

IX.

Whose Voices?

Beyond the PAESE-Conference

---

## Beyond the PAESE-Conference

Voices from Africa and Papua New Guinea

## Whose Voices? Beyond the PAESE-Conference

---

# Beyond the PAESE-Conference

Voices from Africa and Papua New Guinea

Richard Tsogang Fossi

November 2017, the French president Emmanuel Macron addressed the students at the university Ouaga I Professeur Joseph-Ki-Zerbo in Ouagadougou about ancient African art treasures stored en masse in French and European museums.<sup>1</sup> According to him, African cultural heritage can no longer be held hostage by Europe.<sup>2</sup> As a result, the French president made a ground-breaking promise to return these heritage objects to their rightful owners within a scope of five years.<sup>3</sup> This dauntless promise to return art works looted during French colonial domination inspired hopes in Africa, and meanwhile seismic reactions were registered in Western countries, mostly former colonial masters. Art markets, museums, and art galleries' holders, curators, private collectors and politicians suspected the end of their existence. The fear of losing collections which had somehow become a part of themselves was obvious. Yet, neither the circumstances under which these objects had come to them more than a century before, nor the traumatic and destabilizing effects of their absence in the communities of origin, were subjects of questioning.

Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, who on behalf of the French president submitted a report containing recommendations and a schedule for the return of African heritage objects held in France, called for a new relational ethic.<sup>4</sup> Since then, many people have expected to witness waves of restitutions. Instead, indifferent silence seems to have followed the speech,

and despair to overshadow the glimmer of hope that had arisen: in fact, until 2019, only one object had left France so far for its homeland,<sup>5</sup> followed by 26 others – out of thousands! – in 2021 to the Republic of Benin. Unlike France, Germany as the first colonial master of Cameroon (1884–1916), Togo (1884–1914), Namibia (1884–1914), Tanzania (1885–1914) and Papua New Guinea (1884/1899–1914), decided to invest in intensive, lengthy provenance research programmes.<sup>6</sup> This provenance research encompasses ancestral human remains,<sup>7</sup> ethnological, zoological, botanical and mineralogical objects<sup>8</sup> removed against the backdrop of violent colonial extractive policies. German guidelines on how to deal with collections from colonial contexts have been issued since 2018<sup>9</sup>, and researching the provenance of colonial art works has become one of the tasks of the German Lost Art Foundation, academic institutions, and museums, inspiring new perspectives and synergies termed postcolonial.<sup>10</sup>

The PAESE project is therefore one of the first large-scale postcolonial provenance research collaborations to be launched over collections from colonial contexts in Germany. It aimed at investigating the circumstances of the removal of artefacts in colonial times, at fostering provenance research projects in different German federal states, and at establishing, promoting dialogue, transparency, and cooperation with, and networking the communities of origin and Germany.<sup>11</sup> It has proven important to carry out such a project. However, some questions have remained unasked and/or unanswered, especially from an African perspective, for instance pertaining to the prevalence of European laws coined against restitution, the fate of objects whose provenance cannot be clarified due to lack or loss of archives,<sup>12</sup> or the person entitled to keep such pieces. And there are more questions around who has to prove the ownership of the disputed artefacts, or Germany's true commitments towards countries whose art assets have been unlawfully removed, plundered or looted? And so forth.

The last panel, scheduled as a momentous phase of the conference, aimed at giving the floor to those who were/are particularly deprived of their heritage and memories, such as workers in the cultural sector or intellectuals from the communities of origin,<sup>13</sup> who are knowledgeable about these questions. This final postscript culls some points from the discussions that need to be highlighted in the context of a changing political and curatorial landscape.

