

THE MIGRATED MUSEUM: RESTITUTION OR A SHARED HERITAGE?

A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment for the Degree of Philosophy

By

WINANI W. THEBELE

University of the Witwatersrand

Department of Anthropology

Supervisor: Dr Hylton White

December 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS i

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS vi

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 TOPIC 1

1.2 RATIONALE 14

1.3 LITERATURE REVIEW 18

1.4 METHODOLOGY 29

1.5 OUTLINE 35

CHAPTER 2 POLICY FRAMEWORKS 36

2.1 DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL POLICY—EXPATRIATION AND RESTITUTION 36

2.1.1 Issues of Security and Cultural Heritage 36

2.1.2 The International Scenario on Policy 40

2.1.3 ICOM and the Protection of Cultural Heritage 43

2.1.4 ICOM West African Red List 44

2.2 DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY IN BOTSWANA, PRECOLONIAL TO POSTCOLONIAL 50

2.2.1 Indigenous Patrimony 50

2.2.2 The Colonial Policy Setting in Botswana 54

2.2.3 The Postcolonial Period and the Development of the Monuments and Relics Act 55

2.3 DEVELOPMENT AND CURRENT STATE OF A SHARED HERITAGE POLICY 63

2.3.1 West African National Regulations and Bilateral Agreements on Cultural Heritage 70

CHAPTER 3 MIGRATED COLLECTIONS 74
3.1 THE MIGRATED MUSEUM—CONCEPTUALISATION 74
3.1.1 Migration of Objects: A Two-Way Process 80
3.1.2 The Museum Concept 83
3.2 A FOCUS ON THE COLLECTORS 94
3.2.1 Scientific Expeditions 95
3.2.2 Missionaries 96
3.2.3 Trade Expeditions 99
3.2.4 Curatorial Expeditions 99
3.2.5 Scholars and Researchers 101
3.2.6 Punitive Expeditions 102
3.2.7 Case Studies 106
3.3 THE BRITISH MUSEUM 117
3.3.1 A Synopsis of African Collections at the British Museum 117
3.4 BOTSWANA COLLECTIONS IN EUROPE AND THE US 124
3.5 BOTSWANA COLLECTIONS IN OTHER AFRICAN COUNTRIES (SADC) 132
3.5.1 Museum Africa in Johannesburg 134
3.5.2 University of the Witwatersrand 134
3.5.3 South African National Library 135
3.5.4 Livingstone Museum in Zambia 135
3.5.5 Natural History Museum of Bulawayo, Zimbabwe 135
3.5.6 National Museum of Namibia in Windhoek 136
3.5.7 Iziko Museums in Cape Town 136
3.6 CONTEMPORARY CASES OF TRAFFICKING 142
CHAPTER 4 EXPATRIATION AS ALIENATION 149
4.1 SLAVERY AS NATAL ALIENATION 151

4.2 HUMAN REMAINS 155
4.3 CULTURAL OBJECTS 170
4.4 HERITAGE AND CULTURE AS TOOLS FOR RESTORATION 174
CHAPTER 5 RESTITUTION 181
5.1 CONCEPTUALISATION OF RESTITUTION 181
5.2 A SYNOPSIS OF SUCCESSFUL CASE STUDIES OF RESTITUTION OF BOTSWANA COLLECTIONS & TO OTHER PARTS OF AFRICA 197
5.2.1 The Botswana Situation 198
5.2.2 The African Situation 203
5.2.3 The International Scenario 207
5.3 NORTHERN CRITIQUES OF FURTHER RESTITUTION 213
CHAPTER 6 EXPERIMENTS IN SHARING 221
6.1 ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONCEPTIONS OF EXCHANGE 226
6.2 MIMESIS AND ALTERITY 230
6.3 CASE STUDIES OF COLLABORATIONS UNDER THIS MODEL 236
6.3.1 German and Namibian Museums 238
6.3.2 Conference: *Association Between African and European Heritage Institutions* 238
6.3.3 Berlin History Museum Panel Discussion, 2017: *German Colonialism: Fragments of the Past and Present* 239
6.3.4 Berlin Museum of History Symposium, 2018: *The Stone Cross from Cape Cross—Colonial Objects and Historical Justice* 239
6.3.5 Memorandum of the Edmonton Museum in Canada with the Six First Nations 240
6.3.6 Collaboration Between the University of Zurich's Museum of Ethnography and the Ugandan National Museums 240
6.3.7 Collaboration Between Varnesborg Museum and the National Museum of Namibia 241

6.3.8 The Berlin Postcolonial Collections Project 241
6.3.9 The Humboldt Forum in Berlin 241
6.3.10 Willoughby Collections Project: *Colonial Agendas* 242
6.3.11 Nigerian Collaborations Over Benin Bronzes 242
6.3.12 Malawian Collaboration with the National Museum of Scotland 242
6.3.13 The Swedish African Museum Programme 242
6.3.14 ICCROM Training Programme 243
6.3.15 ICOM Newsletter: Salvaging Haiti's Heritage 243
6.3.16 UNESCO and the Heritage of Mali, Syria, Iraq and Egypt 243
6.3.17 ICOM Newsletter: Heritage in Danger 244
6.3.18 The British Museum and Collaborations with African Countries 244
6.3.19 Collaboration Between the Iziko Museums, the Museum Association of Namibia, the Botswana National Museum and the CAM 245
6.3.20 The Botswana National Museum and the Ditsong Museums of South Africa 246
6.3.21 Africa Accessioned Network 246
6.3.22 The Prevention in Museums in Sub-Saharan Africa Project and the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa 246
6.3.23 The Australian Government and the Repatriation of Ancestral Remains for the Australian Aboriginal People and Torres Strait Islanders 247
6.4 ASSESSMENT OF SUCCESSES AND FAILURES 247
CHAPTER 7 POLICY PROPOSALS 254
7.1 OUTLINE OF PRINCIPLES 254
7.2 PROPOSALS FOR FORMAL LEGISLATION 256
7.3 PROPOSALS FOR BEST MUSEUM PRACTICE 259
CHAPTER 8 CONCLUSION 268
BIBLIOGRAPHY 273
APPENDICES 294

APPENDIX 1 A CASE PROCESSING SUMMARY FOR RESPONDENTS; GENDER, OCCUPATION, COUNTRY, YEAR.....294

APPENDIX 2 LISTS OF BOTSWANA COLLECTIONS AS PROVIDED BY MUSEUMS 297

List of Objects from Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum, Cologne/Germany.....297

List of Object from the National Museum of Scotland (UK) 300

List of Objects at the Banyoles Museum in Spain Which Were Part of the El Negro Display 300

List of Objects from the International Slavery Museum/Museums of Liverpool.....300

List of Objects at the Seattle Museum/USA. 300

List of Botswana Objects from the British Museum.....301

List of Botswana Objects from the Livingstone Museum in Zambia 340

List of Objects from the Museums of Kent and Brighton/UK (the Willoughby Collection) 342

List of Objects from the Smithsonian Museum of African Art.....364

APPENDIX 3 A DIGITAL MAP SHOWCASING THE DIASPORA DISPERSION OF BOTSWANA'S COLLECTIONS.....374

APPENDIX 4 LANGUAGE EDITING CERTIFICATE.....375

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CAM	Commonwealth Association of Museums
DAC	Department of Arts and Culture
ICOM	International Council of Museums
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency
SAMP	Swedish African Museum Programme
UCT	University of Cape Town
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
AFRICOM	International Council of African Museums
ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
SADC	Southern African Development Community

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 TOPIC

The 'migrated museum' is a self-developed concept that I as the researcher use to explain the presence of cultural materials from ex-colonial countries found in foreign museums and art galleries. The concept of migration is heavily infused with meanings and so is the idea of a migrated museum. Migration refers to movement for economic, trade, family, religious, educational and social purposes. There is also forced migration, as in the case of refugees and exiles; and this also applies to objects. This concept is, therefore, not easy to define because it has multiple layers of meanings. It is this sense of ambivalence and multi-layering that makes it a very interesting topic for study. The research study is using this to show how some objects have been forcibly removed from their original human contexts and are today in foreign museums.[1] But there is also the historic process whereby they were removed, which were in situations that could be broadly defined as colonial. How are such collections to be curated in an era where there are calls for decolonisation? Should they be returned to their places of origin, or can responsibility for them be shared between the institutions of formerly colonising and colonised peoples as is often now proposed as an alternative to restitution?

The topic of this thesis is, therefore, important in the field of museology and cultural property. It covers a range of issues related to notions of sharing, gift giving, reciprocity and exchange, national and local identities, heritage, culture, museums, alterity, and mimesis. Addressing the illegal trade in stolen objects and other heritage is a difficult exercise to undertake. The above discussed issues cut across a number of other disciplines in the social sciences, such as humanities, economics, and museological studies. Being a professional museologist in Botswana places me to explore this topic from the point of view of a museum practitioner who has witnessed its ramifications through the continent and in museums and collections of former colonial and imperial powers. As a museum practitioner, I have also used first-hand knowledge of the African museum context in issues of repatriation and sharing. This could appear as allowing advocacy to intrude in what should have been impartial observations, reflections and analysis, but it was done in an effort to highlight aspects of the African experience that needed

[1] Erna Lilje, "The museum researcher giving indigenous objects a voice of their own", This Cambridge Life, 2018, https://medium.com/this-cambridge-life/the-museum-researcher-giving-indigenous-objects-a-voice-of-their-own-e54feb8bbe45

more clarity and have not been covered in other writings. This also explains the reliance of the thesis on the practitioner's perspective.

This project, therefore, brings together a number of topical issues that are currently seen as separate aspects of heritage and the practice of its display on the continent of Africa. These include repatriation of human remains and artefacts taken under the legal regimes of the colonial era. Also, worth noting is the heritage stolen under the guise of conquest and imperial order in the form of punitive expeditions as well as illegal trading and excavations in the postcolonial period. The study also touches on the difficult issue of the contemporary global drive to share through exchanges between museums and other institutions and their heritage in the light of UNESCO's commitment to promoting knowledge of human differences, similarities, and the values of cultural tolerance.

The research question is therefore, centred on this migrated cultural property and the option for some of the global North museums, such as the British Museum, to keep it where it is as shared universal heritage against the call by many African countries to return the cultural property back to countries of origin. The study seeks to bring to light the complexity surrounding the proposal to share. It questions the practicality of the sharing: How equal, fair, and honest is it for individuals and institutions from both African countries and the global North? It uses anthropological understandings of reciprocity to interrogate this proposed sharing, while also considering the practicality and challenges associated with the option of restitution. Examples of successful restitution cases in Africa and other parts of the world are explored in the same light. Different periods and methods of transfer are also looked at in order to assess the proposal for sharing. Likewise, the UN Commission Report gives details of thematic discussions on the migration and protection of cultural property against illicit trafficking.[2]

These objects were in most cases taken out of their original cultural and historical contexts in colonised countries. While this applied mostly to the settler colonies and protectorates, exploration territories also lost cultural property in the same manner. In this same context, the problem of illicit trafficking of cultural property is not new nor is it only a colonial phenomenon in Botswana and Africa in general. It started with the first contact of the Atlantic and Indian Ocean worlds, with Portuguese sailors and Arab traders, and grew even more during the colonial period, which is from the 19th century. Contact with Arab traders took place long

[2] United Nations, "Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice: Report on the Fifteenth Session". (Geneva: UN, 2010).

before the arrival of other European powers,[3] and they traded in commodities and later in human beings.[4] The Portuguese were also involved in the trade of commodities, which is how they penetrated Mozambique, Angola and other West African coastal lands. This was long before the Scramble for Africa and the colonial period. The navigation into foreign lands allowed them to collect cultural property as discoveries, for curiosity, for learning, and to share with others back home.[5]

Again, there is a deep antiquity to such movements of things from Africa. According to John Mack, early traders are reflected in most parts of Africa as having started the migration of cultural property. Many trading routes are reflected for different regions, such as the North African Carthage route, Sudan and the Phoenicians, and the Roman Empire's links with Sudan and Ethiopia. Collections from Morocco and Algeria reflect the trade between the Berber of North Africa and the Arabs. There is also a reflection of trade between Egypt, the Nile Valley, Nubia, Palestine, Jordan and the Sinai area. The collections also reflect the expansion of the Ottoman Empire into North Africa.[6] But the collecting became more forceful during the colonial period. In areas where the migration was done through trade, the objects were bought for very small amounts or traded for cheap European goods. According to Philip Jones, "the natives had a growing appetite for European goods" and were therefore, willing to trade in their cultural wares. The same applied to the Bamum of Cameroon.[7] The rising market in Europe and later in America fuelled this thirst to trade in artworks or ethnographic objects.

Kings Phiri of Malawi also supports such arguments about the early trade in cultural property.[8] According to Phiri, Portuguese explorers did the earliest trafficking of cultural property in the Nyasaland region. Some known examples include the Lacheda Expedition by the Portuguese in 1798 and another in central Malawi in 1833. In 1889, the Caravise Expedition visited many parts, of central Malawi. These missions and findings are indicated in Malawian and Portuguese official reports. David Livingstone's expeditions in 1856 and 1873 continued such

---

[3] Gunther Wessel, "Dealers and Collectors, Provenances and Rights: Searching for Traces," in *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting the World's Heritage*, ed. France Desmarais. (Paris: ICOM, 2015), 1.

[4] Emily Mudge, "Portuguese Explorers: A Brief History of Portugal Part 4," Portugal.com, 2020, https://portugal.com/portugal-blogs/portuguese-explorers-a-brief-history-of-portugal-part-4.

[5] Donald Fraser, *Winning a Primitive People: Sixteen Years Work Among the Warlike Tribes of the Ngoni and the Senga and Tumbuka Peoples of Central Africa*, (London: Seely, Service & co., 1914). See also Philip Jones, "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," in *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets,* eds. Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald (De Gruyter, 2018), 124–125.

[6] John Mack, *Africa and its Cultures*, (London: British Museum Press, 2000), 49–62.

[7] Philip Jones, "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," 125, 165.

[8] Kings Phiri (retired professor of history, University of Malawi), in conversation with the author, 2015.

trafficking. Together with his team, he visited several places and collected samples of objects in order to prove his case back home. This is proof that cultural trafficking in this region was done long before the colonial era. But the shift to colonial conquest in the 1890s was a major period for extraction. In the case of Malawi, this covered major resisting groups such as the Yao and Tumbuka. The looting included livestock, ivory, spears, gold, and other items of cultural and historical value, particularly items attesting to African ways of life. Objects associated with cultural practices were taken as indices of primitive culture and were displayed as souvenirs and curios for aesthetic reasons in European museums.[9] According to Phiri, what European looters did not like or want to take away, they destroyed under the pretext that they were for heathen cultural practices.[10] Similarly, for European museums, particularly the British Museum, the collecting, which covered all regions of the world, started with the first voyages of explorations and discovery of the new lands by Cook and others.[11]

In summary, this deliberate aim to amass cultural property from African countries by Europeans was part of an endeavour to prove the superiority of civilised Western nations over the 'savagery and barbarism' of the colonised people. Therefore, according to McLeod, the collecting plan did not present equality or consent. Most such objects were acquired from African countries before and during the years of accession to independence by these countries. Many objects were amassed in the 19th century, and this was according to the plan of the British government, which is one of the imperial powers that collected the most.[12]

Lilje Erna supported the above observation by arguing that awareness of cultural disruption is nothing new as discussed by today's scholars of heritage. British administrators in the late 19th century understood that their presence have an effect on local populations: The disruption of peoples' ways of life and, in the long run, the loss of context that has followed the presence of foreign objects in European museums. Their argument, one that infuriates many African heritage managers, was that their collecting was prompted by the urgency to make a lasting record of material cultures that seemed to be under threat of disappearing.[13] But if material culture is seen as having been threatened, then where did these threats originate?

---

[9] Philip Jones, "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," 125.

[10] Kings Phiri (retired professor of history, University of Malawi), in conversation with the author, 2015.

[11] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, (London: British Museum Press, 1993), 93. (McLeod is a former curator of ethnography at the British Museum from 1973–1990. His thinking showed a lot of transformation and his stance of equality as opposed to that of curators at the time}. See also Philip Jones, "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," 123.

[12] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 9–10.

[13] Erna Lilje, "The museum researcher giving indigenous objects a voice of their own."

For example, from 1970–1999, the Department of Ethnography in the British Museum was housed at the Museum of Mankind. African collections were sourced from Benin and from all corners of the African continent, including Ghana, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Gabon, Nigeria, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Congo, Egypt, South Africa, the Kalahari, and Tunisia. As a result, the art, religion and cultures of many African peoples are represented at the British Museum today. Their collection also marked a "scramble for African culture and art" as against the "scramble for African territories" because many other European powers were also busy collecting from Africa.[14] The above discussion presents a synopsis of how the migrated museum began and what happened to African collections in the diaspora.

However, there is also the case of contemporary trafficking of cultural property, which is not done because of colonial ideology and all the reasons associated with the early trade and migration of cultural property. According to UNESCO, cultural migration is trade in cultural property that involves theft, looting, and the illicit import and/or export of cultural property. This refers to areas where there is civil strife today, such as Syria, Mali, Iraq, Egypt.[15] The UNESCO definition therefore does not encompass all the different periods of transfer as discussed above; it only dwells on the contemporary period in which theft of heritage is most prevalent and leaves out earlier periods. The notions of cultural migration, restitution and sharing of heritage are in line with the current area of focus by UNESCO, international Council for Museums (ICOM) and the UN on illicit trafficking of cultural heritage and sharing heritage as a universal responsibility. These are also supported by UNESCO conventions such as the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import/Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, and the 1954 Convention on the Protection of Heritage in Case of Armed Conflict. The 1954 Convention advocates for a shared responsibility towards the prevention of illegal transfers of cultural property, and the promotion and protection of heritage as a global responsibility. The 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects complements the above and deals with international law in restitution cases. The term 'cultural property' as per UNESCO's definition will be used interchangeably here with heritage, both intangible and tangible, as there is no universal definition of the two terms.[16]

---

[14] John Mack, *Africa and its Cultures*, 10–13.

[15] UNSECO, *Legal Practical Measures against Illicit Trafficking in Cultural Property, UNESCO Handbook*. (Paris: UNESCO, 2006).

[16] UNSECO, *Legal Practical Measures against Illicit Trafficking in Cultural Property, UNESCO Handbook*, 4. See also France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*, (Paris: ICOM, 2015).

To shed more light on the subject of restitution and shared heritage, one must first understand the circumstances behind the migration of cultural property. The proposal by this study is to consider both the options of restitution and of sharing. Collaboration, sharing and restitution should be addressed as key options because they have a bearing on one another. They determine the future of African heritage in the 'diaspora'. Africa, like other parts of the globe, has been heavily affected by the migration of cultural property, as already indicated, and as shall be discussed in the next chapters. This also elucidates the current debate in Europe and in other parts of the world about decolonisation, leading to the need for provenance research and collaboration between museums of the global North and the global South, including on justified cases of return. The words restitution, repatriation and return are also used interchangeably in this study, notwithstanding the fact that the study attempts an in-depth enquiry into their meanings and implications.

The following are some definitions of terms used in this study:

- *Restitution***:** In the context of displayed colonial objects, restitution assumes many meanings. In normal terms, this would mean restoration of something lost or stolen to its rightful owner, or some form of compensation. According to Sarr and Savoy, it is the act of "return to rightful owner" as an act of re-activating a concealed memory. It is also an act of re-instating or re-instituting the objects that are in European museums back to source countries. In short, this is an act of putting right what had gone wrong.[17]
- *Repatriation***:** Repatriation in the African context does not only entail return back to countries of origin, but also the re-interpretation of the object by those who know it and its use better, namely the communities of provenance. This would also mean the return of human remains to countries of origin.
- *Return***:** Giving objects back to the communities of origin. However, scholars have used the three terms repatriation, restitution, and return interchangeably, particularly in the current discussions about the return of colonial holdings, including objects and human remains.
- *Decolonisation***:** Decolonisation is above all else an epistemic process of remaking societies and persons. This reintroduces the communities of origin back into their lost history and cultural materials. According to Jeremy Silvester, "the process also includes re-evaluating

[17] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 27–39.

the museum and its colonial dealings and holdings. It is a process of shedding off the colonial blanket in search of a new one which includes communities of origin".[18]

- *Curios*: This term is used in the thesis to indicate the lack of scholarly research on the migrated objects that were brought into museums. These were displayed in museums for the wonder and curiosity of visitors. Bénédicte Savoy and Charlotte Guichard indicated that upon collection and deposit into museums, such objects lost cultural value and adopted a new value based on rarity and uniqueness, since there was no research associated.[19]
- *Exotic*: The migrated objects were rarities, exotic findings by the collectors, which museums such as the British Museum were proud to be associated with. Noémie Étienne dissects the reasoning behind the concept of curios. According to her, "exotic is a Greek word meaning foreign. In this sense the exoticism associated with the migrated objects would imply the process of commodification of these objects, sale into foreign markets and exhibition into foreign museums". In summary, this is relocation or transportation from African contexts into Western ones. To her, these now become "ethnographic fragments" because they have been detached from African settings into a foreign culture where they are not provenanced.[20]

Of late, the International Council of African Museums (AFRICOM) has also been advocating for a shared heritage in cases where restitution becomes a problem and is not the best option for the possessing country. This calls for institutional collaboration, which is evidenced by ease of access by the country of origin to websites and collections. This includes the option for exchange exhibitions, research, sharing of expertise, and capacity building. Hence, it is critical to make a thorough analysis of this option and to make an assessment of its positive and negative aspects, while also making reference to the concept of sharing in this situation of object transfer and its use in non-Western settings. The concern, as already highlighted, is whether this is really a better option than restitution, and what this entails for both parties, particularly the descendants of the original owners.

---

[18] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network. 'Museum Collections make Connections' between Europe and Africa: A Case Study of Finland and Namibia," in *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe: A New Field for Museum Studies*, eds. Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere (transcript-Verlag, 2018), 112.

[19] Bénédicte Savoy and Charlotte Guichard, "Acquiring Cultures and Trading Value in a Global World," in *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets,* eds. Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald (De Gruyter, 2018), 7.

[20] Noémie Étienne, "Transaction and Translation," in *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets,* eds. Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald (De Gruyter, 2018), 7 & 15.

