

The European Character of the Intellectual History of Dutch Empire

110

SUSAN LEGÊNE

In response to Koekkoek, Richard and Weststeijn, this contribution argues against an ‘add-on approach’ to an intellectual history of empire that, in terms of both periodization and perspective, would be inspired by methodological nationalism. Instead of adding an intellectual history of Dutch empire to other ‘national’ imperial histories, we need to approach imperialism from a European perspective, broaden the discussion beyond the strict discipline of history, and strengthen the active dialogue with scholars (historians and others) who write from the perspective of the new, post-colonial nation states outside of Europe. It is urgent to counter a Netherlands-centric focus in our view of the imperial past.

Het Europese karakter van de intellectuele geschiedenis van het Nederlandse ‘empire’
Deze bijdrage is kritisch over de oproep van Koekkoek, Richard en Weststeijn om een Nederlandse intellectuele geschiedenis van het imperialisme toe te voegen aan de bestaande internationale geschiedschrijving. Het imperialisme is geen optelsom van nationale geschiedenissen, maar intrinsiek Europees. De Neerlandocentrische oproep biedt daarom zowel qua periodisering als qua perspectief geen overtuigend historiografisch kader. Erin meegaan betekent een versterking van het methodologisch nationalism dat veel van deze internationale geschiedschrijving kenmerkt. Liever dan een Nederlands verhaal daaraan toe te voegen, dienen we deel te nemen aan het bredere debat dat wordt gevoerd vanuit andere dan de strikt historische disciplines. Daarbij is het van groot belang om ook actief de dialoog te zoeken met auteurs die werken vanuit het perspectief van de nieuwe postkoloniale naties van na 1945.

In this forum, René Koekkoek, Anne-Isabelle Richard, and Arthur Weststeijn call for a new alignment between the historiography of the Dutch empire from the perspective of intellectual history and the international historiography of empire at large. They urge us to become more active in bringing these Dutch intellectual histories into the body of international scholarship. Although I really appreciate their initiative to rattle the existing historiographic order and I do acknowledge the scholarship with which they elaborate on the questions emerging from their approach, I disagree with their basic premise of a long-term perspective on ‘visions’ (that is, an intellectual history) of ‘Dutch Empire’. It is not my intention to quibble over details. However, I strongly recommend exploring other ways of strengthening international historiographic debate about the imperial past. We should approach the intellectual histories of empire as an intrinsically international intellectual history that is relevant not only to the histories of the separate nation states of contemporary Europe, but equally to the post-colonial states whose intellectual histories are entangled with European imperialism, and to the supranational organizations that in varying degrees and with different degrees of success were established in the wake of imperialism at the start of the postcolonial, post-Second World War world order. The ambition to construct a grand narrative on ‘Visions of Dutch Empire’ means forging a national history from a process that is inseparable from European history.¹

History, Historiography, and Historical Debate

The imbalances in international scholarship identified by Koekkoek, Richard, and Weststeijn do, indeed, exist; however they cannot be countered with more historiography inspired by the same methodological nationalism that characterizes many of the works to which they refer.² Moreover, whereas the authors refer to Ann Stoler’s discussion of ‘colonial aphasia’³ in the

1 I thank the editorial board for their feedback and Larry Wallach for the editing of this contribution to the forum discussion on ‘Visions of Dutch Empire’.

2 Methodological nationalism: Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London 1995); Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller, ‘Methodological Nationalism and the Study of Migration’, *Archives européennes de sociologie* 43:2 (2002) 217-240 DOI 10.1017/S000397560200108X; and Anna Amelina, *Beyond Methodological Nationalism: Research Methodologies for Cross-Border Studies* (New York 2012). An example of imperial historiography

‘beyond’ methodological nationalism is Anthony B. Pinn, Caroline Field Levander, and Michael O. Emerson, *Teaching and Studying the Americas, Cultural Influences from Colonialism to the Present* (New York 2010).

3 See also Francis Gouda, Remco Raben, Henk Schulte Norholt, and Ann Laura Stoler, ‘Book Review: Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense’, *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde / Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia* 165:4 (2009) 551-567.

Netherlands, and historical ‘notions of Dutch imperial exceptionalism’, I start from the premise that Dutch imperial exceptionalism or colonial aphasia are not historical features of Dutch society that should be reversed by historians, but rather that we need to critically reflect on how historians have contributed to this. Starting in the nineteenth century, history books, history paintings, exhibitions, and architectural structures helped establish visions of Dutch empire that contributed to the Netherlands’ place within Europe’s nineteenth-century imperial balance of power acts; and after 1945, history books relegated the Dutch empire to the past while requiring that imperial immigrants now identify with a narrow national Dutch history.

