaries as gifts, and by the mid-1800s, the collection was so small that it could be housed in a single room” (“A Brief History”). In 1858, Said Pasha, the Viceroy of Egypt, established the Antiquities Service to control excavations. This led to the creation of the Cairo Museum with French scholar Auguste Mariette as the first director and curator. The Cairo Museum continued to be directed by British and French scholars for the next century.

In this time period Egypt was occupied by the British and was included within the British Empire. In 1922 the United Kingdom declared Egypt independent due to a growing nationalism movement. However, Britain continued to exert influences in Egypt through the government and other venues. Then in 1952 a revolution occurred that caused the British to finally leave Egypt. Mostafa Amer became the first Egyptian director of the Antiquities Service in 1953. The Antiquities Service was originally part of the Ministry of Education, but in 1960 it became part of the Ministry of Culture. During the nineteen seventies the Antiquities Service was renamed the Egyptian Antiquities Organization.

The role of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization was laid out in the Law on the Protection of Antiquities. It states:

The Antiquities Organization shall be responsible for the preservation of antiquities, museums, storage facilities, archaeological sites and areas and historical buildings and shall provide for their protection by the
Antiquities Police and by its own security guards and watchmen in accordance with appropriate regulations (Law No. 117 of 1983, article 29).

The description was explained in October of 1951, when the Egyptian Ministry of Antiquities developed law number 215, known as The Law on the Protection of Antiquities. The law was revised in 1953 with number 529, in 1965 with law number 24, and again in 1983 with law number 117. The main subjects discussed in the Law on the Protection of Antiquities include the definition of antiquities, system of ownership, extent of protection, fortuitous discoveries and archaeological excavations, sanctions, and authorities responsible for protection (Law No. 117 of 1983).

The Law on the Protection of Antiquities begins by defining an antiquity as “any movable or immovable property that is a product of any of the various civilizations or any of the arts, sciences, literatures and religions of the successive historical periods extending from prehistoric times down to a point one hundred years before the present” (Law No. 117 of 1983, article 1). Regarding ownership, article 6 states that, “[a]ll antiquities with the exception of religious endowments shall be deemed public property, and the ownership, possession and disposition of them shall be subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this law and regulations made thereunder” (Law No. 117 of 1983). However, article 36 claims that the Antiquities Organization can compensate a mission with up to ten percent of the antiquities they discovered.

The law states that a person who discovers an antiquity must notify authorities within forty-eight hours. If this does not happen, they will be punished for an “unauthorized possession of an antiquity” (Law No. 117 of 1983, article 24). The
punishment for the export of antiquities is defined in article 41. It states that the punishment for “[e]very person who unlawfully exports or participates in the exporting of an antiquity from the Republic shall be liable to a prison term at hard labor and a fine of not less than 5,000 and not more than 15,000 pounds” (Law No. 117 of 1983, article 41).

The Egyptian Antiquities Organization changed its name to the Supreme Council of Antiquities (SCA) in 1994, with Mohammed Abdel Halim Nur el-D as its Secretary General. He was replaced in 2002 when Dr. Zahi Hawass assumed the position of Secretary General. “Under his charismatic leadership, this organization has undergone dramatic changes, and continues to develop in its role as the guardian of Egypt’s priceless heritage” (“A Brief History”).

On February 15 2005, Hawass was given an honorary doctorate from The American University in Cairo. During his speech he spoke about his position as the Secretary General:

And now I have the responsibility for all of the antiquities in Egypt. This is a heavy charge, to protect our common past. But it is an important job, and I am honored to do it. The past is not just dry bones and broken pots, or even just magnificent statues. It is what has made us all who we are today, and if we do not understand it, we are doomed to failure in the future. Here in Egypt, we are at a critical point. Our past, which belongs to the entire world, is in danger, threatened by the exploding population, pollution, and especially by ignorance. (Hawass, “Honorary Doctorate”)
Hawass is passionate about his mission, and he is determined to make sure the world knows Egypt has a voice. Hawass has made this position his life, devoting his every action to the protection and conservation of Egypt’s antiquities.

In 2010 Hawass proposed revisions to the Law on the Protection of Antiquities, which had not been updated since 1983. In the beginning of the law he writes, “the progress of countries is measured by their success in keeping hold of their culture and heritage, and I think Egypt is one of the very few countries in the world maintaining her cultural patrimony” (“Law No. 3 of 2010”). The statement is reflected in one of the main changes to the law, which no longer allows people to keep ten percent of their discoveries. Parliament intensified the protection of antiquities by increasing the jail times and penalties for the illegal export under Law No. 3 of 2010.

Hawass has taken many steps to protect Egypt’s heritage. However, problems will always occur. The penalties and fines are high, but this has not stopped people from looting sites across Egypt. In January 2011 the world’s eyes were on Egypt, for the country underwent an eighteen-day revolution. The people of Egypt were fighting for their rights and drove out the thirty-year dictator, President Hosni Mubarak. The main protests during this political uprising occurred in Tahrir Square, Cairo, and this is where the Egyptian Museum is located.

“The initial chaos drove many of the estimated 1,000 foreign archaeologists working in the country to abandon dozens of sites” (Barth 68). “This created an unfortunate window of opportunity at some sites for armed criminals to overpower the unarmed guards and break into antiquities-storage magazines” (Der Manuelian 6). The Egyptian Museum in Cairo was broken into during the revolution and looted. It was
reported that two mummies had their heads ripped off, and a number of artifacts were stolen. Hawass wrote in a personal letter:

   During the Revolution, the museums were fine. The only one that suffered any thefts was the Egyptian Museum in Tahrir Square, Cairo, and even then only 37 objects were taken. The Museum was protected by some of the young people who were demonstrating in the Square – they formed a human chain around it that night (Hawass, 28 April 2011).

Hawass had reported, “that despite a few minor, isolated instances of damage, the museum’s treasures, including many objects from King Tut’s tomb, were safe” (Radford). However, this was not the case. Hawass later admitted the damage was worse than originally thought. Since then, some of the artifacts that were stolen have been found and returned.

The transition after the revolution has been difficult but rewarding for the Egyptian people. For Hawass it has been strenuous, and on March 3, 2011 he resigned from his position as Secretary General. “[T]o encourage the government to do something, to protect the sites” (Marchant 1). Hawass left because of his disapproval of the looting and of how it was being handled and resolved. Hawass said he would come back to the position when “there is stability at the sites and if there are police…to protect the sites. …Since I cannot stop this, I cannot come back” (Hawass, “Why Dr Hawass Resigned”). He is quoted as saying "[f]rankly, I'm the only one who can do good things to save the monuments now…[a]nd after all the officials saying they need me, I couldn't say no" (Barth 68). The Prime Minister, Essam Sharaf reinstated Hawass on March 30, 2011.
Unfortunately, since the revolution, more sites have been looted. For example, “[v]andals seized the opportunity and looted Saqqara, a massive burial ground outside Cairo famous for the Step Pyramid, built around 2630 B.C.” (Barth 68). Hawass is now working with a unique police force to develop stronger protection around Egypt’s cultural heritage sites. “Yet no long-term comprehensive management plan to protect them has yet been agreed upon” (Weeks 5). Hawass says, “there has been a change in practice. There are two courts in Egypt, one for ordinary people and one for the army. The army courts are mostly dealing with the cases of theft at the moment. The decisions of these courts are final and cannot be appealed against” (Hawass, 12 May 2011). However, there have not been any new laws created.

There has been help from abroad to assist in the protection of Egypt’s antiquities. UNESCO visited the sites and museums in Egypt in May 2011. The UNESCO representatives were in Egypt for thirteen days and analyzed the security. “They also came to discuss ways to repatriate any of the objects that went missing during the January Revolution and that may be smuggled out of the country” (Hawass, “Meeting with UNESCO and Interpol”). Also, in May 2011, the International Coalition to Support Protection of Egyptian Antiquities met with the Egyptian Government of Foreign Affairs to discuss ways of protecting its antiquities.

The Coalition consists of representatives from Capitol Archaeological Institute, the Archaeological Institute of America, the American Schools of Oriental Research at Boston University, and the National Geographic Society. “The meetings resulted in the Ministry and the Coalition forming a public-private partnership, and an agreement to develop a framework that commits resources to improve site protection throughout
Egypt” (Archaeological Institute of America). The projected projects discussed will focus on the protection of sites, training to prevent looting, and the development of a better system of cataloguing artifacts.