The related concepts of heritage, museums, restitution and culture are also explored here in order to provide further context to the argument. This is in cognisance of the fact that the notion of culture is difficult and highly contested today. Culture governs established and applied values of exchange among and within diverse groups. It is the case, nonetheless, that, "there have … been specific developments in the definition of culture that can be traced to the history of colonialism".[21]

As a point of departure, therefore, the study undertakes a critical analysis of whether the sharing currently proposed is grounded in the original locality of the objects or rather in the new place of abode. Questions that also come to the forefront are**:** What exactly is shared? How is it shared and by whom? why share, and when? What are the standards used in this sharing? Or is this sharing addressing only theoretical and not practical concerns? Is this proposed sharing done reciprocally and is it visible? In the historical context, the study will look at whether we are sharing, exchanging and returning cultural property in order to rectify the unequal past or because it is good practice and the current trend and expectation?

Kumwenda, ex-director for the Museums of Malawi, also supports UNESCO, ICOM and the UN's proposals for sharing and universality because he feels that mainline museums can keep the collections and give ex-colonies access through websites.[22] As shall be demonstrated throughout the study, many different views with regards to these notions have been advanced by both community and heritage managers, particularly from Africa.[23]

Given the above set of circumstances, where restitution could be a difficult and politically sensitive issue between nation states, sharing is one way in which cultural property can be 'restored' to its rightful owners. This allows for sharing with a much wider audience than simply those to whom the objects directly belong by right. The expectation for return as well as for sharing is a quest to partake in decision making on the future use, display, and exhibition of cultural property. In this way, objects even when displayed in cosmopolitan museums will reflect the history of their circumstances. This would also restore their tangibility and enable them to play a representational and significant role.[24] In some instances of return, this allows

---

[21] Lyndel V. Prott, *Witnesses to History: A Compendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects*, (Paris: UNESCO, 2009), 4.

[22] M.G. Kumwenda (ex-director for the Museums of Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.

[23] Glyn Balkwil (Curator, Ditsong Museum of Cultural History) in conversation with the author, 2016.

[24] Stephen Greenblatt, "Resonance and Wonder," in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, eds. Ivan Karp and Stephen D. Lavine, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), 43.

for the restoration of the objects to their former states and use, for example, in ritual and other traditional processes. There have been many recorded cases of successful return in African countries and other parts of the world, as shall be demonstrated in section 5.2 that follows on the same. A good example from Botswana would be the return of El Negro from Spain.[25] These are discussed at length in Chapter 5.

The shared object contributes not only to the sense of a transcending of national and international geographic identity, but also of a shared entity belonging to a people much wider than a geographic setting. This also goes beyond any particular community, language or ethnic group, and yet at the same time gives cogency and a sense of pride and achievement to the local people for whom such cultural objects have special meaning. However, this can still be questioned to establish whether the pride is derived from the fact that the object has been returned to its rightful owners or that it now occupies an international space.

Addressing the acceptance and promotion of cultural diversity, Lyndel Prott calls for an equal representation of all cultures.[26] Lynn Meskell also argued that "one of the important positions in moral socio-political philosophies is that we are all citizens of the world, who have responsibilities to others".[27] The points made by these two scholars are why this study enquires into the correlation between respect for cultural diversity, or tolerance of differences, and the valorisation of one's own cultural objects and achievements. This is an aspect that has by coincidence been highlighted by the issue of illicit trafficking. The idea is not to sweep the question of illicitness under the carpet or to be unwilling to address the issues of legality and morality, and it is also not due to the political inadequacy of the answers by former colonial powers that ex-colonial states stall from advocating for restitution. Rather, the question is in current circumstances where restitution is a difficult and politically sensitive issue between nation states, in what other ways can cultural property be 'restored' to its rightful owners? Can this proceed in a way that allows for shared ownership and open access by the owners and the global community?

---

[25] Botswana Government, "Repatriation Document on El Negro," Unpublished Paper, (Gaborone, 2005), 2. See also Alinah Segobye, "Missing bodies …," *Botswana Daily News*, (2005); 10–11; Aedin Mac Devitt, "Upholding the Law: an Overview of the Trends in Art and Museum Law Today," *ICOM News* 63, no. 1 (2010).

[26] Lyndel V. Prott, *Witnesses to History: A Compendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects*. See also Stephen Greenblatt, "Resonance and Wonder," 43.

[27] Lynn Meskell, *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies: Material Worlds—A Series,* (London: Duke University Press, 2009).

To answer these questions about the notion of sharing, we have to first understand and appreciate the plurality of different methods of transfers as attested in the ethnographic record and the anthropological study of exchange. This takes us back to precolonial ways of sharing among non-Western societies. Alongside the question of restitution, this is another central point driving this study, namely whether this transferred cultural material can really be shared and what this sharing implies. I want to establish whether the migration of cultural property could have been done under the same circumstances as exchanges in precolonial societies. This helps test the contemporary concept of a shared responsibility and universality against comparative anthropological concepts of sharing. It also allows us to investigate how we could make relationships equal in the newly proposed setting governed by notions of universality, sharing, and inclusivity.

Individuals, missionaries, hunters, auctioneers, dealers, explorers, travellers, companies, states and, of late, criminal syndicates instigated the migration of cultural property in different periods.[28] All the individual instigators had different motivations for trafficking in these collections. Many reasons have been advanced for this**.** Firstly, there were no museums in Africa; hence the objects were deposited in foreign museums for display and safekeeping. Secondly, the objects were to be subjected to further research and analysis in laboratories and universities or research institutions as scientific discoveries. This also applies to the transfer of masses of human remains to Europe during the same time for anatomical explorations of bodies, which eventually found their way into museums as displays. Thirdly, they were taken as private collections. Fourthly, they were taken for sale to foreign markets and auctions. Lastly, the objects were taken just for the pleasure of it to decorate homes, libraries, and galleries as curios, as a sign of prestige and for civic pride. The last point is authenticated by Doreen Nteta, a former Botswana National Museum director, who indicated that the early classical museums in Europe were places for the privileged to indulge in scientific and spiritual introspection or to gaze in wonder at exotic curiosities from the colonies.[29] Most of the early collections were meant to arouse wonder and curiosity in the onlookers. This was wonder about those who originally made them, owned them, and gave them away. Greenblatt also argues that this was the age of marvelling aesthetically at curios from the colonies. Having diverse and

[28] Winani Thebele-Kgwatalala, "The Prevention and Fight against Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Goods, Case of Botswana," (Unpublished Paper Presented at a *UNESCO Work*, *Windhoek, 14–15th September, 2011*), 2.
[29] Doreen Nteta, "The Museum Service in Botswana," (Research Essay, University of Zimbabwe, 1992), 2.

varied collections such as in the British museum was a sign of "mastery of the world".[30] Even much later, McLeod confirms this by indicating that the British Museum collected more objects every year than any other major museum in the world. To use his words, "in a few years it became clear to us that no other museum was collecting as widely and as comprehensively as we were".[31] On this note, Greenblatt feels that "the voices of the people who owned them might object to their display and that it is important that these voices are listened to".[32]

Against the backdrop of all these methods of transfer, which include scientific expeditions, explorations and discoveries, trade expeditions, missionary encounters, curatorial expeditions and punitive expeditions, illegal excavations, political unrest, and looting, the thesis seeks to establish the visibility of the concept of sharing. In all the different methods of transfer, was the migration of cultural property based on reciprocity?

McLeod gave a thorough summary of all the different methods used for acquiring this cultural property from Africa and other parts of the world by the British Museum over the years. These ranged from curatorial expeditions; first explorations and discovery voyages; networks of friends in areas of collecting; auction sales and open markets in the UK; commissioned field work; independent researchers, even those from other European countries such as Germany, Netherlands and Hungary; families of deceased collectors; gifts, exchange; sale by the public; and those who just deposited at the museum for one reason or the other, such as visitors, travellers, tourists, the public and anthropologists. There was also aid from officials and curators in the countries of collection, partnerships and so-called collaborations.[33] This then makes the migration of cultural property, its restitution, and the option for sharing, a complex global problem. This is in consideration of the many communities and regions of the world that have lost their objects to a diversity of institutions such as museums and universities. They are bound to want them back, agitating for access, combined research, collaboration and reconciliation.

Similarly, the problem of illicit trafficking of cultural property is not a new phenomenon in Botswana. However, at the beginning, before and during the early stages of the colonial period, this transfer was not seen as illegal or anything that could be prevented by law, by both the

[30] Stephen Greenblatt, "Resonance and Wonder," 50–51.
[31] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 13–33.
[32] Stephen Greenblatt, "Resonance and Wonder," 46.
[33] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 15.

giving and receiving powers.[34] The state of being a colony in this sense meant being under a metropolitan power, being under a superior power, which had both economic and political control over the lesser state. Many reasons have been advanced to explain what led to the era of colonialism by the Western world. Philip Curtin et al. indicated that it was the need for market outlets, imperial expansion as well as for resources.[35] Colonialism meant the establishment of territories and the exploitation of indigenous peoples by imperialists. It also marked unequal relations between the colonial power and the indigenous populations of Africa, Asia, and the Americas.[36] Domination was primarily for the control of resources, but other aspects such as cultural artefacts and human remains became part of the same domination.

It is within the context described above that large amounts of objects were moved from Africa to colonising countries. This is evidenced by the diversity of collections and their regional representation.[37] While this was colonisation for economic reasons, Nanda described it as the "remaking of culture" an age in which the culture of the colonisers, the Portuguese, British, French, Italians and Spanish, were establishing their cultures over the colonised as a way of life.[38] According to Nandy, the impact of colonialism in India was not just economic but also psychological and cultural. He also feels that the enduring effect on British society was even greater because colonial thinking produced an illusion of cultural supremacy for the coloniser.[39] This is another perspective on the colonial situation and the migration of cultural property and human remains. While it affected the colonised, there was also an impact on the coloniser, which is still visible and has led to the current debates on decolonisation.

Furthermore, the colonial context embodies a form of 'cultural Darwinism' that explains the race-based structures that dominated the colonial era.[40] Cultural Darwinism is in some instances used synonymously with 'social Darwinism'. Interestingly, social Darwinism was used in the 1870s to justify the concepts of societal hierarchies between the colonisers and the colonised in the colonial structure. The two concepts (cultural and social Darwinism) is based on

---

[34] Kenji Yoshida and John Mack (ed.), *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?*, (Suffolk: James Currey, 2008), 58. See also UNSECO, *Legal Practical Measures against Illicit Trafficking in Cultural Property, UNESCO Handbook*, 3.

[35] Philip Curtin et al., *African History: From Earliest Times to Independence*, (London: Longman, 1989), 372–376.

[36] Joseph McQuade. "Colonialism was a Disaster and the Facts Prove It," *The Conversation*, 27 September, 2017.

[37] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 35–37.

[38] Serena Nanda, "South African Museums and the Creation of a New National Identity," *American Anthropologist* 106, no. 2 (2004).

[39] Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 31–33.

[40] Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects," in *Witnesses to History: A Compendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects*, ed. Lyndel V. Prott, (Paris: UNESCO, 2009), 193.

Darwin's thoughts on 'survival of the fittest' and 'natural selection'.[41] The amassing and migration of cultural materials was done along the same discriminatory lines. The main perpetrators became the educated and civilised colonisers. This explains the conclusion that the early museums created by Europeans were based on curiosity and wonder. The curiosity part was for the collectors while the wonder was for visitors to the museums. In this case "the enlightened ones were trying to understand society and culture albeit from a mistaken perspective hence, the appellation, that Darwinism was a therefore a science, initiated by curiosity and wonder".[42] Moreover, while cultural Darwinism was linked to race-based theories, the preferred theory today is cultural diversity. Presumably, it is still within the same context that Ashis Nandy talked of a cultural consensus during the colonial set-up in which the cultural and social dominance symbolised masculinity over women and femininity.[43] This would metaphorically relate to the dominance of colonial powers as in men over the colonised states that could be represented by femininity. It is also within this dominance that one finds the justification to rob the dominated of their cultural property.

However, even today's setting still creates a good environment for the neglect and trafficking of cultural property. There is an influx from rural areas into cities by the young due to economic reasons at the expense of local cultures, language and traditions in rural areas.[44] It is also crucial to take note of the dynamics of history, from illegal human trafficking to cultural trafficking, when faced with the option of shared heritage. This study, therefore, unpacks this concept of sharing to show the dynamism of a shared heritage, which encompasses artefacts, histories, human beings and living cultures, as cited in the case of the Pacific Islanders.[45] While international organisations would move more into policy issues to address the above issues, historians and anthropologists would ask whether we are sharing, exchanging and returning in order to rectify the unequal past.

The study also undertakes critical analyses of copyright and intellectual property rights with regards to illicit trafficking and the return of illegally trafficked cultural property and artworks.

---

[41] This takes after Darwin's concept of 'survival of the fittest and natural selection' (those are chosen will survive) as applied to human societies. Darwin's idea, therefore, fuelled racism and social inequality, where some cultural groups were better than others. The Darwinism concept is therefore a good tool to explain the mind-set of white European colonists towards the colonised. They saw them as non-human. This also explains the mind-set of the wealthy and elite who profited and exploited the labourers, e.g. factory workers during the industrial revolution.

[42] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, (Berlin, 2016), 33.

[43] Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism,* 4.

[44] Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism,* 14.

[45] Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism,* 29.

It demonstrates how attention to copyright, intellectual property rights, and the return of stolen cultural property complement and or influence one another.

1.2 RATIONALE

As stated already, the migrated museum is an important area of discussion in museums and cultural studies and it will be demonstrated to touch on a wide range of issues covering a number of disciplines. While the topic cuts across a number of disciplines, the study will, however, concentrate on museological issues and the implications that arise for these from a critical analysis of sharing and restitution. Museums, collections and heritage sites construct and structure the identities of Indigenous people. It is also worth noting the active role played by agents such as missionaries, colonial armies through their punitive expeditions, curators through curatorial expeditions, illegal trading, excavations, and theft in both the colonial and postcolonial era. This study conducts an overview of illicit trafficking in the case of Botswana and uses other African countries, such as South Africa, Malawi and Nigeria, as a yard stick to measure these developments. It looks at different perpetrators, the kinds of objects they migrated, and the historical and current state of such objects. It also looks at what the benefit is today to both the current owners and the countries of origin. Historians, missionaries, traders, explorers, travellers, scientists, curators, hunters and anthropologists flocked into Africa, including Botswana, and through this contact heritage material was transferred to these people's countries of origin. One wants to know the types of artefacts taken out and their current condition. In the same way, the study looks at characters such as Isaac Schapera, a well-known authority in Botswana's colonial history, and his connection to migrated artefacts and records, especially those found in Cape Town and the UK. If he received these as presents from local chiefs, do we see any form of reciprocity between him and the communities that lost the artefacts, or between these communities and the institutions that house the artefacts today? The cases of Schapera, the missionary Willoughby, and others are used to see if the proposed sharing is equal, fair, and just. This is also to establish whether the cultural migrations were effected through the application of these transfer processes or not.[46]

A good number of Botswana artefacts are found in neighbouring country's museums because the museum in Botswana is a postcolonial invention. Most of the materials were therefore,

[46] The Reverend Willoughby was in charge of the London Mission station at Palapye, Botswana. He accompanied King Khama, Sebele and Bathoen on the trip to England to ask for the Queen's protection against the encroaching Boers and the British South Africa Company.

deposited in neighbouring state museums during the colonial period. In Malawi, for example, a publication called *Kukumba Mbiri Mu Malawi* gives a summary of research findings in Malawi up to March 1973.[47] According to this source, archaeological findings and other research in Malawi were linked up with those of other sister colonies. The findings obviously went to the earlier institutions in the region, such as the South African Museum, the Natural History Museum in Zimbabwe, and the Museum of Man, now the Johannesburg Museum. Much as objects were collected from Botswana and other countries through trade, purchase, and exchange, a good number went as gifts, for safe keeping, and for research analysis in neighbouring institutions and to the colonising country, which in this case meant to the British Museum since most of the Southern African states fell under British rule. It is within this context that Botswana lost cultural property. However, despite the attention given to object migration over the past decade in Africa and other parts of the world, nothing on Botswana and the presence of its cultural property in the diaspora and illicit trades has been documented and discussed. Object migration was for a long time ignored by heritage managers and government in Botswana, possibly with the assumption that it is a foreign problem. The subject of illicit trafficking has remained ignored together with relevant conventions by UNESCO on the subject, such as the 1970 Convention that deals with the illegal import and export of cultural property; the 1954 Convention and its protocol that deals with the protection of cultural heritage in case of armed conflict; the 2003 Convention that deals with the protection of intangible cultural heritage; the 2005 Convention about cultural diversity; the 1995 UNDROIT Convention that deals with international law about the repatriation of cultural property; the UNESCO Convention of 2 November 2001 on the protection of the underwater cultural heritage; the 1972 Convention on the Protection of Immovable Heritage; and many other protocols by the UN on the rights of Indigenous People, protection of Indigenous languages, etc. This is in cognizance of the few recorded cases of restitution such as the return of El Negro from a museum in Spain, the return of the Van Rensburg Collection from the Mafikeng Museum in South Africa, and the return of the entomological collection from Mr Forchhammer of Serowe in Botswana in the 1990s.[48] There was also an offer by the Iziko Museum flagship in South Africa with a long list of Botswana collections in their possession to negotiate return.

[47] P.A. Cole-King, "Kukumba Mbiri Mu Malawi," Publication Malaŵi Government Department of Antiquities 15 (1973): 1–10.
[48] Mr Forchhammer was an entomologist who did his own private collecting.

This also includes registered cases of theft and the handing over of collections by departing expatriates (These are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5).

It is only recently through the efforts of UNESCO to address the issue of non-ratification and non-implementation of conventions by African states in regional groupings through seminars and workshops that Botswana National Museum and government gave renewed focus to this issue of global concern. Hence, there is a need for a comprehensive analytical study on the subject to highlight how Botswana has been affected by the problem and to contextualise the problem in Botswana with reference to the continental and global scenario of object trafficking, sharing, and restitution.

It is in this light that the study seeks to draw attention to this epoch of uncontrolled and free cultural migration in African museology to show how this has affected the development of Africa's heritage in museums and communities, and what it means for cultural objects to be returned or shared. The earlier stages of the illegal removal of African heritage have had a lasting impact on African museological history, which is visible even today, as also indicated by the Sarr-Savoy Report.[49] Emphasis is also drawn to the measures that are put in place to combat this problem at national, regional and international levels. It is the aim of this research to explore ways in which migrated heritage could be returned or shared by concerned states, through processes in which museums, as state or community institutions, play a leading role.

The thesis is also focus on the current culture of remembrance in Africa and Europe concerning the colonial past and its reappraisal in recent years. The focus area is still the museum and its collections. There is a significant discussion in German museums and universities and in many other parts of Europe about their own collections from the colonial time and how to exhibit colonialism. The interest for museum curators in Europe is to hear something about European museums and their foreign collections from an African perspective. Their interest is to know what should be done in the future and what the opportunities are for more cooperative arrangements between African and European scholars and museums. They want to know what the discussions are in Botswana museums and among museum curators in other parts of Africa, and what expectations exist in Africa concerning the reappraisal of colonial rule in Europe and

[49] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 2.

museums with collections from the colonial era.[50] This is a shift from the attitudes of earlier times when objects were wondrous curios.[51]

This is, therefore, a new museology that transcends national and international boundaries; a museology of collaboration and partnerships; a museology for sharing and universality; a museology for exchanges of ideas, collections and exhibitions. Lynn Meskell supported this by equating cosmopolitanism to universality, globalisation, multiculturalism and sharing in which there are global networks and responsibility to communities of provenance. According to Meskell, "cosmopolitanism encompasses among other things, the call for return of cultural property to source nations and indigenous use".[52] This addresses current issues of historic reappraisal, injustices, social inequality, legacies of colonialism, exploitation, violence, cultural diversity, and recognition. The discussion on colonial collections and their possible return and sharing are therefore anchored in this broad global discussion.

The urging of UNESCO has prompted Botswana and other Southern African Development Community (SADC) countries to initiate the ratification process for its conventions. In November 2017, Botswana ratified the 1970 and 1954 conventions and its two protocols as well as the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention. Only the 1972 Convention was ratified a few years back and specifically for monuments and tourism development and as a measure by the government to diversify the economy from minerals and livestock. The 2003 Convention was also ratified in 2009 through the facilitation of the Department of Arts and Culture (DAC), now under the Ministry of Youth Empowerment, Sport and Culture Development. There is, therefore, a need for a comprehensive analytical study of the subject to highlight how Botswana has been affected by the problem of the illegal transfer of heritage. This is also to contextualise the problem in Botswana into the continental and global scenario of both illicit trafficking, restitution and a shared heritage; to draw Botswana's attention to the current debates around this lost heritage; and to find out if the early collectors in Botswana who instigated cultural migrations documented collected artefacts, which would remain invaluable information to Botswana and other Africans.

For the above players who managed to establish museums, particularly in neighbouring countries such as Malawi (Nyasaland) and the Northern and Southern Rhodesias, how much

[50] Arnulf Scriba (Curator, Special Exhibitions & Projects, Berlin Museum of History) in conversation with the author, 2017.
[51] Stephen Greenblatt, "Resonance and Wonder," 45.
[52] Lynn Meskell, *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies: Material Worlds—A Series*.

did this benefit the colonies? What knowledge and ideas did they impart to the local communities? What documentation is available on the same? These institutions became cultural hubs for the neighbouring colonies. Even those who aspired to establish museums in the future had to benchmark with them. As a result, theoretical studies on heritage started in their sister universities and any internship by neighbouring curators was done at these early colonial museums. For example, Doreen Nteta, who later became the second director of the Botswana National Museum, was sent to train in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe).[53] Alec Campbell, who started the Botswana National Museum, had worked in Rhodesia before and he also drew a lot of support from Zimbabwe when he started the museum in Botswana. The same applied to the South African Museum in Cape Town.[54] It could, therefore, be argued that these early museums were nonetheless colonial influences on the development of museums and heritage.

1.3 LITERATURE REVIEW

Within the given global scenario of debates on migrated collections, restitution, and the proposal for a shared responsibility, there is a generous amount of literature to support the topical issues addressed by this study. The focus on colonial holdings, the idea to decolonise the museum, and the continued illicit trafficking of cultural property has drawn attention from scholars, museum professionals, politicians, law enforcement, and the media globally. The past years have witnessed interest in the documentation of museums, colonial collections, and repatriation. Some of the publications followed thematic discussions through workshops, conferences and seminars. This was done by heritage practitioners, curators, law enforcement officers, the media, politicians and governments, scholars and academics, and national and international heritage bodies such as UNESCO, ICOM, AFRICOM, Interpol and the UN. As a result, there is extensive literature on the subject through which all these stakeholders advocated for heritage preservation and its safeguarding and promotion as a 'shared' responsibility. The available literature allows for the theoretical study and understanding of the process of cultural migration. This also enables a thorough reflection on different approaches applied in object migration, the exchanges and the human relations processes involved, current discussions on restitution, provenance research, and the proposed collaborations and

[53] Doreen Nteta, "The Museum Service in Botswana."
[54] Alfred Tsheboeng, "Archaeology and Planning in Botswana," (MA Thesis, Manchester University, 1991).

partnerships. Some of the sources also discuss the new and proposed museum models and best practices in museums.