## Postcolonial Provenance Research and New Directions

In the last decades, the term “postcolonial” has become one of the keywords to theorise and investigate colonial history from a critical point of view with the aim of uncovering and dismantling persistent imperial structures, the aftermaths of colonial epistemic, structural and physical violence.<sup>14</sup> As Dirk Göttsche puts it, postcolonial discourse uses individual and collective memory to promote critical knowledge of the history of colonialism and raise awareness of its continuing impact in the present. It also works towards political, social and cultural decolonisation in a globalised, interconnected and yet conflict-ridden world that continues to be marked by colonial legacies such as racism, asymmetrical power relations and uneven access to resources and opportunities.<sup>15</sup>

Postcolonial discourse offers a lens for analysing and understanding the legacies of colonialism and the ways in which the colonial discourse inevitably structured social, racial, cultural, monetary and political hierarchies which still underpin relationships between the West and its Others today, albeit in other forms.<sup>16</sup> The colonial discourse ‘advocated’ the predominance of the West over other peoples on a racial and social-Darwinist basis in terms of the struggle for existence, and considered the idea of racial equality as a “senseless dream”.<sup>17</sup> Against this backdrop, the use of violence, force and systematised slavery against the colonised populations, who were deemed inferior, wild, lazy and uncivilised, became a tool of the so-called civilizing mission.<sup>18</sup>

At the cultural level specifically, this violence culminated on the one hand in the wilful destruction of cultural goods of the colonised<sup>19</sup> and, on the other hand, in the violent, forcible removals of these<sup>20</sup> in order to stock European museums. These removals were also justified through a “saviour paradigm”<sup>21</sup> by museum directors and owners like Felix von Luschan (1854–1924), or Karl Weule (1864–1926), who claimed that, in the clash of two cultures, the weaker was bound to disappear, and that it was urgently necessary to secure their cultural materials as testimonies for upcoming generations and for so-called scientific purposes.<sup>22</sup> As concerns the Christian missions, who equally removed but also destroyed cultural goods with frenzy,<sup>23</sup> their actions were supposed to symbolise and materialise the victory of Christianity over the so-called forces of darkness, paganism and wizardry.<sup>24</sup> Yet, to the museum men and the colonialists of all kinds,<sup>25</sup> as well as the missionaries, these removals, and the change

in value of things that they entailed – commodification and commoditisation<sup>26</sup> – led to wide networks of African artefact trafficking, of which Africans themselves were hardly aware and from which they did not benefit.<sup>27</sup>

In this regard, postcolonial provenance research is deemed necessary in order to uncover the processes of colonial extraction of cultural goods and humans, and also to critically reassess the narratives that surround their display in curatorial practices. Such a critical approach provides impulses to the “postcolonial museum”.<sup>28</sup> Such provenance research is understood by Albert Gouaffo as a wide, multiperspectival, multidirectional and transnational process, which is not the sole task or privilege of the museologists, the ethnologists or anthropologists. It is a cross-research process at the intersection of many academic disciplines that help to understand the colonial context. It is pivotal research on the colonial context as one of physical, linguistic/verbal, psychological, military and symbolic violence. Along the same lines, almost everything acquired in the colonies was extracted via processes far from on an equal footing, and thus symbolises the colonial asymmetrical power relations. This calls for a minute scrutiny of the acquisition context.

At the moral or ethical level, postcolonial provenance research must rely on mutual trust, transparency and readiness to discuss on an equal footing, because “the African states asking for the return of their cultural heritage are not beggars”, as Albert Gouaffo says (see above). Quests for restitution are not new, but as Bénédicte Savoy has made visible, these have been voluntarily sabotaged and delayed over the years through lies and misinformation by European museum directors or museum holders.<sup>29</sup> This situation will only change when there is a reversed burden of proof: the new White Man’s burden. Africans are not the ones to prove that the requested artefacts are parts of their cultural heritage; rather, Europe should have the burden of proving that she acquired the artefacts legally. European museums holding artefacts from the colonial context should become “objects of investigation” and not remain “subjects of research” (Gouaffo). In this sense, they should become like libraries, open without restrictions to the communities of origin. A new ethical relationship in the sense of a postcolonial provenance research should not be based on the principle of “us” and “them” – one of binary exclusion and an essentialisation of identities, but on “us in a common world”, where we are connected through our past, even if we do not necessarily share its interpretation. This leads to the idea of museums as “contact zones”<sup>30</sup>, e.g., as interacting spaces of possible shifts in meaning and practices. Europe should therefore consider a decentralisation of her knowledge production, including more possible universalities instead of persevering in an exclusive universalism.