“The permission of the Egyptian government has been required for all archaeological excavations since 1869. Any artifact which has been duly recorded as Egypt's national property… must be regarded as such for perpetuity unless a clear record exists of its legal sale or transfer to another owner” (“Stolen Treasures”). Hawass continues to fight for Egypt’s cultural heritage. He states, “it is important that we send a message that even though we have had a Revolution, we must still work hard to keep out antiquities sites safe and clean. It is the responsibility of all Egyptians, not only the government” (Hawass, “Another Good Day”). The battle for restitution is one that is very important to Hawass and the following chapters will look into his actions.
Chapter Four:

Hawass’ Actions
Hawass has made tremendous strides in the revival of the public’s awareness of Egypt’s cultural heritage. He has written a number of books and articles concerning archaeology. Hawass has not been afraid to use the media to aid in this effort of awareness about cultural heritage. Hawass’ role in the media has brought restitution to the eyes of the general public. His charismatic personality has both aided and deflected from his cause. Hawass’ persona tends to be overconfident and arrogant, which has resulted in many museum professionals disliking him. He has been accused of being overbearing and has denied archaeologists access to archaeological sites. This chapter will explore Hawass and the way his personality has supported and hindered his relationship with other museum professionals. The chapter will then focus on his attempts to have Egyptian artifacts returned to Egypt.

Hawass began his archaeological journey after receiving his Bachelors of Science degree when he joined the Egyptian Antiquities Organization. This was not his original plan; he initially attended school to become a lawyer, but ended up not enjoying the classes. Hawass felt that this was not the path he was meant to take, and archaeology soon became his life’s passion. “For me archaeology is not just a job. It combines everything that I could want, imagine, intellect, action and adventure” (Hawass, “Homepage). From 1974 through 1979, Hawass served as Inspector of Antiquities for the Giza Pyramids, Imbaba, and Bahariya Oasis. In 1980 he was then promoted to Chief Inspector of Antiquities for the Giza Pyramids. Seven years later he attended the University of Pennsylvania, where he studied as a Fulbright Fellow and earned his Ph.D. in 1987. He served as the General Director of Antiquities for the next ten years.
career change took place in 2002 when he was appointed to the Secretary General of Egypt’s Supreme Council of Antiquities.

Hawass has made a number of discoveries throughout his career. Hawass’ most famous discoveries are the Tombs of the Pyramid Builders at Giza, the Valley of the Golden Mummies at Bahariya Oasis, and two previously unknown Old Kingdom pyramids. His archaeological projects include searching for the tombs of Cleopatra and Mark Antony and the tomb of Ramesses VIII. Currently he is in charge of the Egyptian Mummy Project to study ancient human remains, with a specific focus on King Tutankhamun’s family.

Hawass has made the public fully aware of his discoveries. He has appeared in a number of documentaries on the National Geographic and Discovery channels. The History Channel did a reality show on him and his archaeological work called *Chasing Mummies*. His role in *Chasing Mummies* has provided more international awareness. The reality show documented the archaeological adventures of Hawass’ and a group of interns. In the episode, “Robbed,” Hawass “makes it clear to the world community that every important Egyptian artifact must be returned to Egypt. And so, a missing piece of an offering table is headed back to Karnak Temple in Luxor from New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art” (“Chasing Mummies”). *Chasing Mummies* aired in the United States in July through September 2010, with ten episodes.

He also promotes a men’s clothing line in which his name is used. The clothes are “a line of rugged khakis, denim shirts and carefully worn leather jackets that are meant, according to the catalog copy, to hark ‘back to Egypt’s golden age of discovery in the early 20th century’” (Taylor). Betsy Bryan, archaeologist from John Hopkins
University, feels that Hawass “sees the need for improving modern Egypt’s self-image by means of embracing its antiquities. … It’s an effective tack. It wakens people to the simple message of what the nationalistic competition of the nineteenth century ended up doing” (Waxman 25). Hawass’ clothing line is a way of using Egypt’s past as a tool for promoting Egypt’s cultural heritage and reminding the world that Egypt has a voice.

A number of advancements in terms of protecting and reviving interest in ancient Egyptian heritage have occurred under Hawass’ guidance as Secretary General. His duties cover museums, antiquities, funding, and projects. Other secretariat duties include but are not limited to permits, press, international cooperation, foreign missions, cultural development, and the repatriation of stolen objects. He has established procedures and site management for the conservation and protection of antiquities. Hawass has also done work to update the management of Egyptian museums’ collections.

His work in the museum sector has also been rewarding. “Dr. Hawass has been instrumental in sending exhibitions of the treasures of King Tutankhamun abroad for the first time in decades. One exhibition is touring eight American cities and London, while the second will visit seven cities in the U.S.” (Hawass, “About Zahi Hawass”). Currently, the Egyptian Museum in Cairo houses the largest collection of Egyptian antiquities and sees an average of two and half million visitors per year. Hawass has also started the planning for twenty new museums throughout Egypt. The museums will fall into five categories: regional civilization museums, site museums, specialized museums, Greek and Roman Coptic and Islamic museums and the three great Cairo museums. “Through our cultural development programs we are reaching out to native Egyptians, offering many new ways and opportunities to learn about their past, and providing them with new
hope and new skills for the future. All these activities strengthen the value of our museums as cultural and educational platforms, and help build our nation” (Hawass, “A New Era” 7). He writes that the museums “will have the highest levels of security and displays, and some European and American museums will not compare” (Hawass 28 April 2011).

The two newest are the Grand Egyptian Museum in Giza and the National Museum of Egyptian Civilization in Old Cairo. “The main feature of the new Grand Museum near the Giza pyramids will be the 5,000 artefacts from the tomb of Tutankhamun but its collections will be extensive” (Hawass, “A New Era” 15-16). The goal of the regional civilization museums will be to demonstrate the life and history of everyday Egyptians. “Regional and community museums…pursues a more direct economic benefit for the local community through special commercial programs based on museum activities. Regional and local museums have also integrated new approaches such as oral history and local indigenous guides” (Herreman 423). The site museums will be “built near the entrances to specific archaeological sites to house artefacts that have come from local excavations, with a special focus on recent discoveries” (Hawass, “A New Era” 10). These new museums are part of Hawass’ plans to showcase and secure the artifacts of Egypt.

One challenge for Hawass has been working with other museums. One of his duties in his position as Secretary General is being responsible for retrieving Egypt’s artifacts from around the world. In most cases Hawass has been very successful in retrieving objects that he feels belong in Egypt. Over 5,000 stolen artifacts have been returned to Egypt during his position as Secretary General (Hawass, “Secretary
One example of successful repatriation is the Royal Duck Vessels from Saqqara (fig. 3), which date from the Middle Kingdom, Twelfth Dynasty. Two of the missing four vessels were returned in 2008, and are now housed in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. Another example occurred in 2008 when the Miami International Airport detected, retrieved and returned an illegal shipment of an Egyptian coffin (fig. 4) from Spain. The coffin was the Coffin of Imesy, circa 1070-975 B.C.E.

Hawass has now made public a ‘wish list’ of six objects, which he is requesting to be returned to Egypt. “They should be handed over to us. … I’m not asking for the moon. … We are the best keeper of these objects because they are part of our cultural heritage” (El-Aref, “Antiquities Wish List”). This list contains the Rosetta Stone, now in the British Museum in London; the bust of Nefertiti in the Egyptian Museum in Berlin; the statue of Great Pyramid architect Hemiunu in the Roemer-Pelizaeus Museum in Hilesheim; the Dendera Zodiac in the Louvre in Paris; the bust of Kephren’s pyramid builder Ankh-haf in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston; and the Statue of Ramesses II in the Egyptian Museum in Turin. The items on this list have been his most challenging to retrieve, and the museums that house the objects have no intention of returning them. The two most well known cases are the Rosetta Stone, and the Bust of Nefertiti. Hawass has made many attempts to work with the British Museum and the Berlin Museum; however, none of his requests have been granted.

The Rosetta Stone (fig. 5) is a fine-grained granodiorite stone with a rule of law inscribed on it, issued by King Ptolemy V., 196 B.C.E. There are three scripts engraved on the stone. The upper portion is written in ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs; the middle is Egyptian demotic script; the lower section is ancient Greek. All the texts roughly
describe the same laws. The stone got its name because it was discovered near the town of Rosetta, Egypt, today known as el-Rashid. Pierre François-Xavier Bouchard, a French soldier, found it by accident in 1799. Bouchard recognized that the stone could be important, and he brought it to the Institut de l’Égypte in Cairo.

In 1801 the British defeated the French, who were occupying Egypt at the time, and the stone was part of their spoils of war. The British claimed most of Napoleon’s discoveries as their own. George III gave the Rosetta Stone to the British Museum in 1802, where it has been ever since. Jean François Champollion, curator of the Egyptian wing at the Louvre, was the first to fully decipher the stone. Scholars were able to decipher the text by comparing the ancient Greek to the hieroglyphs. The Rosetta Stone is such a valuable Egyptian artifact because it led the path to a better understanding the ancient language, and ancient Egypt.