We should acknowledge that imperial policies and views – which can be characterized as repertoires for ruling different people differently⁴ – have been crucial for the construction of citizenship both in Europe and in colonial society overseas. Within Europe’s vast imperial world, the ‘colonizers’ could for a long time easily circulate as ‘Europeans’ rather than as the citizens of separate European nation states. Their white skin was their passport.⁵ These policies and views also shaped colonial societies as empires collaborated in the large-scale relocation of people within the European imperial realm, as in the case of slave trade and indenture. Only since the beginning of the twentieth century have national distinctions among European colonial elites overseas become more meaningful. But nationality gained relevance in the colony because of developments within Europe.⁶ Meanwhile colonial society also saw the formation of anticolonial nationalism. ‘Europeanness’ was no longer a common feature and stronghold in the mix of ideas and practices connected to ruling pluralistic and increasingly diverse societies in unconnected regions. With respect to the Netherlands, after 1949 (the date of Dutch acknowledgement of Indonesian sovereignty), 1962 (departure from

4 I refer here to Cooper’s political/historiographic analysis of empire as ‘a political unit that is large, expansionist (or with memories of an expansionist past), and which reproduces differentiation and inequality among people it incorporates. [...] An empire-state is a structure that reproduces distinctions among collectivities while subordinating them to a greater or lesser degree to the ruling authority. [Empire concerns] ... the making and policing of boundaries, the design of systems of punishment and discipline, the attempt to install awe as well as a sense of belonging in diverse populations’. Frederick Cooper, *Colonialism in Question. Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley CA 2005) 27 and 30.

5 See, for instance, the experiences of the Hungarian planter arriving at Sumatra with no resources except for his being European: L. Székely, *Öserdöktöl az ultetvenyekig* (Budapest 1935), translated into Dutch by Madelon Székely-Lulofs as *Van oerwoud tot plantage. Verhaal van een plantersleven* (Amsterdam 1935).

6 Maaiké H. van den Berg, ‘A German Border Crossing in a European Colonial Community: The Deutsche Bund in the Dutch East Indies and Its Transnational Sense of National Belonging (1915-1940)’ (MA thesis Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam 2015).

Netherlands New Guinea), and 1975 (Surinamese independence), such ideas and practices were increasingly relegated to 'the past'. Dutch society now perceived itself as an historically homogeneous nation state with a colonial past that could be separated from its continental history; meanwhile, the Netherlands itself had become a strong building block for the new states order within Cold War Europe. As mentioned before, this 'forgetting' about the plurality of the imperial past should not in the first place be understood as 'colonial aphasia', but as a political practice of nation formation to which Dutch historiography has contributed.⁷

Koekkoek, Richard, and Weststeijn discuss 'visions of (Dutch) empire' in two ways: in terms of history (what happened until 2017), and in terms of historiography (how historians write about what happened). In terms of history, they examine Dutch imperial views, ideas, and prospects. What were the visions of the past, and future, of empire developed by Dutchmen like Hugo Grotius, Herman Willem Daendels, and Conrad Theodor van Deventer? In terms of historiography, they ask how imperialism has been studied, understood, and framed in the Netherlands, and what steps we need to take from there in order to improve the relevance of this historiography to international debates about the intellectual history of the imperial past.

Intellectual history is closely linked to historiography, since legal, economic, ethical, and aesthetic visions that are part of intellectual history almost always use historical references and temporal arguments that refer to the past, present, and future. Koekkoek, Richard, and Weststeijn connect the intended 'long-term perspective' on such an intellectual history to a chronology: the concept of 'Dutch Empire' was shaped, transformed and rendered uncertain as an idea that can be traced over more than four hundred years and that is available for periodization. The authors distinguish three overlapping periods: the republican empire (1550-1800); the transformation of and resistance to empire (c. 1750-1850); and, finally, 'from colonial to postcolonial empire?' (with question mark; 1850-2017). At the same time, the position paper as an intervention in the *status quaestionis* also suggests