## Reconnection with Home Communities and the Issue of Restitution

Is there hope that the PAESE project will trigger new ways of dealing with collections from the colonial context, with new approaches to a collaborative provenance research, new methodologies and epistemics as well as a revolutionary handling of the issue of restitution, one that has recently mobilised public opinion worldwide?<sup>31</sup> As mentioned above, the PAESE project calls for closer collaboration with the source communities. According to Flower Manase, however, there is a need to define these communities: Who are the real owners? Who are the potential beneficiaries of restitutions? And who do the museums, which are mere custodians, actually serve today – the higher classes, or elites? Or are they committed to everyone in the community? According to Nzila M. Libanda-Mubusisi and Tommy Y. Buga, the collaborative approach helps identify which objects may be eligible for restitution based on the values that the communities still attach to them.

As Amuna Wagner puts it, these debates are not only conversations about the past or solely about objects. The restitution movement is concerned with the possibilities of what the homecoming of human bones or cultural objects can mean for our societies and creative economies. Discussing the artefacts' history and unlawful acquisition, and tracing the disputes between museums and the societies of origin, can illuminate new paths into decolonial African futures.<sup>32</sup>

Nevertheless, we should not lose sight of the fact that, even in Europe, museums are faced with difficulties such as the contamination of collections through pesticides, which also complicates restitution efforts.<sup>33</sup> Furthermore, the need to work closer with the communities and societies of origin is based on the fact that information about the displaced ancestral remains or the cultural objects as well as their functions is not located at specific places such as the museums or archives only. As Amber Aranui reports from her experience in New Zealand: "It is important to note that provenance information does not survive solely within museum archives. Information can be obtained from a number of sources and be found in a number of different countries".<sup>34</sup> But is researching provenance tantamount to apologising, repatriating and making reparations, or is it only an extension of the old strategies of the 1970s to bury or delay demands for restitution?<sup>35</sup> It is true that restitution alone cannot dissolve all the colonial wrongdoings. Yet, Adebo Abiti holds that "restitution, decolonisation and nation state formation must be addressed by re-evaluating violence against societies that have experienced land displacement, brutal killings

and the looting of cultural objects, all of which have caused unresolved painful memories and injustice".<sup>36</sup> This would give us the chance to rehabilitate local Indigenous knowledge as a form of alternative cultural practice that will today also become a force against persistent colonial epistemic violence.<sup>37</sup>

The restitution issue also has to do with the infrastructures that must welcome the returned cultural goods. Nzila M. Libanda-Mubusisi notes that, although African countries need their cultural goods back, in many cases they seem not to be ready due to a lack of infrastructures and because of administrative problems. Although she relies as illustrations on the instances of the stone cross "pradao", removed by the German colonial government in 1893 and kept in the German Historical Museum (*Deutsches Historisches Museum*) Berlin, and which was returned to Namibia in August 2019, or the Bible and Whip of the Nama ruler Hendrik Witbooi,<sup>38</sup> this echoes arguments put forward in Europe in the 1970s to counter restitution requests.<sup>39</sup> Indeed, for decades it has been claimed that sub-Saharan Africa is neither equipped nor has the necessary expertise in the domain of conservation, although in recent years new structures and innovative museum practices have been established in Senegal, Benin and Cameroon.<sup>40</sup> What then are the role and degree of implication of source communities in the research and decision-making processes for restitution, bearing in mind that, until now, the recipient countries have been the ones to decide on what to return and when? In this regard, we also need to focus on the local knowhow as concerns expertise on conservation issues, since many of the old artefacts looted or extorted<sup>41</sup> were not taken from museums. This means that there were improved local conservation methods that the colonial domination destabilised and, in some cases, caused to vanish completely.