The Rosetta Stone was legally removed from the country in 1801. The current Egyptian law states that “every antiquity found on, or in the ground, shall belong to the Public Domain of the State Egypt” (Merryman, “Wither the Elgin Marbles?” 112); however, this law was not enacted until 1912. Neil MacGregor, director of the British Museum, claims the Rosetta Stone was “legally acquired according to the laws and customs of the time” (Waxman, 268), and he sees no reason for the Rosetta Stone to be returned. In the end, the decision about where the Rosetta Stone belongs is a moral and ethical choice.

Hawass first requested that the Rosetta Stone be repatriated in July 2003, but the British Museum denied his request. Hawass said that the Rosetta Stone should be returned, "otherwise I will have to approach them using a different strategy. … I don't
want to fight anyone now, but if the British Museum doesn't act, we will have to employ a more aggressive approach with the Government” (Vallely). In 2005 the British Museum sent a replica of the Rosetta Stone to Cairo, but this did not satisfy Hawass’ requests.

“We have evidence, direct evidence, that proves exactly what was stolen. For all of our history our heritage was stolen from us. …England does not truly value the Rosetta Stone. …They kept it in a dark, badly lit room until I came and requested it. Suddenly it became important to them” (Frenkel). The remarks made by Hawass have not helped in the debate over the restitution of the Rosetta Stone. The British Museum strongly supports the mission of the universal museum. The Rosetta Stone sees an average of five and a half million people annually, which is a far greater number than visitors to the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. Therefore, in the British Museum’s view, the Rosetta Stone will be better served in its current location.

The second well-known restitution case of Hawass is the request for the Nefertiti Bust (fig. 6) from the Egyptian Museum in Berlin. Very little is known about Queen Nefertiti. It is known that her name means ‘the beautiful one has come’ and that Queen Nefertiti was the wife of Pharaoh Akhenaton, also known as Amenhotep or Amenophis IV of the eighth dynasty. The Pharaoh ruled the capital el-Amarna, which is close to Thebes. Records of Queen Nefertiti vanished by the fourteenth year of Pharaoh Akhen rule. It is unclear what happened to the records.

The bust of Nefertiti was discovered in the beginning of the twentieth century when the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft (German Orient Society) was excavating el-Amarna, today known as Tell el-Amarna. The head of the team was Egyptologist
Ludwig Borchardt, and the bust was excavated from the workshop of the ancient Egypt sculptor Thutmose, on December 6, 1912. “As was usual at the time, the finds were divided between Egypt and the foreign holder of the excavation license. In this partition the painted bust of Nefertiti was part of the German Share” (Siehr 115). After the bust was shipped to Germany, it was given to the lead sponsor of the excavation, James Simon. Simon donated the bust to the Egyptian Museum in Berlin in 1920. The bust was shown to the public in 1923.

The bust of Nefertiti became an instant attraction. The bust is made of limestone and has a long neck and a symmetrical face. Her left eye is missing and her ears are chipped. She wears a blue crown with a band that wraps around it. The lower center of the crown is missing the uraeus, which is the cobra on crowns that distinguishes royalty. The Egyptian Government requested the Nefertiti bust be returned to Egypt in 1925, otherwise they would not allow Germany to excavate in Egypt. In 1929 Egypt requested the bust again in exchange for other antiquities, but Germany refused again. In 1933 German diplomats wanted to return the bust to Egypt, but Hitler did not let them. Egypt did not discuss the return of the bust again until the 1950’s, but they were not successful.

The excavation of the bust and its removal to Germany was done in accordance with the Egyptian Laws for the discovery of antiquities. Hawass believes otherwise, and states that “German archaeologist Ludwig Borchardt knowingly falsified documentation of his 1912 discovery of the likeness of Nefertiti, referring to it only as a "plaster bust of a princess" in his diary so that it might evade the notice of Egyptian authorities while he sneaked it out of the country” (“Egypt Seeks to Reclaim Nefertiti”). The German government believes that “[n]othing in the factual record suggests that the Antiquities
Service and the DOG [Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft] engaged in anything less than complete compliance with all applicable Egyptian laws and regulations” (Urice 143). Therefore the Egyptian Museum in Berlin has no intention of returning the bust to Egypt. Hawass made another attempt to retrieve the bust in January 2011, but the German government denied the request, “[c]iting the fact that his letter was unofficial because it was addressed to Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation president Herman Parzinger and not to a head of government” (“Egypt Seeks to Reclaim Nefertiti”). In addition to the legal argument there is the preservation argument, in which the museum claims the bust of Nefertiti is too fragile to travel.

The third item on Hawass’ ‘wish list’ is the statue of Great Pyramid architect Hemiunu (fig. 7), which is now housed in the Roemer-Pelizaeus Museum in Hildesheim, Germany. Hemiunu lived during the 4th Dynasty, ca. 2540 B.C.E., and was the son of prince Nefermaat. German archaeologists at the tomb of Hemiunu discovered the statue in 1912. The Antiquities Service divided the finds between Germany and Egypt. The statue was then sent to the Roemer-Pelizaeus Museum.

The life-size limestone statue is sixty-one inches high by twenty-four inches wide by forty-one inches deep. The statue is a realistic representation of the architect of the pyramids. “The statue originally was painted. The shape of the eyes and nose, badly damaged by ancient robbers, has been restored. The eyes were once inlaid in gold frames with rock crystal and would have shown in a lifelike way” (“Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids”). Hemiunu is seated on a throne and his feet are rested on a block of hieroglyphs. His right hand is clenched while his left hand rests on his knee.
The next object on Hawass’ ‘wish list’ is the Zodiac of Dendera (fig. 8). The Zodiac currently resides in the Louvre. Originally it was part of the ceiling of a chapel in the Temple of Hathor at Dendera. The sandstone relief depicts the night sky, and “[t]he Denderah zodiac is one of only four known representations of the cosmos of ancient Egypt” (Waxman 91). On the Zodiac the “vault of heaven is represented by a disc, held up by four women assisted by falcon-headed spirits. Thirty-six spirits or ‘decans’ around the circumference symbolize the 360 days of the Egyptian year” (“Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids”).

General Desaix de Veygoux discovered the Zodiac during Napoleon’s expedition. In his book, The Rape of the Nile, Brian Fagan writes that Sebastien Louis Saulnier commissioned Jean-Baptiste Lelorrain to remove the Zodiac “from the ceiling of the temple and ship it to France” (155). To remove the Zodiac from the ceiling, Lelorrain blew holes in the roof with gunpowder. The Louvre’s website states that “[t]he Zodiac of Dendera was transported to France in 1821 with the permission of Egyptian ruler Mohamed Ali Pasha” (“Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids”). Saulnier and Lelorrain “sold the Zodiac to King Louis XVIII for 150,000 francs” (Fagan 157). The Zodiac was then given by the Cabinet des Médailles de la Bibliothèque Nationale to the Louvre in January 1907 (“Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids”).

The bust of Ankh-haf (fig. 9) is the fifth artifact on Hawass’ wish list. The bust was discovered by a museum expedition funded jointly by the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston and Harvard University, under the directorship of George A Reisner in 1925. “The bust was found laying in the debris of the exterior mud-brick chapel of the great mastaba” (Dunham 2). The Egyptian antiquities service gave the bust to Reisner and his
expedition team as a reward for the “[e]xpedition’s contemporary discovery and successful clearing of the neighboring intact tomb of Queen Hetep-heres, mother of King Khufu (Cheops), and in restoring her gilded furniture for the Egyptian Museum in Cairo” (Bolshokov 5). The Bust was first exhibited in 1927 at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

The life size sculpture portrait of Ankh-haf is made out of white limestone and covered with a coating of gypsum. The sculpture is painted in a red ochre wash normally used to represent the flesh of men. The bust represents a “mature man with an intelligent gaze, aging features, bags under the eyes, and a receding hairline. The nose and ears are missing, having been hacked off presumably by vandals” (Bolshokov 5). Studies of the Ankh-haf bust suggest that at one time the bust had arms. The bust is not stylized or idealized and depicts a life like version of Ankh-haf. Hawass would like to have the bust returned to Egypt. However, his assistant is quoted as saying, “Ankh-haf was a gift to Boston, I don’t think it is going to fly” (Waxman 23). Boston has denied the request to send Ankh-haf back to Egypt, citing it “could not travel in its current condition” (Waxman 20).

