Afterword: Material reckonings with military histories

Henrietta Lidchi

Dividing the Spoils was devised and extensively discussed at a time when the question of provenance research and reckoning with the colonial past of collections, through prominent amongst a number of scholars and museum professionals, was not subject to the heightened attention that has more recently surrounded them. The context in which this volume will appear is noticably different.

In 2017-19, the circumstances that galvanised the questions of colonial spoils and their fates into the forefront of public discourse were an unlikely synergy between international politics and popular culture. In November 2017, the debate was triggered politically by a speech by French President Emmanuel Macron, in Oagadougou, Burkina Faso. In an unprecedented move for a European statesman President Macron announced that it was no longer acceptable that African cultural heritage had a larger foothold in museums in Paris than in Dakar, Lagos and Cotonou and suggested the need for a serious reconsideration of issues around the current retention of such objects in national collections across Europe.[1]

Consistent with the high intellectual standards of French public life, President Macron shortly thereafter commissioned a report on the question of colonialism, collections and return from two prominent scholars, Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, who set about the task through extensive international consultation.[2] This intervention, unique for a European head of state, was quickly buoyed in the public imagination by the Afrofuturist filmic event that was *Black Panther*, released by Marvel Studios in February 2018. Notable here was a relatively short early scene, commented on and quickly shared across social media, in which the hero's nemesis (Killmonger) stands in a museum, *qua* the British Museum, and gazes intently at the content of key African displays. He proceeds to question, correct and possibly

permanently incapacitate, the arrogant (female) curator by poisoning her cup of coffee. Killmonger then seizes his ancestral objects, an action that is described within the terms of the film (and echoed as such widely outside) as a long-overdue act of redistributive justice.[3] The barely concealed Docklands location with some rather poor signage does not convincingly stand in for one of the most prestigious museums in the European world, located in its own historic building in Bloosmbury - but that is hardly the issue. The point being made, and widely understood, is that the question of imperial or colonial collecting is no longer reserved for the privileged or exclusive discussion and adjudication by the scholarly community and museum directors.

In July 2018, these events were followed by the German Museums Association (Deutscher Museumsbund) publication *Guidelines on Dealing for Collections from Colonial Contexts*, funded by the Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and the Media, and subsequently publicly endorsed by the German Federal Minister of Culture.[4] This thorough document seeks to provide a professional guide to those in the museum sector working with colonial collections, where colonialism is defined as a relationship based on domination in which the colonised lose self-determination.[5] The German *Guidelines* provide a nuanced history and lengthy summary as a framework for working through the circumstances that have yielded German museum collections, providing a threefold differentiation regarding collections and their colonial circumstances: collections that reflect formal colonial rule; those that reflect informal colonial rule and those that reflect colonialism.[6] The *Guidelines* evoke the systematic methodology previously applied to another category of highly contested object, namely the type of provenance research used to track and trace things through multiple hands in order to establish a near continuous chain of possession for personal property alienated during the Second World War era (1933-1945) in Europe and thus eligible for restitution claims under the processes put in place after the agreement of the Washington Principles in

1998.[7] The German *Guidelines* provide definitions, a glossary and short essays, as well as reading lists in order to provide wider contextual understanding of museological history in Germany.[8] This move towards addressing German colonial history is part of a wider trend to renew German ethnological museums at a moment when their collections have finally settled in their home institutions following reunification in 1990. As noted by Sarr and Savoy, it is also nestled within the evolving controversy surrounding the rebuilding of a Prussian Palace (Hohenzollern palace or Stadtschloss) in Berlin to house the former ethnological and Asian art collections now known as the Humboldt Forum.[9] This city footprint was formerly occupied by the Palace of the Republic built in 1973-6 which served as a public and representative space under the former German Democratic Republic. The Palace of the Republic was a building iconic to many but was nevertheless levelled to make way for a new vision of the Federal Republic of Germany with Berlin as its capital. The imperious overtones of this gesture, with its eradication of a difficult history, were not lost on a number of inhabitants of the formerly divided city, the location of the 1884-85 conference in which European powers set about formalising their self-styled division of Africa. In tone and content, the German *Guidelines* is a measured undertaking with what appears to be significant economic and political traction. Greater alignment is displayed amongst various agencies and interests now in Germany with a seemingly more informed media and clear ministerial and financial support being aimed at the issue of colonial heritage defined as a necessary aspect of processing the German past.[10] The matter is conceived of as having an important role in the 'common social culture of rememberance' which is described as the basis on which German civil society can grow and be maintained.[11]

The German *Guidelines* nevertheless received a comparatively muted reception when set against the Sarr and Savoy publication which was eagerly anticipated by the international media and the museological fraternity. Published in English and French, *Restituer Le*

Patrimoine Africain[12] is a deftly aimed polemic targeted at a French public largely convinced of the benefits of viewing non-western art within a value system defined by the high call of Arts Premiers, and thus more wedded to artistic movements which remain of value in France such as Modernism and Primitivism.[13] This habitual *mise en valeur* distinguishes French attitudes to the objects emerging from a colonial context in an ever expanding European debate, as the French cultural establishment continues to hold firmly to the aesthetic value of objects and their connective role in French national public life.[14] Arguably, the French also remain institutionally more phlegmatic about the process whereby the colonial and post-colonial life histories of objects have largely involved the stripping away of identities in order to insert them into new narratives of value.[15] Indeed a broad critique levelled at the Sarr and Savoy report is that it gives no weight to the accrual of heritage value and personal feelings that attach themselves to objects and collections over time as they move from one location to another, and as they are accessioned into private lives and museum collections and that their transcultural roles, identities and histories are therefore overlooked.