7 Susan Legêne, 'De mythe van een etnisch homogene nationale identiteit. Kanttekeningen bij de verwerking van het koloniale verleden in de Nederlandse geschiedenis', *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 116:4 (2003) 553-560; Susan Legêne and Martijn Eickhoff, 'Postwar Europe and the Colonial Past in Photographs', in: Ann Rigney and Chiara de Cesari (eds.), *Transnational Memory. Circulation, Articulation, Scales* (Berlin 2014) 287-311. DOI 10.1515/9783110359107.287. See also my critique on our own recent Dutch history

handbooks like R. Aerts et al., *Land van kleine gebaren. Een politieke geschiedenis van Nederland 1780-1990* (Nijmegen 1999, reprint Amsterdam 2013 with an extension to 2012) in Susan Legêne, 'Impressed Images/Expressed Experiences: The Historical Imagination of Politics', in: L. Jensen, J. Leerssen, M. Mathijsen (eds.), *Free Access to the Past. Romanticism, Cultural Heritage and the Nation* (Leiden and Boston 2010) 304-307 DOI 10.1163/ej.9789004180291.i-334.92.

that this phenomenon of the Dutch Empire is explored only now; that we as historians working on changing visions of imperialism in Dutch history from the early modern period to the present try to understand and intervene in the colonial aphasia, the denial of the colonial past and sense of imperial exceptionalism in contemporary society. I am very sympathetic to that ambition, because I agree that we have work to do. At the same time, however, I am disappointed about their focus and references in the debate, directed almost exclusively towards a specific Netherlands-centric body of historical work. We know that the legacies of ‘ruling different people differently’ still work in the intricate interplay of hierarchies omnipresent in the arena of intellectual history. Historians in this field should take these legacies seriously and actively search out opportunities to extend their own professional networks.

Against an ‘Add-On Approach’

Koekkoek, Richard, and Weststeijn state that historians in current international historiography ‘share a disregard for one of the most significant imperial powers in (early) modern global history: the Dutch empire’. The aim of their road map is to offset this imbalance. However, why does Dutch imperial history, or the voices of Dutch historians, lag behind those of other imperial histories and historical debates? Indeed, historiography of empire is dominated by studies of British imperialism, and to a lesser extent of French imperialism, and maybe, although I doubt this, Spanish and Portuguese, or, in a different register, Russian imperialism. But what does this observation actually mean: should the Dutch just catch up? In British historiography, the authors often do not even specify that the imperialism they discuss is about the British empire – for instance, MacKenzie’s *Museums and Empire* is not about museums and empire but about museums in capital cities of the former British Empire.⁸ That empire in this context equals British Empire is not even an issue for the subtitle of the book. I do not believe in a so-called ‘add-on’ approach: that (Dutch) historians should bring *Visions of Dutch Empire* to the *Visions of Empire* in British history and other imperial histories.

8 John M. MacKenzie, *Museums and Empire: Natural History, Human Cultures and Colonial Identities* (Manchester 2009). The same goes for many of the titles in this famous series ‘Studies in Imperialism’ at Manchester University Press. One of the latest volumes, however, chose a dedicated comparative perspective: John M.

MacKenzie (ed.), *European Empires and the People: Popular Responses to Imperialism in France, Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany and Italy* (Manchester 2011). Another ‘British’ example is Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose, *At Home with the Empire: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World* (Cambridge 2006).



Registration book of indentured labourers ready for restoration and conservation. Documents on the recruitment, travel and settlement of indentured labourers from China, British India and the Netherlands Indies to Suriname offer just one of the many traces of imperialism as a joint European effort. In this case they indicate how shared views on labour and discipline as well as common identification techniques substantiated the many large-scale migration movements within the imperial world. Collection National Archives of Suriname (NAS), Paramaribo. Photo: Photograph taken by the author during a guided tour in October 2012.

One major concern with such an approach is that it does not challenge, but rather reinforces the historiographic biases in national imperial histories in the context of British or French imperialism. Examples of these biases can be found in the disturbing imbalances of and blank spots and taboos in historiography concerning, for example, different parts of the British or French empires, with respect to both their colonial past as such and to their decolonization history; or the insufficient understanding of processes of state formation in Latin America in the context of imperial histories. It does not solve either the bias in national historiographies according to which some nations are supposed to have not been involved in imperialism at all (as is the case, for instance, in Norway or Switzerland).⁹ Instead of regarding separate national (or certain ‘transnational’) histories as a cradle or an old-age home for imperial visions, we need to understand the deep entanglement of the processes of nation-state formation in Europe with imperialism as a fundamentally *European* endeavour. For the sake of the discussion, to put it even more strongly: I would take here the position that with all its border rhetoric and crisis in normative border politics¹⁰, the current European Union of (still) 28 countries is connected with the 1885 Berlin Africa conference, as well as with Versailles 1919, Sèvres 1920, and Lausanne 1923. Europe inverted the *terra nullius* concept of Berlin 1885, designed for its use overseas¹¹, and this still is reflected in the stitched patchwork of borders of the European (nation-) states of today, borders that provide a historical suggestion of who belongs where – former colonial subjects included.¹²