The final piece on Hawass’ wish list is the Statue of King Ramesses II (fig. 10). Ramesses II was from the New Kingdom and reigned during the 19 Dynasty, 1279 – 1213 B.C.E. The statue of Ramesses II depicts him seated and wearing a long robe draped straight, down forming a bell shape above his feet. He is wearing sandals and a large crown and holding a heqa-sceptre. His face is rendered more realistically, depicting a large nose and a small mouth and chin. “The nine bows, representing the enemy foreign tribes, are symbolically incised under the king’s feet and two prisoners, an Asiatic and a Nubian are also depicted on the base, underscoring the king’s absolute supremacy over
Egypt and its possessions” (“King Ramesses II”). Standing beside his feet are small figures. On the right is Queen Nefertiti and on the left is Ramesses II’s son, Amonherkhepeshef.

The Turin Museum identifies the statue of Ramesses II as part of the Drovetti Collection. According to their website, the museum was founded in 1824 with the “acquisition by King Carlo Felice of a large collection. This was assembled by Bernardino Drovetti, of Piedmontese origin, who, following his service with Napoleon Bonaparte went to Egypt to become the French Consul (technically to the Ottoman Sublime Porte)” (“King Ramesses II”).

In 2009, Hawass visited the Egyptian Museum in Turin when he was in Italy for an international book fair. On his website he describes how pleased he was with the renovations the museum had made. He states that the statue of Ramesses II impressed him and that he “had seen some five times before, but never really appreciated. Under the new lighting, I could see how beautiful and important it truly is - I even told the press that it is a unique masterpiece of the kind that I would like to see returned to Egypt” (Hawass, “Turin and Seville”). Since then Hawass has added the statue of Ramesses to his ‘wish list’.

Hawass doesn’t seem to care what the provenance history is when it comes to requesting the ‘wish list’ artifacts be returned to Egypt. “He considers these [six] monuments to be exempt from any international agreements or from protection because of legal purchases; they are integral parts of the Egyptian cultural heritage, he argues, and need to be in Egypt” (Waxman 17, 18). However, the museums that house them feel differently. Retired Head of the Egyptian Department at the Louvre, Christiane Ziegler,
feels that “[t]hese objects are ambassadors. They inspire people to go and see other objects in the country. As for seeing things out of context, she said, “if that’s the case, then we should put everything back in the tombs and leave it in the dark” (Waxman 85).

Hawass has taken the motivation to protect Egypt’s antiquities through his position as Secretary General. “[H]e has worked tirelessly for decades to secure the monuments, implement site-management plans, construct new provincial museums and storage magazines, modernize collections-management systems, improve the standards of Egyptian scholarly publications” (Der Manuelian, 6). Hawass will continue working to protect Egypt’s artifacts, but each of his actions produces a reaction that might prevent the realization of his goals.
Museums and Restitution:

The Actions and Effects of Dr. Zahi Hawass

Chapter Five:

The Effects of Hawass’ Actions
Secretary General Hawass has taken a number of actions to make the world knowledgeable about Egypt’s past. Every action has produced an effect, sometimes positive and sometimes negative. His acts have provided an understanding of Egypt’s history. When Hawass discovered the tombs of the great pyramid builders, it was determined that slave labor did not build the pyramids. Skilled craftsmen and temporary laborers built them. With every discovery, Hawass is helping people understand the past, which results in an understanding of everyone’s heritage. Each action Hawass takes opens people’s eyes across the world and teaches them about the importance of cultural heritage. However, some of his actions have hindered his relationship with market nation museums, which has led to complications in requesting certain artifacts. Throughout this chapter Hawass’ actions will be analyzed and their effects will be discussed.

People in the public eye draw attention to themselves. Every action they make is praised or criticized. Hawass is no exception. For example, Hawass’ name is on a clothing line. Hawass’ ethics were questioned when photographs were taken for the clothing line, because there were Egyptian antiquities in the background. In one image, a model is seated on a replica of King Tutankhamen’s chair (fig. 11). After this event, rumors flourished that Hawass was using real artifacts to help sell his clothing line, but that was never the case. “The photographs were shot in the Tutankhamen exhibition in Times Square, … and while the artifacts in the display cases were real, the throne was a copy, according to Lora Flaugh, a designer and brand strategist whose company Art Zulu created the line” (Taylor).

In the end, by putting his name on a clothing line for men, Hawass is boosting his image. He has clarified that all the proceeds from the clothing line go to a children’s
cancer hospital in Cairo, instead of going towards the preservation of antiquities. His role in the media has caused people to question his values. Putting one’s name on a clothing line is behavior more characteristic of a celebrity than a professional Egyptologist. However, one positive that came from his clothing line is the general awareness of Egypt’s antiquities.

One way Hawass is bringing awareness to the public is through the media. Hawass uses his position of power to get involved with the media and make his views known. “His pursuit of Egyptian objects outside of Egypt has been almost as relentless as his drive to become the face of Egyptian archaeology everywhere” (Joffe 78). In the reality show *Chasing Mummies*, Hawass and a group of interns make discoveries across Egypt. In this role, Hawass serves as a spokesman for the Egyptian people. However, through his show people were also able to see his personality come out. The way he worked with his interns caused his views to become controversial. He didn’t treat his interns as professionals, and often pushed them to their breaking point. Because he acted this way on television, people began to question his authority and position. Some viewers felt the show was faked, and that Hawass was using this as a way to become famous. Hawass’ role in the media ended up affecting the way people view him.

Notwithstanding his negative publicity, Hawass’ position has allowed him to make an impact on the restitution of Egyptian artifacts. His educational background and passion for Egyptian antiquities has caused him to go after objects that have been taken illegally. He has retrieved 5,000 artifacts for Egypt from all over the world. The outcome of his successful returns allows the Egyptian people to discover more about their heritage. In turn there has grown a need to build new museums to house the additional
items. Hawass has set in motion the development of twenty new museums across Egypt. “In this new era of museums, one of our principal goals will be to encourage tourists to visit many of these new museums, which will enormously enhance their experience of Egypt” (Hawass “A New Era for Museums” 21).

The first to open, in 2012, will be the National Museum of Egyptian Civilization. Its collection consists of 150,000 artifacts. The Egyptian online news site Al-Ahram presents the article “The Tale of Two Museums”, which discusses the Egyptian Civilization museum. It states that the museum “will present the full range of the rich and diverse heritage of Egyptian culture throughout the ages. … [T]his will be the very first of its kind and of this scale in the entire Arab world” (El-Aref, “The Tale of Two Museums”. With all these new museums being developed, people with appropriate educational backgrounds will be needed to work in the museums. Currently Hawass is working on creating and developing Master’s and PhD programs in Museum Studies.

Each of these actions is a step that could benefit the Egyptian economy. Currently, Egypt is “the most populous country in the Arab world and the second-most populous on the African continent. Nearly all of the country's 80 million people live in Cairo and Alexandria…These regions are among the world's most densely populated, containing an average of over 3,820 persons per square mile” (“Egypt”). “Despite their concerns, investors still acknowledge that Egypt offers enormous potential. As the region's most populous country, the demand for commodities and sheer scale of its available manpower has the potential to make Egypt a regional economic powerhouse” (Ratcliffe 20). However, this is difficult because “the SCA is perennially underfunded, even though archeological tourism generates considerable income. …But much of this
money goes to the government treasury, and the SCA routinely postpones or ignores conservation, maintenance, documentation, and tourist management because of a lack of funds” (Weeks 5). Therefore many factors make it difficult to analyze the effects of the development of tourism.

The new museums and educational programs will also develop the possibility of a boost in the national economy. “[O]ne in five of Egypt's 80 million people live in poverty. Three-fifths of the unemployed are between the ages of 15 and 24” (Stokes 17). New museums create new jobs, both in the short term and in the long term. In the short term there will be jobs for the construction of the new museums and development of the infrastructure to prepare the buildings. In the long term there will be permanent staff positions, such as directors, curators, registrars, and display and exhibition personnel.

When artifacts are returned to museums, the value of the artifacts increases the overall wealth of the museum. Tourism will increase due to the inclusion of the artifacts within the museums. “To reverse course and return the economy to its pre-protest trajectory requires new business opportunities that will revive investor confidence. Restoration of tourism will be the first priority. Two million Egyptians work in jobs related to the industry, and the IMF had expected tourist receipts to total $14.2 billion this year” (Stokes 17). The rise of tourism could also lead to increased activities for local businesses, such as hotels, restaurants, and other establishments. “Viewed from the perspective of the economic importance of the art market and cultural tourism, works of art and cultural property in general appear to be elements of capital, just like machines, means of transport, buildings, land and commodities, as all these thing generate revenue” (Pomian 76).
There are also a number of social and cultural benefits that museums can bring to an area. Opportunities for educational programs are increased. Hawass has a program to send promising scholars abroad for study. “He has started a children’s program at the Cairo Museum… [and] persuaded the education ministry to require more serious study of ancient Egypt in elementary schools” (Waxman 20). These programs enrich the study of artifacts and Egypt’s cultural heritage. Additional workshops and volunteer activities create opportunities for the local community to interact with one another and museum personnel. Successful construction of these new museums will help the people of Egypt to continue becoming part of the global community.