## The Question of Terminologies and the Role of Education

The question of terminologies is of great importance when discussing colonial history and memory in general, and collections from colonial contexts in particular. Postcolonial research and also decolonial<sup>42</sup> curatorial practices,<sup>43</sup> which have to undermine persistent (neo)colonial mindsets so as to enhance counter-narratives and an emancipatory way of dealing with collections from colonial contexts, must pay attention to the words used to construct knowledge and narratives that define the artefacts. Klaus Zimmermann refers to

this linguistic dimension with regard to the Christian missions as “colonial linguistics” (*Koloniallinguistik*) or “missionary linguistics” (*Missionarlinguistik*)<sup>44</sup> and defines this as “the grammatical and lexical description of foreign languages in the context and interests of Christian proselytising of these peoples and, to this end, the writing of Christian treatises”.<sup>45</sup> Accordingly, Zimmermann argues that European domination over the belief systems of the Others would not have been possible without this linguistic tool.<sup>46</sup>

Strategies of a critical engagement with the translocated cultural heritage from the colonial context show how the colonial matrix shaped knowledge by excluding knowledge skills of the communities of origin, and by deriding their belief or medical systems and social norms. This is particularly clear when studying the Christian way of labelling cultural goods. Sacral or power objects were and are still recorded simply as “fetishes”, “amulets” or “sorcerers’ tools” and “witchcraft”, while local rulers are referred to as “Häuptlinge”,<sup>47</sup> a highly pejorative designation of “Others” as “Naturvölker”: “primitive peoples”.

Still in this regard, the discussions on disputed colonial collections can be channelled by revisiting notions such as “gift”, “purchase”, “collection”, “donor”, “communities of origin/source communities”, etc. The formulation “so-called communities of origin” by the organisers of the conference,<sup>48</sup> without in return also speaking of “so-called recipient countries”, triggered uneasy reactions because, according to Nzila M. Libanda-Mubusisi, Tommy Y. Buga and Albert Gouaffo, the syntagma appears symptomatic of the persistent colonial mindset. How can communities of origin be qualified “so-called”? Does this mean that nobody knows who and where they are, or that they claim a status which is not true? The expression “shared heritage” also appears problematic because, as Flower Manase puts it, “is it the objects that are shared, or the stories around them? [...] Instead, we are sharing the burden”.

Some other notions, such as the terms “gift” or “purchase”<sup>49</sup> also pose questions, as in the case of the Tangué in the *Museum Fünf Kontinente* in Munich (Inventory Number 7087), loot from the plundering of Lock Priso’s (1846–1916) houses, the resisting ruler of Bonaberi (then Hickory Town) on the 22 December 1884 by the medical doctor and colonial administrator Max Buchner (1846–1926), assisted by the German marines led by Admiral Eduard von Knorr (1840–1920).<sup>50</sup> According to the inventory of the Munich Museum, this disputed artefact is registered simply as a “gift” (*Geschenk*), without any mention of the plundering war that led to its removal. This highlights the fact, as Flower Manase also stresses, that not only the terminologies, but also the catalogues themselves need to be revisited.



Although the conference did not offer a specific contribution to the topic, the question of the importance of schools as places of implementing nation-building politics<sup>51</sup> was also raised. More than half a century after independence, many school textbooks, especially for sub-Saharan Africa, are written and published in Europe, and European languages have become the official languages. This cannot favour the consolidation and transmission of African cultural heritage, nor can it inspire students to become involved in the renaissance of their cultural identity, said Tommy Y. Buga. In this regard, history curriculum reforms are required as well as the need for workers in the cultural sector to also take part in the process of rethinking the postcolonial school and school textbooks as media of collective, cultural, and historical memory. As Ruth Firer and Sami Adwan note, “history and civics subjects are especially influential tools for conveying values, and therefore play a central role in the formation of public opinion and in forming both self-identity and the attitudes towards the others”.<sup>52</sup> In this regard, the influential potential of school textbooks can also be exploited for a better reconnection to one’s cultural heritage.