Different ways of doing things are in evidence across the European context as they consider some of the more ignoble chapters in several national histories. Just before the high level announcement by Federal and State Ministers for culture in Germany, consciously intended to follow that of President Macron, the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*[16] contrasted approaches between Germany, the Netherlands and France, arguing that the French with their elaborate proposals and the Germans with their extensive Federal structure had been slightly caught off guard by the pragmatism of the Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen, the museum in the Netherlands whose March 2019 publication *Return of Cultural Objects: Principles and Process*[17] seemed to offer a swifter approach to these difficult questions on more generous terms. This perceptive summary of European methodology noted that each country proffered a different solution, with Presidential pressure being enacted on museums in France (top

down) while museums in the Netherlands were seeking to influence the Dutch state (bottom up)[18] such that the Dutch Minister of Culture, Education and Science swiftly laid plans in March 2019 to set up a commission for a national conversation, subsequently confirmed in October 2019 and scheduled to report in September 2020.[19] As the issue continues to be publicly discussed, the thoroughness of the German museological approach remains in evidence with the amended and expanded edition of the German *Guidelines*, enhanced by non-European and indigenous perspectives, followed in July 2019 barely a year after first publication in 2018.[20]

Each initiative attempts a nationally salient reshaping of the relationship between claimants, nation states and museums in the context of national imperial histories and contemporary *realpolitik*. In the United Kingdom where museums are part of the cultural sector *and* a devolved matter, run at the national level as non-departmental government bodies by governing Boards of Trustees (for the nation), institutional attitudes remain obscure, with clear direction being taken solely in the arena of human remains.[21] British museums have remained relatively silent throughout the recent debate despite the fact that the "bronzes" and ivories that came onto the world art market as a consequence of the punitive Benin Expedition of 1897, a British naval-military colonial intervention (see Mack, Chapter 2), remain the most frequently cited instance of colonial spoils and gains considered ill-gotten. The conspicuous position of the "Benin Bronzes" as exemplars of the issues in question is derived from their ubiquitous presence as status objects in the collections of the world's major art museums, as a consequence of the British practice of selling prize at auction (see Spiers, Chapter 1), a fact conspicuously referenced in the *Black Panther* narrative.

Reasoned scepticism in the face of an enthusiastic media attention and multiple government initiatives may be consistent with an awareness that there are levels of mimickry and competitive edge to this profoundly European museological debate. Its avowed and public

purpose may be driven by ideas of repair and the moral health of civil society, but the consequences of this revisionist impetus are still uncertain and may possibly even result in new assymetries of power or new forms of convenient historical erasure. Given the extent and complexity of European colonial history, the primary focus on sub-saharan African collections in the articulation of this debate seems unnecessarily restrictive, and may indicate the influence of a rapidly reconfiguring global geo-political landscape noticably at play on the African continent. The scramble to address colonial histories and the possibility of return to Africa (a continent whose countries compose twenty five per cent of the member states of the United Nations) should be viewed against the new political and economic realities and anxieties in Europe, not least that of maintaining a foothold in resource-rich former colonial territories while China's and Russia's influence continues to grow.

Although many of the documents and initiatives mentioned above seek to widen and bring nuance to ideas of colonial collecting, in the popular imagination this is a phenomenon almost entirely rooted in the idea of looting, thus illicit acts of appropriation (or 'abduction', as used by Mack this volume). This perception further perpetuates an undifferentiated interpretation of all museum collections deriving from beyond Europe as being the direct result of imperious governments and vengeful armies seizing artworks to distribute or potentially defray military costs, or of greedy soldiers secreting objects in their knapsacks for the purposes of gift giving, private pleasure or profit. Surprisingly then, the public and international discussion which addresses colonial wars and their institutional afterlives, accords few, if any, column inches or ministerial statements to the question of military museums or their collections. This ommission further highlights the paucity of understanding of how the military collected and appropriated, of how objects were dispersed and apportioned between national public institutions, military museums and private owners, and of the role of objects in military culture.

A further gap in understanding concerns the variation of practices across Europe. British museums, for example, benefitted by commissioning collections from those who accompanied military expeditions (for example see Spiers, Chapter 1 and Mack, Chapter 2) or from buying at auctions where prize was sold (see Spiers, Chapter 1 and Tythacott, Chapter 8). Dutch museums, in relation to Indonesian collections, benefitted from direct allocations once key objects were placed in the primary collection of what is now the National Museum of Indonesia in Jakarta,[22] and were thus retained after Independence in 1949 by the Republic of Indonesia. Senior military officers and Government officials of both countries during the colonial period reserved especially important trophies and gifts to be sent to their sovereigns as symbols of national-imperial victory[23] (see Voigt, Chapter 11). In the post-colonial period, national museums in both countries repatriated (though rarely in the quantities requested) or sold back objects linked to looting on military expeditions.[24]

This neglect of military history and an apparent lack of interest in how military codes and conventions have historically framed and legitimised the taking of objects on military campaign is a factor which constrains future interpretation and understanding of the nature and sources of these objects in their current museum settings. There is a critical impact on the ability to do the research on the provenance of objects that is required in a reasoned, thorough approach to these issues: the need to compare categories of objects; to establish networks of people;, and to create likely chains of circumstances and possession in a context where the original posessor, be they individual or communal, may not have been recorded, may not easily be established and, in the case of certain cultural contexts, may not necessarily be considered the recognised or legitimate owner.[25]

If there is any logical consequence to the current interest in colonial collecting it is that curators working on non-European material culture will, in the immediate future, have to develop a far better understanding of military history and military culture to deal successfully

with the challenges that new kinds of provenance research will require of them. In the British context this means an appreciation that the British army[26] was a fluid and ever-changing entity, whose identity is heavily based its history of campaign service, perpetuated through regiments that retain their relationship with these past events even as the army structure evolves. This, as Kirke and Hartwell show (Chapter 5), is a culture guided by formal and, equally importantly, informal rules whose history is kept alive through transferred memory, with war service in the past requiring that respect and honour is served to earlier generations of combatants who are emphatically remembered through activities that anthropologists might describe as ritualised. The culture of memory is constructed in one respect around the military officers' or sergeants' mess as a domestic and semi-public space, important because it embodied the sense of home for a peripatetic regiment and as such was the former home of many regimental collections.