The successful retrieval of artifacts by Egypt expands knowledge of ancient Egypt. Seeing objects in their original context, visitors to the museums can develop a greater understanding of ancient Egyptian culture. There are also a number of other benefits to the retrieval of artifacts. National pride is heightened with the development of new schools, museums, and the restitution of cultural objects. Museums can “play an important role in developing a sense of identity and community cohesion for the area in which they are located” (Ambrose 9). It is important to a culture that the people know their history, and this can help develop a sense of place and pride.

The situation for the market nation museums would be much different if Hawass were successful in retrieving the objects on his “wish list”. Many market nation museums believe in the concept of universal museums. These museums provide many benefits to their visitors, such as the connections that can be made by comparing objects from different cultures. This can then lead to an understanding of different peoples. If
museums lose their artifacts, that would reduce the value of the universal museum concept.

The loss of such blockbuster items such as the Rosetta Stone or the bust of Nefertiti could result in the loss of visitors. The objects would also not be viewed by as many people. The ‘wish list’ items reach a greater audience in their current locations than they would if they were in Egypt. Tourist travel to Egypt is currently not even encouraged, due to the political unrest. There is also the concern for the safety of the object; for example, according to the Egyptian Museum in Berlin the Nefertiti bust is too fragile to travel.

Another concern about the return of these objects to Egypt is the current political situation. Hawass believes:

If what happened in Cairo – that the police abandoned the streets for 4 hours on January 28, 2011 – had happened in any other city in the world, then there would be chaos, thefts and destruction on an even greater scale. I therefore am still insisting that artifacts stolen from Egypt should be returned…even if they do not have the ideal facilities for them (Hawass, 12 May 2011).

This view that even if museums do not have “ideal facilities,” artifacts should still be returned, is not a correct way of dealing with the situation. If these items were to be sent back, their security would be jeopardized and it would put the artifacts in danger.

The political situation in Egypt is not the only disconcerting effect. “The Egyptian economy, however, relies heavily on tourism, oil and gas exports, and Suez Canal revenues” (“Egypt”). “Tourism annually contributes $15 billion to Egypt’s gross
domestic product of some $216 billion” (Joffe 75). After the revolution, tourism suffered greatly, and “[s]o far, the short-term economic impact has been severe. Egypt's central bank anticipates the country's current account deficit in the first quarter of 2011 to double to $3bn, from $1.4bn in the second half of 2010. The bank has attributed the losses to a fall in tourism revenues, remittances from workers abroad and foreign investment” (Ratcliffe 21).

“Tourism is a major pillar of the Egyptian economy, and given the income that archeological sites generate, one might think their protection would be a primary goal. After all: no sites, no money” (Weeks 5). The type of care and protection of the artifacts is a concern. Currently the museums in Egypt are not comparable to market nations’ museums. In the Egyptian museums “[t]hey do not have an easily accessible record of each artefact that describes the movement of each item … and the condition of each item” (Hawass, “A New Era for Museums in Egypt” 9). Hawass’ assistant, Janice Kamrin, says, “Egypt tends to be a couple of decades behind in various things. Collections management is a new concept. The staff is badly trained and incredibly underpaid” (Waxman 24). Thus, the return of these objects removes them from where they have been receiving fine care, which is not in the best interest of the artifacts.

Allowing market nation museums to keep the artifacts ensures for better care and security for the objects. However, if these museums do not return the ‘wish list’ artifacts, Hawass may take extreme actions against them. Egypt has suspended archaeological digs in the past when museums did not cooperate with him. For example, Hawass demanded that “the Louvre return five fresco fragments it purchased in 2000 and 2003 from a gallery and at auction. They belonged to a 3,200-year-old tomb near Luxor and
had been in storage at the museum” (Kimmelamn). The Louvre was hesitant, and Hawass suspended “long-term excavation at Saqqara, near Cairo, and said it would stop collaborating on Louvre exhibitions” (Kimmelamn). Cutting ties between countries could result in long-term negative attitudes and conflicts between the countries.

For Egypt, the effects of cutting ties between countries and museums could threaten Egypt’s economy. Egypt “depends on the millions of dollars sent by foreign governments and related museums and the billions from foreign tourists” (Waxman 21). Museums and governments pay for excavations, but if Egypt suspends museums from excavations they will lose money. Hawass doesn’t see this as a potential threat. He says, “[i]t’s not good for us, not at all. Conservation is what’s good, site management. Excavation doesn’t help me. What helps me is to preserve what we have. I don’t need their discoveries. It’s better off in the ground” (Waxman 19). Should this happen and museums stop doing excavations, they will not put money into supporting Hawass’ archaeological efforts.

Determination to restore Egypt’s cultural artifacts has caused Hawass to expand his efforts to a global level. On April 7 and 8, 2010 Hawass held a conference on International Cooperation for the Protection of Cultural Heritage. Thirty countries were invited to the conference and twenty-five countries attended. “The two-day conference [was] attended by antiquities officials, deputy culture ministers and museum directors from…countries that have seen some of their national heritage stolen over the centuries” (“Cairo Meeting”). Hawass stated, “I was very glad that so many countries were able to participate; this shows how many countries have been affected by the problem of illegal excavation and trafficking of antiquities” (Hawass, “Conference on Stolen Antiquities”).
“A number of countries, including Egypt, made presentations on their problems and their successes; the conference attendees discussed both the difficulties they face and the solutions they would like to see implemented” (“Recovering Stolen Treasures”). The conference also focused on creating lists of artifacts that should be returned to its place of origin. “Representatives are also considering calling on the United Nations cultural body, UNESCO, to amend a convention banning export and ownership of antiquities stolen after 1970 - so that they can pursue items that were snatched earlier” (“Egypt Calls for Antiquities Unity”). The main goal of this conference was to get other source nations to fight together in the mission of restitution. “We need to co-operate… We need unification between our countries. Every country is fighting alone; every country suffered alone” (“Teamwork Needed to Recover Looted Antiquities”). In the past, museums and nations were fighting for their right by themselves, but now Hawass has brought them together.

Hawass wrote, “[t]he Conference…was a great success last year and … I think the second conference will be important too because it will provide a forum for new ideas for the future and increased cooperation between the delegate countries” (Hawass, 28 April 2011). Thanks to the conferences countries are working together on new ideas and creating new goals. The countries’ relationships to one another have been heightened. This could also lead to stronger regulations in the antiquities trade. As a result, this could decrease the black market.

This chapter has highlighted some of the effects of Hawass’ actions. It cannot be denied that Hawass has brought world attention to Egypt. His discoveries have increased world knowledge about Egypt. Hawass is very aware of how to use the media to promote himself and his desire to obtain, secure and display Egyptian antiquities. His methods are
not always professional. His role in *Chasing Mummies* does not show a scholar teaching other professionals in a nurturing way. He is often abrupt and non-caring. His actions and attitudes are not the way to obtain future donations or encourage new scholars.

Controversy aside, Hawass has been able to retrieve artifacts from all over the world, which has created a need for new museums. These museums will help boost the Egyptian economy. New jobs will be created, infrastructures will be enhanced, and museums built. Permanent professional staff positions will be created, as well as maintenance and security positions. “The new challenge is to balance the desired development that tourism brings and the protection of local heritage; to contribute to attract foreign visitors and simultaneously make them aware of the value of preserving local heritage” (Herreman 423). Many Egyptians and tourists will become much more aware of the ancient Egyptian world.

Hawass does not want to stop at building new museums. He wants the return of major artifacts on his ‘wish list’. These objects have been on display in major museums for years. Once again, Hawass is not tactful in his attempts to have these objects returned. He threatens to cut ties with these countries only to jeopardize future relations with them. The following chapter will conclude with a discussion of possible choices for museums in restitution battles, and a review of alternative solutions to future disputes between museums.
Chapter Six:

Dispute Resolution
“Life may be short, but art is long. The object that endures is humanity’s mark on eternity. We cherish cultural objects as intimations of immortality, of the defeat of time” (Merryman, “The Public Interest in Cultural Property” 348). When the importance of an object is brought to light, it explains why nations continue to fight over the ownership of antiquities. Throughout the past chapters, the views of restitution and the legal advancements created to aid in these situations have been discussed. This was followed by a look into Egypt’s battle for the return of its cultural heritage, specifically looking into the role of Hawass, Egypt’s Secretary General of Antiquities.