The object of this study is to position the problem of object migration within the broader historical factor of colonialism and the race relations that went with it. Meanwhile, as indicated in the introduction, this is a pivotal point that has given rise to other historical factors. These are factors such as the destruction of the African museum; impoverishment of African states by robbing them of their cultural material; the alienation of cultural objects in terms of their irrelevance to the receiving communities; and the trafficking of humans and human remains and their restitution.[55] The migration of cultural property connects the history of colonialism to the present where states and cultural organisations such as UNESCO, Interpol and ICOM are now talking about restitution, sharing, universal heritage, and combating the contemporary illicit trafficking of objects. This aggregates to re-writing the past in the present, as concluded by the Sarr-Savoy Report.[56] This also covers an era when museums in the Western world are now talking about collaboration with African countries or communities of provenance.

The existing records on Botswana have not, however, related the issue of sharing or restitution to anthropological understandings of reciprocity. Beginning with Marcel Mauss, Anthropological approaches in the tradition of exchange and sharing have been woven into this study alongside and to complement the core literature from museology. These include anthropological works on sharing, exchange, gift giving and reciprocity, and the postcolonial problematics of alterity and mimesis.[57] Though this is not a major focus for the thesis, it provides a standpoint from which to assess the moral claims made in proposals for restitution or sharing. This helped conceptualise how cultural property has been alienated and whether it might be appropriately returned or shared. The research also drew examples from other scholars of anthropology and portrays the implication of the migration of cultural heritage over the years.[58] The focus is on the kind of relations that ensued between the source and receiving countries as a result of these migrations. What were the outcomes of the migration of cultural objects? Mauss' believed that the identity of the giver communities, or source country in our

[55] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 5–8.

[56] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 88.

[57] Reference is made to the different scholars of anthropology who look at the different concepts of exchange, reciprocity, alterity and mimesis such as Michael Taussig, Marcel Mauss, James Laidlaw, Annette Weiner, Alain Testart, Lewis Hyde, Susan Wright, Chris Show among others. See also Scott Shershow, *The Work and The Gift*, (University of Chicago Press, 2005), 10–19.

[58] Scott Shershow, *The Work and The Gift*, 10–19.

case, is always embedded in objects and that his creates a permanent link with them.[59] This notion of reciprocity creates a continuous bond between the two parties resulting into future encounters and exchanges. This study aims to find out if this bond is visible between African countries and the Western countries, particularly in the colony and coloniser setting, and to establish if this could have been the root cause of Africa's continued dependency syndrome on the global North and its continued poverty, as also observed in the Sarr-Savoy Report.[60] This is about the hierarchical set-up in which one party is superior to the other. In a critical analysis of the exchange setting, the research takes into consideration Mauss' conclusion that the gift works to build solidarity and harmony and cohesion in societies. In the colonial object migration setting and the relations that persisted there was no such solidarity. It is only now with the current conversations about shared responsibilities and collaborations that one begins to see a glimpse of what Mauss was talking about.[61]

Meanwhile, the use of the outlined concepts in the enquiry about the migration of cultural property was meant for the validation of the transfers as well as the repatriations, sharing and universality of the cultural heritage. This was also to establish if the migration epoch is a normal historical and cultural occurrence in societal life or an abnormal undertaking that cannot be justified or aligned to normal processes of migration and exchange. This is with a view to justify the current demands and expectations by requesting states and international bodies, the emotions involved, and the complexities, dilemmas and challenges faced by receiving states. The application of anthropological concepts is used to shed light on the comprehensive concept of the migration of cultural property. Weiner, for instance, investigated the category of 'inalienable possessions', which when given away must finally return in some way, even if by proxy, to the giver. In this way the cultural right remains with the original owner.[62]

Therefore, the research also examines issues of copyright and intellectual property rights so as to test the idea of sharing as opposed to the return of cultural property. If the migrated object still retains the identity and cultural right of the owner and if its return were expected, then the issue of copyright and intellectual property should remain with the original owner. Looking at the whole issue of migration of cultural property over the years from Botswana and other African countries, the study used the same background to establish the degree of ownership

---

[59] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms & Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, (London: Routledge, 1954).
[60] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 2.
[61] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms & Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*.
[62] Annette Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping While Giving*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

they hold over the cultural property that is abroad. What remains to be seen is whether this is sufficient basis to argue for return and to claim and prove ownership. It should be noted though that ICOM, UNESCO and Interpol today put more emphasis on property inventorying and the documentation of objects. This entails making a unique and permanent mark to prove authenticity and assure ownership when tracing a stolen object. Claims for goods trafficked during the colonial period, which are otherwise not documented, could therefore only rely on the available anthropological concepts of exchange and reciprocity, copyright and intellectual property. Meanwhile today's claims would rely on proving and authenticating beyond doubt through proper inventorying and documentation.

One of the thorny issues with Botswana and other African countries is that some of the finest pieces of cultural property are housed in foreign countries and that the art and skill of their production has since died with their original owners. Obtaining a replacement, therefore, will be close to impossible, even though the art of creation still remains with the source community. A good illustration is the Botswana/South Africa situation in which traditional crafts, visual arts and traditional music from Botswana are reproduced in South Africa. This followed the cultural renaissance in Botswana by young artists in the 1990s. Since there are shared communities between the two countries, it is now unclear where the music is originating. South African Tswana now claim ownership and in the absence of any intellectual property, Botswana has no case. Hence, establishing a database of Botswana collections in the diaspora as well as documenting intangible cultural heritage such as music is also an initiative to claim copyright and intellectual property on the material culture and to authenticate possible claims.

According to John McAvity, the chairperson of ICOM's Technical Committee on Legal Affairs and Executive Director and CEO of the Canadian Museums Association, copyright applies in most activities offered by museums.[63] This takes into account exhibitions, digitisation of museum collections, research, education, websites, conservation of artworks, and even gift shops. In order to comply with the law, museums must obtain copyright permission from owners of the collections as well as the creators. This could lead to the quest to find copyright owners or their heirs, which is often difficult as many claimants would come forward due to greed. Copyright laws enforce respect and accord rights to private owners. According to copyright laws, these rights are extended to the creators and heirs for 50 or more years,

[63] John McAvity, "The Importance of Copyright," *ICOM Newsletter* 67, No. 1–2 (2014): 28–29.

depending on national laws. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is a UN structure that sets broad-based standards for copyright for national use and adoption by state parties. The reflection here was that with the right and appropriate laws and regulations, the claims for restitution and the right to copyright can work for African countries that have lost and are still losing cultural property. According to the former ICOM Director General Julien Anfruns, there is a need to keep up with the challenges posed by the fast-moving legal environment in terms of intellectual property. The internet era is also throwing up a whole new set of privacy and copyright issues as museums increasingly put their collections online.[64]

Torsen and Anderson, external consultants from WIPO, provided legal information and discussed specific experiences of institutions whose cultural collections bear implications for intellectual property rights.[65] Given WIPO's contribution on issues of heritage, it became imperative for the research to consult extensive literature on and by WIPO and even conduct interviews online where possible. This was to capture the current trends and guidelines by WIPO on best practice and the best ways to safeguard cultural property. This includes the application of copyright and intellectual property laws in cases of repatriations, shared ownership and management of the heritage.

For the most part, however, I locate this study in terms of museological work. Examples of work that deal with the problematics of the study include pieces by museologists on the histories of colonial collections. The book *A Colonial Thing* included reflections by various scholars on an exhibition based on colonial collections held by the Welt museum Wien in Vienna and looked at the different areas from which the collections came and the collectors involved.[66] The source *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets* contains essays by a number of scholars that detail the different streams of object migration during the colonial period, the perpetrators and different methods of transfers.[67] *German Colonialism: Fragments Past and Present*, a publication by the Deutsches Historisches Museum, is a compendium of articles by different scholars reflecting on German colonialism and the amassing of cultural property from the spheres of influence, the different methods of collecting, and the different communities affected by this. This is about the historical detail of

[64] Julien Anfruns, "Foreword," *ICOM Newsletter* 63, no. 1 (2010): 2.

[65] Jane Anderson and Molly Torsen, "Intellectual Property and the Safeguarding of Traditional Cultures: Legal Issues and Practical Options for Museums. Libraries and Archives," (Geneva: WIPO, 2012), 122.

[66] Joy Slapping and Claudia Augustat, "A Colonial Thing Booklet," (Vienna: Weltmuseum Wien, 2019).

[67] Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald, *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets*, (De Gruyter, 2018).

the violence of German colonialism and the impact on the colonised, with a proposal into what needs to be done to correct this historical wrong.[68]

A publication by ICOM, *Countering Illicit Trafficking in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting the World's Heritage*, gave details related to current cases of illicit trafficking in various countries, looting from sites, stealing from museums, and the market for artworks. It also discussed measures put in place by international structures such as ICOM to fight cultural migration and by different countries and legislation aimed towards negotiations and combat against trafficking and traffickers.[69] The book *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations* discussed the central themes addressed by the thesis, which are the migration of cultural property and the efforts by states in the global community to work together towards a shared responsibility. It also interrogated the issue of human remains in museums in Southern Africa with the intention to develop legislation to facilitate repatriations, collaborations and the involvement of communities. This has also proved to be a rich resource for the thesis in its interrogation of the issue of human remains and the challenges involved.[70]

Historical Judgement, a publication by the Deutsches Historisches Museum, gave detail on colonial collections and their provenance. It includes voices of lawyers, museum experts, politicians, diplomats, media and the public who reflected on international law in relation to colonial justice. It also discussed German colonial history and the migration of collections, and governmental positions on colonial collections and repatriations. It reflected detail on the voices of the communities of origin.[71] *Museums and Restitution: New Practices, New Approaches* similarly examined contemporary approaches to restitution and how these have been applied at a national, regional and international level by both museums and political leaders. The source also examined current cases of restitution.[72] *The Best in Heritage* is an ICOM publication containing essays by scholars from various countries about best practice in museums. It explored how museums can be connected as partners for the management of heritage, which addresses the concept of a shared heritage.[73]

---

[68] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*.
[69] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*.
[70] Viv Golding and Jen Walklate (eds.), *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, (London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019).
[71] *Historical Judgment* 1 (2019).
[72] Kostas Arvanities and Louis Tythacott, *Museums and Restitution: New Practices, New Approaches*, (Surrey: Ashgate, 2014), 2.
[73] Luka Cipek (ed.), *The Best in Heritage: 17th edition, Dubrovnk, Croatia, 26–28 September 2018*, (Zagreb: ICOM, 2018).

The *Revista Muzeelor*, Volume 1, a peer reviewed Journal by the National Institute for Cultural Research and Training, Romania, also presented a set of essays by scholars and museum professionals. These discussed the evolution of the museum as an institution and its expected development into a cultural hub. The focus of this volume was the reinvention of the museum into a suitable entity amid all the debates about repatriation, equality, collaborations, reconciliation and best practice.[74] A recent special issue of *Museum and Society* likewise contained articles addressing a number of thematic areas for the thesis such as ceremonial objects, repatriation, indigenous communities, provenance research and the issue of human remains as a problematic heritage in museums.[75] Another major point of reference is the famous Sarr-Savoy Report, *The Repatriation of African cultural heritage: Towards a New Relational Ethics*. This report was commissioned by the French government after the declaration by the French president Emanuel Macron in 2017 that French museums will return all African collections to Africa.[76]

The book *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe***:** *A New Field for Museum Studies* contains papers by different scholars who discussed diverse attempts at cooperation between museums of the global North and the global South. It discussed the concept of decolonisation, restitution and repatriation of colonial collections and the African museum as understood in the African sense: Spiritual and royal objects and their significance in African settings.[77] *Museums and their Communities* by Sheila Watson is another invaluable source that looked at the changing roles of the museum over time and its current challenges, and at the role of communities and problems of ownership.[78] *Cultural Property and Contested Ownership: The Trafficking of Artefacts and the Quest for Restitution*, edited by Briggitta Hauser-Schaublin & Lyndel Prott, reflected on relevant international conventions and their implementation. It looked mostly at contemporary trafficking, the dealers involved, and the related challenges and disputes for return. The contributions by experts on international law, anthropologists, historians and archaeologists were invaluable to the development of this thesis.[79]

---

[74] Virgil Stefan Nitulescu (ed), *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019).

[75] *Museum and Society* 18, no. 1 (2020). See also Philipp Schorch, "Sensitive Heritage: Ethnographic Museum, Provenance Research and the Potentialities of Restitution," Museum and Society 18, no. 1 (2020): 3.

[76] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics."

[77] Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere, *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe*, (Bielefeld: transcript-Verlag, 2018).

[78] Sheila Watson, *Museums and their Communities*, (London: Routledge, 2007)

[79] Brigitta Hauser-Schaublin and Lyndel Prott (eds.), *Cultural Property and Contested Ownership: The Trafficking of Artifacts and Quest for The Restitution*, (Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2016).

Stefano Manacorda and Duncan Chappell discussed cultural migrations, the perpetrators and illegal status of the trade, and give examples of restitution cases.[80] Donald Fraser gave an account of research activities in the region and the exchange of collections within the regional institutions as well as the British Museum before and during the colonial period. This grounds the study's argument on the migration of cultural property to neighbouring states and to the colonising power. His work also adds to the enquiry on the different perpetrators and methods of transfer in the cultural migration process.[81]

Ana Vrdoljak also added to this critical discourse by advocating for the rights and contribution of Indigenous people in the administration of their heritage and development of laws supporting this undertaking.[82] Tereba Togola discussed the case of illicit trafficking in Mali and pointed out that at first the problem of migration of cultural property was not seen as illegal. However, today with all the different cases of migration and the sophistication of the trade there is a need for relevant laws to regulate the movement of cultural property.[83] Bruce Gilley also discussed colonialism and the negatives brought by colonialism to both communities and their heritage.[84] Simon Knell in *Altered Values* discussed new approaches in collecting artefacts as compared to the earlier illegal approaches.[85] Yoshida Kenji's cross reference to the *Primitivism Exhibition* reflected on the current state of the migrated collections in European museums, the narratives that accompany them and how unrepresentative this is for the communities of origin. Yoshida drew our attention to the plight of the communities whose collections are misrepresented in foreign museums.[86]

Anne Mayor, Vincent Négri and Eric Huysecom emphasised the fact that African heritage is not safe and needs a concerted effort to be protected. The source is also valuable in the discussion of responses by states that have lost heritage and the discussion on a shared heritage.[87] Rob Pickard in *A Review of Policies and Practice* also advocated for universal heritage and the use of legislation to achieve this. He brought to light the role of governments

---

[80] Stefano Manacorda and Duncan Chappell, *Crime in the Art and Antiquities World: Illegal Trafficking in Cultural Property*, (New York: Springer, 2011), 1–2.
[81] Donald Fraser, *Africa Idylls*, (London: Service & Co., 1925).
[82] Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects."
[83] Tereba Togola, "The Plight of Mali's Past," in *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?*, eds. Kenji Yoshida and John Mack, (Suffolk: James Currey, 2008), 58–63.
[84] Joseph McQuade. "Colonialism was a Disaster and the Facts Prove It."
[85] Simon Knell (ed.), "Altered Values: Searching for a New Collecting," in *Museums and the Future of Collecting*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).
[86] Kenji Yoshida, "Ethnographic Exhibitions Today," in *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?*, eds. Kenji Yoshida and John Mack, (Suffolk: James Currey, 2008), 165.
[87] Anne Mayor, Vincent Négri and Eric Huysecom (eds.), *African Memory in Danger*, (Journal of African Archaeology Monograph Series 11, 2015).

and national interests as against museum expectations and mandates as one of the thorny issues affecting museum development and operation.[88] Yet another source of interest is *The Smuggling of Art, and the Art of Smuggling: Uncovering the Illicit Trade in Cultural Property and Antiquities* by Raymond Fisman and Shang Jin Wei. It tackled the issue of the migrated museum to expose the legality and illegality of the trade.[89] The article analysed the illicit trade in cultural property and antiquities and also gave insight into the different reporting systems between source and destination countries. The authors demonstrated how the volume and movement of objects can be measured by taking records from borders and airports compiled by customs authorities. Their analysis provides a valuable framework for studying the extent of such illicit streams in the present.

Susan Ashley discussed policy and theories associated with the management of heritage at a local and international level. The source contributes to the study in its enquiry into laws and policies governing the restitution and management of heritage and universality.[90] In their book *Armed Conflict and International Law: In Search of the Human Face,* Marielle Matthee, Brigit Toebes and Marcel Brus also discussed the migration of objects and the related legislation. They gave a comprehensive report about UNESCO's international alerts to countries such as Algeria, Chad and Egypt with a view to protect Libya's looted and trafficked cultural heritage. The source helps the thesis in its analytical overview of international responses to today's illegal transfers of cultural heritage.[91] Desmarais's line of thinking warrants analysing of successful security programmes by museums and countries as well as proper measures to put in place and key issues to consider for the future security of museums, archaeological sites and private collections.[92]

According to Willem Hekman in *A Handbook on Emergency Procedures* by ICOM'S International Committee for Museum Security, the problem of illicit trafficking is not the only threat to the security of collections; there are other threats such as floods, fires and wars.[93] He explored the many different mechanisms to put in place in response to risks and emergencies

---

[88] Rob Pickard and Council of Europe, *European Cultural Heritage: A Review of Policies and Practices*, (London: Council of Europe, 2002), 5.

[89] Raymond Fisman and Shang Jin Wei, "The Smuggling of Art, and the Art of Smuggling: Uncovering the Illicit Trade in Cultural Property and Antiquities," *American Economic Journal* 1, (2009): 82–96.

[90] Susan Ashley, "*Theoretical Approaches to Cultural Policy*," (Unpublished, 2008).

[91] Marielle Matthee, Brigit Toebes and Marcel Brus (eds.), *Armed Conflict and International Law: In Search of the Human Face*, (The Hague: Asser Press, 2013).

[93] Willem Hekman, "Introduction," in *A Handbook on Emergency Procedures* by ICOM'S International Committee for Museum Security (Paris: ICOM, 2010), 4.

in museums and heritage sites. The handbook was useful in providing detail to the measures put in place for security and to prevent further transfers. Craig Forrest investigated the migration of objects, the legal aspect of the transfers, and existing laws regulating the trade. He warned that objects are migrated through illicit excavations, looting and illicit trafficking.[94] Meanwhile, Elizabeth Brumfield also touched on related legislation for heritage. She emphasised the need to improve security in museums to curb the migration of cultural property. According to her, this also calls for proper inventorying of objects: A key concern of this study.[95] Susan Keitumetse also promoted the thinking that states should develop laws guiding the protection of heritage and that they should draw from those developed during the colonial period.[96]

Karolyn Monteil and Vanessa Kredler indicated that the fight against illicit trafficking of cultural property in Africa is gaining momentum due to the support of UNESCO. According to them, UNESCO has in turn made Africa a priority in its programmes.[97] Silvester suggested that African natural and cultural heritage is an important source of knowledge for the development of Namibia, and a clear indication that losing cultural heritage to other nations is detrimental to countries' development. His perspective contributes to the study's discourse on the migrated museum and Africa's underdevelopment due to the loss of its heritage.[98] France Desmarais on the other hand proposed the development of a Red List by countries as a solution to the current problem of illicit trafficking of cultural property. She examined responses by African countries, museums, and the global community to the call for the restitution of cultural property back to countries of origin. Desmarais also addressed the security of cultural property in museums as an initiative to stop the loss of heritage and history from repeating itself.[99] The Oram & Nteta Report (one of the few sources on Botswana, its heritage and the migration of cultural property) detailed the disjointed structure of museums in Botswana and proposed an all-inclusive structure and the development of relevant laws to allow for a concerted effort

[94] Craig Forrest, *International Law and the Practice of Cultural Property*, (London: Routledge, 2012).
[95] Elizabeth M. Brumfield, "It's a Material World: History, Artefacts and Anthropology," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 32, no. 1 (2003): 205–223.
[96] Susan Keitumetse, *African Cultural Heritage Conservation and Management: Theory and Practice from Southern Africa*, (Switzerland: Springer, 2016), ix.
[97] Karalyn Monteil and Vanessa Kredler, "UNESCO Empowers African Museums," *AFRICOM News* 8 (2010): 17.
[98] Jeremy Silvester, "Namibia Celebrates Heritage Week," *Museums Matters* 23, no. 2 (2013): 18.
[99] France Desmarais, "Heritage in Danger," *ICOM Newsletter* 61, no. 1, (2010): 14–21.

towards the management of heritage. The source aided the thesis in its argument towards a shared heritage and collaboration by institutions and with the community.[100]

The Swedish African Museum Programme (SAMP) publication of 2008 contributed to the survey on combat and prevention of the transfer of cultural property by both countries and international heritage bodies. It also investigated the level of ratification of the 1970 Convention by African countries and the challenges involved.[101]

On the question of shared heritage, Shawkat Alam et al. offered a detailed narrative of the notions of universality and sharing in the development of international protocols in their *Handbook of International Environmental Law*. According to them, this will make international collaborations and exchanges much easier. The thesis draws from their examples in its deliberation on the development of policy for heritage and the issue of a shared heritage.[102] In a publication by the Council of Europe, Rob Pickard also advocated for universal heritage and the use of legislation to achieve the same.[103] Alam et al. similarly deliberated on the universality of a shared heritage as well as the development of relevant legislation to guide and regulate relations with stakeholders.[104]

Finally, Martin Legassick and Ciraj Rassool interrogated the treatment of human remains in relation to the colonial legacies and their repercussions as witnessed in museums today.[105] In her book *Contesting Human Remains in Museums,* Tiffany Jenkins also gave detail on the current cases of human remains in museums and the involvement of relevant communities. She gave insight into the ongoing debates and conversations on human remains and their handling by museums.[106] The World Archaeological Congress First Code of Ethics also gives impetus to this study in its analysis of the handling of human remains and their restitution by museums. The thesis draws from its examples to interrogate the current regional issues on human remains that are linked by colonial histories, shared communities and landscapes.[107]

---

[100] J.L. Oram and Doreen Nteta, "National Museum Monuments and Art Gallery, Botswana Extension Project Consultancy Report," (Gaborone: Government Printer, 1984).
[101] SAMP, "Illicit Traffic and Security of Collections: Survey of SAMP Network," (Stockholm: SAMP, 2008), 1.
[102] Shawkat Alam et al., *Handbook of International Environmental Law*, (London: Routledge, 2012).
[103] Rob Pickard and Council of Europe, *European Cultural Heritage: A Review of Policies and Practices*, 5.
[104] Shawkat Alam et al., *Handbook of International Environmental Law*.
[105] Martin Legassick and Ciraj Rassool, *Skeletons in the Cupboards: South African Museums and The Trade in Human Remains 1907–1917*, (Cape Town: South African Museum, 2000).
[106] Tiffany Jenkins, *Contesting Human Remains in Museum Collections: The Crisis of Cultural Authority*, (New York: Routledge, 2013).
[107] World Archaeological Congress, "World Archaeology Congress First Code of Ethics", (WAC: Venezuela, 1990).