My second concern with an add-on approach is that the focus in the position paper on the long-term development of ‘Visions of Dutch Empire’ seems to boil down to an intervention in a discussion taking place predominantly among a community of (Dutch) *historians* only. No reference

- 9 The example of Norway was addressed in the HERA international research project PhotocLEC. See, for instance, the discussion on colonialism in Norwegian museums at the project website: <http://photoclec.dmu.ac.uk/content/national-story-%E2%80%93-norway> (29 January 2017). See also Sigrid Lien and Hilde Nielsen, ‘Absence and Presence: The Work of Photographs in the Sámi Museum, RiddoDuottarMuseat-Sámiid Vuorká-Dávvirat (RDM-SVD) in Karasjok, Norway’, *Photography and Culture* 5:3 (2012) 295-311; Lionel Gauthier and Jean-François Staszak, ‘Framing Coloniality: Exotic Photographs in Swiss Albums, Museums, and Public Spaces (1870s-2010s)’, *Photography and Culture* 5:3 (2012) 311-326; Legêne and Eickhoff, ‘Postwar Europe and the Colonial Past in Photographs’, 292, 297.
- 10 Henk van Houtum and Freerk Boedeltje, ‘Questioning the EU’s Neighbourhood Geo-Politics: Introduction to a Special Section’, *Geopolitics* 16:1 (2011) 121-129 DOI 10.1080/14650045.2010.493779.
- 11 Dierk Schmidt and Lotte Arndt, *The Division of the Earth: Tableaux on the Legal Synopses of the Berlin Africa Conference* (Cologne 2010).
- 12 As more often, I would like to refer to Etienne Balibar, *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship* (Princeton 2004), which has been important for my position in the debate.

is made to other social scientists such as anthropologists¹³, museum professionals¹⁴, scholars of literature and cultural studies¹⁵, artists¹⁶, or activists knocking at the door of academia¹⁷ and who have published about and still work on visions of empire, just as historians do. Edward Said did not include Dutch orientalists in his paradigm-changing book *Orientalism*, with the exception of a brief mention of Snouck Hurgronje.¹⁸ Neither the heated international debate that followed this publication, nor the studies that took up or challenged Said's analysis, included Dutch philological and scientific traditions of Indology and oriental studies. One of the explanations for this absence in international historiography is the dominant use of the Dutch language in the relevant publications of the time (which were not easily accessible for those who did not read Dutch). But that is not the only reason. Within the Netherlands we also saw (and at times still see) a straightforward debunking of a postcolonial approach to colonial histories: it is not our cup of tea.¹⁹

- 13 Just two of many examples relevant to an intellectual history of empire: Danilyn Rutherford, 'Sympathy, State Building, and the Experience of Empire', *Cultural Anthropology* 24:1 (2009) 1-32 DOI 10.1111/j.1548-1360.2009.00025.x, which focuses on the Dutch half of New Guinea; and Hans Pols, 'Psychological Knowledge in a Colonial Context: Theories on the Nature of the "Native Mind" in the Former Dutch East Indies', *History of Psychology* 10:2 (2007) 111-131 DOI 10.1037/1093-4510.10.2.111.
- 14 For instance, the 'country series' of the Rijksmuseum, which explores long-term perspectives through collection histories. See also Susan Legêne, Bambang Purwanto, and Henk Schulte Nordholt (eds.), *Sites, Bodies and Stories: Imagining Indonesian History* (Singapore 2015).
- 15 Authors like Pamela Pattynama (Netherlands East Indies) and Michiel van Kempen (Suriname), biographers like Dik Vermeulen (Multatuli), and many others.
- 16 The work of Netherlands-based artists like Fiona Tan and Wendeline van Oldenburgh addresses deep-rooted views of empire.
- 17 Barryl Biekman, to mention just one name, has played a crucial role in energizing discussions on Dutch slavery and its legacies in postcolonial society. See, for instance, Barryl A. Biekman, *Gedenkboek realisatie van het Nationaal Monument Nederlands Slavernijverleden: met de menselijke waardigheid voor ogen* (S.L. 2002). Relevant in this context as well is the activism of Jeffry Pondaag, supported by lawyer Liesbeth Zegveld. Like Henk van Houtum and Freerk Boedeltje, 'Questioning', concerning borders, Zegveld also discusses morality, which is an integral part of intellectual history. For instance, Liesbeth Zegveld, 'Body Counts and Masking Wartime Violence', *Journal of International Humanitarian Legal Studies* 6:2 (2015) 443-461 DOI 10.1163/18781527-00602008.
- 18 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (New York 1978, ed. 1995) 209-210, 255. In Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York 1993), only Multatuli is mentioned once (page 290).
- 19 See, for instance, Peter van der Veer, *Modern oriëntalisme. Essays over de westerse beschavingsdrang* (Amsterdam 1995), which was severely criticized by Frits Bolkestein in his review in *NRC Handelsblad*, 13 January 1996. Relevant in this respect are Frances Gouda, 'What's to Be