Provenance research in the broader museological context will equally require a more flexible appreciation of what constitutes military material culture, beyond weapons, the latter assiduously collected during the colonial period and deposited in many national museums, but which, in the post-colonial period, have been of diminishing interest and are now rarely displayed in world culture galleries or exhibitions, or indeed researched by their holding institutions.[27] However, as the chapters in this book suggest, and as new research findings within a larger follow-up project is increasingly evidencing, an approach based on material culture theories and provenance methodologies, aware of military history and culture, offers a new appreciation of what at first glance appears to the outsider to be the idiosyncratic and disparate nature of military colonial collections. Unsurprisingly, military hierarchies of collecting and display do not conform to the canonical categories that are classically associated with 'ethnographic' objects,[28] even if the sources of the collections heavily intersect. Questions of how materiality and value perform in a military context are key,

especially if we are to consider properly the role of things as they move from the closed, quasi-domestic comfort of the mess to the public setting of the military museum. Regimental museums have, until recently, been most consciously targeted at an audience of military personnel, featuring a requisite pilgrimage at the beginning of a military career seen as fostering an *esprit de corps* which helps to preserve the inherited history of a regiment or corps through generations, and that might later on serve to promote cohesion and resolve in combat situations.

Museum collections of non-European and indigenous cultures have been developed in the nineteenth and twentieth century through a number of channels, and there are plentiful theorisations that pertain to collectors in which the missionary and the military are recognised. For the professional collecting of ethnography Michael O'Hanlon has provided a convenient characterisation of primary, secondary and circumstantial to codify the role of collecting within a given field expedition. This threefold categorisation helps chart the relation of academic anthropology to fieldwork which has typified British social anthropology since the early twentieth century, and is sometimes understood to have provided the best documented museum collections.[29] Nevertheless, during the 1990s much was written about tourist art and souvenirs in historic collections, putting forward the view that objects now resting in museum collections express a variety of social and political entaglements, presented (as gifts) or made to be sold (as souvenirs) rather than taken (as loot).

As one reviews this literature on collecting histories, it is clear that military collections are both absent and distinctive. Ethnographic collecting has traditionally had aspirations to collect in order to represent cultures or cultural forms that are extant: living, in the midst of transition or change or in decline. The material culture or artforms that it seeks to extract – traditional and contemporary – stand for aspects of culture that are judged salient to understanding of a culture as a larger series of processes including how it expresses itself

materially (or immaterially). Military collecting takes place in the midst of heightened political circumstances, in extremis amidst conflict and death, as well as amongst fallen combatants – friends or foe. The special nature of this environment with its associations of sudden and premature termination of life explains a number of unusual features of the value systems embodied in military collections which on the surface appear abberant when compared to 'ethnographic' collecting and display practices.

A distinctive factor is the tangible influence of what might be termed 'sentiment'. Military collections and military displays are unexpectedly emotional assemblages with their own hierarchies of value, intimately associated with people: heroes, fellow combatants, worthy opponents, despised enemies, the named and the unnamed. They are especially tied to campaign histories, to traditions of warfare therefore, and to a sense of community within military organsisations. They are part of the living history and memory culture of the regiment. Key events are extensively and repeatedly memorialised, a practice clearly evident in the prevalence of Colours, or standards, and the reason why those enemy standards that are captured take pride of place in military displays (see Kirke and Hartwell, Chapter 5). Trophies, momentoes and souvenirs are distinctive features of military collecting. However this memorialising culture is more especially evident in the repeated presence in military museum collections of things best described as relics and reliquaries. Steven Hooper, who has long worked with the material culture of the Pacific has provided a useful theory of relics.[30] His distinction between body, contact and image relics[31] provides a means to begin to appreciate the emotional nature, and ritualised function, of military museum collections that can appear on the surface to be both idiosyncratic and disparate.[32] In particular, Hooper discusses the type of relic-related behaviour and artefacts that are linked to national heroes including fallen heroes such as Vice-Admiral Lord Nelson. His discussion of the afterlife of

hair removed from Nelson's body transports us quickly, in form and intention, to a military example of recent salience related to this volume.

Until March 2019, the National Army Museum (NAM) had in its collections a composite object linked to Emperor Tewodros II and the punitive attack on his city fortress at Maqdala, Ethiopia by a British military expedition in 1868. This artefact was acquired in 1959 through a private donor.[33] It was formed of three separate things. A letter in Amharic with the Emperor's seal functioned as a background to a small piece of card positioned on the bottom right of the letter on which writing in pencil identified the pieces of hair attached (sewn) to the card as that of Emperor Tewodros II (known to the British as Theodore). The Emperor's letter has been translated, and its content is known to be linked to the capture and retention of a British envoy and prisoner Hormuzd Rassam who was moved to Maqdala[34] as a hostage, one of the reasons used by the British to justify the 1868 military intervention. The 'gruesome souvenir'[35] was noted to have been acquired after the Emperor's suicide by Lieutenant Colonel Cornelius James (1838-89) of the Bombay Staff Corps of the British Indian army while creating his unofficial posthumous watercolour portrait of the Emperor.[36] The material assemblage was given to the National Army Museum in 1959 with the following details: 'Framed letter bearing the great seal of Emperor Theodore, also a lock of Theodore's hair taken after death, with translation and six other documents'.[37] As a composite object it can only be understood through the idea of a reliquary and relic: the combination of letter and mounted hair samples are layered presentational codes that serve to ritualise and which are associated through touch and body with a vanquished enemy. Looking at the National Army Museum's collection, James appears to have acquired two such locks of hair. The composite relic was one of two artefacts held by the museum that contained hair samples from Emperor Tewodros II: the other was a lock of hair, also mounted on card and seemingly a gift handed by James to his future wife and her female relatives, possibly consistent with the role of hair

as a loving memento (part of a Victorian language of mourning, courtship and friendship) linking the living and the dead.[38]