In conclusion, given that the subject of cultural migration has not been given attention in Botswana as indicated earlier, it is not surprising that despite the emergence of a wide array of literature over the past decade, there is still little literature on Botswana and the presence of its cultural property in the diaspora as well as ongoing thefts and illicit trades. This refers particularly to heritage managers, the Botswana government as well as international heritage organisations. Any mention of the Botswana situation was done in passing when addressing other issues of concern on heritage, such as monuments development or when dealing with illegal transfers in other countries. In the broader context of heritage, the focus of the Botswana government is on the illegal transfer of wildlife and diamonds and that of heritage is relegated the last position or none at all.

The multi-layered process of object transfer is therefore a problem that for a long time has been ignored in Botswana. The assumption could have been that it affects other countries and that Botswana has nothing of interest to lose. Meanwhile, heritage managers, particularly from the National Museum, which is a government department, have had to tow the government line, which included the prioritised development of monuments for tourism and economic development. The illegal transfer of cultural material has not been a part of the state's agenda. Even the few cases of restitution registered in the country, such as El Negro, or the Van Rensburg Collection at the National Museum, did not draw the attention of Batswana towards cultural migration, let alone to documenting it in a scholarly, critical and focussed manner. Some further sources are worth noting on Botswana because they directly address the thesis's research question. These are from *Pula Journal* in which Bruce Bennett[108] and Alinah Segobye[109] contributed articles on the repatriation of El Negro, and Neil Parsons[110] wrote an article on El Negro and what his return means to the world of heritage and museums.

1.4 METHODOLOGY

As a point of departure, the study started by consulting collections of secondary sources relating to museum collections in Botswana and South Africa. The investigation used existing literature on heritage by heritage- managers, curators and scholars on the protection, promotion

[108] Bruce Bennett, "Dead Bodies on Display: El Negro in Cross-Cultural Perspective," *PULA: Botswana Journal of African Studies* 16, no. 1, (2002): 1. See also Botswana Government, "Repatriation Document on El Negro," 2.
[109] Alinah Segobye, "Missing Persons, Stolen Bodies an Issue of Patrimony: the El Negro Story," *PULA: Botswana Journal of African Studies* 16, no. 1 (2002), 13. See also *Botswana Daily News,* "El Negro Buried—5th October, 2000," (2000): 2.
[110] Neil Parsons, "El Negro," *The African Journal* (2002). See also Neil Parsons, "One body playing many parts—le Betjouana, El Negro, and il Bosquimano," *PULA: Botswana Journal of African Studies* 16, no. 1 (2002): 19–29.

and management of heritage and museums in Botswana. The intent was to collect existing information on migrated artefacts and illegal trades, restitution, and shared heritage. This included records on copyright and intellectual property rights and the existing legislation on these migrated artefacts both in Botswana and elsewhere. The available literature was consulted in the University of Botswana library, the Botswana National Museum reference library, the Botswana National Archives, the Botswana Public Library in Gaborone, Wits University library and library collections from sampled museum institutions such as Ditsong Museums and Iziko Museums of South Africa. This initial stage of the literature review was done to determine the level of availability of relevant sources for use by the study and to develop background to direct the oral interviews. The consulted sources included books, booklets, newspapers, journals, pamphlets, brochures, documents, book reviews and reports, published and unpublished articles from books, newspapers and journals. These helped shed light on the contextual history of the development of museums in Botswana and the migration of objects.

The Botswana Reference Library and National Archives provided secondary sources on heritage in Botswana. The Botswana Collection, a section of the University of Botswana library, also provided information on what has been covered on the development of heritage, its management and protection and on the few known or recorded transfer and restitution cases in Botswana. This included cases on other African countries. It should be noted though, that a large portion of thefts and migrations have not been recorded. This is because they were either not known or the migrations were not viewed as illegal at the time. The first museum in Botswana was established in 1967, a year after the country's independence, before which much heritage, including documentation and research findings, was taken to neighbouring country museums. The objects went to museums in Cape Town, the Livingstone Museum, Natural History Museum, Bulawayo and the UK. In most cases, no records were made of these transfers: Only the presence of this heritage in neighbouring country museums and museums abroad bears testimony to what transpired in the past. In the Botswana case, most citizens do not even know about the existence of this heritage in other countries.

Also noteworthy is the stream of publications on Botswana by the Botswana Society through its publication *Botswana Notes and Records.* The society was established to support the work of the museum, and therefore, its publication has covered a wide range of topics on heritage. The UNESCO website is another rich source of information. This is an online databank on different topics about universal heritage by different scholars and from different forums and

cases by UNESCO. It provided much needed data added to the contextual framework, guiding the arguments and analysis of issues. Interpol's database on *Stolen Works of Art* around the world acted as a complementary source to the study. The database includes records of thefts held by courts, archives and states and restitution cases that it has dealt with. The same applies to records and publications by UNIDROIT (International Institute for the Unification of Private Law), which also hosts the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention. Access to all these sources has been through the internet, or by direct consultation with officials from these institutions. Where possible I visited their information centres or libraries.

The second stage of the research study included visits to three African countries from different regions that provided a different cultural, political and economic background than Botswana. Each visit lasted 10 days, during which national libraries, national archives, museums and sites were visited for both oral interviews and the use of secondary sources. The services of assistants for translation and interpretation of records became necessary in cases where the responses were given in a language other than English. As stated earlier, in some countries in West and North Africa, the migration of cultural property has been worse, hence the need to draw examples from West or North Africa as represented by the visit to Nigeria. The visit to Nigeria covered two cities, Abuja and Lagos. In Abuja, the focus was mostly on interviews with senior museum officials since the headquarters of the Commission of Nigerian Museums are there. These mostly covered government positions and strategies in relation to migrated Nigerian collections and efforts towards restitution. The second visit was to Lagos, where the National Museum is and where some of the restituted material is housed. The Museum in Lagos also houses the office for export certificates, which is used by the government and the Commission of Museums to prevent the illegal import and export of objects. All exports of cultural property are signed for by this office. Nigeria is one of the African countries that have much heritage in foreign museums, particularly the British Museum. A good example is the Nigerian Benin bronzes from the then Benin Kingdom. It was therefore important to interview key people in Nigeria to get insight into these transfers, efforts at restitution and the ongoing cases of dialogue on the subject. The people I interviews include Edith Ekunke, Director of the National Museum in Lagos; Prince Adedoyin Shyllon, art collector & lawyer; Isa Jalo, Director of the Federal Capital Territory Administration; Folarin Shyllon, law professor at the University of Ibadan; Mr Minin Alhaji Nagya, Deputy Director at the National Library; Peter Odey, Deputy Director of the Nigerian Commission of Museums; Jafaru Yunusa Dauda, Director of Research Planning & Publication of the National Commission of Museums; Minin

Alhaji Nagya, Deputy Director of the National Archives; and Imoesin Yona, senior archivist at the National Archives. This was to establish whether similar patterns of transfers have applied to Botswana and to benchmark the way forward in cases of restitution and combat. The benchmarking shed light on different approaches to restitution through dialogue and the application of existing bilateral and cultural agreements on the same. This also shed light on the legal measures put in place to combat illegal migrations today.

Malawi and South Africa, which are from the same regional block as Botswana, were used to establish the substance of heritage transferred to neighbouring countries due to the absence of a museum in Botswana during the colonial period. This includes the inter-exchange of artefacts among regional colonies. According to Donald Fraser, the Central Africa Archives of Nyasaland published information on archaeological remains in the region. He has also gaven testimony on the existing setting in object exchange in the Southern African region, such as San rock art paintings. The Museums of Southern Africa were interested in seeing if the objects in their possession were in any way related to those in the Central and East African regions. This led to a collaboration with the South African Museum in Cape Town to undertake expeditions and share findings in order to compare notes and findings. Some of the objects and records went to Cape Town, and this explains the presence of artefacts from Malawi or Nyasaland, Tanzania, the DRC etc. at Iziko Museums. Records from that period testified to these regional connections, for instance, for the cave excavations in Nyasaland in 1926, expert advice came from the South African Museum.[111] Information from the Central Registry of Nyasaland between 1926 and 1965 points to the discovery and finding of flora and fauna of Nyasa near Karanga by the British Museum through the government geologist Dr F. Dixey. He submitted the findings to the British Museum. These were natural history collections and the samples were taken abroad, presumably with some going to the South African Museum. Findings and artefacts from the expeditions were also published in the Nyasaland Times, Blantyre Printing and Publishing Co. in 1925.[112] This is therefore an indication of the regional object exchange regime during the period and the link with the coloniser. It also justifies the need to use case studies from the neighbouring states.

[111] Donald Fraser, *Africa Idylls*. See also Iziko Museum of Social History, "Documentation Records of Botswana Collections at Iziko Museums," (Cape Town: Iziko Museums, 2015); R.H.N. Smithers, "Report of Trustees for 1949," (Bulawayo: High Court, 1949), 179.
[112] Donald Fraser, *Africa Idylls*.

The British Museum was also a key site for the study. I visited the British Museum October 2015 for one week. Effort was made to confine the research to the indicated geographical framework of enquiry. At the British Museum, I had access to the Anthropology Library and the museum's website for collections as well as the Africa section of the museum. The curators also made available a list of objects from Botswana. I interviewed Julie Hudson, Chris Spring, and Peter Hamil, who are all curators from the Africa section of the Museum. I also interviewed Godfrey Abeshin, a security officer of Nigerian origin working for the British Museum.

The visits were realised by connecting with heritage managers and Botswana Embassies in the countries under discussion to facilitate the visits and draw up the research programme. The approach allowed for a coordinated, consultative and productive consultation of both secondary and oral sources. In cases where informants were not readily available, questionnaires covering the thematic areas of the research were sent to the informants, and a questionnaire was also issued for direct answering or written responses.

Oral interviews accounted for a good part of the research, particularly after the literature review. The interviews acted as a crucial spring of information and a focal point to this research project. They are relevant for their in-depth investigation into issues. Furthermore, interviews afforded the researcher an opportunity to understand the value communities place on migrated heritage as well as the values and beliefs surrounding this heritage.[113] This also applies to establishing how communities feel about the option to share the heritage. Oral interviews were complemented by cases of living testimonies by relevant people in Botswana, South Africa, Malawi, and Nigeria. The interviews were done with museum officers, heritage practitioners, law enforcement officers, politicians, and government officials in all the selected countries. Interviews in South Africa, Nigeria and Malawi were used for contextualisation, reference and comparison. These also provided much needed information on the contribution of heritage managers, communities, and governments. They shed light on existing laws and regulations, on international heritage organisations, and on measures taken by recipient countries regarding illegal transfers of cultural property.

While the research confined itself to its framework of enquiry, which is the migration of cultural property in Botswana, the selected three African countries and the British museum; it

[113] Winani Thebele-Kgwatalala, "The Evolution and Development of the Museum in Botswana towards a Heritage Institution," (MA Thesis, University of Botswana), 35–36.

has where possible covered known foreign museums harbouring the heritage under discussion as well as art galleries, dealer shops and private collections. This justifies the secondary attention to German museums, Namibian collections and museums, and American and Canadian museums. A section of the thesis is devoted to an outline of known diaspora museums that have collections from Botswana and those in other African country museums. The emphasis of the study has been to plot a map of Botswana's cultural distribution in the diaspora and establishing a database on the same. The database and map gave detail of what collections there are, where they are, and how, by whom and when they were transferred. This could in the future act as a guide in case there is need to repatriate or engage in collaborations. The methodology used to identify the diasporic museums that have Botswana collections involved visits to the museums, visits to websites and the sharing of information through emails. In some instances, information about the presence of Botswana collections was shared by colleagues, who then introduced me to the curators of the concerned museums. It has been crucial that the study makes in-depth analysis of the different methods of transfers for cultural property as well as a survey of the different perpetrators and the various motives for transferring the objects so as to validate cases of restitution and to interrogate the notion of sharing. Procedurally, in cases of restitution, if courts are engaged, demanding institutions and countries are asked to prove beyond doubt that the cultural property is theirs. Hence, the analyses of the situations leading to transfers and the perpetrators are to help to authenticate the migration stories and ownership. The study has also drawn examples detailing the cultural distribution of the sampled countries of Malawi, South Africa and Nigeria and others.

Emphasis was placed on plotting a map of Botswana's cultural object distribution in the diaspora. In drawing the diasporic map, the study drew from the well-known cases of object exchange, migration and restitution from different parts of the world. This includes cases such as El Negro, repatriated from Spain, where some objects still remain. There is also the Van Rensburg Collection from Mafikeng Museums, where some objects still remain. The Iziko Museums in Cape Town have in turn shared a list of Botswana objects and human remains in their possession. Apart from these, there have also been declarations made by those who hold the collections such as the Brighton Museum and Hove Museum in the UK. I also made contacts with different professionals from museums around the world who have in turn declared what their museums hold and shared lists on the same. This has been the most effective method of contact in plotting the diasporic map. There were also instances where after presentations at workshops, seminars and conferences, people made declarations that I later

followed up through emails and telephone conversations. In some cases, I checked museum websites for collections from Botswana and then followed up with officials for confirmation and available lists and documentation. Only a small fraction of Botswana's diasporic collections was identified, and there is still potential to do further enquiries in the future using the same method.

With a processual and collaborative approach in mind, I publicly presented work from this study while it was ongoing. This was done through presentations at seminars and conferences at Wits University, Botswana National Museum as well as the University of Botswana, and at doctoral forums hosted by the National Institute of Humanities and the Development of Social Sciences, who are sponsoring the research work. The presentations brought feedback from scholars as well as heritage managers and curators. Where possible and funds permitting, I also attended relevant seminars, workshops and conferences organised in other areas of the globe and by relevant stakeholders. In this way, I managed to present part of the findings, participate in debates and follow fresh arguments and publications on the topic, which greatly enhanced the research project. The feedback from colleagues, particularly those from European institutions holding Botswana collections, has also been an invaluable resource for the study.

1.5 OUTLINE

Chapter 2 explores the existing policy frameworks relating to migrated collections, internationally and in Botswana. Chapter 3 looks at the concrete histories of a number of migrated collections that contain items from Botswana and other African countries, while Chapter 4 examines the expatriation of both cultural property and human remains as a form of colonial injustice. Chapter 5 relates and interprets several case studies of restitution, while Chapter 6 looks at experiments in sharing, both from broadly anthropological perspectives and through case studies of such collaborations. Chapter 7 provides a set of policy proposals based on the research, followed by a brief conclusion to the thesis.

CHAPTER 2
POLICY FRAMEWORKS

This chapter examines existing policy frameworks involving the migration of objects. It begins by tracing the development of related international policy agreements between states and institutions that are involved in regulating the global flow of heritage. The second part of the chapter focuses on Botswana by examining the development of local policy frameworks relating to heritage. The development of policy relating to heritage in Botswana dates from the precolonial era through British colonialism and on into the period of independence. Finally, I compare the case of Botswana to that of other African states where questions about the migration of cultural heritage under colonialism have already been negotiated.

2.1 DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL POLICY—EXPATRIATION AND RESTITUTION

2.1.1 Issues of Security and Cultural Heritage

The management and protection of heritage is a policy issue, especially where this heritage is repatriated and/or shared among states. There is, therefore, a need for international, regional, and national policies and laws to guide the implementation of such arrangements. Bodies such as UNESCO, ICOM, WIPO and the UN have developed international legal instruments that address the issue of heritage and also to help states in crafting domestic legal instruments. Meanwhile, African, European, Asian and American states have also developed their own national legal instruments to domesticate these protocols and conventions. Some of the most widely referred to protocols and conventions in the heritage space are the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import/Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property; the 1954 Convention on the Protection of Heritage in Case of Armed Conflict and its two protocols; 2003 Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage; the 2005 Convention on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions; the 2001 Convention on the Protection of Under Water Heritage; the 1972 Convention on the Protection of Natural Heritage (tangible); the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects; and the UN protocols on the Rights of Indigenous People, the Protection of Indigenous Languages, etc.

This has not been a smooth development. Bodies such as UNESCO have struggled to see member states ratify protocols, and due to the absence of relevant national legislation, it has

been difficult for states to implement and apply the conventions to their own domestic environments. These international bodies ensure that countries comply through domestic legal structures in order to implement any protocol to which they become a party. However, this does not mean that international protocols are cast in stone. They can be challenged, depending on the political environments of different states and regions. The domestication process is also meant for the different individual states to infuse regulations better suited to local legal, cultural, political and social contexts. In some instances, states have ratified conventions and could not implement them for some time because they did not have the relevant national legislation to allow for implementation. The US is a good example of such. In 1983 it established the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, which worked as an organ to stop the illegal import and export of object in the US and as a means to implement the 1970 Convention.[114] In some instances, states have ignored the protocols altogether because they have other priority areas or mistrust the global ideological alignment of these frameworks. Hence, it is important to be wary of the power dynamics at play when dealing with international law. The result is that countries around the world have been slow to adopt the international protocols and develop their own internal legal structures.

In countries where conventions have been ratified, domesticated, and applied by law enforcement agencies, such as in West Africa, there have been breakthroughs in preventing illegal traffic and assuring the return of objects. This also applies to state parties that have put in place laws on restitution and collaboration. Italy is a case of a cosmopolitan state that has also nationalised the ratification process through legislation and through internal structures such as the Ministry of Culture and its specialised police. Mariano Mossa, the head of the Heritage Police section, indicated that the revenue from the illegal sale of objects ranks fourth in the world after the sale of weapons, drugs, and financial products. Italy has the largest number of migrated objects, totalling about 5.7 million objects.[115] The Carabinieri is a specialised police force in Italy founded in 1814 as a security organ by the state. While it has evolved through many different components of service, the latest service to cultural heritage has been tremendous.[116] The internal situation in Italy is what prompted the Italian government to put in place legal structures and law enforcement agencies.

---

[114] *United States III of Public Law 97/446, Statute 2329 of 1982,* (USA).
[115] *Botswana Daily News*, "Italy Police Recover Stolen painting," 63 (2014): 2.
[116] Carabinieri, "Historical Calendar of the Carabinieri Corps", *Yearly Calendar* 324/88 (1988).

The cutting edge of advocacy for return is that museums and governments have also resolved to engage in critical issues of security as a way of combating illicit trafficking. This is an approach enforced and advocated for at an international level through UNESCO agents of security and law enforcement, ICOM'S International Committees for the Security of Museums, as well as the UN. Training sessions on issues of security in heritage have been organised at an international level by ICOM, UNESCO and Interpol. Laws and regulations have also been put in place to talk to the issue of security in museums, security of sites and monuments, security of museum collections, and security of general heritage. Every country has to craft its domestic laws, however, so that they suit its own unique cultural and political environment. Much as some of the regulations are prompted by international protocols, they nevertheless differ between countries.

In his *"*Foreword" to the ICOM Newsletter of 2011, the ICOM Director General Julien Anfruns indicated that ICOM's International Committee for Museum Security is an invaluable source of professional expertise for museums in security matters. It offers a platform to dialogue, cooperate and share information among museum security specialists. This in turn enhances their institutional safety systems. According to Anfruns, to prevent the menace of trafficking, the international community has to work together as a united force and complement one another's efforts for best universal practices. [117]

The result of this global emphasis on security has been a positive move toward achieving safety and the development of regulations on cultural property. CCTVs, backup generators, export and import regulations and export certificates have been put in place. While some countries are implementing security regulations, some are still at drafting stage, for example, Botswana is still fighting to get approval of the Botswana museums and Monuments Bill. Countries that have ratified the conventions and are from the same regional block (SADC) have also been cooperating to implement conventions. They have agreed to act vigilantly in their markets for collections. This cooperation and vigilance could apply to any state that has sent alerts on missing objects. Nigeria for one has put in place regulations that regulate the export of cultural property. South Africa and Malawi have developed laws on the same. However, in some instances, international protocols and national regulations on culture have become contested zones. This is situations where countries do not agree on certain components of the law because

[117] Julien Anfruns, "Foreword," 2.

they have not been interpreted in the same way or mean different things to them.[118] According to St John Simpson, it is not easy to deal with a country that has not ratified the conventions because there is nothing that binds the other country in a case of non-ratification.[119]

Interpol is restricted by the laws of the states where it works, but it is also guided by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This is in cognisance of the fact that heritage promotion and protection is advocated for as a human right. According to Interpol, effective law enforcement cannot happen in isolation. This is why it is constantly building new strategic and operational partnerships with a diverse range of international organisations and the private sector. This creates a strong front against the illegal movement of cultural goods. It also considers the fact that in our increasingly globalised world, crime does not stop at national borders.[120] Interpol cooperates with ICOM, UNESCO, the UN, and national security agents in different countries, such as police, defence forces, and WIPO, on issues concerning heritage.

Interpol is staffed with trained law enforcement officers. The National Central Bureau in each member state updates its criminal databases constantly. It also cooperates with national police on cross border investigations and on operations and arrests of illicit traffickers and illegal dealers. It also provides training on Interpol's tools and resources to strengthen the ability of national police to fight globalised crimes, including illegal object migration. The training also benefits stakeholders such as museum curators. The National Bureau in Botswana offered training to the Botswana National Museum curators from 13–14 August 2014 on *The Investigation of Transnational and Organized Intellectual Property Crime* in Gaborone. One of the curators, Babutsi Mosarwa, pursued this further to acquire a certificate. Interpol also continually prints publications, charts, fliers and other publicity material detailing "the most wanted works of art" and update issues concerning the illegal migration of artefacts.[121] These initiatives by Interpol add to the global drive towards a shared responsibility in the management of heritage.