Koekkoek, Richard, and Weststeijn contribute to getting beyond this former splendid isolation in language and approach. Nevertheless, they seem to continue the equally important disciplinary trend of the ‘nationalization’ of colonial history after decolonization. Colonial history became a special topic in Dutch history, while failing to maintain an appropriate interaction between Netherlandic, Indonesian, Surinamese, South African, and other historiographies. The references in the position paper show that this is the case here again. We find established names in Dutch historiography, but there is no mention of a single Indonesian, Surinamese, South African, Ghanaian, or other historian, anthropologist, nor of any other scholar or artist working on empire from a different national or global perspective that might turn the Netherlands into a province in Europe.²⁰ The paper acknowledges that it would be interesting to look at Dutch colonialism from the perspective of Javanese political elites; however, that is an under-theorized remark. Why Javanese political elites, and why should *we* do that? I would guess that it is because we have written sources ready for reinterpretation. But why, then, are there, in addition to Peter Carey’s work²¹, no references to critical approaches to the canon of Indology that, not unlike orientalism as discussed after Said, provides a primary and very essential layer of interpretation for these texts?²² Rather, I would argue that we need to get out of the hierarchies set by the inherent power relations at stake in the historiography of empire and that resonate in the footnotes of the position paper both with respect to the contextual framework for the knowledge of the authors referred to and the one-sided emphasis on historians while excluding other disciplines. Why

Done with Gender and Post-Colonial Studies’ (Inaugural Lecture, University of Amsterdam 2001); Elleke Boehmer and Sarah de Mul (eds.), *The Postcolonial Low Countries: Literature, Colonialism, and Multiculturalism* (Lanham MD 2012); Philomena Essed and Isabel Hoving (eds.), *Dutch Racism* (Amsterdam 2014); Susan Legêne, ‘Bringing History Home: Postcolonial Immigrants and the Dutch Cultural Arena’, *BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review* 126:2 (2011) 54-70 DOI 10.18352/bmgn-lchr.7310.

20 I refer, of course, to Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton 2000), which coined the well-known argument that the newly independent postcolonial states like India have histories that should not necessarily all centre on European history. See, also, Henk Schulte

Nordholt, Bambang Purwanto, Ratna Saptari, and Masri Maris, *Perspektif baru penulisan sejarah Indonesia* (Jakarta 2008) or Maurits S. Hassankhan, Jerry L. Egger, and Eric R. Jagdew (eds.), *Verkenningen in de historiografie van Suriname. Van koloniale geschiedenis tot geschiedenis van het volk I/Explorations in the Historiography of Suriname. From Colonial History to History of the People I* (Paramaribo 2013).

21 Peter Carey published and translated the writings of Pangeran Diponegoro and many other historical texts, as in Peter Carey and Arya Panular (eds.), *The British in Java, 1811-1816: A Javanese Account* (Oxford 1992).

22 As in Sadiah N. Boonstra, *Changing Wayang Scenes: Heritage Formation and Wayang Performance Practice in Colonial and Postcolonial Indonesia* (PhD, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam 2014).

strengthen ‘Visions of Dutch empire’ in international historiography rather than join in the debate on global perspectives as a global debate?²³

In short, I believe that we should refrain from further developing Dutch imperial history or discussing what is Dutch about visions of empire, and deliberately get away from the implicit post-1945 and post-decolonization framing of imperial history as national European historiographies in which Dutch historiography needs to be put forward more strongly. Instead, we need to explore how imperialism shaped nations including the Netherlands and how it correspondingly shaped our understanding of an intellectual history that does not necessarily take the nation, or even Europe, as its frame of reference.