In 2018, recognising the relevance of the 150th commemoration of the storming of Maqdala, there were two iniatives that sought to address this moment in the British imperial past, one in a national museum, and one in a military museum. According to their current documentation the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A) acquired Ethiopian ritual items and clothing through various official channels including the Foreign Office (1868) and also connected to the imprisoned civil servant Hormuzd Hassam, the Secretary of State for India (1869), H. M. Treasury (1872),[39] as well as the sale of articles from Major Trevenen James Holland of the Bombay Staff Corps (1869) who, with his colleague Sir Henry Montague Hozier of the 3rd Dragoon Guards, provided the only official account of the expedition on the orders of the Secretary of State for War.[40] A small display, *Maqdala 1868*, was created by the V&A for the 2018 anniversary using twenty pieces from the collection. The display was located in the museum's silver gallery which while apparently incongruous in light of the contested history context, was institutionally consistent with classification of some of the work as part of a decorative art collection, [41] in particular the ritual items, such as the eighteenth century gold alloyed crown[42] and the gold chalice[43] probably from the Church of Our Lady of Qwesqwam, near Gondar. The interpretation within the display covered Ethiopian cultural history at the time, the history of the campaign and, most affectingly, the poignant personal stories of the members of the Ethiopian Royal Family whose clothes, photographs and jewellery, all featured. In a non-military context the fate of Emperor Tewodros II, his second wife Queen Terunesh, who died a captive, and of their son only serves to emphasize the unsettling nature of colonial histories, eliciting justifiable empathy given that Prince Alemaheyu Tewodros's destiny, after his parents' death, was to be one of a number of ill-fated child wards[44] of Queen Victoria (see also Voigt, Chapter 11). Dying

prematurely in his enforced exile, after the clash with the British Empire had deprived him of both his parents, and in the care of those in whose name the military campaign against his dynasty was conducted. Prince Alemaheyu Tewodros's remains are buried at Windsor.

The V&A sought to structure its interpretation of the Maqdala collections in three ways - through documents of the time (conveyed in black labels), through contemporary community narratives (red labels) and in the institutional voice (white labels). Through balance in size and adjacency, this colour coding approach signalled the equivalence of different categories of interpretative voice, thus representing the simultaneity of different perspectives revolving around this difficult and intertwined history. *Maqdala 1868* texts cited oppositional British views of the time recorded by Hansard, notably from William Gladstone, the then Prime Minister, who voiced disquiet at the abduction of sacred items during a military campaign but ultimately did nothing to rectify the injury (see also Spiers, Chapter 1).[45] The V&A's 2018 display prompted renewed demands for return of objects from the Government of Ethiopia, originally made in 2008, which were answered in public by a proposal by the V&A for long term loans and better dialogue.[46]

More quietly, but ongoing since April 2018, the questions of the National Army Museum's composite Tewedros relic, and in particular the hair samples, were being discussed between the museum's management and the Ethiopian Government. In March 2019, the two sets of hair samples were transferred in a small ceremony by the Director, Justin Maciejewski, DSO, MBE to Her Excellency Dr Hirut Kassaw, Ethiopia's Minister of Culture, Tourism and Sport. The hair samples were handed over, contained in a small box draped with the flag of the Republic of Ethiopia (and thus reminiscent of military funerals) to be transferred in the Ethiopian National Museum prior to being interred with the remains of the Emperor. The press release and media reports [47] that accompanied this gesture in the context of wider discussion about colonial collections included some understated, but intringuing clarifications

regarding the thinking behind this act of return. The NAM worked within the terms of existing English legislation, namely *The Human Tissue Act* (2004) rather than under a broader understanding of restitution or repatriation. This required two perceptual shifts. Firstly, a generous and permissive interpretation of the 2004 Act was mobilized as this normally excludes hair, nails and teeth, as body parts that naturally separate from the body in life. This recognised the deliberate act of retrieval in a situation of war, which is known to have taken place in this case. The identification of hair as a pertinent human remain in this case was tacitly acknowledged when the NAM Director was quoted saying 'We very much look forward to the occasion when we can hand over these symbolic human remains to the people of Ethiopia.' [48] Secondly, to allow for the hair, and the hair alone, to be returned, the composite relic had to be disassembled. Only the was presented in the small coffin to Ethiopia's Minister of Culture, Tourism and Sport. The frame, the letter and the card mounts on which the hair samples had originally been placed for both the composite relic and the other item were retained and remain in the possession of the museum. This accommodation could be seen in a narrow sense as a bureaucratic interpretation of an existing piece of legislation to allow a national institution to return an element of its collection in response to a powerful request linked to a well-known and contested historical episode. It can also be seen in a more straightforward sense as a gesture of good will, a demonstration of mutual recognition and regard; an affective link between the National Army Museum and the claimants. The intersection here revolves around the understanding of these items as reliquaries and relics, having heightened sentimental and symbolic value. The combination of paper items (be they letters or mounts) and the hair are simultaneously contact and body relic and, permanently entangled in questions of national history, tragedy, heroism and martyrdom, wherever they are placed. The editors of this volume would argue this intriguing case study implies a shared understanding on behalf of the military, represented by the museum, and the