Meanwhile, because of the absence of comprehensive legislation, the museum in Botswana has for a long time lagged behind most museums in the region and the world. The latter were from

---

[118] Jos Van Beurden, *Treasures in Trusted Hands: Negotiating the Future of Colonial Cultural Objects*, (Leidon: Sidestone Press, 2017).
[119] St John Simpson, "Back to Kabul: Case Studies of Successful Collaboration," in *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting the World's Heritage*, ed. France Desmarais. (Paris: ICOM, 2015), 186.
[120] Gunther Wessel, "Dealers and Collectors, Provenances and Rights: Searching for Traces." See also Interpol, "Connecting Police, Securing the World," *Interpol Newsletter* (2018).
[121] Interpol, "Connecting Police, Securing the World."

the onset founded on specific policies that in turn strengthened their development and regulated their functions, roles and relations in a positive way.[122] In most of the regional countries, there is a national character to institutions. The national museums are funded by government and bureaucratically managed.[123] However, apart from being influenced by government regulations, museums in neighbouring states have, unlike the museum in Botswana, developed relevant museum policies.[124]

2.1.2 The International Scenario on Policy

Under international law the process for repatriation becomes a multi-layered process. The aim of international law is to enforce repatriation and to guarantee the full involvement of a people in issues regarding their culture. This is culture in its totality and not only objects but also human remains and intangible cultural heritage.[125] This is an indication that the international community and the international law today have abandoned earlier colonial mentalities. As Vrdoljak has indicated:

> It is imperative that the international community generally, and Museums, specifically acknowledge the pre-eminence of the rights, laws and customs of Indigenous peoples in their cultural heritage over those of the scientific or artistic communities, or national interests and laws of the relevant state. Indigenous peoples must be involved in and approve the development of any international and national frameworks for the protection and restitution of their cultural heritage.[126]

Most museums and states around the world have adopted policies to guide their functions. These policies enable the museums to declare their interests to funders and authorities and to execute all their services.[127] Policy statements of this nature are important and ensure that the right information is given with regards to research, control of access to collections, collections management and the operation of the museum.[128] A guiding policy helps the museum to reaffirm important professional, legal, and ethical principles in its focus areas and scope of operation. In most states, the enactment of legislation is executed together with the

---

[122] Alec Campbell, "The National Museum and Art Gallery: Remembering How it Started, the Early Years and the Initial Period After It Became a Government Department," *Botswana Notes and Records* 44 (2012): 28.

[123] R.S. Fish (Accountant & Board Member, Supa Ngwao Museum) in conversation with author, 2016.

[124] The continuous reference to Southern Rhodesia, however, does not mean that this is a comparative study. This is just but a reference to a museum situation that influenced developments in Botswana. There has been a profound influence of Southern Rhodesia on Botswana's initiatives towards the preservation of cultural heritage. Zimbabwe's museum setting has been a clear example that a coordinated museum structure (National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe) guided by policy would be ideal for museums in Botswana.

[125] Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects," 194–195.

[126] Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects," 198.

[127] J.L. Oram and Doreen Nteta, "National Museum Monuments and Art Gallery, Botswana Extension Project Consultancy Report," 10.

[128] J.L. Oram and Doreen Nteta, "National Museum Monuments and Art Gallery, Botswana Extension Project Consultancy Report," 15.

establishment of an organisation responsible for implementation. These could be museums, galleries or heritage councils. In Egypt for example, the Supreme Council of Antiquities falls under the Egyptian Ministry of Culture. Commissions and governing boards are set up for the preservation of relics and the practical conservation of monuments and sites. For instance, Zambia, South Africa, Namibia, Malawi, Nigeria and Zimbabwe, just to name a few, have established commissions and governing boards. While many nations do not have specific legislation governing museums, they often have laws relating to cultural heritage and the everyday running of the museum. This process goes with widespread publicity work, which results in awareness and visits to museums and protected sites by the public. The governing boards conform with legal conditions connected to functions of the museums, their collections, and operations.[129] They are also responsible for ensuring that there are relevant laws in place that deal with the protection of heritage and that the state adheres to international regulatory standards in protocols and conventions. The regulatory bodies also become enforcing entities once laws have been adopted.[130]

Neil Brodie took a closer look at the international scenario and the current global problem of the security of heritage against trafficking and gave a summary of the operations of the art market and related legislation. According to Brodie, legislation governing art and cultural property is the current topic of discussion by museum professionals and the media. Copyright, intellectual property, migration of objects and the need for regulatory measures are at the centre of the discussions.[131] As a result of all the discussions, publicity by the media, and the growing role of the museum a number of related regulations have been formulated. The legal instruments are becoming numerous and complex and this makes it difficult for museums to keep abreast with international developments such as ratifications of the many UNESCO conventions by states.[132] With the growing importance of the museum's role in society, there has been increased legislation on museums, art and cultural law. This is also because restitution claims by countries and museums and the growing trade in art require relevant legislation.[133]

---

[129] ICOM, "Code of Ethics for Museums," (Paris: ICOM, 2017), 11.

[130] *United States III of Public Law 97/446, Statute 2329 of 1982,* (USA).

[131] Neil Brodie, "The Internet Market in Antiquities," in Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting the World's Heritage, ed. France Desmarais. (Paris: ICOM, 2015), 14. See also Aedin Mac Devitt, "Upholding the Law: an Overview of the Trends in Art and Museum Law Today," 10.

[132] St John Simpson, "Back to Kabul: Case Studies of Successful Collaboration," 186.

[133] Aedin Mac Devitt, "Upholding the Law: an Overview of the Trends in Art and Museum Law Today," 12.

Many countries have started developing specific museum laws. Germany is working on a law on cultural heritage based on its Basic Law. In Switzerland, the Federal Act on Museums and Collections came into force in 2010. In Brazil, the new statutes governing museums were introduced in 2009 together with an enforcing entity, the Brazilian Institute of Museums. Countries that are known for the sale of world art, such as the UK, Switzerland, the US, France and Italy, have been forced to put in place laws to address the issue of repatriation and combat against trafficking. In the UK, the Holocaust Restitution Act was introduced in 2009 to address the return of art stolen during the period of the Nazis.[134] Principles of the Washington Conference on *Holocaust—Era Assets* of 1998 were also adopted by several countries, even though they were not very restrictive and binding. In 2009, the French government also voted in a law allowing for the return of heads of Maori warriors to their home country New Zealand. There has also been action by different countries in reaction to the 1970 UNESCO Convention. The US Federal Native American Graves Protection Repatriation Act of 1990 and US Homeland Security Act of 2002 came into force.[135] These are just a few examples. Many other developments are paving the way for more legal structures on heritage and museums.

Meanwhile, for European countries, while they have individual national laws, the European Union's Parliamentary Committee for Culture takes care of several autonomous national and regional ministries. However, this further complicates and confuses the museum case and the law and its professionals, even though it was initially meant to be a de-centralising initiative.[136] While legislation is lagging behind museum ethics in the contemporary era, it is developing at a quickening pace in different countries. This is due to media attention on the movement of art objects in museums, particularly with the global focus on restitution and collaboration or a shared heritage.[137]

All is not just smooth with this international legislation cycle, however. There are many contestations going on, particularly with restitution. One of the thorny issues leading to disputes is that countries in the global North will normally move on to craft laws regulating their dealings with the global South without necessarily involving actors from the same block

---

[134] Brigitta Hauser-Schaublin and Lyndel Prott (eds.), *Cultural Property and Contested Ownership,* 12–13. See also Aedin Mac Devitt, "Upholding the Law: an Overview of the Trends in Art and Museum Law Today, 12–13.

[135] Brigitta Hauser-Schaublin and Lyndel Prott (eds.), *Cultural Property and Contested Ownership,* 12–13.

[136] Aedin Mac Devitt, "Upholding the Law: an Overview of the Trends in Art and Museum Law Today," 11.

[137] Christopher Whitehead and Francesca Lanz, "Museums and a Progressive Sense of Place," in *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, eds. Viv Golding and Jen Walklate, (London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019), 20. See also Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 13

at the crafting table. Copyright, intellectual property laws and provenance research have come about sometimes in order to resolve some of the disputes.[138] As a result of disputes between countries and due to disparities in their cultural property laws and intellectual property regulations, ICOM developed a mediation strategy in 2006. It has also been considering a coalition on the same with WIPO through its Legal Affairs Committee.[139]

2.1.3 ICOM and the Protection of Cultural Heritage

ICOM was founded in 1946 and advocates for museums and their professionals. The Council advocates for the promotion and protection of world heritage. ICOM views illicit trafficking of cultural property as a top priority. However, most of its efforts are directed at contemporary methods of migrating cultural property, which includes dealers, while less attention is given to collections migrated in previous eras. This is notwithstanding the fact that ICOM supports and has a voice in issues of restitution regarding cultural property and human remains. Just like other international organisations (Interpol, UNSECO, UN, WIPO and EU), ICOM addresses all functions of the museum field. ICOM also collaborates with UNESCO, Interpol and the World Customs Organization in its fight against the trafficking of cultural property.[140]

ICOM supports the protection of heritage against natural disasters and armed conflict through its Disaster Risk Management Committee. It also partners with the International Committee of the Blue Shield**.** All these are addressed by the 1954 Convention, which was ratified by Botswana in November 2017. ICOM often partners with UNESCO to mobilise expert networks from all over the world to rescue heritage that is in danger. They managed to send experts to Mali, Haiti, and the Skogar Museum in Iceland, to help rescue heritage during times of civil strife and natural disaster. Together with UNESCO, it managed to send international alerts with regards to the plight of heritage in Syria, Libya, and many other areas.[141]

ICOM has developed Red Lists on heritage under threat all over the world through its International Observatory founded in 2013. This helps reinforce its fight against the illegal migration of objects. Red Lists are instruments to counter trafficking in cultural objects and

---

[139] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*.
[140] Gunther Wessel, "Dealers and Collectors, Provenances and Rights: Searching for Traces."
[141] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*, vii–ix.

many have been developed for different countries as per the need at a given time. This also depended on the volume of illicit trafficking in the country, region or continent. Red Lists detail objects under serious threat in war zones and other risk areas, as part of a deliberate move by ICOM to curb the migration of cultural property. The focus on the Red List here gives us an idea of efforts by different players (nations, regions, internal organisations, and individuals) regarding this international problem. The Red List concept also reflects ICOM's goal of a concerted effort to protect, promote, and celebrate heritage.[142]

These are some of the available Red Lists:

1. ICOM Red List of Colombian Cultural Objects at Risk (2010)
2. ICOM Red List of Chinese Cultural Objects at Risk (2010)
3. ICOM Red List for Latin America
4. ICOM Red List for Iraq
5. ICOM Red List for Peru
6. ICOM Red List for Cambodia
7. ICOM Red List for Central America
8. ICOM Red List for Mexico
9. Red List for Egypt
10. ICOM, Emergency Red List of Haitian Cultural Objects at Risk of 2010.[143]
11. The ICOM Emergency Red List of Cultural Objects at Risk for Yemen of 2018.[144]
12. ICOM Red List of West African Objects of 2010, particularly Mali's Cultural Objects at Risk.[145]

2.1.4 ICOM West African Red List

ICOM published the Red List of West African Cultural Objects at Risk in 2010. The Red List is a concrete tool to ensure the protection of objects that are at high risk of migration. Any cultural artefact that could have originated from a Red List region should only be acquired after provenance research. Certificates of origin or authenticity as used by Nigeria should be

[142] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*, vii.

[143] The emergency Red List of Haitian cultural objects was initiated as a result of the earthquake in 2010. The aim was to protect cultural objects from being smuggled out of Haiti. The earthquake had exposed Haitian heritage to looting, theft and destruction, hence the emergency list was designed to create awareness and mobilise the support of the international community to keep watch and report any possible sales.

[144] Due to the conflict in Yemen, museums and sites were looted and cultural objects were trafficked to foreign countries. The Red List was a response to this problem.

[145] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*, vii. See also (2015). Data Base, Paris: ICOM

provided in case of the import and export of Red List objects. Museum and states are required to issue documents related to the migration of the goods. If there is suspicion that an object from West Africa has illegally trafficked, one is supposed to alert state authorities, heritage institutions, or ICOM. A Red List is not a list of actually stolen objects but of inventoried objects within the collections of recognised institutions, which need urgent safeguarding.[146]

Meanwhile, there is still a need for legal instruments to protect heritage besides the Red Lists. The study has made reference to the adoption of legal structures in the same regard by West Africa. This does not, however, mean that there are no similar legal instruments for the other regions and continents. This is just to give a rough scenario of the African situation. West Africa is a good case study because of its positive response and action in aligning with international protocols and domesticating them where possible. Perhaps the swift and positive response by West Africa towards the adoption of these legal instruments is also due its historical vulnerability to the migration of cultural property. Many West African countries, such as Mali and Nigeria, are still in conflict with European museums for the return of objects migrated years ago. The most practical reaction, therefore, would be to put in place proper legal structures to prevent history from repeating itself.[147] Some of the ratified and signed regulations and agreements (international instruments) by West African countries to protect cultural heritage are summarised as follows:

- The Hague Convention of 14 May 1954 for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.
    - Ratification: Côte d'Ivoire (1980)
    - Accessioned: Mali, Nigeria (1961), Burkina Faso (1969), Niger (1976), Senegal (1987), Benin (2012)
- First Protocol of 14 May 1954
    - Accessioned: Mali, Nigeria (1961), Niger (1976), Burkina Faso & Senegal (1987), Benin (2012)
- Second Protocol of 26 March 1999
    - Ratification: Nigeria (2005)
    - Accession: Niger (2006), Benin & Mali (2012)

[146] ICOM, "Red List of West African Cultural Objects at Risk – Mali," (Paris: ICOM, 2012), 8.
[147] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 160–161.

- UNESCO Convention of 14 November 1970 on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property
    - Ratification: Niger & Nigeria (1972), Senegal (1984), Burkina Faso & Mali (1987), Côte d'Ivoire (1990)
- UNESCO Convention of 16 November 1972 concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage
    - Ratification: Nigeria (1974), Senegal (1976), Côte d'Ivoire (1981), Benin (1982), Burkina Faso (1987), Guinea-Bissau (2006)
    - Acceptance: Niger (1974), Mali (1977), Togo (1998)
- UNIDROIT Convention of 24 June 1995 on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects
    - Ratification: Burkina Faso & Côte d'Ivoire (1995), Senegal (1996)
    - Accession: Nigeria (2005).
- UNESCO Convention of 2 November 2001 on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage.
    - Ratification: Nigeria (2005), Benin (2011), Togo (2013)
- BENIN Decree No. 35/PR/MENJS concerning the protection of cultural property (1 June 1968). Article 10 of the Constitution of 11 December 1990
    - Law No. 91-006 implementing the Cultural Charter in the Republic of Benin (25 February, 1991)
    - Law No. 2007-20 concerning the protection of cultural heritage and natural heritage of a cultural character in the Republic of Benin (17 August 2007)
- BURKINA FASO Decree No. 2007-816/PRES promulgating Law No. 024-2007/AN of 13 November 2007 relating to the protection of cultural heritage in Burkina Faso (3 December 2007)
- CÔTE D'IVOIRE Law No. 87-806 concerning the protection of the cultural heritage (28 July 1987). Article 7 of the Constitution of 23 July 2000
- GUINEA-BISSAU Article 17, paragraph 1 of the Constitution of 16 May 1984
- MALI Decree No. 203/PG-RM instituting a National Cultural Heritage Protection Commission (13 August 1985)
    - Decree No. 275/PG-RM regulating archaeological excavations (4 November 1985)
    - Law No. 86-61/AN-RM concerning dealers in cultural goods (26 July 1986)
    - Decree No. 299/PG-RM regulating the prospecting, marketing and export of cultural properties (19 September, 1986)

    - Article 70 of the Constitution of 27 February 1992
    - The Inter-ministerial Order No. 94-7968/MCC-MAT to regulate the profession of dealers in cultural property, prospecting, marketing and export of cultural property, 18 July 1994)
    - Order No. 96-1591/MCC-SG to repeal and replace Order No. 0003/MSAC
    - DNAC of 12 January 1989 to set up and define the operating procedures of regional and local Cultural Heritage Protection Commissions (14 October 1996)
    - Law No. 10-061 amending Law No. 85-40/AN-RM of 26 July 1985 relating to the protection and promotion of the national cultural heritage (30 December 2010)
- NIGER Law No. 97-002 relating to the protection, preservation and enhancement of national cultural heritage (30 June 1997)
    - Decree No. 97-407/PRN/MCC/MESRT/IA establishing the procedures for its implementation (10 November 1997)
    - Article 82 of the Constitution of 18 July 1999, revised 13 May 2004
- NIGERIA Decree No. 77 on the National Commission for Museums and Monuments (28 September 1979). Article 60b of the Constitution of 29 May 1999
- SENEGAL Law No. 71-12 governing the management of historic monuments and of excavations and discoveries (25 January 1971)
    - Decree No. 73-746 for the application of Law No. 71-12 of 25 January 1971 Governing the management of historic monuments, excavations and discoveries (8 August 1973)
- TOGO Law No. 90-24 on the protection of national cultural heritage (23, November 1990)
    - Article 40 of the Constitution of 12 September 1992, revised in December 2000
    - Decree No. 2010-173/PR on the National Commission for Cultural Heritage.[148]

A publication by the SAMP of 2008 also investigated the migrated museum and the development of related legislation. The source discusses the status of ratification of the 1970 Convention and other related protocols by African countries and the fact that by then not many African countries had ratified it. SAMP also seeks to find out the degree to which the conventions have been ratified and to know what the efforts are at domesticating the conventions through national legislation and at implementing the conventions, particularly in

[148] The list of protocols have been given in detail by ICOM through its newsletter (*ICOM Newsletter*, 2010). See also Francesco Francioni and James Gordley (eds.), *Enforcing International Cultural Heritage Law*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 110–124.

Africa. In reaction to these concerns, UNESCO is now urging and following commitments closely to ensure that countries ratify and implement.[149] On record today there are 37 African Union countries that have ratified the convention. This is also evidenced through the above-provided list of ratified protocols and conventions by West African countries, which also includes the 1970 Convention. Even Southern Africa countries such as Botswana, Zambia, Swaziland and Namibia have ratified the convention as well as other protocols.[150]

According to Guntenaar, the answer to the current problem is collaboration between museums and taking into account views by the experts and technical staff from different fields and functions of the museum. This is in preference to the present process whereby police, customs and Interpol are bound by a diversity of national laws and local regulations. This state-controlled process has often resulted in uncoordinated and ad hoc databases of stolen works of art by different countries. The top-down process is where instruction, ideas and oversight are done by top management (who sometimes are not technical experts) and work is guided by set rules and regulations that are otherwise not addressing the real problems. In this setting, hands-on people who understand the challenges only receive orders. This has delayed procedures and produced unsatisfactory results.[151] My observation is that this is a problem quite often faced by national museums, which have to take orders from governments that quite often ignore the interests and mandate of the museum. The ICOM Code of Ethics advocates that museums and collectors should exercise due diligence before acquiring cultural objects. However, this depends on support by the receiving countries and their degree of commitment to a shared responsibility towards heritage. Allegiance to the related conventions would also help in this regard because they advocate for the establishment of legal provenance before acquiring objects. Close analysis is necessary to establish the degree of response.[152]

In light of the international outcry on the problem of illicit trafficking, Desmarais concluded that the growth of the market for cultural property and the migration of heritage go with an enabling environment. This refers to mass tourism and the absence of national legislation by many states.[153] According to Elizabeth Brumfield, illicit excavations, looting, and illicit trafficking are the greatest threats to cultural property. It is important for museums to inventory

---

[149] SAMP, "Illicit Traffic and Security of Collections: Survey of SAMP Network," 1. See also Neil Brodie, "The Internet Market in Antiquities," 14.
[150] UNESCO, "Database of National Cultural Heritage Laws," (2003), https://en.unesco.org/cultnatlaws/list
[151] Floris Guntenaar, "Combat against Illicit Traffic," *MW2014; Museums and the Web 2014* (2014).
[152] ICOM, "Code of Ethics for Museums."
[153] France Desmarais, "Heritage in Danger," 14–21.

collections properly to allow for proof of ownership and tracking as required. This includes putting in place proper security measures to safeguard collections. Museums and countries therefore have to adhere to international standards of object management and international laws on heritage protection.[154]

However, it is a complicated undertaking to prove the legality of object migrations, considering the different ways and circumstances under which collections were migrated and often the length of time since this occurred. It is appropriate, therefore, to argue the case of object migration and restitution from the observation of it being a matter of rights. Hatala argued that current generations do not have the right to involve themselves in discussions of migrations that preceded their time.[155] As a counter argument, Dahmali points out that African heritage has to be returned to communities of origin because it is a part of their being, spurning the question of generations.[156] Culture is dynamic and does not end with a single generation. It is inherited and is passed on to the next. Hence, those who inherit the heritage do so along with its problems. This means that the issue of migrated collections today and the conversations and contestations about restitution are inherited by current generations. It too becomes their birth right and the link or chain is not broken. This accords with how many European countries have taken to facing the colonial past through apologies, repatriations, reparations and collaborations.[157]

Narrowing down the enquiry to the British Museum as one of the case studies, Africa was always the focus of its ethnographic research. This led to the growth of its African collections, acquired through curatorial expeditions and the commissioning of researchers and experts in specific fields. These were a reflection of the changing relations within the master/servant umbrella between the British and what John Mack has referred to as its imperial trappings. This also applied between Africa and the West and between the museum and its public. Globally, Africa is still at the centre of museum interests in collecting and research.[158] However, as indicated earlier, after independence, African states started demanding the return of objects and imposing restrictions on the free movement of artefacts enjoyed over decades by the British Museum and other cosmopolitan museums. As McLeod says, "by the 1970s all restriction by

[154] Elizabeth M. Brumfield, "It's a Material World: History, Artefacts and Anthropology," 205.
[155] Erich Hatala Matthes, "Repatriation and the Radical Redistribution of Art," *Ergo* 4, no. 32 (2017).
[156] Cherki Dahmali, "African Looted Heritage is Not a Shared Heritage," *AFRICOM Newsletter* (2018).
[157] Dag Henrichsen, "Cape Cross? African Places—History and Stories," *Historical* Judgment 1 (2019): 20.
[158] John Mack, *Africa and its Cultures*, cover page.

the newly independent countries were being made and demands for return made. This marked a new environment all together for the British Museum".[159]

The British Museum's free diasporic operations, research, exhibitions and collecting were now affected. It could no longer say that objects were better off in a 'civilised' country. It started hesitating to collect objects offered or sold to it by individuals or companies that were not acquired legally.[160] This was a time to start taking African countries seriously, listening to their demands and reviewing policies and attitudes in order to accommodate them and their demands. Needless to say, return was the focus for many of these African countries that had collections at the British Museum. They also started putting in place legal measures to restrict and regulate the trade in objects. This marks the beginning of the contemporary legal scenario in the migration and return of cultural property.