Longue Durée, Periodization, and Intellectual Histories

My last response concerns the call for a long-term perspective as such. I fully agree with the urgency of strengthening this perspective, but again only if *longue durée* – interpreted as the long term – does not imply a projection of contemporary state formation into a distant past. Rather than the vague periodization with overlapping periods proposed in the position paper, I would argue that in terms of (empire-) state formation, any periodization has to take the 1814-15 Congress of Vienna as a major turning point in imperial history. The position paper mentions Daendels, whose appointment ‘heralded a new era of colonial state-building’ (wording that stresses the European situatedness of the authors, who would face many problems in explaining this trumpet metaphor in Indonesia). The authors suggest that in 1818, Johannes van den Bosch subsequently provided this turn toward empire with its intellectual foundations. Implicitly, they thus suggest a *longue durée* intellectual history from Grotius to Van den Bosch (and on to Van Deventer). This line-up is not convincing. The periodization suggests a long-term project in which Dutchmen over 400 years more or less consistently worked on empire as a project (and heralded new phases in it).²⁴ However, colonialism is a distributed, fragmented object, whereas the *longue durée* is about structures – visions and structures are not easily brought into a single frame of interpretation.

Replying to Stephen Howe in 1993, Martin Shipway discusses this value of the notion of *longue durée* as well, in the context of a political

23 See, for instance, Peter Carey, ‘Revolutionary Europe and the Destruction of Java’s Old Order, 1909-1830’, in: David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam (eds.), *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c. 1760-1840* (Basingstoke 2009) 167-188.

24 The position paper refers to Jo Guldi and David Armitage, *The History Manifesto* (Cambridge 2014), which calls for getting beyond short-termism.

history of (the end of) empire that also addresses the Dutch and Indonesian decolonisation history.²⁵ I agree with his conclusion that, if we follow Braudel's distinction of different layers of time related to structure, conjuncture, and event, imperialism and the end of empire did not bring structural changes in the *longue durée*, no shifts in the world system. Rather, it was a conjuncture, in the most literal sense – both temporal and entangled – a development with no clear beginning or ending, whereas decolonization belongs to the *histoire événementielle*. This approach – colonialism as conjunctures, decolonisation as a series of events – is indeed in line with how scholars in postcolonial, new nations often frame their (political and intellectual) history of nation-building.

If we acknowledge that imperial history is not a linear development but relates to different notions and concepts of 'times'²⁶, with different entanglements and conjunctures, we can move on with the inspiring ideas presented at the 2016 Leiden 'Visions of Empire' conference, for instance with respect to sources and disciplines (think of economic social sources, of language as a source, of objects, places, intuition, and art). So, in addition to my proposal to skip 'Dutch' and not broaden the (psychological/medical) notion of aphasia in order to diagnose and cure *ourselves*, I propose that the periodization of 400 years of Dutch intellectual history as suggested in the position paper and the corollary suggestion of a connection to a constructed *longue durée* be critically reconsidered.

Susan Legêne (1955) is professor of Political History at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and former Head of the Curatorial Department of the Tropenmuseum in Amsterdam. Her research focuses on processes of inclusion and exclusion in colonial and postcolonial nation state formation. In terms of historiography she is also interested in e-History, as well as in tangible and intangible heritage as primary sources. Recent publications are: Susan Legêne, 'Tagging Borobudur. Heritage Education and the Colonial Past in Onsite and Online Museum Collections', in: Carla van Boxtel, Maria Grever, Stephan Klein (eds.), *Sensitive Pasts. Questioning Heritage Education* (Oxford and New York 2016) 109-129; Chiel van den Akker and Susan Legêne (eds.), *Museums in a Digital Culture. How Art and Heritage Become Meaningful* (Amsterdam 2016); Susan Legêne, Bambang Purwanto, and Henk Schulte Nordholt (eds.), *Sites, Bodies and Stories. Imagining Indonesian History* (Singapore 2015). Email: s.legene@vu.nl.

25 Martin Shipway, *Decolonization and Its Impact: A Comparative Approach to the End of the Colonial Empires* (Malden MA 2008) 235, and *passim*.

26 Also framed as durational time, rectilinear time, and, as from a heritage and memory perspective,

circular time. Cf. Chris Lorenz, 'Unstuck in Time. Or the Sudden Presence of the Past', in: Karin Tilmans, Frank van Vree, and J. M. Winter (eds.), *Performing the Past: Memory, History, and Identity in Modern Europe* (Amsterdam 2010) 67-102.