Hawass has played an important role in the restitution of stolen antiquities. He has brought the debate before the eyes of the public, and has been very successful in recovering stolen artifacts from Egypt. However, Hawass has a ‘wish list’ of some very important artifacts he would like to see returned to Egypt. The museums that house these specific objects have no intention of returning them. However, if Hawass were successful in retrieving the ‘wish list’ artifacts this would produce a ripple effect. Other countries with ‘wish list’ artifacts would request their artifacts be returned as well. As a result, this would lead to the downfall of the universal museum concept. This chapter will discuss methods of resolving restitution cases, where Hawass’ ‘wish list’ objects should be housed, and how future disputes might be handled.

Krzysztof Pomian questions the interest of restitution in the article, “Cultural Property, National Treasures, Restitution”. “[I]s it an effort to eradicate the unfortunate legacy of European supremacy, colonization and discrimination…? Or, does it also reflect a change in the social status and economic role of such cultural property…?” (Pomian 72). The question that needs to be solved is how to determine the correct way to
handle restitution cases of cultural objects. It would seem that the correct way to answer that question is simply to ask, to whom does the object belong? However, the answer to this question does not come easily. Do you look at the legal right, the moral right, or where the best care can be provided for the object?

First, it is necessary to determine the type of restitution claim being made. Marie Cornu and Marc-André Renold discuss the nature of unclaimed cultural property in the article, “New Developments in the Restitution of Cultural Property: Alternative Means of Dispute Resolution”. Cornu and Renold break the types of restitution cases into two main categories: the issue of unlawfulness and the ownership connection (14). The claim of unlawfulness focuses on theft and illegal exporting, whereas the claim of ownership deals with a country requesting an object back because the object in question is said to originate from that country.

The legal advancements that have been created have been helpful in protecting cultural heritage. Be that as it may, “[l]egislation alone does not halt the pillage of sites, but it can provide legal safeguards and remedies for nations suffering from the loss of cultural heritage to illicit antiquities market” (Luke 194). In her book, The Return of Cultural Treasures, Jeanette Greenfield discusses the effectiveness of the 1970 UNESCO Convention. She states that the “1970 UNESCO Convention is the only international convention which makes any direct provision for return of certain cultural property” (Greenfield, 369) and that there are a number of criticisms to be made about the effects of the convention. Such as:

It is dependent on each state’s own definition of what constitutes as cultural property, and upon each states taking its own legislative measures.
The convention directly covers only property stolen from museums, public monuments or similar institution. The scope of protection for cultural property of importance is unclear and much of the convention uses ambiguous language (Greenfield, 369).

Greenfield also points out that the 1970 Convention is not retroactive, meaning that the law only applies to cases that follow the ratification date. In addition, both nations must have signed the convention, and this convention has not been universally ratified.

Therefore, when museums are dealing with claims of restitution there are a number of options for resolution. First, when an artifact is requested for repatriation, the museum that houses the artifact can simply return the object. However, museums are usually not keen on doing this. Thus, museums resolve to use alternative methods for handling these debates. In some circumstances the return of an object may be subject to conditional terms of an agreement. In some cases the museum might request something in return for repatriating the object. This could include other valuable artifacts or licenses for excavation digs in the country of origin.

Short or long-term loans of artifacts can be another possible solution. The museum that is requesting an object may agree to the artifacts being loaned to them. This could be from a number of months to a number of years. “Long-term loans are a common option in this field. When no simple or conditional restitution is envisaged, the parties quite often agree to the loan of assets whose restitution was requested” (Cornu and Renold 20). There are also permanent loans, but most museums are not in favor of this choice. Permanent loans resemble donations, where the ownership of an item remains with its current museum, but the physical object is located in the museum that it is loaned
to. There is also the option for museums to create a joint ownership of the artifact. This would also produce agreements similar to long-term loans.

A replica of the artifact may be created by the museums that house the original object and given to the requesting museum. This option is used very rarely, because it does not specifically resolve the debate. Also, museums and visitors alike want the real object. “A copy distorts the harmony of our natural perception of the original” (Goushchin 76). Looking at a replica is never as impressive as studying the real artifact.

Museums that are requesting artifacts for restitution may also drop the request in exchange for financial compensation. “This situation is fairly common, particularly when the claimant realizes that the case is a difficult one and is more interested in financial compensation than in the work itself” (Cornu and Renold 22). This, however, is not an option for Hawass when it comes to repatriation of Egypt’s cultural heritage.

It is my conclusion that cultural heritage objects that were illegally taken out of Egypt, either through theft or illegal export, should be returned without question. However, in regard to Hawass’ ‘wish list’, those six artifacts should not be returned to Egypt. The objects on the list are: the Rosetta Stone, the bust of Nefertiti, the statue of Hemiuunu, the Dendara Zodiac, the bust of Ankhaf, and the Statue of Ramesses II. Each of these items was legally acquired following the laws of the time. Hawass may argue that these objects were taken during times of colonization, and that Egypt was not willingly giving away its artifacts. Regardless, none of the current laws relating to restitution specifically cover what should be done with artifacts that were taken during colonial occupation. Therefore, it is appropriate to follow the laws of the time when the object was acquired.
For example German archeologists at the tomb of Hemiune discovered the statue of Hemiune in 1912. At the time, the finds of excavation digs were divided between Egypt and the excavation team. Thus, when the tomb of Hemiune was discovered, the antiquities authority divided the finds between German Museum and Cairo Museum. As a result, the German Museum’s acquisition of the statue was completed legitimately. The current law states that all discoveries are property of Egypt. The find of the statue of Hemiune belongs to Germany since this law was not established until 1983.

Hawass has also requested objects back that were given as gifts, such as the obelisk of Thutmose III, known as “Cleopatra’s Needle” (fig. 12), in Central Park, New York. The obelisk is part of a pair that was originally located along the Nile in 1500 B.C.E. In 18 A.D. the obelisks were moved to Alexandria. “They remained there until one obelisk was moved to London in 1879. The New York obelisk was erected in the Park two years later and was offered by the Egyptian Khedive to America in exchange for funds to modernize his country” (Obelisk). Hawass wrote the New York Conservatory commending them for taking care of the obelisk, but he felt they were no longer doing a sufficient job. “If the Central Park Conservancy and the City of New York cannot properly care for this obelisk, I will take the necessary steps to bring this precious artifact home and save it from ruin” (Hawass “Obelisk in Central Park”). Hawass is justified in wanting the obelisk to be cared for properly, but he is not justified in asking for the return of artifacts that were given as gifts. Since the obelisk is located in Central Park and is subject to New York weather, the Conservatory should consider taking steps to relocate the obelisk to a museum.

It is important to realize the need for the universal museum when discussing
where the ‘wish list’ objects belong. “They are repositories of things and knowledge, dedicated to the dissemination of learning and to serving as a force for understanding, tolerance, and the dissipation of ignorance and superstition about the world” (Cuno Who Owns Antiquity, 122). Placing artifacts from different cultures next to one another allows for education and reduces prejudices. “The social functions of objects testify to our common humanity. They illustrate one’s connections with others, express a shared human sensibility and purpose, communication across time and distance, dispel the feeling that one is lost and alone” (Merryman, “The Public Interest in Cultural Property” 349). The principles of the universal museum are vital for future generations.

Hawass’ main argument is that the objects belong in Egypt because they represent Egypt’s cultural identity. “The need for cultural identity, for a sense of significance, for reassurance about one’s place in the scheme of things, for a ‘legible’ past, for answers to the great existential questions about our nature and our fate – for all these things, cultural objects provide partial answers” (Merryman, “The Public Interest in Cultural Property” 349). However, the ‘wish list’ objects are not needed in Egypt to achieve these goals. Hawass wants the Rosetta Stone back because it represents Egypt. In a sense Hawass is comparing the role of the Rosetta Stone in Egypt’s history to the role of the Declaration of Independence in the United States history.

The Declaration of Independence is viewed by the United States as an icon of the country. There is a major difference, though between the Rosetta Stone’s role in representing Egypt and the Declaration of Independence role in representing the United States. The Declaration of Independence helped the formation of our country. It helped establish guidelines that led to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, which are
documents we live by every day. The significance of the Rosetta Stone was not
recognized until after years of study. The stone represents ancient Egypt and has nothing
to do with modern-day Egypt. Therefore, Hawass’ argument that the Rosetta Stone
represents Egypt’s identity is incorrect; the stone represents the identity of ancient Egypt.

The International Community of Museums (ICOM) describes the role of a
museum in the following way:

Museums have the duty to acquire, preserve and promote their collections
as a contribution to safeguarding the natural, cultural and scientific
heritage. Their collections are a significant public inheritance, have a
special position in law and are protected by international legislation.
Inherent in this public trust is the notion of stewardship that includes
rightful ownership, permanence, documentation, accessibility and
responsible disposal (ICOM 3).