claimants and recipients of the object, represented by the Ethiopian Government, of the emotional power and value of the fragments, and in particular of the composite object, holding a letter, and the mounted hair lock as a material encapsulation and embodiment of a complex transcultural history. As noted by Hooper (and Mack, Chapter 2) the disentangling of person/object is not always easily achieved,[49] even if the gesture of return in this instance required precisely such an action. One interpretation of this case of return was a tacit agreement to divide the spoils which for both parties have invested political, emotional and ritual value, with the transfer of the hair as body relics out of the NAM collection, but the retention of the papers and mounts as touch relics within it.

Opening up the field of military collecting to more forensic investigation, testing the proper understandings of historical circumstances and setting out an appreciation of military collections and the performance of material culture brought back from campaigns overseas requires a critical attentiveness, not a comfortable acceptance of long-held assumptions. As historian and anthropologist James Clifford has recently noted, a commitment to complexity and to interdisciplinarity requires detailed provenance research, a certain quality of ironic distance, a sense of the longue durée of these issues and their contingent conclusions, as well as a particular a form of transgressive hope.[50] The hope is that we can trust ourselves and others to challenge historical orthodoxies, to value the work that we mutually undertake and to proceed objectively but with sensitivity and respect. In so doing we may produce fuller understandings of the legacies that these transcultural histories bestow on us and that the resulting collections require us to address.

References

Bailey, M., ‘London museum returns emperor's hair—taken by a British officer as a war trophy—to Ethiopia’, The Art Newspaper, 21 March 2019, www.theartnewspaper.com/news/maqdala

Bailey, M. ‘London’s National Army Museum to return emperor's hair to Ethiopia’, *The Art Newspaper*, 4 March 2019, www.theartnewspaper.com/news/london-s-national-army-museum-to-return-emperor-s-hair-to-ethiopia

Bailey, M. ‘Ethiopia toughens position on Maqdala treasures calling for full restitution’, *The Art Newspaper*, 20 April 2018, www.theartnewspaper.com/news/ethiopia-toughens-position-on-maqdala-treasures-calling-for-full-restitution

Van Beurden, J., *Treausre in Trusted Hands: Negotiating the Future of Colonial Cultural Objects* (Sidestone Press: Leiden, 2007)

Bringreve, F., Stuart-Fox, D. with Ernwati, W ‘Collections After Colonial Conflict: Badung and Tabanan 1906-2006’, in ter Keurs, P. *Colonial Collections Revisited* (Leiden University Press: Leiden, 2013), pp. 146-185.

Campfens, E., ‘NAZI-LOOTED ART: A Note in Favour of Clear Standards and Neutral Procedures’, *Art and Antiquity*, 22:4 (2017), pp. 315-45.

Clifford, J., ‘Ishi’s Story’ in J. Clifford, *Returns: Becoming Indigenous in theTwenty-First Century* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 2013), pp. 90-191.

Cordrea-Rado, A. ‘UK Museum offers Ethiopia Long Term Loan of Looted Treasures’, *The New York Times*, 4 April, 2018, www.nytimes.com/2018/04/04/arts/design/v-and-a-ethiopian-treasure.html?searchResultPosition=1

Deutscher Museumsbund/German Museums Association, *Guidelines on Dealing with Collections from Colonial Contexts* (German Museums Association: Berlin, 2018)

Deutscher Museumsbund/German Museums Association, *Leitfaden. Umgang mit Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen Kontexten, 2. Fassung 2019* (Deutscher Museumsbund: Berlin, 2019)

Crowley, T., and A. Mills, *Weapons, Culture and the Anthropology Museum* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018)

Gere, C., and J. Rudoe, *Jewellery in the Age of Queen Victoria: A Mirror to the World,* (British Museum Press: London, 2010)

Embassy of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, London ‘Culture Minister visits British Museums on debut visit to the UK’, 29 March 2019, www.ethioembassy.org.uk/culture-minister-visits-british-museums-on-debut-visit-to-the-uk/

Gignoux, S., ‘Emmanuel Macron promet à l’Afrique des restitutions d’œuvres africaines « d’ici à 5 ans »’, *La Croix*, 28 November 2018, www.la-

croix.com/Culture/Expositions/Emmanuel-Macron-promet-lAfrique-restitutions-doeuvres-africaines-dici-5-ans-2017-11-28-1200895496

Kultusminister Konferenz, 'Erste Eckpunkte 1 zum Umgang mit Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen Kontexten 2 der Staatsministerin des Bundes für Kultur und Medien, 3 der Staatsministerin im Auswärtigen Amt für internationale Kulturpolitik, 4 der Kulturministerinnen und Kulturminister der Länder 5 und der kommunalen Spitzenverbände', Anlage II, z. NS 1. Kultur-MK, 13 March 2019, Berlin, pp. 1-8 www.kmk.org/fileadmin/pdf/PresseUndAktuelles/2019/2019-03-25_Erste-Eckpunkte-Sammlungsgut-koloniale-Kontexte_final.pdf

Häntzschel, J.,'Begründete Zweifel', *Süddeutsches Zeitung*, 12 March 2019, https://www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/restitution-begruendete-zweifel-1.4364409

Harris, C., *Photography and Tibet* (Reaktion Books: London, 2016)

Harris, C., *The Museum on the Roof of the World: Art, Politics and the Representation of Tibet* (University of Chicago press: Chicago, 2012)

Hartwell, N., 'Artefacts of Mourning from the Indian Uprising', (forthcoming, ICOMAM, 2020)

Haughin, C., Why museum professionals need to talk about Black Panther', *The Hopkins Exhibitionist,* 20 March, 2018 [https://jhuexhibitionist.com/2018/02/22/why-museum-professionals-need-to-talk-about-black-panther/]

Hickley, C., 'Culture ministers from 16 German states agree to repatriate artefacts looted in colonial era', *The Art Newspaper* (14 March 2019), www.theartnewspaper.com/news/culture-ministers-from-16-german-states-agree-to-repatriate-artefacts-looted-in-colonial-era

Holland, T.J., and Hozier, H., *Record of the Expedition to Abysinnia by order of the Secretary of State for War*, Volumes1-3 (Her Majesty's Stationery Office: London, 1870).