## Conclusion

If the collections from colonial contexts remain an unresolved problem, as Jos van Beurden postulates,<sup>53</sup> we must acknowledge the different strategies that the recipient countries and the source communities design every day to overcome the impediments that still obstruct the path to reconciling efforts to deal responsibly with colonial legacies on both sides. How to restore disrupted memories and identities, and how to cope with the necessity to fix the historical, colonial wrongdoings through repatriations and returns of ancestral remains and cultural goods? And how do we envision our future as a shared future, or how do we envision our future while giving Others the chance for their futures to equally exist or coexist? These are questions that still need to be asked if we want to act, not in the sense of colonial antagonism, but in a way that challenges exclusionary and intolerant policies.

- 1 See for statistics: Gbadamosi, Nosmot (2022): "Africa's Stolen Art Debate is Frozen in Time", in: *Foreign Policy*, 15 May 2022. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/05/15/africa-art-museum-europe-restitution-debate-book-colonialism-artifacts/>, accessed 8 March 2023; Wagner, Amuna (2023): "Colonialism Tried to Rob Africa of Its Heritage. Now, the Restitution Movement is Bringing It Back Home", in: *AMAKA, Politics & Society*, 11 January 2023, <https://amaka.studio/explore/articles/the-restitution-movement-africa-s-fight-for-its-stolen-art>, last accessed 8 March 2023; Sarr, Felwine; Savoy, Bénédicte (2018): *Restituer le patrimoine africain*, Paris, p. 31; for the speech of President Macron see <https://www.elysee.fr/en/emmanuel-macron/2017/11/28/emmanuel-macrons-speech-at-the-university-of-ouagadougou>, accessed 8 March 2023.
- 2 Sarr; Savoy, 2018, *Restituer*, p. 11.
- 3 For these key concepts of "ownership" and "possession", stressing the predominance of the legal aspect in the "ownership", as opposed to the factual aspect in the "possession", see Anghem, Emil (1989): "Besitz und Eigentum. Zu einem Problem der politischen Philosophie", in: *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung*, Vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 94–110.
- 4 Sarr; Savoy, 2018, *Restituer*, pp. 67–68.
- 5 Rea, Naomi (2019): "France Released a Groundbreaking Report on the Restitution of African Art One Year Ago: Has Anything Actually Changed?", in: *Artnet News*, 11 December 2019, <https://news.artnet.com/art-world/french-restitution-report-global-1728216>, accessed 10 March 2023.