Essentially, the main functions of a museum are to preserve and to educate. “The study
of cultural objects requires that they be accessible to scholars; their environment requires
that they be accessible to the relevant public” (Merryman, “The Public Interest in
Cultural Property” 360). “Visibility and accessibility are therefore interests to take into
account in deciding whether art stays at home or moves abroad” (Bator 299). In the case
of Egypt, the objects are more accessible abroad. Kwame Appiah, Professor of
Philosophy at Princeton University, feels that “[w]hat matters is not ownership; it’s
access—that as many people in the world get access to the richest aesthetic experience
possible” (“Is It All Loot?”). As far as preservation, the objects are currently in a
position of safekeeping. If they were to be returned to Egypt their security might be
threatened.

Before market nation museums consider returning artifacts to Egypt, it is necessary for Egyptian museums to update their everyday procedures. Egypt’s museums need to develop management plans that support both short and long-term goals. First, there needs to be greater security in museums, monuments, and archeological cites. The SCA “employs 58,000 people; about two thirds are local security guards, poorly paid, untrained, and unarmed” (Weeks 5). Therefore, taking steps to enhance protections and security could go a long way to prevent looters.

In the article, “Can Egypt Protect Its Ancient Monuments?” Kent Weeks says that the next important step is to “[t]rain on-site inspectors and give them greater responsibility. Design better security for sites and museums. Allocate more money for site conservation and documentation. Take a strong stand against commercial and political interests that threaten the monuments” (Weeks 5). Each of these actions would go a long way in aiding in the goals of Hawass.

One of the most important elements that would help the debates among museums regarding restitution would be cooperation between the countries and museums. For example, “The Metropolitan Museum of Art purchased the Euphronios krater (fig. 13) in 1972 for $1 million. It also purchased a 15-piece collection of Hellenistic silver in two lots, in 1981 and 1982, for $2.75 million, from Robert E. Hecht” (“Italy Claim Against Metropolitan Museum”). After the museum purchased the krater, the Italian authorities began looking into the provenance history of the objects, and in 2004 Italy requested the objects be returned. “In 2006, the Met and Italy reached an amicable agreement, whereby the Met would return the 20 pieces to Italy in exchange for long-term loans of
antiquities “of equivalent beauty and importance” (“Italy Claim Against Metropolitan Museum”). By working towards an understanding, both parties were able to create a solution that benefited both.

The development of strong regulations will aid in the resolution of debates over the restitution of cultural heritage. In the article, “The Restitution of Heritage,” Peter Gathercole suggests that “[o]ne step would be to hasten endorsements by those states not yet signatories of the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the illicit transfer of cultural property” (Gathercole 2). Currently, for the 1970 UNESCO Convention to be able to participate in restitution debates, both countries must have signed the Convention. Gathercole also suggests that another solution, “would be for all museums to be seen to boycott dealings with those market makers in the art trade, including collectors, who deal in any way in stolen or suspect objects” (Gathercole 2). When museums stop collecting antiquities that have been stolen, the market for stolen antiquities will decline.

Another way to help resolve restitution debates among museums would be to develop standard international practices among museums. In the essay, “How Much Provenance Is Enough? Post-Schultz Guidelines for Art Museum Acquisition of Archeological Materials and Ancient Art,” Ildiko DeAngelis states, “[t]he nature of the museums doing the collecting will determine the quantity and type of information considered essential about the history of archeological materials and objects of antiquities being considered for acquisition” (DeAngelis 398). At present, museums are in charge of developing their own collection policies.

Also, the provenance history that is required may change depending on the type of museum. “Art-connoisseurship-based museums place primary importance on an object’s
aesthetic value and, consequently, collecting practices will not preclude acquiring an
object of aesthetic merit merely because the work may lack information about its “find
spot” or what archeologists call ‘provenience”’ (DeAngelis 398). Standard guidelines
need to be developed that would identify the required provenance history about artifacts
before they become part of a museum’s collection.

ICOM has guidelines available on which museums can base their policies. The
ICOM guidelines for acquiring collections states that “[t]he governing body for each
museum should adopt and publish a written collections policy that addresses the
acquisition, care and use of collections. The policy should clarify the position of any
material that will not be catalogued, conserved, or exhibited” (ICOM). It also says that
need objects acquired by loan, gift, or purchase must have a valid title. This is also
expressed in the guidelines for provenance and due diligence:

Every effort must be made before acquisition to ensure that any object or
specimen offered for purchase, gift, loan, bequest, or exchange has not
been illegally obtained in, or exported from its country of origin or any
intermediate country in which it might have been owned legally (including
the museum’s own country). Due diligence in this regard should establish
the full history of the item since discovery or production (ICOM).

I believe it would be in the best interest of museums worldwide to take these guidelines
and make them standard requirements among all museums. “Such steps would help to
build confidence within the international museum community that all its members are
committed to an even-handed internationalism” (Gathercole 2). With museums all on the
same page when it comes to acquisitions, future acquiring of antiquities would allow for
fever disputes between museums.

There are many benefits to stronger regulations and the cooperation between museums. “One area that museums can and, in some cases, have already started to exploit is the creation of partnerships and networks with other museums within and beyond the continent” (Abungu 391). Thus the most critical benefit is the development of trust between museums. When museums have a sense of trust, artifacts will be more readily loaned. Opportunities for educational programs will be developed for the training of museum professionals at all levels. Common problems can be solved through international groups instead of each museum trying to find solutions individually. Standard international practices could be developed to resolve restitution debates. Nations working together will adopt stricter regulations regarding looting and black market sales.

There has been significant legal advancement in dealing with cases of restitution. The previous chapters have shown the problems that exist in resolving the debate over ancient Egyptian antiquities. Restitution cases usually fall into two categories, unlawfulness or national ownership. The 1970 UNESCO Convention has set guidelines for the protection of cultural heritage lost to illicit antiquities markets. When dealing with claims of restitution, museums have many options. They can return the object, ask for something in return, or send the object as a loan. Joint ownership of the artifact is another alternative. A replica of the artifact may be sent to the requesting nation. Finally, the museum requesting the artifact may settle for financial compensation.

Hawass’ six ‘wish list’ items should not be returned to Egypt. There is not an existing law that covers what should be done with artifacts taken during colonial rule.
Hawass’ desire to have these items returned to Egypt has generated much publicity for Egypt. He is a man of many gifts, and his desire to preserve Egypt’s antiquities is a noble one. His ideas frequently run ahead of current situations. He wants to build twenty Egyptian museums, yet does not have the funds to complete the first two. He wishes for donations from abroad, yet jeopardizes these donations by refusing to allow countries to excavate in Egypt when they do not cooperate with him. He lacks trained professionals to run museums and provide security for these museums. The current economy does not allow for a sustainable wage for museum personnel. “[T]he low salary and near-universal reluctance of their superiors to delegate authority leads to frustration. A large number leave to become tourist guides. Instead of taking 300 Egyptian pounds a month from the SCA (about $50), they can earn six or seven times that amount as guides” (Weeks 5). Therefore, until the professional positions in museums can be filled with trained employees, it is not best for blockbuster items to return.

When museums work together by sharing artifacts, knowledge, and financial resources; repatriating objects; or adopting regulations; they are practicing the principles of a universal museum. The universal museum is “[d]edicated to serving as a force for understanding about the world in which we live, its ancient past and living present. This cannot be achieved by segregating antiquities as cultural property… This can only be achieved be sharing the world’s common cultural legacy” (Cuno, “Art Museums, Archaeology, and Antiquities” 22). Thus the concept of the Universal museum is one that will lead to fewer prejudices and greater awareness of other cultures. Hawass states that “[i]n Egypt we have a special mission because our past does not belong to us alone, but belongs to the world as a whole. It is our shared history, our shared heritage”
(Hawass, “A New Era for Museums in Egypt” 8). Therefore, the objects of Egypt need to be spread globally, and this challenge is resolved using the concept of the universal museum.
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Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums 2002

10 December 2002

The international museum community shares the conviction that illegal traffic in archaeological, artistic, and ethnic objects must be firmly discouraged. We should, however, recognize that objects acquired in earlier times must be viewed in the light of different sensitivities and values, reflective of that earlier era. The objects and monumental works that were installed decades and even centuries ago in museums throughout Europe and America were acquired under conditions that are not comparable with current ones.