Hooper, S., 'A Cross-Cultural Theory of Relics: On Understanding Religion, Bodies, Artefacts, Images and Art,' *World Art*, 4:2 (2014), 175-207

Marshall, A. 'Living Things, With No Bone or Tissue, Pose a Quandary for Museums', *The New York Times*, 21 March 2019, www.nytimes.com/2019/03/21/arts/design/museums-human-remains.html

Mueller, A., 'Russia in Africa', *Monocole 24*, 9 February 2019, https://monocle.com/radio/shows/the-foreign-desk/266/

Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen, *Claims for Return of Cultural Objects: Principles and Processes* (Leiden: NMVW, 2019)

Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen, 'The National Museum of World Cultures identifies the principles on the basis of which the museum will assess claims for the return of objects of which it is the custodian', press release, 7 March 2019, www.volkenkunde.nl/en/about-volkenkunde/press/dutch-national-museum-world-cultures-nmvw-announces-principles-claims

Noce, V.,'French President Emmanuel Macron calls for international conference on the return of African Artifacts', *The Art Newspaper*, 26 November 2018, www.theartnewspaper.com/news/french-president-emmanuel-macron-calls-for-international-conference-on-the-return-of-african-artefacts

Noce, V., 'France Retreats From Report Recommending Automatic Restitutions of Looted African Artefacts', *The Art* Newpaper, 5 July 2019, www.theartnewspaper.com/news/france-buries-restitution-report

O'Hanlon, M., 'Introduction', in M. O'Hanlon and R. L. Welsh (eds), *Hunting the Gatherers: Ethnographic Collecting, Agents and Agency in Melanesia* (Berghahn Books: Oxford, 2000), pp. 1-34.

Phillips, R.B., 'The other Victoria and Albert Museum: Itineraries of Emprie at the Swiss Cottage Museum, Osborne House', in M., Wellington Gathtan and E., Troelenberg (eds.), *Collecting and Empires: An Historical and Global Perspective* (Harvey Miller Publishers: London, 2018), pp. 239-257.

Price, S., *Paris Primitive, Jacques Chirac's Museum on the Quai Branly,* (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 2007).

Ryan, J.R. *Picturing Empire: Photography and the Visualization of the British Empire* (Reaktion Books: London, 1997)

Sarr, F., and B. Savoy, *Restituer Le Patrimoine Africain* (Philippe Rey/Seuil: Paris, 2018)

Ragbir, L., 'What *Black Panther* Gets Right About the Politics of Museums', 20 March 2018, *Hyperallergic*, https://hyperallergic.com/433650/black-panther-museum-politics/

Schuetze, C. F., 'Germany Sets Guidelines for Repatriating Colonial-Era Artifacts', *New York Times,* 15 March 2019, www.nytimes.com/2019/03/15/arts/design/germany-museums-restitution.html

Thomas, N., 'We need to confront uncomfortable truths about European colonial appropriation', *The Art Newspaper*, 29 November 2017, www.theartnewspaper.com/comment/macron-repatriation

Wiener, J., 'Object Lessons: Dutch Coloniaism and the looting of Bali', *History and Anthropology*, 6:4 (1994), 347-70

---

[1] As reported for instance by S. Gignoux, 'Emmanuel Macron promet à l'Afrique des restitutions d'œuvres africaines « d'ici à 5 ans »', *La Croix* (28 November 2018), www.la-croix.com/Culture/Expositions/Emmanuel-Macron-promet-lAfrique-restitutions-doeuvres-africaines-dici-5-ans-2017-11-28-1200895496, accessed 30 May 2019; V. Noce, 'French President Emmanuel Macron calls for international conference on the return of African Artifacts, *The Art Newspaper* (26 November 2018), www.theartnewspaper.com/news/french-president-emmanuel-macron-calls-for-international-conference-on-the-return-of-african-artefacts, accessed 30 May 2019; N. Thomas, 'We need to confront uncomfortable truths about European colonial appropriation', *The Art Newspaper* (29 November 2017), www.theartnewspaper.com/comment/macron-repatriation, accessed 30 May 2019.

[2] F. Sarr, and B. Savoy, *Restituer Le Patrimoine Africain* (Paris: Philippe Rey/Seuil, 2018), pp. 141-64.

[3] See for example C. Haughin, 'Why museum professionals need to talk about Black Panther', *The Hopkins Exhibitionist* (20 March 2018), https://jhuexhibitionist.com/2018/02/22/why-museum-professionals-need-to-talk-about-black-panther/, accessed 30 May 2019; L. Ragbir, 'What *Black Panther* Gets Right About the Politics of

Museums', *Hyperallergic* (20 March 2018), https://hyperallergic.com/433650/black-panther-museum-politics/, accessed 30 May 2019.

[4] Deutscher Museumsbund/ Museum Association, *Guidelines on Dealing with Collections from Colonial Contexts* (Berlin: German Museums Association, 2018).