- 6 Gbadamosi, 2022, *Africa's Stolen Art*.
- 7 See Fründt, Sarah; Förster, Larissa (2018): "Menschliche Überreste aus ehemals kolonisierten Gebieten in deutschen Institutionen. Historische Entwicklungen und zukünftige Perspektiven", in: Marianne Bechhaus-Gerst, Joachim Zeller (Eds): *Deutschland postkolonial? Die Gegenwart der imperialen Vergangenheit*, Berlin, pp. 505–531.
- 8 See e.g. the recent workshop: "Extracted Cameroon: Natural History and the Power of Collecting Sciences. Paper Workshop Humanities of Nature, Museum für Naturkunde Berlin", 10/11 November 2022, <https://www.hegemonie.fr/Extracted-Cameroon-Natural-history-and-the-power-of-collecting-sciences-4064>, accessed 8 March 2023; Heumann, Ina; Stoecker, Holger; Tamborini, Marco; Vennen, Mareike (2018): *Dinosaurierfragmente. Zur Geschichte der Tendaguru-Expedition und ihrer Objekte 1906–1918*, Göttingen.
- 9 German Museums Association (2018) (Ed.): *Guidelines on Dealing with Collections from Colonial Contexts*, Berlin.
- 10 Förster, Larissa; Edenheiser, Iris; Fründt, Sarah; Hartmann, Heike (2018) (Eds): *Provenienzforschung zu ethnografischen Sammlungen der Kolonialzeit. Positionen in der aktuellen Debatte*, Berlin, <https://edoc.hu-berlin.de/handle/18452/19769>, accessed 8 March 2023; Andratschke, Claudia (2018): Netzwerke erweitern – Von NS-Raubgutforschung zur Provenienzforschung in ethnologischen Sammlungen der Kolonialzeit, in: *Ibid.*, pp. 295–310.
- 11 See <https://www.postcolonial-provenance-research.com/>, accessed 6 March 2023.
- 12 Förster et al., 2018, *Provenienzforschung*, pp. 184ff.
- 13 Members of the panel: Richard Tsogang Fossi (Chair, University of Dschang, Cameroon); Flower Manase (National Museum, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania); Nzila M. Libanda-Mubusisi (National Museum Windhoek, Namibia); Albert Gouaffo (University of Dschang, Cameroon); Tommy Yaulin Buga (National Museum and Art Gallery, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea).
- 14 Lützel, Paul Michael (1997): "Der postkoloniale Blick", in: Paul M. Lützel (Ed.): *Der postkoloniale Blick*, Frankfurt a. M., p. 7–32, here p. 7.
- 15 Götsche, Dirk (2019): "Memory and Postcolonialism. Introduction", in: Dirk Götsche (Ed.): *Memory and Postcolonial Studies: Synergies and New Directions*, Oxford et al., p. 1–41, here p. 1.
- 16 See Said, Edward (1993): *Culture and Imperialism*, London, p. 3.