Over time, objects so acquired—whether by purchase, gift, or partage—have become part of the museums that have cared for them, and by extension part of the heritage of the nations which house them. Today we are especially sensitive to the subject of a work’s original context, but we should not lose sight of the fact that museums too provide a valid and valuable context for objects that were long ago displaced from their original source. The universal admiration for ancient civilizations would not be so deeply established today were it not for the influence exercised by the artifacts of these cultures, widely available to an international public in major museums. Indeed, the sculpture of classical Greece, to take but one example, is an excellent illustration of this point and of the importance of public collecting. The centuries-long history of appreciation of Greek art began in antiquity, was renewed in Renaissance Italy, and subsequently spread...
through the rest of Europe and to the Americas. Its accession into the collections of public museums throughout the world marked the significance of Greek sculpture for mankind as a whole and its enduring value for the contemporary world. Moreover, the distinctly Greek aesthetic of these works appears all the more strongly as the result of their being seen and studied in direct proximity to products of other great civilizations.

Calls to repatriate objects that have belonged to museum collections for many years have become an important issue for museums. Although each case has to be judged individually, we should acknowledge that museums serve not just the citizens of one nation but the people of every nation. Museums are agents in the development of culture, whose mission is to foster knowledge by a continuous process of reinterpretation. Each object contributes to that process. To narrow the focus of museums whose collections are diverse and multifaceted would therefore be a disservice to all visitors.

Signed by the Directors of:

The Art Institute of Chicago
Bavarian State Museum, Munich
(Alte Pinakothek, Neue Pinakothek)
State Museums, Berlin
Cleveland Museum of Art
J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles
Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York
Los Angeles County Museum of Art
Louvre Museum, Paris
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
The Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
The Museum of Modern Art, New York
Opificio delle Pietre Dure, Florence
Philadelphia Museum of Art
Prado Museum, Madrid
Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg
Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum, Madrid
Whitney Museum of American Art, New York
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Date of deposit of instrument</th>
<th>Type of instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ecuador</td>
<td>24/03/1971</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bulgaria</td>
<td>15/09/1971</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nigeria</td>
<td>24/01/1972</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Central African Republic</td>
<td>01/02/1972</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cameroon</td>
<td>24/05/1972</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kuwait</td>
<td>22/06/1972</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cambodia</td>
<td>26/09/1972</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mexico</td>
<td>04/10/1972</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Niger</td>
<td>16/10/1972</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Libyan Arab Jamahiriya</td>
<td>09/01/1973</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Argentina</td>
<td>11/01/1973</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Iraq</td>
<td>12/02/1973</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Brazil</td>
<td>16/02/1973</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Dominican Republic</td>
<td>07/03/1973</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Egypt</td>
<td>05/04/1973</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Panama</td>
<td>13/08/1973</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Poland</td>
<td>31/01/1974</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jordan</td>
<td>15/03/1974</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Algeria</td>
<td>24/06/1974</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>23/09/1974</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
<td>27/01/1975</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>21/02/1975</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Tunisia</td>
<td>10/03/1975</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Nepal</td>
<td>23/06/1976</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>08/09/1976</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Bolivia (Plurinational State of)</td>
<td>04/10/1976</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 India</td>
<td>24/01/1977</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Nicaragua</td>
<td>19/04/1977</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Qatar</td>
<td>20/04/1977</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Mauritania</td>
<td>27/04/1977</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>02/08/1977</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Uruguay</td>
<td>09/08/1977</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 El Salvador</td>
<td>20/02/1978</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Mauritius</td>
<td>27/02/1978</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Canada</td>
<td>28/03/1978</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Oman</td>
<td>02/06/1978</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Italy</td>
<td>02/10/1978</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Hungary</td>
<td>23/10/1978</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Guinea</td>
<td>18/03/1979</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Honduras</td>
<td>19/03/1979</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Cyprus</td>
<td>19/10/1979</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Peru</td>
<td>24/10/1979</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Cuba</td>
<td>30/01/1980</td>
<td>Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Sri Lanka</td>
<td>07/04/1981</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>21/04/1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>30/04/1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>05/06/1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>14/02/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Democratic People's Republic of Korea</td>
<td>13/05/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>02/09/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>09/12/1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>14/01/1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>21/06/1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>09/12/1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>10/01/1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>06/04/1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>07/04/1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>09/12/1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>28/04/1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>28/04/1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>28/04/1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>24/05/1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>21/06/1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>30/10/1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>28/11/1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>26/01/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>30/10/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>23/05/1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>07/11/1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>06/07/1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>25/08/1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>28/08/1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>10/09/1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>04/11/1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>05/11/1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>26/03/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>31/03/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>12/07/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>05/09/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>06/12/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>03/07/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>27/10/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>06/03/1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>15/03/1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>07/01/1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</td>
<td>30/04/1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>09/10/1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>27/07/1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>14/06/1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>25/08/1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>11/09/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>25/09/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>10/04/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>13/06/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</td>
<td>01/08/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>09/09/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>26/09/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>13/01/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>03/02/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>26/03/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>29/08/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>03/10/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>18/12/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>28/05/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>09/11/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>09/11/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)</td>
<td>21/03/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>08/09/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>20/09/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>30/05/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>01/02/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>16/02/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>26/04/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>14/09/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>30/11/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>17/06/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>31/03/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>17/07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>08/02/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>17/06/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1This Convention entered into force on 24 April 1972. It subsequently entered into force for each State three months after the date of deposit of that State's instrument, except in cases of notifications of succession, where the entry into force occurred on the date on which the State assumed responsibility for conducting its international relations.
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Hi Dr. Hawass.

I am currently writing my Masters Thesis on the Restitution of Egypt's cultural objects. Through my studies I have found your involvement as Secretary General has truly aided in the efforts of retrieving your cultural heritage.

You have had challenges retrieving some objects from museums, such as the Rosetta Stone, and the Dendera Zodiac, and I imagine that the current political uprising will make it more challenging. With the current situation, ie looting in Egyptian museums, do you still feel these objects should be returned? Even though the objects security is threatened?

A year ago you held a conference on International Cooperation for the Protection of Cultural Heritage. The conferences goal was to unite countries to fight together, since then has there been any progression?

Also, are you against the idea of a universal museum? Do you feel objects should be returned to the source nation even if that country does not have the means to care for the object?

Your role in the media has certainly brought restitution into the eyes of the general public. How do you feel your international persona has aided or hindered the case of restitution?

I would be honored if you would respond to my inquiry.

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to hearing back from you.

All the best,

Bonnie Roche
Dear Ms Roche,

Thank you for your e-mail. In response to your questions:

- During the Revolution, the museums were fine. The only one that suffered any thefts was the Egyptian Museum in Tahrir Square, Cairo, and even then only 37 objects were taken. The Museum was protected by some of the young people who were demonstrating in the Square – they formed a human chain around it that night (please explore my website for details: www.drhawass.com). The one million tourists who were also in Egypt at the time all left the country safely too.

I sincerely believe that if what happened in Cairo – that the police abandoned the streets for 4 hours on January 28, 2011 – had happened in any other city in the world, then there would be chaos, thefts and destruction on an even greater scale. I therefore am still insisting that artifacts stolen from Egypt should be returned to it (www.sca-egypt.org/eng/RST_MP.htm) as well as those six unique items on my 'wish list' that are important and should be on display in their homeland:

- Bust of Nefertiti (Berlin)
- Rosetta Stone (London)
- Statue of Hemiuu (Hildesheim)
- Bust of Ankhhaf (Boston)
- Statue of Ramesses II (Turin)
- Dendera Zodiac (Paris)

- The Conference on International Cooperation for the Protection and Repatriation of Cultural Heritage (www.sca-egypt.org/eng/RST_ICHC.htm) was a great success last year and was due to be held in Cairo again this year, but had to be postponed. The Minister of Culture in Peru recently approached me to host the conference there in July after we helped them to repatriate some artifacts from the States (see www.sca-egypt.org/eng/MR_PR.htm for the press release issued on December 17, 2010), however. I think the second conference will be important too because it will provide a forum for new ideas for the future and increased cooperation between the delegate countries. It will involve 100 countries and UNESCO representatives as well.

- I am not against universal museums. Objects that have been stolen from Egypt and taken out of the country illegally should be returned, but those that were acquired legally can stay where they are. I think that countries should have their heritage returned to them, even if they do not have the ideal facilities for them. Egypt, on the other hand, is currently building more than 20 state of the art museums across the country, including the Grand Egyptian Museum in Giza and the National Museum of Egyptian Civilization in Old Cairo. They will have the highest levels of security and displays, and some European and American museums will not compare.
I think that I have a strong personality, but that this has been valuable, especially in facing the problems and criticism against me brought up during the Revolution from within Egypt and abroad. I am determined to fight for what I think is important though and that includes taking a strong stance against the market in illegal artifacts.

Best wishes,

Zahi Hawass
[Quoted text hidden]
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