

Repatriation of sacred indigenous cultural heritage and the law

Citation for published version (APA):

Tünsmeijer, V. M. (2020). *Repatriation of sacred indigenous cultural heritage and the law: Lessons from the United States and Canada*. Maastricht University. <https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20201022vt>

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2020

DOI:

[10.26481/dis.20201022vt](https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20201022vt)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.umlib.nl/taverne-license

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Propositions

1. Repatriating indigenous sacred cultural heritage can be classified as a measure states take to fulfil Art.27 ICCPR.
2. The elements of federal Indian law in the United States and aboriginal law in Canada that were examined do not fully respect contemporary indigenous rights standards.
3. There is a need for more indigenous judges amongst the American and Canadian judiciary.
4. Museum self-regulation through soft law codes cannot pose the complete solution to repatriation requests.
5. Future repatriation models in Europe should be based on the experiences that have already been made in repatriating indigenous cultural heritage elsewhere. They should also be drafted to strengthen not weaken human rights standards.
6. International law as a legal field requires further decolonization.
7. The fragmentation of international cultural heritage law showcases the political nature of international law.
8. Law is storytelling.