- 17 See Buchner, Max (1887): *Kamerun. Skizze und Betrachtungen*, Leipzig, p. 176–180. For the whole theory, see Darwin, Charles (1859): *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*, London.
- 18 See Buchner, 1887, *Kamerun*, pp. 176–180; Bade, Klaus J. (1988): "Imperial Germany and West Africa: Colonial Movement, Business Interests, and Bismarck's 'Colonial Policies'", in: Stig Förster, Wolfgang J. Mommsen, Ronald Robinson (Eds): *Bismarck, Europe, and Africa: The Berlin Africa Conference 1884–1885 and the Onset of Partition*, Oxford; Barth, Boris; Osterhammel, Jürgen (2005): *Zivilisierungsmissionen. Imperiale Weltverbesserung seit dem 18. Jahrhundert*, Constance.
- 19 See Tsogang Fossi, Richard (2021): "Eugen Zintgraff's Diary as a Document of Theft and Destruction of Art Treasures in the Colonial Context", in: Anna Brus, Michi Knecht, Marin Zillinger (Eds): *The Post/Colonial Museum. Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften*, Vol. 2, pp. 77–90.
- 20 Le Gall, Yann (2023): "'Nur mit Gewalt zu erlangen'. Militärische Gewalt und Museumsammlungen", in: Assilkinga, Mikael et al.: *Atlas der Abwesenheit. Kameruns Kulturerbe in Deutschland*, Heidelberg: arthistoricum.net, 2023, pp. 113–137.
- 21 Habermas, Rebekka (2021): "Rettungsparadigma und Bewahrungsfetischismus: Oder was die Restitutionsdebatte mit der europäischen Moderne zu tun hat", in: Thomas Sandkühler, Angelika Epple, Jürgen Zimmerer (Eds): *Geschichtskultur durch Restitution? Ein Kunsthistorikerstreit*, Köln, pp. 79–99.
- 22 See Ankermann, Bernhard (1914): *Anleitung zum ethnologischen Beobachten und Sammeln*, Berlin, p. 8–10; Sarreiter, Regina (2012): "Ich glaube, dass die Hälfte Ihres Museums gestohlen ist", in: Britta Lange, Regina Sarreiter: *Was Wir Sehen. Bilder, Stimmen, Rauschen. Zur Kritik anthropometrischen Sammelns im Pergamon-Palais der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, Basel, p. 43–58.
- 23 Boza, Isabella (2019): *Geschenkt, gekauft, erbeutet – Missionarisches Sammeln in Kamerun und Indien*, Museum der Kulturen Basel, <http://www.mkb.ch/de/museum/Fellowship.html>, accessed 8 March 2023.
- 24 Ratschiller, Linda (2013): "'Die Zauberei spielt in Kamerun eine böse Rolle'. Die ethnographischen Ausstellungen der Basler Mission (1908–1912)", in: Rebekka Habermas, Richard Hölzl (Eds): *Mission Global. Eine Verflechtungsgeschichte seit dem 19. Jahrhundert*, Vienna/Cologne/Weimar, p. 241–264.
- 25 Habermas, Rebekka (2013): "Intermediaries, Kaufleute, Missionare, Forscher und Diakonissen. Akteure und Akteurinnen im Wissenstransfer. Einführung", in: Rebekka Habermas, Alexandra Przyrembel (Eds): *Von Käfern, Märkten und Menschen. Kolonialismus und Wissen in der Moderne*, Göttingen, p. 27–48.
- 26 Kopytoff, Igor (1986): "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditisation as Process", in: Arjun Appadurai (Ed.): *The Social Life of Things*. New York, p. 64–91.
- 27 See for example Tsogang Fossi, Richard (2020): "Itinerary of a Cameroon Cross River Collection in Art Market Networks: An Analysis of Transaction Correspondence between Hamburg-Berlin-Leipzig", in: *Journal for Art Market Studies*, Vol. 4, no. 1.
- 28 Brus, Anna; Zillinger, Martin (2021): "Transforming the Post/Colonial Museum", in: Brus, Anna; Knecht, Michi; Zillinger, Martin (Eds): *The Post/Colonial Museum. Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften*, Vol. 2, p. 11–27, here p. 12f.
- 29 Savoy, Bénédicte (2021): *Afrikas Kampf um seine Kunst. Geschichte einer postkolonialen Niederlage*, München; see also Savoy, Bénédicte (2022): *Africa's Struggle for Its Art: History of a Postcolonial Defeat*, Princeton.
- 30 See Clifford, James (1997): "Museums as Contact Zones", in: James Clifford: *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, Cambridge/London, p. 192.
- 31 Sarr; Savoy, 2018, *Restituer*, p. 42–48.
- 32 Wagner, 2023, *Colonialism Tried*.
- 33 Pontone, Maya (2023): "Harmful Pesticides in Museum Collections Complicate Repatriation Efforts", in: *Hyperallergic*, 23 February 2023. <https://hyperallergic.com/803145/harmful-pesticides-in-museum->