The above scenario compelled the Trustees of the British Museum to push for a new collecting plan and policy. The historical method of collecting in the 1970s included or allowed buying at auctions and buying from dealers and collectors. The newly established policy, however, still encouraged the acceptance of gifts and commissioning collectors to visit areas of interest to the world, which was done mostly through curatorial field expeditions over the years.[161]

2.2 DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY IN BOTSWANA, PRECOLONIAL TO POSTCOLONIAL

2.2.1 Indigenous Patrimony

As already highlighted, Botswana has not had an all-encompassing policy on heritage to guide the management and protection of heritage by the different heritage institutions and structures, let alone the National Museum. Besides various ad hoc pieces of legislation, there has also been no holistic legislation by government to guide the general operations of the museum. Currently, the only available related legislations are the National Policy for Tourism of 1990, the Monument and Relics Act of 2001, reviewed in 2004, and the 2004 Policy on Culture**.**[162] There are also other acts and regulations aimed at the protection and preservation of other areas

[159] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 9, 17. See also Francisco Bethencourt, "Colonial Objects: Imposed, Appropriated and Exhibited," *Historical Judgment* 1 (2019): 9.
[160] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 13–14.
[161] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 15.
[162] Ministry of Youth Sport and Culture: National Museum, "Revised National Policy on Museum Development," (Gaborone: Government Printer, 2008), 15.

of heritage, which do not directly affect the museum. Examples include the regulation of poaching and the sale of wildlife products. The regulations are complemented by the penal codes enforced by law enforcement structures such as the Police and the Botswana Defence Force. These acts and policies do not, however, address the functions of the museum, in particular relating to cultural heritage, works of art, and issues of illicit trafficking and restitution. The regulations only contain the position of the government on education, tourism and culture, and as such are inadequate.[163] A policy for museums in Botswana (encompassing the current international issues of concern, such as restitution and combat against traffickers) that would work alongside the above-mentioned policies is necessary and long overdue. There is also a possibility that in areas where the policy is lacking, the government or institutions have for years benchmarked with neighbouring country protocols, drawing from neighbouring South Africa and Zimbabwe.[164] This is because of the colonial and historical links with the two countries. There are also linkages with international protocols as evidenced by the numerous UNESCO conventions. However, with reference to the topic of discussion, there are already proposals for collaboration on the development of relevant legislation on heritage in the SADC. This is to allow for regional restitutions and cooperation to stop illegal imports and exports in cultural property. The international protocols, such as the UNESCO and other UN, conventions will be used to guide the development of the proposed legal structures.

From as far back as 1983, the National Museum as well as the existing community museums in Botswana have had no policy or an agreed legal developmental plan. As a result, the museums had nothing to present to the government to justify their needs and projections.[165] A museum policy is an organisational framework that captures the aspirations and values of the stakeholders. It incorporates all the attributes of the museum. Thus, policy is instituted on the needs of society and, in the case of Botswana museums, this had to be in conformity with the national development plan and related legal instruments such as the Five Year National Development Plans of the country, i.e. NDP 10 and 11.[166] A museum policy in Botswana also have to be in line with the nation's Vision 2016 (now Vision 2036), and other key documents such as the Committee of Supply and the Botswana Economic Advisory Committee, which the

[163] *Botswana UNESCO Information Magazine*, (2000): 115–117.

[164] Republic of South Africa, "Draft National Policy on the Repatriation and Restitution of Human Remains and Heritage Objects," (South Africa: Department of Arts and Culture, 2016).

[165] Alfred Tsheboeng, "*Archaeology and Planning in Botswana*" 23

[166] The National Development Plan in Botswana has been categorised into five year plan periods in order to assess and to measure developmental progress. There is so far National Development Plan 9 and 10.

government uses as guides in national development.[167] Vision 2036 is the national policy towards maximum development and prosperity.[168] Aligning this policy to national development strategies and to international protocols such as the ratified 1970, 1954 and 1995 conventions on the illicit trafficking of cultural property, restitution and universal linkages ensures the museum's relevance to national as well as international developments. The policy alignment mostly applies to government funded museums such as the Botswana National Museum. Generally, national museums seek to uphold the highest possible standards in the museum profession, hence, they need a comprehensive policy. However, the situation has been different for the Botswana National Museum and other local museums.

This conclusion is supported by the Oram & Nteta Report, which proposed a comprehensive policy framework for the museum service in Botswana as well as a holistic structure over the current disjointed set-up of local museums.[169] Currently, the National Museum is run as a government department and enjoys more support and recognition than other museums in the country. The regional museums, however, have been left to fend for themselves with just small grants from government to pay for salaries and utilities. A policy on museum development is therefore crucial. It would guide the development of the museum as a heritage institution and contributor to the national development structure. A policy would also guide the staff or museum managers on how to provide solutions to existing problems. A museum operating without a policy is out of context. Decision makers in both the museum and the government need the support of a policy document to guide and justify their actions.

Since the takeover by government in 1976 (mainly due to its inability to sustain itself), the operations of the Botswana National Museum have been influenced by government policies, but these policies had little to do with the museum or its scope of operation. The situation has adversely affected the museum's development because with no protection and guidance of a proper policy, the National Museum cannot follow its mandatory obligations as a specialised institution of heritage. Instead, it operated to satisfy the government's rules and regulations, particularly the strict financial regulations, which do not allow for fundraising or independent financial accounts by government departments. For example, the museum has to follow the

---

[167] *Botswana and UNESCO Information Magazine* 9 (2010): 3, 43–48.

[168] Botswana Vision 2016 Council, *Vision 2016 National Strategy Document*, (Gaborone: Web logic, 2016). See also Botswana Government, "Botswana Economic Advisory Committee Document," (Gaborone: Botswana Government Printer, 2005); this contains some structural goals and projections in the National Development Plan.

[169] J.L. Oram and Doreen Nteta, "National Museum Monuments and Art Gallery, Botswana Extension Project Consultancy Report."

government's line of focus in its development such as satisfying the tourism base by developing monuments at the expense of collections and other museum functions.[170] This is also because the museum was moved from the Ministry of Culture to that of Environment and Tourism. It also elucidates why it took a long time to pay attention to the relevant protocols allowing for the protection of heritage and its return.

How would the development of a coherent policy on heritage accord with both international law and local context? While African heritage was migrated to the Western world, it is important to note that Africans have always had their own ways of preserving, protecting and enjoying their cultural legacy. The reverence given to ceremonial objects, places and sites was a restrictive regulation on its own.[171] This restrictive law, embedded within African traditions acted as a regulation against vandalism and unwanted access. The secrecy surrounding certain objects or sites and their use acted likewise. In this traditional regulatory framework, the spiritual significance surrounding certain objects and sites acted as a form of restrictive guide that could not be questioned. There were even measures for the punishment of those who violated these laws.

The respect for culture, heritage, and places and objects of beauty and cultural significance was a part of historical Setswana culture. These restrictions on the handling of objects and access to sites have now been overridden by the modern museum and its modern policies as discussed by this study. These sites have now been declared heritage sites and monuments and have been aligned to the contemporary functions of the museum.[172] However, regardless of this, the main objective of repatriation and restitution is to restore the humanity of those communities who have been affected by the disclosure, migration and exposure of these objects. On the issue of human remains, it is important that the processes of handling them take into account the belief systems and human dignity of the relevant communities.[173] Reinnette Stander reminded that in all of the above, cultural protocols should be taken into consideration to enable action or

---

[170] Alec Campbell, "The National Museum and Art Gallery," 13–14.

[171] Khwami Amoah Labi, "*New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa*" in Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe**;** A New Field for Museology, Thomas Laely et al (eds), (transcript Verlag, 2019).

[172] Botswana National Museum, *The Zebra's Voice* 12, no. 2 (1985): 4.

[169] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects," Unpublished Paper Presented at *the Human Remains Management and Repatriation Workshop, Cape Town, 13–14 February 2017*.

implementation. This also accounts for traditional or indigenous patrimony in precolonial and colonial societies.[174]

2.2.2 The Colonial Policy Setting in Botswana

The development of cultural heritage legislation in Botswana dates as far back as 1911. A number of laws and regulations were formulated then, even though there was no museum in Botswana. This move must have been influenced by developments in neighbouring colonies, some of which already had museums. The trend in particular was to collect much the sought-after San relics, and these needed to be protected by the law. The Kalahari region in Botswana and its San peoples (Basarwa) had to be protected by law, such that this became a sphere of influence for the British Museum and British-initiated museums in the neighbouring colonies only. Some of the laws and regulations were as follows:

- In 1911 the Bushman and Relics Act and the Ancient Ruins Protection Proclamation dealt with the protection of "Bushmen Relics".
- In 1934**,** the Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiquities Proclamation provided restrictions on the export of relics. It advocated for permits in case of export but there were no regulations for implementation.
- 1933 saw the development of the Conveyance of Dead Bodies Act, now an outdated piece of legislation.[175] It certainly did not address cases such as the current conversations about the repatriation of human remains from museums, anatomical institutions abroad, and provenance research about the same.
- In 1935 the Bushmen and Relics Act was modified to provide for the consultation of chiefs and ethnic groups in the areas where monuments or relics were found. I believe this could be complementary to the requirements of the 1970 and 1954 Conventions on the involvement of indigenous communities and provenance research as advocated for by the museum fraternity today.
- In 1951, the Bechuanaland Protectorate Bushmen Relics Amendment Proclamation provided for granting permission to excavate by the Resident Commissioner in consultation with the chiefs and ethnic groups.

---

[174] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects."
[175] *Botswana Government Regulations Conveyance of Dead Bodies Act, Vol. XIV of 1933,* Chpt. 65.

- In 1967, the National Museum was established through the Monument and Relics Act, and in 1968 the National Museum was opened.
- In 1970 the Monument and Relics Act was amended again under the custodianship of the National Museum. The Act covered many issues on the management of heritage, but as we shall see, it was still inadequate and proved to be limited in its scope. It also did not say anything about the regional museums and the heritage under their custody. In 2001 the Act was reviewed, and again in 2004.[176]

2.2.3 The Postcolonial Period and the Development of the Monuments and Relics Act

The National Museum was founded in 1967 through the Monuments and Relics Act, which despite the numerous amendments originates from 1911. It has been reviewed, modified and reincarnated several times. In reality, it is essentially one of the earliest pieces of heritage legislature in the protectorate. Between 1911 and 2004 the Monument and Relics Act was revised on several occasions in a bid to address its shortcomings.[177] For example, the amendment in 2001 was meant to address the limitations of the 1970 amendment and to fill in the gaps that it had left. These are gaps such as the function of collections (plan for collecting and scope), measures for the promotion and protection of publicity programmes and outreach, and the marketing and promotion of the museum. This also includes the function of marketing and fundraising, which is a needed component. It also left out the education and publicity component of the museum. It had and still has no guiding policy.[178] The amendment also had to take into account other contemporary needs such as Environmental Impact Assessments. The latest amendment was in 2004, which still does not address other functions of the museum, both old and new. It still did not address the issue of collections and related policies nor publicity and educational programmes. There is, therefore, an urgent need to review or repeal the Act in order to come up with a new law or make additions that address current trends and discussions.

The above situation is caused by the fact that despite the numerous amendments made, the Act is still very limited in scope in that it is biased towards archaeology. Even though the Act has

---

[176] *Botswana Monument and Relics Act of 1997*, Chpt. 59: 03. See also J.L. Oram and Doreen Nteta, "National Museum Monuments and Art Gallery, Botswana Extension Project Consultancy Report"; *Botswana Government Regulations Conveyance of Dead Bodies Act*.
[177] Law Revision Commissioner, *The Laws of Botswana, Vol. VIII 8*, (Gabarone: Government Printer, 1968).
[178] Matlhodi Mmutle, "Protection of Cultural Heritage in Botswana," in *Legal Frameworks for the Protection of Immovable Heritage in Africa*, eds. Webber Ndoro and Gilbert Pwiti, (ICCROM conservation studies 5, 2005), 52.

tried to address the main concerns of heritage in Botswana, as understood at the time, there are still a lot of deficiencies. It says little about other entities such as ethnographic and historic collections, scientific specimens, and the educational, marketing and publicity components that are an integral part of the museum service. It shows many limitations, particularly in its coverage of the wider heritage sphere. The policy gaps addressed by the amendments therefore still prevail.[179] For example, the 2003 UNESCO Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage is not catered for.[180] The Act also does not address the status of antiquities, and is not very clear on the issue of legal penalties for dealers and traffickers. It does not make any reference to ICOM's Code of Ethics on monitoring standards for Archaeological Impact Assessments, the handling of human remains by museums, and the due diligence needed in the acquisition of objects.[181] It is not well known to law enforcement agencies such as Interpol, the police and the military. It has therefore not been easy for them to enforce it or deal appropriately with cases of destruction of heritage.

The gaps in the Act are also because views and concerns by heritage managers were not taken into account when the latest reviews of 2001 and 2004 were done. That is why it does not address heritage in its totality.[182] Despite assuming control of the museum in the 1970s, it was only with the recent recognition of heritage, the focus being on monuments and tourism (from the late 1990s) and the listing of Tsodilo Hills as a World Heritage Site in 2002, that government started offering support. The focus area for government, which is monuments and arts and crafts for tourism and economic benefit, is just a fraction of the total heritage and museum function. After the 1970 amendment, the National Museum, which was the custodian of the Act, was faced with a staff shortage for its effective implementation. The situation continued until the1980s. This explains why the government had to recruit a large number of heritage staff between the 1980s and 1990s, but this only helped to expand the functions of the museum and not operationalise them through law. The National Museum has alongside the Monument and Relics Act come up with other acts to facilitate the implementation of the revised Act. An example is the 1967 National Museum and Art Gallery Act that sought to incorporate the new function of the art gallery. However, most of these acts are more inclined

[179] *Botswana Monument and Relics Act of 1997*, Chpt. 59: 50
[180] Mathlodi Mmutle, "Protection of Cultural Heritage in Botswana," 49.
[181] Mathlodi Mmutle, "Protection of Cultural Heritage in Botswana," 52.
[182] Philip Segadika (Chief curator of Archaeology, Botswana National Museum) in conversation with the author, 2016.

towards archaeology and art and they still do not say anything about the other functions of the museum, including collections.

At an operational level and as indicated earlier, the development of museums in Botswana has not been guided by policy. Tsheboeng argued that "it was because of its conceptual poverty and humble beginnings that the Botswana National Museum was established without the support of a policy statement".[183] Given the contextual background of various legislative structures, which either do not adequately address the issue of heritage or are found in different ministries, it has been difficult to adequately address and manage the national heritage in Botswana. In addition to that, the existing regulations, acts and policies have not always complemented one another. For example, regulation on the protection of wildlife and minerals as part of the country's heritage do not say anything about cultural property.

In conclusion, the Botswana museum situation differs from that in neighbouring states since it is a postcolonial development. The museum was established through the National Museum and Art Gallery Act drawn up in 1967. The Act has guided the operations of the museum over the years and was never changed, save for the reviews outlined. It was formulated to act as an overall policy for the National Museum.[184] However, over the years and with the growth and expansion of the museum and its functions and taking into consideration international trends, the Act has proved inadequate, warranting its replacement. Another policy issue affecting the development of the Botswana National Museum in particular is that the museum was migrated from one ministry to another for quite some time. It moved from the Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs, under which it was conceived, to the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Culture until around 2008 and finally to the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism, where it is currently hosted. The museum has also been left under the administration of ministries that had nothing to do with cultural preservation and conservation of heritage. As such, other government regulations clashed with museum operations. For example, the 1978 Town and Country Planning Act in Botswana do not complement the Monuments and Relics Act. While the Act advocated for protection of heritage sites, the Town and Country Planning Act either destroyed or gave away land for other developments.[185] The latter did not provide for any relation between itself and the Monuments and Relics Act. It only protected a few buildings

[183] Alfred Tsheboeng, "Archaeology and Planning in Botswana," 23.
[184] Law Revision Commissioner, *The Laws of Botswana, Vol. VIII 8*, 59.
[185] Alfred Tsheboeng, "Archaeology and Planning in Botswana," 30–33.

around the city, leaving out the majority of ancient structures and potential monuments. The Regional Town and Country Planning Act was modelled around that of then Rhodesia, but unlike the Rhodesian act, it did not provide for a relationship with museums and monuments. It also did not address the issue of the migration of Botswana's heritage to neighbouring state museums as well as to Europe and America. Nor did it look at how these could be returned or made accessible to Botswana. Hence, it was not reflective of relations at a global scale, which would be very limiting in the current world conversations and debates on heritage.

At independence, land boards took over the administration of land use from traditional leaders (*dikgosi*). However, the Tribal Land Act, which were enforced in the 1970s, also did little to protect monuments, sites, antiquities, and ethnographic objects.[186] The disjointed policy environment in Botswana proved unfavourable for the development and protection of museums and heritage in Botswana as well as for addressing international areas of concern in heritage. This has also been the case with some other African countries.

The observation of this study is that it was only recently that the government started opening a small window of support. The new position should hopefully influence the development of a rounded policy for museums with specific regulations on restitution and illegal migration of objects. The legal framework on heritage has been limited, and hence, there has been inadvertent implementation of international legal frameworks and the use of informal guidelines. The linkages between the existing legislation, such as the 2004 Monuments and Relics Act, and the informal guidelines could be developed for better practice. The proposal is that proper legal structures be put in place for the adoption and domestication of relevant international laws and protocols on heritage for the advancement of museum functions. This should also include clauses on the migration of cultural property and the relations between those who hold it and those who own it (collaborations). The new law should also include the regulation of the migration of cultural property as well as the handling and return of the cultural property and human remains. It is important to know the fate of the collections that are restituted once they are back home. Some countries have found themselves wanting because they had not adequately prepared for the returns, for example, Namibia and the repatriation of Nama/Herero human remains and Australia in the return of Aboriginal remains.[187] The legal

[186] Alfred Tsheboeng, "Archaeology and Planning in Botswana," 30–33.

[187] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 160. See also Paul Turnbull, "International Repatriation of Indigenous Human Remains and its Complexities: The Australian Experience," *Museums and Society* 18, no. 1 (2020): 6–11.

tools should include penalties for perpetrators and linkages with law enforcement agencies. Due to national and international pressure because of its human remains displays and casts, Iziko Museums has proceeded to do provenance research on the same. In 2005, they introduced the Human Remains Policy, which works to guide the handling of human remains and follows their possible repatriation.[188]

A relevant policy in Botswana would assist in making decisions relating to the different target audiences, exhibitions and publications.[189] A policy component on education should be developed to link museum education to that of schools, communities, stakeholders and other museums. This would set priorities and ensure a coordinated programme. The development of such legislation would also require a degree of cooperation with existing educational bodies in its formulation in order to encourage collaboration on shared interest areas.[190] There is also a need to develop a public legislative framework to support the museum's outreach programmes within communities. In the National Museum, public programmes for disseminating information have been represented by the radio, publications, *The Zebra's Voice* Newsletter, TV shows, and the museum curio shop. This also applies to support societies such as the Friends of the Museum and the Botswana Society.[191] Such a policy structure would help regulate and guide these services and activities. The lack of a collections policy for the National Museum is another setback. In her 1999 thesis, Setlhabi highlighted the importance of a policy component to address ownership, legal title rights and copyright issues. According to her, these can only be clarified through policy.[192] Susan Keitumetse similarly observed that in order for the museum to remain visible, it should engage meaningfully and develop a sound policy component for collaborative research. It should also include contemporary focus areas such as the public, ethno-tourism, cultural heritage tourism policies, human remains, and decolonisation.[193] This points out to another function that needs the existence of a relevant legal structure in order to prosper. A policy guiding the museums operations and/or services would in this way afford the museum some degree of autonomy. For example, the current government

---

[188] Wendy Black et al., "Who Were They? Repatriation and the Rehumanisation of Human Remains in Museums in Southern Africa," in Museums and Communities: *Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, eds. Viv Golding and Jen Walklate, (London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019), 313

[189] Doreen Nteta, "The Museum Service in Botswana," 22–23.

[190] Doreen Nteta, "The Museum Service in Botswana," 23–24.

[191] Doreen Nteta, "The Museum Service in Botswana," 26–27.

[192] Keletso Setlhabi, "Developing a Collections Policy of the National Museum Monuments and Art Gallery of Botswana (NMMAG)," (MA Thesis, Deakin University, 1999).

[193] Susan Keitumetse, "Botswana National Museum, Addressing Policy through Research Collaboration," Unpublished paper presented at a *Botswana National Museum Seminar (DNMM), Gaborone, 2009*, 6.

regulation discourages the formulation of an active sale policy and all sales from the museum's hired facilities such as the theatre or *kgotla* accrue to government coffers.[194] The museum needs income-generating legislation to guide and regulate fundraising projects and activities. Funding should also follow a clearly stipulated legal framework, a component that the Botswana National Museums does not have.[195]

Without legislation to guide their relations with the National Museum, the regional museums do not have a place in the government museum setting. There is also no standardisation for museums and no policy to address that aspect.[196] A policy addressing this area would guide the relationship between the museums and government and among themselves.[197] Michael Taylor, a former museum curator, concluded that the unequal development between the National Museum and regional museums (with more resources concentrated in the National Museum as well as government support) was due to the lack of policy regulation. This led a lack of transparency, no synergy in addressing issues of national and global interest, and no communication between the museums. A policy in this sense will be helpful in ensuring a smooth flow of services by the museums and cordial relations between the government and the museums.[198] The prevailing environment makes the regional museums feel that the National Museum is side-lining them, particularly when addressing provenance issues that affect their local communities.[199] The operationalisation of the proposed bill would go a long way in resolving this problem. Shared heritage is not only about global universality, but also about locally concerted efforts in the management of heritage.[200] Museum administrators recognise the need to develop public policy frameworks in order to guide their interactions with communities.[201] It is the lack of a suitable legal environment that museums are still grappling with, instead of focusing on the current global issues on heritage. Once the domestic situation is resolved, then it should be easy to think about collaborating with the international

---

[194] Doreen Nteta, "The Museum Service in Botswana," 169.

[195] Beverly Sheppard, "Do Museums Make a Difference? Evaluating Programs for Social Change," *Curator: The Museum Journal* 43 (2000): 72.

[196] Alda Costa, "Museums and Communities," *ICOM Newsletter: What Museums for Africa* (2010): 86.

[197] Duncan Enga, "Relations between the National Museum and Regional Museums in Botswana," (2016).