[5] Deutscher Museumsbund/ Museum Association, *Guidelines on Dealing with Collections from Colonial Contexts* (Berlin: German Museums Association, 2018).p. 11.

[6] *Ibid*., pp. 16-23.

[7] The *Washington Principles on Nazi-confiscated Art* are a set of undertakings endorsed by forty-four governments as a consequence of the conference on Nazi Looted Assets that took place in Washington, DC, United States on the 3 December 1998. These have been followed up by further declarations and restitution commissions in a number of European states. See for discussion of their principles, history and application: E. Campfens, 'NAZI-LOOTED ART: A Note in Favour of Clear Standards and Neutral Procedures', *Art and Antiquity*, 22:4 (2017), 315-45.

[8] The 2018 report runs to a lengthy 128 pages, see *Guidelines on Dealing with Collections from Colonial Contexts.*

[9] Sarr and Savoy, *Restituer Le Patrimoine Africain*, pp. 12, 18. Savoy as an academic working in Paris and Berlin is uniquely placed in being able to connect French and German developments, being influential in both contexts.

[10] See for example: C. Hickley, 'Culture ministers from 16 German states agree to repatriate artefacts looted in colonial era', *The Art Newspaper* (14 March 2019), www.theartnewspaper.com/news/culture-ministers-from-16-german-states-agree-to-repatriate-artefacts-looted-in-colonial-era, accessed 30 May 2019; C. F. Schuetze, 'Germany Sets Guidelines for Repatriating Colonial-Era Artifacts', *New York Times* (15 March 2019), www.nytimes.com/2019/03/15/arts/design/germany-museums-restitution.html, accessed 30 May 2019.

[11] Kultusminister Konferenz, 'Erste Eckpunkte 1 zum Umgang mit Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen Kontexten 2 der Staatsministerin des Bundes für Kultur und Medien, 3 der Staatsministerin im Auswärtigen Amt für internationale Kulturpolitik, 4 der Kulturministerinnen und Kulturminister der Länder 5 und der kommunalen Spitzenverbände', Anlage II, z. NS 1. Kultur-MK, 13 March 2019, Berlin, p. 1. www.kmk.org/fileadmin/pdf/PresseUndAktuelles/2019/2019-03-25_Erste-Eckpunkte-Sammlungsgut-koloniale-Kontexte_final.pdf, accessed 30 May 2019.

[12] Sarr and Savoy, *Restituer Le Patrimoine Africain*.

[13] As noted during the building of the Musée du Quai Branly, now Musée du Quai Branly Jacques Chirac, named after the President so influential in its development and known for his connoisseurial interest, and nationally mourned after his passing in September 2019 in the museum itself. See S. Price *Paris Primitive, Jacques Chirac's Museum on the Quai Branly,* (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 2007).

[14] A critical article in 2019 published in *The Art Newspaper* argued, following a conference called to discuss the Sarr and Savoy report, that it is being quietly buried by French political and museum authorities, as the French policy context develops in an opaque and contradictory fashion. V. Noce, 'France Retreats From Report Recommending Automatic Restitutions of Looted African Artefacts', *The Art* Newpaper (5 July 2019), https://www.theartnewspaper.com/news/france-buries-restitution-report, accessed 10 October 2019.

[15] J. Wiener, 'Object Lessons: Dutch Colonialism and the looting of Bali', *History and Anthropology*, 6:4, p.350.

[16] J. Häntzschel,'Begründete Zweifel', *Süddeutsches Zeitung* (12 March 2019), www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/restitution-begruendete-zweifel-1.4364409, accessed 30 May 2019.

[17] Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen, *Claims for Return of Cultural Objects : Principles and Processes* (Leiden : NMVW, 2019) and Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen, 'The National Museum of World Cultures identifies the principles on the basis of which the museum will assess claims for the return of objects of which it is the custodian', press release (7 March 2019), www.volkenkunde.nl/en/about-volkenkunde/press/dutch-national-museum-world-cultures-nmvw-announces-principles-claims, accessed 30 May 2019.

[18] Häntzschel,'Begründete Zweifel'.

[19] As announced in the letter sent on 10 April 2019 by Ingrid van Engelshoven, the Minister of Education, Culture and Science to the Second House of the Dutch Parliament.

[20] The July 2019 version of the guidelines benefited from an international consultation process in October 2018. which sought to widen the debate by including non-European and indigenous perspectives as invited speakers and as authors in the written report. The new guidelines stress the need for equity collaborative working between German museums and countries of origin. The 2019 report is 200 pages. Deutcher Museumsbund/German Museum Association *Leitfaden. Umgang mit Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen Kontexten, 2. Fassung 2019* (Berlin: Deutscher Museumsbund, 2019).

[21] T. Flessas, 'The Repatriation Debate and the Discourse of the Commons', *LSE Law, Society and Economy Working Papers,* 10 (2007), www.lse.ac.uk/law/working-paper-series, accessed 30 May 2019.

[22] See for example F. Bringreve, D. Stuart-Fox with W. Ernwati, 'Collections After Colonial Conflict: Badung and Tabanan 1906-2006', in P. ter Keurs, *Colonial Collections Revisited* (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2013), pp. 160-62.

[23] R. B. Phillips, 'The other Victoria and Albert Museum: Itineraries of Emprie at the Swiss Cottage Museum, Osborne House', in M. Wellington Gathtan and E. Troelenberg (eds), *Collecting and Empires: An Historical and Global Perspective* (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2018).

[24] Such initiatives have not been systematically studied though there are instances of museum collections, being returned in small quantities to nations post independence. For some reference to cases see J. Van Beurden, *Treausre in Trusted Hands: Negotiating the Future of Colonial Cultural Objects* (Leiden: Sidestone Press, 2007).