- collections-complicate-repatriation-efforts/?utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=D022423&utm\_content=D022423+CID\_b1d5db51020f6ee32e24fee5ece0bc6c&utm\_source=hn&utm\_term=Harmful+Pesticides+in+Museum+Collections+Complicate+Repatriation+Efforts&fbclid=IwAR2\_9I\_nSlc-7jyKWwB714FbP1mGIWmB-RIMtrIn12DKNagJXAhJhqJ12fE, accessed 1 March 2023.
- 34 Aranui, Amber (2018): "The Importance of Working with Communities – Combining Oral History, the Archive and Institutional Knowledge in Provenance Research: A Repatriation Perspective", in: Förster et al., 2018, *Provenienzforschung*, p. 45–54, here p. 47.
- 35 See Savoy, 2021, *Afrikas Kampf*, p. 74f.
- 36 Adebo Abiti, Nelson (2021): "The Uganda Museum's Tribal Representation: Colonial Repositories and Community Reconciliation in Uganda", in: Anna Brus, Michi Knecht, Martin Zillinger (Eds): *The Post/Colonial Museum. Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften*, Vol. 2, p. 29–44, here p. 30.
- 37 Ibid., p. 30.
- 38 See Gram, Rikke; Schoofs, Zoe (2022): *Germany's History of Returning Human Remains and Objects from Colonial Contexts: An Overview of Successful Cases and Unsettled Claims between 1970 and 2021*, Working Paper German Lost Art Foundation, Vol. 3, p. 41.
- 39 Savoy, 2021, *Afrikas Kampf*, pp. 77–82.
- 40 See Sarr; Savoy, 2018, *Restituer*, p.146–150.
- 41 On how some communities resisted extortion of ancestral cultural goods, see Ethnological Museum (*Ethnologisches Museum*) Berlin, Archive, File "Museum Umlauf, Zu den Katalogen 222 und Kamerun-Sammlung", I MV 753, fol. 321ff. (1914).
- 42 See van Beurden, Jos (2018): "Decolonization and Colonial Collections: An Unresolved Conflict", in: *Low Countries Historical Review*, Vol. 133, no. 2, p. 66–78; Conrad, Sebastian (2011): "Dekolonisierung in den Metropolen", in: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft. Zeitschrift für historische Sozialwissenschaft*, Vol. 37, p. 135–156.
- 43 See Lerp, Dörte; Lewerenz, Susann (2021): "Getrennte Geschichten. Der Kolonialismus im Deutschen Historischen Museum", in: Wolfgang Geiger, Henning Melber (Eds): *Kritik des deutschen Kolonialismus. Postkoloniale Sicht auf Erinnerung und Geschichtsvermittlung*, Berlin, p. 155–162.
- 44 Zimmermann, Klaus (2016): "Missionarslinguistik in kolonialen Kontexten. Ein historischer Überblick", in: Thomas Stolz, Ingo H. Warnke, Daniel Schmidt-Brücken (Eds): *Sprache und Kolonialismus. Eine Einführung zu Sprache und Kommunikation in kolonialen Kontexten*. Berlin/Boston, p. 168–191, here p. 169.
- 45 Ibid., p. 172. Original German: "...die grammatische und lexikalische Beschreibung fremder Sprachen im Kontext und zum Ziel der christlichen Missionierung dieser Völker und im Zusammenhang damit das Abfassen von christlichen Schriften".
- 46 Ibid., p. 172. Along the same line, Calvet argues the prominent role of the language in colonialism and speaks of "theophagie", "glottophagie" and "imaginophagie". See Calvet, Jean (1974): *Linguistique et colonialisme. Petit traité de glottophagie*, Paris.
- 47 See, for example, in the Ethnological Museum Berlin, inv. No. III C 502 "Häuptlingsmütze"; Inv. No. III C 1931 "Häuptlingsstock"; Inv. No. III C 4830 "Zauberrassel"; inv. no. III C 4935 "Weibliche Zauberfigur", etc.
- 48 See conference announcement and programme, <https://www.postcolonial-provenance-research.com/conference/?lang=en>, accessed 11 April 2023.
- 49 See Sarr; Savoy, 2018, *Restituer*, p. 21.
- 50 Buchner, Max (1914): *Aurora colonialis. Bruchstücke eines Tagebuchs aus dem ersten Beginn unserer Kolonialpolitik 1884/1885*, Munich, p. 194; Kum'a Ndumbe III (2012): *L'Afrique s'annonce au rendez-vous la tête haute*, Douala, p. 95–96.
- 51 See, for example, Bentrovato, Denise (2015): *Narrating and Teaching the Nation: The Politics of Education in Pre- and Post-Genocide Rwanda*, Göttingen.
- 52 Firer, Ruth; Adwan, Sami (2004): *The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict in History and Civics Textbooks of Both Nations*, Hanover.
- 53 Van Beurden, 2018, *Decolonization*.