[198] Michael Taylor, "Life, Land and Power: Contesting Development in Northern Botswana," (PhD Thesis, University of Edinburg, 2001).

[199] These are views from regional museums officers such as G. Kediseng of Khama Museum, (Serowe: 28th November, 2015), Oliver Ramatopi of Supa Ngwao Museum,(Francistown: 20th November, 2016), and Duncan Enga of Nhabe Museum, (Maun: 11th December, 2016) and was collected through oral interviews.

[200] Susan Keitumetse, "Botswana National Museum, Addressing Policy through Research Collaboration," Unpublished paper presented at a *Botswana National Museum Seminar (DNMM), Gaborone, 2009*, 6.

[201] Alda Costa, "Museums and Communities," 72.

community, to follow up on migrated collections, and to put in place regulations on object migrations and repatriations.

The absence of a clear policy has therefore affected the museum sphere in Botswana. There is a need for a constant review of existing policies because the current policy will not fit future needs, and this affects all sectors of the museum and its relations with society.[202] A legal structure in this regard becomes an evolving process, dictated to by dynamic and contemporary developments at both national and global levels. This assists towards rationalisation and intellectualising museum practices, which are in most cases only dominated by technical inclinations. The case of a relevant legal framework in Botswana as espoused by Weber Ndoro, should be seen in light of the above discussion. Government regulations have either been inadequate or very restrictive and constraining and do not allow for free discourse in implementing the museum's mandate. This has obviously made the development and implementation of the law on heritage difficult.[203] Another example is that the development of monuments and their marketing in Botswana has for a long time been a contested issue between the National Museum and the Botswana Tourism Organisation. The latter threatened to take over the running of the monuments and even dictated how the sites should be developed, and it did so with the full support from the relevant ministry.[204] Meanwhile, a complementary approach of stakeholder partnership is needed.

Mosesane argued that although this is a disturbing situation, there is a possibility that the situation was a result of the fact that the museum institution was a new development in Botswana, having only been introduced in the 1960s. People involved with museums in and outside the country should have been involved in the formulation of a policy suited to the museum, not politicians. With the National Museum run as a government department, policy makers and politicians could not come up with a museum policy or any law related to museums or the preservation of cultural heritage.[205] Meanwhile, control and implementation has also been made very difficult by the loosely structured system of museums in Botswana.[206] Lack of a policy for the regional museums make the regulation of their relations with each other, the National Museum and government difficult. There is nothing to guide their scope and

---

[202] Simon Knell (ed.), "Altered Values: Searching for a New Collecting," 11.

[203] Webber Ndoro and Gilbert Pwiti (eds.), "Preface," in *Legal Frameworks for the Protection of Immovable Heritage in Africa*, (ICCROM conservation studies 5, 2005), 1–8.

[204] Gaogakwe Phorano (Director, Botswana National Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015.

[205] Nonofo Mosesane (Chief curator, Botswana National Museum) in conversation with the author, 2017.

[206] Alfred Tsheboeng, "Archaeology and Planning in Botswana," 87.

projections, and this also made alignment to international trends and issues of concern, such as the migration of cultural property and restitution, very slow. They also lack proper training in museology and need government support in that regard.

The prevailing scenario led Tsheboeng to conclude that due to the absence of a policy, the museum's role in development has for a long time been shrouded in confusion. In his view "the absence of an all- rounded policy strategy could lead one to speculate that the museum has represented shadowy or unclear objectives and as such manifest promise of dubious success".[207] This is an insinuation levelled at its founders and also the successive leadership of the National Museum over the years. This is notwithstanding the fact that the museum has been struggling to get permission from government to implement its newly proposed legislation, the Botswana Museums and Monuments Service Bill, submitted for approval since 2004. The lack of approval for the proposed policy could lead one to speculate that government does not want to lose its grip on the National Museum and that the government is not keen to have the National Museum established as a parastatal. This could be for fear of losing total control of the monuments that it uses for tourism purposes and economic benefit.

The drafting of the Botswana Museums and Monuments Service Bill could be counted as another noteworthy initiative by the National Museum. It was done in consultation with the regional museums. This comprehensive policy was done with the help of Dawson Munjeri, a consultant from Zimbabwe, in 2001–2002. The policy proposes an inclusive structure for all museums. It argues for unity and centralisation, leading to the much-desired centralised museum system found in neighbouring countries. This was submitted to parliament for approval in 2004 and for a long time there was no feedback. It was only in 2014 that the National Museum started making follow-ups with the Ministry of Environment and Conservation of Natural Resources and the Attorney General Chambers for the resuscitation. This would also mean Cabinet approval of the bill so that it is put into practice. The move was also due to the need to incorporate clauses and regulations on the 1970, 1954 and 1995 UNESCO conventions ratified in November 2017 and for their domestication. The formulated regulations have so far been incorporated into the proposed bill for museums. There is therefore hope that the policy gap that has remained all these years will be closed for the first time in years if the Botswana Museums and Monuments Service Bill is enacted. Many of the functions

[207] Alfred Tsheboeng, "Archaeology and Planning in Botswana," 26.

of the museum have been accommodated by the bill. This includes issues such as the shared responsibility towards heritage, restitution and illegal transfer. The hope is that the bill will render the museum coalition a parastatal so that its operations are not hindered by bureaucracy. It should also allow for a concerted effort by museums towards the preservation of heritage as a national asset.[208]

Nevertheless, some successful measures have also been recorded in spite of the gloomy situation. The registered development towards related legislation came after the establishment of the Environmental Impact Assessment regulation in 2005. This was to incorporate and enforce the undertaking of Environmental Impact Assessment prior to any infrastructural developments. The new infrastructural developments that took place following the diamond boom destroyed sites and monuments. A good example is the old Capitol (cinema) building in Gaborone in the 1990s.[209] The National Museum reacted by creating awareness among developers, policy makers and communities on the need to safeguard heritage. It used different forums, such as *kgotla* meetings, press releases, government media and its own radio programmes. This included visits to sites, communities and monuments, opening of access roads, development of gate houses, the erection of signboards and the appointment of custodians. This move also helped to publicise the work of the museum. Secondly, the historic use of the Mobile Museum Programme as an awareness tool was another instrument of conscientisation to Botswana about the museum and its functions and about the values of their heritage.

2.3 DEVELOPMENT AND CURRENT STATE OF A SHARED HERITAGE POLICY

The reference to policy on a shared heritage would mean bilateral cultural agreements between countries that allow for collaboration and a concerted effort towards the protection and promotion of a country's heritage. This could also refer to deliberate laws promulgated by states in order to regulate their bilateral relations towards restitution of heritage, collaborations, and altered conversations on the migrated heritage. Policies guiding the shared handling of migrated collections in particular have been developed by many countries lately. This is in

[208] Gaogakwe Phorano (Director, Botswana National Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015.

[209] Neil Parsons, "A Hundred Years of Botswana Film and Filming. Botswana Notes and Records," (Gaborone: Botswana Notes and Records, 2006), 33–42.

cognisance of a universal outcry and conversations on the migration and protection of objects. The AU has demonstrated this through the initiation of the African Liberation Heritage Programme. This is a programme meant for all African countries to document their liberation histories in recognition of the shared history and culture of fighting for liberation.[210] The Nigerian government also drafted regulations to allow for its dealings with different European and American countries that hold its Benin bronzes.[211] Many other countries such as Italy and the UK have also come up with such policies.[212] This also takes into consideration the call for shared efforts to safeguard heritage as a universal property and a human right. The shared responsibility also refers to the development of administrative and legal policy framework on culture and heritage at national and international levels by support structures like the UN, UNESCO, and ICOM. However, the observation of this study is that countries are often slow to become party to relevant laws and conventions that allow for focus on a common goal and a concerted effort in the restitution of cultural property. Moreover, some countries, particularly those that have ratified some of these conventions, in both Africa and other parts of the world have not domesticated them through national laws. Local and domestic regulation and laws have not been formulated to deal with the migrations and safeguarding of cultural property and the related penalties. However, by 2014 a number of countries in Africa, particularly in Southern Africa, had started ratifying the conventions and protocols, but some without the related national regulations to allow for implementation. Zambia for one was for a long time the only signatory and had no relevant national regulations for domestication.[213]

The situation is, however, different in other African countries and museums with existing policies and those that have updated theirs, particularly after independence. This is more visible in North and West Africa. According to Webber Ndoro, museum legislation in Africa needed updating after independence because it was promulgated during the colonial era and was outdated. Where it existed, the legislation was often inadequate to meet new concepts, functions and trends in heritage for many African societies, which has been the case in Botswana. Many African museums have therefore been reviewing their legal instruments to

[210] UNESCO and African Union, "Roads to Independence: The African Liberation Heritage Programme," Unpublished paper, (Tanzania: UNESCO & AU, 2010).

[211] Besides the Repatriation Unit, Export Certificate and the Benin Dialogue Group, the Nigerian government has drafted regulations and guidelines for repatriation and collaborations. The currently repatriated objects have been done through general bilateral agreements and one-on-one negotiations with stakeholders holding the collections.

[212] Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects," 193.

[213] Flexon Mizinga (Executive Secretary, National Museums Board, Zambia) in conversation with author, 2017.

decolonise them and make them more relevant to local communities and current trends.[214] Susan Keitumetse, however, disagreed with Ndoro and maintained that it is important for African heritage management regimes to also refer to laws originally formulated by colonial powers to take into account issues of copyright and authenticity.[215]

A number of seminars have been convened in the past few years at different venues to discuss the issue of legal frameworks for museums. One worth noting was convened in October 2002 in Zimbabwe by the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe. Some 22 heritage managers from Anglophone Sub-Saharan Africa attended, accompanied by several from Francophone Africa. Countries that attended are Botswana, Gabon, Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, Tanzania, South Africa, Namibia, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe.[216] This was the third Regional Thematic Seminar of the Africa 2009 Programme for African Museums, and it discussed the implications of current legal frameworks and the possibility for collaborative undertakings for the continent and regions. The participants also shared notes on the enhancement of heritage protection. A key focus was the evaluation of legal frameworks and key issues related to heritage legislation with a view to finding ways to deal with them. Formal and informal protocols were also explored with the aim of developing linkages between the two in order to develop the best practice in legal frameworks dealing with heritage.[217] My observation is that the establishment of laws in this way takes into consideration the belief systems of local communities in relation to their heritage and the management of human remains by museums. These were all efforts at cooperation towards the establishment of legislation on heritage by practitioners.

Legislation is an integral part of heritage management. The discussion of heritage and all the related concepts, such as restitution, universality and sharing, cannot be divorced from the legal realm, particularly where different nation states are involved. Courts and legislation apply in cases of illegal import, export, shared universal heritage, establishing the authenticity of collections, and restitution. This creates an urgent need to put in place administrative, legal and policy frameworks on culture and heritage and the application of international law as

---

[214] Henry Chiwaura, "The Development of Formal Legislation and the Recognition of Traditional Customary Law in Zimbabwe's Heritage Management," in Legal Frameworks for the Protection of Immovable Heritage in Africa, eds. Webber Ndoro and Gilbert Pwiti, (ICCROM conservation studies 5, 2005), 18.

[215] Susan Keitumetse, *African Cultural Heritage Conservation and Management: Theory and Practice from Southern Africa*, (Switzerland: Springer, 2016), ix.

[216] Webber Ndoro and Gilbert Pwiti (eds.), "Preface," 1–5.

[217] Webber Ndoro and Gilbert Pwiti (eds.), *Legal Frameworks for the Protection of Immovable Heritage in Africa*, (ICCROM conservation studies 5, 2005), 85.

mentioned earlier. International law is complementary to conventions and allows for legal dialogue among countries in cases of restitution, sharing, and contestation. The 1995 UNIDROIT Convention particularly deals with private and international law and issues of restitution to countries of origin. International law applies in areas where states are dealing with shared issues or problems. It is therefore more applicable in the contemporary era where there are international debates and conversations on colonial collections by the global North and the global South museums.

There have been notable efforts by international bodies to promote cooperation and shared responsibilities towards the management of heritage. This includes provenance research and reaching out to communities of provenance. In the same way, legal structures have been put in place to regulate and guide the relations with the communities. The 1970 and 1954 UNESCO Conventions also emphasised shared responsibility for the sake of global humanity. This shared responsibility is evidenced by the alerts made by the UNESCO General Director in 2017 towards the safeguarding of Syria's heritage plundered during its civil war. This was a call for a shared responsibility towards the safeguarding of Syria's heritage in a time of need.[218]

In 2007, the UN developed the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. It demanded Indigenous people's involvement in the management of their heritage by countries and museums. This directly calls for a shared responsibility.[219] There is also the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilisation.[220] This protocol demands re-examination of current and future acquisition policies and how the communities of origin benefit from these policies, which are said to be all inclusive. In 1990, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act allowed Indigenous people in the US to claim the return of their sacred objects and human remains.[221]

---

[218] *Botswana Daily News*, "Pacific Cultural Heritage under Threat," (2014, July 8): 29. See also Botswana National Museum, "Workshop Report on Implementation of UNESCO'S 1970, 1954, 1995 UNIDROIT Conventions on Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Objects," (Lobatse: Botswana National Museum, 2019), 14.

[219] United Nations, "United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People/United Nations for Indigenous People," (2015). https//www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeople/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP

[220] United Nations, "Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilisation to the Convention on Bio-diversity," (Canada: UN, 2011). (This is about the equal sharing of resources. It is often used to make sure the source communities benefit from local resources and this would also apply to communities of provenance in case of the heritage discussed by the thesis)

[221] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 161.

However, in spite of the given scenario of local and international legislation, there is still a need to put a sharp lens on whether policies and regulations that have been put in place, particularly in response to the current demands, are enabling enough. It is also important for countries to synergise efforts with the international conventions and protocols on the same subject to allow for domestication and implementation. One also wants to know the degree to which countries that have been adopting these protocols are using them.[222] This thesis, therefore, interrogates the conventions and legal structures put in place by Botswana and the sample countries (Malawi, South Africa, Nigeria, and the UK) in promoting the same. The aim is to look at the strengths and weaknesses of these legal tools with a view to propose a viable solution. Although there are other laws, policies and guidelines, both national and international, the silence of the national legislation from a heritage point of view remains problematic. The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) has drafted guidelines to aid the management of objects as well as human remains by museums. These guidelines ensure that the material recovered is curated, stored and made available for research, and that the best possible scientific standards are maintained.[223]

According to Regina Isaacs, the National Heritage Resource Act of South Africa allows for the restitution of cultural property but has limitations. However, SAHRA only works within the ambit of the National Heritage Resources Act, and the guidelines are only relevant to material recovered from archaeological or palaeontological excavations, while human remains are covered under "material culture".[224] Although the guidelines are explicit about upholding the integrity of collections, the ethical dilemma is still prevalent because human remains are still held in repositories and treated as objects. SAHRA also developed guidelines on restitution. However, this policy is explicit in excluding human remains from its definition of heritage objects. It is therefore clear that although the guidelines in existing heritage legislation and policies are clear on cultural objects, there are no explicit guidelines or principles on human remains and their handling in museums.[225] The thesis observes that human remains are an area that is critical in the history of South African museums today and needs to be covered by legislation.

---

[222] Rob Pickard and Council of Europe, *European Cultural Heritage: A Review of Policies and Practices*, 5.

[223] Reinette Stander, "Legal Frameworks for the Management of Museums," Unpublished Paper Presented at *the Human Remains Management and Repatriation Workshop, Cape Town, 13–14 February 2017*.

[224] Reginah Isaacs in conversation with the author

[225] Regina Isaacs R. A. and Barend van der Merwe (Heritage practitioners, SAHRA) in conversation with the author, 2015.

Malawi has also taken the liberty to revise its colonial legislation since 1964 in order to address current developments and trends and to accommodate the international protocols, such as the 2003 Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage. The Malawi Act also addresses stolen or illicitly trafficked goods, their return and the penalties involved for those on the wrong side of the law. There are, however, a number of other regulations governing the management of culture in Malawi such as the Arts and Craft Act, the Chiefs Act, the Local Government Act, the Monuments and Relics Act, the National Archives Act, the Museum Act and the Copy Right Act.[226] So far there is nothing specific and explicit on the issue of human remains and there is a possibility that, like in the South African case, it is subsumed under a different classification. If not clearly tabulated, the different classifications and interpretations become a problem when dealing with international partners.

An assessment of the legal situation in Malawi and South Africa points to the fact that different protocols and conventions have been sporadically ratified by different countries in Africa over the years, depending on the problem area and needs of individual countries. Meanwhile, some of the conventions have been inadvertently implemented by different states at different periods and levels. However, countries have not been able to curb the transfer of cultural property nor to fully implement the conventions. This gives heritage managers, law enforcement agencies and border officials the responsibility and authority for prevention and enforcing compliance in all respects, with an allowance for penalties.

Copyright is also a major area of concern since intellectual property laws could help demonstrate the legality or illegality of illicitly migrated goods to authenticate returns. This entails looking at whether the object was of ritual significance, whether it belonged to a particular family, to royals or individuals, and if it represents a particular cruel or inhuman treatment. For example, the bed, cup and plate that were used by Nelson Mandela at Robben Island cannot be linked with anyone else or any other place apart from Mandela and Robben Island. It should then be possible to tell who has right to the intellectual property relating to such objects. It is also important to know if the proposed return is for human remains or for cultural property, so that we know what is entailed in the restitution processes and do the

[226] Mthotha C. Tamonda, "The Cox Collection; Museums of Malawi and the Politics of Repatriation 1892–2016," (MA Thesis, University of Cape Town, 2016). See also Lovemore Mazibuko (Director, National Museums of Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.

necessary preparations. This is particularly important where communities and local belief systems are concerned.

Aedin Mac Devitt tackled the subject of migrated collections and legislation and particularly of copyright and intellectual property issues.[227] He discussed copyright and intellectual property in illicit trafficking as some of the current trends in museums that call for proper legislation to govern museums and their collections. He highlighted the use of copyright and intellectual property laws in the return of cultural property, particularly for inalienable possessions. The approach is in line with Marcel Mauss' claim that the identity of the giver is imbedded in the object given. In this way, a permanent image of the giver and its power compels the recipient to reciprocate. The act of giving as such creates a gift-debt that has to be repaid at some point. This permanent image of the giver embedded in the object makes the objects inalienable because its root remains with the giver and it and must therefore be returned.[228] In this case, the enquiry is on whether the recipient countries feel compelled to return, as applied here. Whether there are any benefits for both parties in case of return and what the benefits are. Intellectual property issues for museums are mostly relevant and referred to when digitising museum collections, even though this is often problematic for museums because legal issues transcend the jurisdiction and the ability to comply with the various types of legislation in relevant countries, which is different for each country.[229]

Shawkat Alam et al. emphasised universality and shared heritage and the need to develop relevant legislation. According to them, legislation allows for free international dialogue on heritage. They also talk about environmental law, but with a global approach and a shared responsibility. Different categories of cultural property or heritage are covered by international conventions, treaties and agreements.[230] I, therefore, argue that the copyright and intellectual property rights of the different types of trafficked objects and their cultural and spiritual significance belongs to the communities of provenance. On that note, their ownership of the

[227] Aedin Mac Devitt, "Upholding the Law: an Overview of the Trends in Art and Museum Law Today," 10. See also Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 160–161.
[228] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms & Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, 96–69. See also Annette Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping While Giving*.
[229] Chi Thien Pham, "How Museums Identify and Face Challenges with Diverse Communities," in Museums and Communities: *Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, eds. Viv Golding and Jen Walklate, (London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019), 109. See also Aedin Mac Devitt, "Upholding the Law: an Overview of the Trends in Art and Museum Law Today," 11.
[230] Shawkat Alam et al., *Handbook of International Environmental Law*.

objects does not cease because of the absence of the object. The availability of legislation is therefore meant to buttress this permanent ownership and right.

The Council of Europe also advocates for universal heritage and the use of legislation. This is to guide cooperation between states in the safeguarding of cultural property. Many African countries have also taken strides towards the development of legislation to tackle the problem of cultural property migration and restitution. However, national interests often override museum expectations and mandates and this causes displeasures, particularly for government run museums[231]

According to Susan Ashley theoretical tools have been used to shape cultural policy in the academic sphere. This includes the development of policies in responses to contemporary trends such as the illegal movement of cultural property, promotion of cultural heritage for sustainability and tourism, promotion of Indigenous peoples, universality and shared heritage, cultural diversity, international law, and collaboration, partnerships[232] This is an all-encompassing approach to a shared heritage and legislation.

For the purposes of this study, the relation between theory and policy was considered in relation to the legal framework put in place by international bodies and individual countries towards the handling of colonial objects. This guides the repatriations, protection and promotion of heritage at a universal level. Besides countries being party to international conventions and protocols on heritage, their museums should still adhere to national laws and recognise those of other states. This is to allow for international dialogue, collaborations and exchanges.[233] However, this sometimes creates a dilemma for the local museums. In the African scenario the state of a shared heritage policy along with other policies is much more viable as it complements the local cultural setting.

2.3.1 West African National Regulations and Bilateral Agreements on Cultural Heritage

This section gives a glimpse of the West African legislative scenario. West African countries have entered into a number of bilateral agreements, and as a result, have come up with national regulations to implement and domesticate bilateral agreements. These give a clear detail of the

[231] Rob Pickard and Council of Europe, *European Cultural Heritage: A Review of Policies and Practices*, 5.
[232] Susan Ashley, "*Theoretical Approaches to Cultural Policy*."
[233] ICOM, "Code of Ethics for Museums," 11.

different collections that fall under the bilateral agreements. The following subsections reflects the scenario described above through sampled countries involved in the agreements. The bilateral agreements and domestic regulations cover objects that are most sought after and those that are likely to be found in cosmopolitan museums and international markets. The lists act as a form of alert to other state parties, partners and the international community to assume a shared responsibility of vigilance.

2.3.1.1 Mali/US (1997, 2012)

The agreement gives details of the different sets of collections under the bilateral agreement and places of origin. These are dominated by terracotta since they are from different parts of West Africa.