[25] This would in particular apply to objects that are communally owned, or that due to their sacred nature cannot be owned, but equally those looted from treasuries that already contained looted material.

[26] Though in this volume the British Army is the focus, it is of course the case that the British Navy were also involve in campaigns for example in 1897 during the Punitive Expedition to the Kingdom of Benin.

[27] A recent edited collections attempts to rectify this absence: T. Crowley and A. Mills (eds), *Weapons, Culture and the Anthropology Museum* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018).

[28] This is demonstrated in the critique Tythacott (this volume) makes of the display strategy arising in regimental museum with collections coming from the Yuanmingyaun or Old Summer Palace, Beijing.

[29] M. O'Hanlon, 'Introduction', in M. O'Hanlon and R. L. Welsh (eds), *Hunting the Gatherers: Ethnographic Collecting, Agents and Agency in Melanesia* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000), pp. 12-15.

[30] S. Hooper, 'A Cross-Cultural Theory of Relics: On Understanding Religion, Bodies, Artefacts, Images and Art', *World Art*, 4:2 (2014), 175-207.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

[32] N. Hartwell, 'Artefacts of Mourning from the Indian Uprising', reference to ICOM publication.

[33] National Army Museum, accession no. 1959-09-171

[34] A translation of the letter was found in an album of photographs belonging to Colonel Cornelius Francis (Frank) James; National Army Museum, archives, accession no. 1959-09-170.

[35] M. Bailey, 'London museum returns emperor's hair—taken by a British officer as a war trophy—to Ethiopia', *The Art Newspaper* (21 March 2019), www.theartnewspaper.com/news/maqdala, accessed 30 May 2019

[36] Ryan argues that General Napier wished a post-humoumus photograph of the deceased king. See J.R. Ryan, *Picturing Empire: Photography and the Visualization of the British Empire* (London: Reaktion Books, 1997), p.82.

[37] National Army Museum, reference 1959-10-71.

[38] National Army Museum, accession no. 1959-09-171, C. Gere and J. Rudoe, *Jewellery in the Age of Queen Victoria: A Mirror to the World* (London: British Museum Press, 2010), pp. 164-5.

[39] Through the activities of Richard Holmes manuscripts curator of the British Museum who followed the campaign.

[40] T. J. Holland and H. Hozier, *Record of the Expedition to Abysinnia by order of the Secretary of State for War*, 3 volumes (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1870).

[41] Many of the artefacts became part of the collections of the 'Metalwork Department', now part of the department of 'Sculpture, Metalwork, Ceramics and Glass' which is the internal logic as to why the display was placed in this gallery.

[42] V&A Museum, accession no. M.27-2005.

[43] V&A Museum, accession no. M.26-2005.

[44] Prince Alemaheyu's wardship and guardianship was the subject of a debate in Parliament on 8 March 1872. https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1872-03-08/debates/507237b7-cfa8-4b5b-bd46-bdad6aaeda0e/Abyssinia%E2%80%94PrinceAlamayon, accessed 2 June 2019

[45] This was part of a longer debate about the prize system and the entitlement of the British Museum to use national funds for purchase of such things. William Gladstone (House of Commons debate 30 June 1871) condemned the taking of gold crown and chalice from Maqdala as religious objects, and contended that these should not be in public collections as this would cause the consequence that they could not be alienated in the future, which indeed is presently the case. https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1871-06-30/debates/0e763636-72ee-4a5c-bb3f-f6b19e10922f/AbyssinianWar%E2%80%94Prize%E2%80%94TheAbanaSCrownAndChalice, accessed 2 June 2019.

[46] M. Bailey, 'Ethiopia toughens position on Maqdala treasures calling for full restitution', *The Art Newspaper* (20 April 2018), www.theartnewspaper.com/news/ethiopia-toughens-position-on-maqdala-treasures-calling-for-full-restitution, accessed 30 May 2019; A. Cordrea-Rado, 'UK Museum offers Ethiopia Long Term Loan of

Looted Treasures', *The New York Times* (4 April 2018), www.nytimes.com/2018/04/04/arts/design/v-and-a-ethiopian-treasure.html?searchResultPosition=1, accessed 30 May 2019.

[47] M. Bailey, 'London museum returns emperor's hair—taken by a British officer as a war trophy—to Ethiopia', *The Art Newspaper* (21 March 2019), www.theartnewspaper.com/news/maqdala, accessed 30 May 2019; M. Bailey, 'London's National Army Museum to return emperor's hair to Ethiopia', *The Art Newspaper* (4 March 2019), www.theartnewspaper.com/news/london-s-national-army-museum-to-return-emperor-s-hair-to-ethiopia, 30 May 2019; Embassy of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, London, 'Culture Minister visits British Museums on debut visit to the UK', 29 March 2019, www.ethioembassy.org.uk/culture-minister-visits-british-museums-on-debut-visit-to-the-uk/, accessed 30 May 2019; A. Marshall, 'Living Things, With No Bone or Tissue, Pose a Quandary for Museums', *The New York Times* (21 March 2019), www.nytimes.com/2019/03/21/arts/design/museums-human-remains.html, accessed 30 May 2019.

[48] National Army Museum, 'National Army Museum responds to repatriation request from Ethiopia', www.nam.ac.uk/press/national-army-museum-responds-repatriation-request-ethiopia, accesed 30 May 2019.

[49] Hooper, 'A Cross-Cultural Theory of Relics', p. 199.

[50] J. Clifford, 'Ishi's Story', in J. Clifford, *Returns: Becoming Indigenous in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), p. 101.