2.3.1.2 Guinea-Bissau, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, and Togo

The collections include paraphernalia of objects such as terracotta, clay, stone, metal, monoliths, plaques, statues, and miscellaneous objects. The miscellaneous objects comprise jewellery and ornaments, metal (copper, bronze, silver, gold, alloys) or ivory, bracelets, anklets, necklaces, weapons, and tools. They come from different regions of West Africa and date back to 20 000 BC and 19th century.[234]

Meanwhile, there have been some notable and positive responses by African states to the development of the laws. It was imperative that all states should respond to the call for a shared heritage and the development of regulations guiding the sharing, restitution and repatriation. Since African states have lost extensive collections, the expectation was inevitable that they should eagerly engage in negotiations for repatriation and the sharing of heritage. This is an issue of security and collaboration with diaspora museums holding their collections. The negotiations for return could be done through the use of national bilateral relationships. It also serves in response to the recent pledge to return African heritage and notable cases of successful returns to Africa. However, for some countries, this does not seem to be taking place. Nigeria could be considered a fair example in the response by African states in the development of laws to guide the restitutions and the shared responsibility on heritage. In Nigeria, for example, Mr Jafaru Yunusa Dauda, a former curator of the museum in Kaduna, indicated that as a part

[234] ICOM, "Code of Ethics for Museums," 11.

of the implementation of the ratified conventions, they have had an ICOM sponsored programme in which they invited all the relevant stakeholders, particularly law enforcement. This was meant to create awareness and to educate the stakeholders about the illegal exportation of cultural property. At this forum, it was resolved that all legal exports will be accompanied by an export permit as a tool designed by the Nigerian government to allow for the proper scanning of all the exports in cultural property. According to Dauda, all the efforts at combating illegal exports are making an impact, even though it is slow.[235] The observation is that this helped regulate and curb the illegal migration of cultural property in Nigeria. Due to campaigns and awareness raisings by ICOM and UNESCO, it is now not easy to openly sell Nigerian objects in international markets.

In light of the above discussed scenario, it is clear that the move towards the adoption of international conventions and the development of domestic national legislation has been slow. However, the wheel has since been set in motion, and many countries in Europe, Africa and other regions have recently been reviewing legislation and establishing new laws. This has been necessarily for countries faced with repatriation cases and those that have lost cultural property and are still losing cultural property today. This particularly means the alignment of domestic regulations to international protocols and conventions and the tightening of museum security. The observation of ICOM's Code of Ethics has helped museums that have no or inadequate legal structures in place. Where there is no policy, the trafficking increases. Copyright and intellectual property laws have also been referred to as a way of authenticating ownership and copyright to cultural property. ICOM in turn created Red Lists for different countries and regions to create alerts on vulnerable collections for migration. Of note in Africa is the Red List for Egypt, West Africa and Mali, because these are key areas for trafficking.[236]

In summary, it is important to highlight that during the UNESCO-supported discussions for SADC, museums made pledges to work together as a region and to support one another towards the development, promotion, protection and celebration of heritage. This is an indication of a shared responsibility over heritage. The North and West African countries have taken a leading role in ratifying the conventions on the protection against illegal migration of objects because they are the most affected regions.

---

[235] Jafaru Y. Dauda (Director of Research Planning & Publication of the National Commission of Museums, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015. See also Edith Ekunke (Director of the National Museum in Lagos) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[236] ICOM, "Code of Ethics for Museums," 11. See also ICOM, "Red List of West African Cultural Objects at Risk – Mali."

CHAPTER 3
MIGRATED COLLECTIONS

3.1 THE MIGRATED MUSEUM—CONCEPTUALISATION

Philip Jones talked about James Cook and other navigators' voyages to Australia and around the world in the 16th century as marking the beginning of migrations of ethnographic collections of Aboriginal peoples. It signalled the era of European expansion and collecting.[237] This collecting applies to all the places visited by navigators and explorers. They posed as collectors themselves and drew the interest of others to their visited areas so that they also collected.[238] Given that objects have been migrated as far back as the first voyages by pirates and sailors, the migrated museum would in this context mean the transfer of large amounts of cultural objects from their place of origin to a foreign abode. The foreign abode in this case refers to foreign museums and art galleries, auction houses, studios, etc. Gunther Wessel argued that "collecting is an old activity because people have collected since the Middle Ages". The collecting flourished more during the renaissance period. During this time the European museum evolved from the old classical museum to another level.[239] Dag Henrichsen, the German-Namibian historian, gave oral narratives about the early encounters between the local communities (Nama, Herero, Damara) with foreign people arriving on boats at coastal areas in Namibia and the trade that took place.[240] This was another way of migrating local objects and with no 'informed consent' according to Silvester.[241]

It is within this context that whole museums in the global North were constituted with collections from foreign lands, which is tantamount to migrating a museum from one country to another. This is particularly relevant in areas where more than 50% of the museum's collection is from another or other countries. This is the case with the British Museum, Varnesborg Natural History Museum in Sweden and others. Once taken from their original places, the objects entered into circles of exchange and accumulation by European museums and later American museums. This reduces their scholarly value and makes their provenance very difficult to ascertain.[242] Some were taken from sacred places only to be stored in museum

[237] Philip Jones, "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," 123
[238] Christian Geulen, "World Order and Racial Struggles. German Colonialism," (Berlin: Deutsches Historisches Museum, 2016), 33.
[239] Gunther Wessel, "Dealers and Collectors, Provenances and Rights: Searching for Traces," 1.
[240] Dag Henrichsen, Historical Judgment, Stiftung Deutches Historische Museum, (2019)
[241] Jeremy Silvester, "Museum Objects, Memory and Identity in Namibia," Historical Judgment 1 (2019): 21–24.
[242] Philip Jones, "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," 123.

boxes and warehouses.[243] Larissa Forster argued that due to the large amount of collections brought into European museums, they were in most cases unable to do provenance research.[244] Hence objects remained with little information and were only exhibited as curios, for aesthetics, or remained in storerooms and warehouses.

Since the discussion here is about museum collections and objects, an attempt at giving definitions on the same would be ideal:

- *Collections***:** This means a group of objects of the same or different category such as ethnographic, archaeological, scientific objects, that have been gathered together or collected for keeping in one place. According to Liviu Razvan Pripon and Valentin Andrian Kiss, "collections are a reservoir for the media as well as ensembles that are constantly growing, changing". The colonial collections are going through the preservation identity stage (the provenance stage), from which they are moving from a stage of assimilation to that of dissimilation through restitution.[245]
- *Museum Object***:** Referred to as an artefact, a material thing possessing functional, aesthetic, cultural, symbolic, historical, archaeological and scientific value. These are taken into museums as collections and could be both tangible and intangible. This excludes immovable heritage such as monuments.[246]
- *Diaspora***:** This is diaspora in relation to the migrated objects. According to Sarr and Savoy, this is an ensemble of the displaced objects that are in foreign museums. Their commonality is that they have been remodelled, were acquired through violence at times, and have lost their identities and significance.[247]

Within the object migration cycle, there are two recognisable divisions based on the different ethics driving the object migrations at a given period and time. The first division focuses on collections migrated before and during the colonial period and the years immediately after independence. The collecting agenda was based and justified by the colonial order and the social divisions entailed. These are the collections that form the bases and foundations of metropolitan museums, and the migrated museum concept is anchored within this layer. The

[243] Jeremy Silvester, "Museum Objects, Memory and Identity in Namibia," 24.
[244] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 159.
[245] Virgil Stefan Nitulescu (ed), *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019): 12.
[246] Chi Thien Pham, "How Museums Identify and Face Challenges with Diverse Communities," 108.
[247] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 30.

debates for provenance, restitution, injustices, healing and reconciliations are all anchored within this division due to the unequal race relations embedded within the structures of this migration. However, there is a second division or cycle of migrations that covers the recently trafficked objects by international criminal syndicates based on the availability of market countries such as Japan, China and European countries. This also includes objects opportunistically stolen during conflicts, natural disasters and some thefts driven by ideologies and religion. This cycle is still ongoing, and it forms the justification for the current debate by governments, museums, the media and international organisations advocating on issues of heritage and its illegal transfer. Cultural objects disappear every day through many different means in the contemporary period. This is why we have structures such as the Blue Shield, the Red Lists by ICOM, and alerts to the international community in case of vandalism of a country's heritage during war, such as alerts by UNESCO on the Syrian case and others. The International Observatory on Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Goods by ICOM was meant to map the trade routes, identify the traffickers and the most urgent goods by country and find out where these objects could be. According to Desmarais, it is not easy to know the number of objects that are migrated every year. Illicit trafficking has now become the worst threat to cultural heritage. More looting and high transfers of objects are exacerbated by the expending market and its demands.[248] The migration of cultural property and ensuing debates have meanwhile brought together the heritage, legal, political, media and the diplomatic fraternity.[249]

The return of such material, according Jeremy Silvester, serves to reconnect with long lost heritages and to empower, restore and renew the life and aspirations of the communities of origin. The empowerment and hope could be entailed in the opening of new community museums housing this returned heritage.[250] As a result, Lyndel Prott has concluded thus:

> No grievance will rankle so long, or be the cause of so much bitterness, as the removal, for any reason, of a part of the heritage of any nation. It is therefore, the duty of the world heritage community and individuals to collectively protest against illegal transfers. This is because there are obligations to common justice, decency and the establishment of the power of right among civilised nations.[251]

It is statements such as this by Prott and the call for collective responsibility that make a notable move from restitution and point to a new direction, that of universality and the sharing of the

---

[248] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*, vii., 14.
[249] St John Simpson, "Back to Kabul: Case Studies of Successful Collaboration," 181–187.
[250] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network," 112.
[251] Lyndel V. Prott, Witnesses to History: A *C*ompendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects.

heritage under discussion. We should, however, be mindful that asserting one's inheritance and identity is to do so in contrast to the status of the 'other' as espoused by cultural Darwinism. Hence, we have to move beyond merely asserting singular identity and move towards cultural diversity as advocated for by Prott. The question to be addressed by the research therefore is: How, in the context of migrated objects is this problem addressed? This is also in light of the fact that the official restitution or return of cultural objects is likely to be a long and slow process and may not be a very successful process with all kinds of political machinations taking place at the level of the state and political parties, and given that some states and governments may not have the museum's core business at heart, which has been the case in Botswana for a long time.

While heritage and the museum are not theoretical tools to this thesis, they are critical points of reference used to understand the migration of cultural property sharing and universality today. It is also a fact that over centuries the end point for most of the trafficked goods was the museum. The two can in this way not be divorced from the key concepts of historical exchange and relations as discussed here. Heritage is the newly adopted concept for cultural, natural and scientific specimens, including human remains. It encompasses different world valuables, tangible and intangible, movable and immovable, which are the focal point of discussions in relation to the proposed shared responsibility. Heritage, therefore, becomes a weaving factor in this discussion. The museum concept and cultural migration on the other hand are crucial factors to the notion of migration and the current proposals for sharing. Museums are frequent points of reference for the administering, promotion, safe keeping, collaboration and discussion in the migration of objects. The museum becomes an end product to the whole chain of conceptual reactions, starting with those related to the modes of exchange and the emerging of relationships. Over centuries, the migration of cultural property meant the development and establishment of museums. However, today sharing implies museum partnerships, collaborations, and exchanges in exhibitions, staff, research findings, websites, and expertise. In the context of those who have lost objects, it is with a deliberate aim to partner with those who host our collections as a way of gaining access to what is rightfully ours. Africa and any other part of the world that lost cultural property to the Western world tend to feel uncertain in collaborating with European museums over the collections. Also avenging them of what the ancestors of Europeans have inflicted on their own ancestors over the centuries. This in a way brings some pride on the receiving state.

To sum up, the migration of cultural property has been done legally and illegally over a long period, in the precolonial, colonial and postcolonial periods. Africa lost her cultural property in the same way, and it is now found in cosmopolitan museums such as the British Museum, the Smithsonian Institution, German museums, Scandinavian museums, the Louvre, Trocadero and many such museums elsewhere in the world. Larissa Forster associated the establishment of ethnographic museums in Germany with colonialism, and according to her, the more the number of museums established the higher the demand for collections. This in turn increased the degree of collecting.[252] Africa's state of vulnerability due to wars, recurring famines, chronic poverty, floods and illiteracy placed her on an unstable footing and exposed her to the migration of her cultural property. This was confirmed by McLeod, a former curator at the British Museum, when he indicated that, "as for the other main regions of the world, the collections from Africa were very variable in terms of size, depth and quality".[253] Francisco Bethencourt also indicated that non-European objects such as cowrie shells from Africa were some of the high ranking objects from the colonies.[254] This emphasises the fact that due to the quality of African collections, they were in high demand, and this means more African collections in European museums and the British Museum in particular.

There is more evidence in McLeod's indication that "the centralised Benin Kingdom was rich in import and supported specialised guilds of crafts men and represented one extreme of the African political development. It was, therefore, a focus area for collecting by the British Museum". According to him, the other extreme was epitomised by Bushman collections of the Kalahari Desert in Southern Africa.[255] This is evidenced by the many San artefacts at the British Museum and in many other European museums, documented as coming from Namibia, Botswana and South Africa. This is as per the attached list of artefacts at the British Museum and in the US under the section on Botswana's diasporic collections. Silvester talked about shared communities producing similar objects and how this created problems for the museums of the global North in giving places of origin and identity to the objects. This observation has come up quite often during provenance research and it creates a problem of authenticity and what Silvester calls the "politics of identification".[256]

---

[252] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 155.
[253] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 24.
[254] Francisco Bethencourt, "Colonial Objects: Imposed, Appropriated and Exhibited," 8.
[255] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 31.
[256] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network," 119.

The migration of cultural property started off small and was not seen as illegal, but over centuries whole collections were migrated and filled up European museums, and eventually spread to other corners of the globe. Different parts of the globe have been affected by cultural migration but at different levels. During the peak of the migrations, for both the market and museums, scholars talked of the many curio shops in Paris and London with items for sale by dealers. Strolling around the curio shops to see the exhibition of curios was a journey of discovery according to Emanuel Charpy. He has interestingly termed this "idle curiosity or shopping", where one is not really intending to buy, but to admire, to discover and to learn.[257] Due to all these collections going into France, its museums such as the Louvre hold a diversity of collections from all over the world and reflect the history and culture of human kind. Just like the British Museum, the Louvre and many other such museums in Europe and America have become "universal sites".[258]

Transfers and exchanges between non-Western and Western worlds should in this sense also be seen as a feat of racial engineering. Even the museums or collections kept by white officials in the colonies were just a reflection of a development and culture stitched together by white-defined dictates of museum development in Africa in which the collections were now foreign to the local communities and representing the other.[259] The colour line was drawn throughout the period of migration, for the 'outward' and 'inward' migrations (discussed in the next section), hence racial discrimination and racial superiority dominated the whole period of migration. Colonialism, racism and the migration of cultural property were in this case very closely connected concepts.[260] Nicholas Thomas, on the other hand, talked of colonialism's culture and refers to colonialism as "a project in which the interaction between the coloniser and the colonised was variable and revealed a lot of contradictions". However, instead of real tangible objects, he used art and ethnographic films to reveal the deepness and pervasiveness of colonialism's culture for the coloniser and the colonised.[261]

A good example would be the British Museum's collections policy during the same time. According to McLeod, by collecting widely, the British Museum hoped that in decades to come, the collections would become reputable resources for study by scholars and enjoyment

---

[257] Emanuel Charpy in *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Market*.
[258] Chi Thien Pham, "How Museums Identify and Face Challenges with Diverse Communities," 109.
[259] Michael Taussig, Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses, (London: Psychology Press, 1993), 45.
[260] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 33.
[261] Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture—Anthropology, Travel Culture and Government*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

of the material culture of the world. They put together both contemporary and traditional culture with the hope that in the future the study of such materials would be done in London. Rightfully so, because in McLeod's view, there was nowhere else in the world where there were extensive comparative collections to aid the comparative study of world cultures. This explains the name at the beginning, the Museum of Mankind.[262] Ironically, this presents another type of sharing of heritage and universality by the British Museum, which like the UNESCO conventions, emphasises humanity and universality.

This represents the background against which Botswana and other African countries have lost their cultural heritage. The notion of the migrated museum and its off-shots restitution, a shared heritage, also have their roots within the above scenario. This also reflects the background from which African countries are advocating for return against the UNESCO/ICOM proposal for the universal sharing of this cultural heritage. It is about the unequal relationships within a colonial context and the proposal to erase that history and memories of how it was 'extracted', by simply stating that it is now shared and necessary for everyone to forget its historical provenance; this becomes a challenge to some. The research is in effect unpacking the historical precedents, its contemporary relevance and is also investigating what sharing means in a de-colonising period and if it is the best option for museums and states.

3.1.1 Migration of Objects: A Two-Way Process

The migration of cultural property, particularly during the precolonial and colonial periods, was a two-way process that revolved around imperial power and its officials. The two processes according to this study are the 'inward' and 'outward' migrations. The 'outward' migration refers to those artefacts taken outside Africa, while the 'inward' migration refers to those taken by the coloniser and used within the colonies and in European-initiated museums or local communities as elaborated in the above discussion. While the focus is on objects migrated from African countries to the Western world, there is still a small number of objects that also left the Western world to the colonies and those taken by colonial official, scholars and used within the colonies and colonial museums. Frances Bethencourt indicated that while collecting objects from the colonies was a pivotal part of European expansion, there were also European objects brought into the colonies: "Some of these marked events i.e., arrival in some distant land,

[262] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 60.

success of a voyage or conquest, justified claims, intent etc.". The Stone Cross of Cape Cross (at the Berlin Museum of History and marked for return to Namibia) was erected by the Portuguese sailors on the coast of Namibia in the name of their emperor and to mark that they had been there before the other European powers.[263] Some were used during bartering and exchanges and some just to decorate houses and offices for the colonial officials.[264] In the case of Botswana where there was no colonial museum, both European and local objects were migrated to neighbouring colonies that had museums. The Willoughby story presents a good example of this inward migration. When he accompanied the three Batswana Chiefs to England in 1895, there was an exchange of presents between the queen and the Chiefs. According to John Rutherford, there was a "splendid kaross from the chiefs". The kaross has now been returned and is a part of the Botswana National Museum collection today. Meanwhile, the chiefs also received a number of items from the queen that they brought back to Botswana. These included Setswana bibles for the chiefs, the queen's portrait for each one of them, Indian shawls for the wives of the chiefs, and another for Khama's eldest daughter, and a magic lantern for each of them.[265] However, this small number of items cannot compare to the many migrated objects from Botswana. Due to his base at Palapye, there is evidence that a lot of collecting expeditions were undertaken into the Tswapong hills, Bukalanga and Ngamiland by Willoughby, and he mentions this in his personal papers, found at SOAS and the Birmingham University library. He extensively documented during the expeditions the local traditions related to the collections.[266]

Michael Taussig in *Mimesis and Alterity* brought light to this discussion on the inward and outward migration of cultural property. Describing the Cuna Kingdom of the dead, he addresses how just like that of the living it is stuffed with Western consumer goods or objects that were taken from the white men. This could have been through trade, barter, exchanges, gifts, theft and some for sale at European trading stations and shops. These Indigenous people of the Americas invoked the Western presence through these commodities.[267] To the Cuna, the image of a Western commodity bore a determined spiritual connotation. The migration of objects is therefore coloured by a mosaic of alterities in different parts of the globe, particularly

---

[263] Francisco Bethencourt, "Colonial Objects: Imposed, Appropriated and Exhibited," 7.

[264] Winani Thebele-Kgwatalala, "The Evolution and Development of the Museum in Botswana towards a Heritage Institution," 80–81.

[265] John Rutherford, *Little Giant of Bechuanaland: A Biography of William Charles Willoughby*, (Gaborone: Mmegi Publishing House, 2009), 63. See also the "Birmingham Personal Papers by Willoughby," (Birmingham University, 2019).

[266] John Rutherford, *Little Giant of Bechuanaland: A Biography of William Charles Willoughby*, 66 & 81.

[267] Michael Taussig, Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses, 132.

where the imperial hand had landed.[268] This mosaic of alterities was not coloured by collections from Botswana or Africa alone, but also collections from different corners of the globe.[269] The presence of these commodities created 'othering' through the European presence. Europeans were mimicked through the use and presence of these objects, which represented the 'inward migration' of objects as discussed here. There is also a diversity of European artefacts in North Africa and John Mack thought that these were presented as gifts, as samples, and for exchange exhibitions and other programmes.[270]

While a small number of European objects were finding their way into the colonies, a host of collections went to European museums and the volumes cannot be equated. The cross-cultural migration does not underscore the fact that migrating and displaying a whole array and variety of collections from the colonies showed how the colonised communities and peoples had been subjugated. Whatever theory or concept is applied by the perpetrators of this historical mishap against Africa and its communities, the conclusion according to Amadour-Mahtar M'Bow is that**:**

> architectural features, statues and friezes, monoliths, mosaics, pottery, masks, marbles and all objects taken, were more than just curios and scientific, historical and cultural discoveries. They bore witnesses to the history of a culture and of kingdoms, empires (the Baganda, Mwenemutapa, Rozvi, Timbuktu, Benin etc.) and communities whose spirit they have perpetuated and rekindled.[271]

In Greenblatt's words, "displaced objects are a memorial complex, a cultural machine that generates an uncontrollable oscillation between homage and desecration, longing and hopelessness". Nostalgia also goes with these objects and this is for lost kingdoms, civilisations, cultures and communities in countries of origin.[272] This is evidenced by the Lakota of North America, who would take a shaman to the museum to perform a ritual in order to release spiritual power from their ceremonial objects so as to free them to become simple museum objects.[273] In his discussion of the Ovambo Sacred stones, Silvester maintained that much as they were taken out of context, the link with their sacred place of origin remains intact,

---

[268] Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*, 147–148.
[269] Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*, 147–148.
[270] John Mack, *Africa and its Cultures*, 65.
[271] UNSECO, *Legal Practical Measures against Illicit Trafficking in Cultural Property, UNESCO Handbook*, iii.

[272] Greenblatt, Stephen. "Resonance and Wonder." In Ivan Karp and Stephen D. Lavine. 1991.

[273] Carsten Viggo Nielsen, "When Objects of Religious Significance Mediate Power," in *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, eds. Viv Golding and Jen Walklate, (London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019), 88.

hence the need to return them. The intangible cultural heritage around their being is with the community of origin.[274]

The good of it is that because of this wide dispersal of the African heritage in the diaspora, it has become incontestable that African art and crafts occupy an exceptional part in the universal space today. In other words, the objects present a very strong global presence for Africans. This has also created a strong element of admiration for African culture. Needless to say and in spite of the glory, back home, in Nandy's words, the migration of cultural property has turned African kingdoms into cultural tombs.[275] It is this whole sad background behind the migrations that makes Ellen Ndeshi Namhila conclude that, "the repatriation of cultural objects is more than just recognition to the legal ownership by the communities of origin, but a practical act of apology and reconciliation".[276]

3.1.2 The Museum Concept

The migrated museum stands out as a significant theme for this research study. It allows for an analytical study into the transfer of cultural material from one part of the world to another. However, it is also important to start by understanding what a museum really is, because it is a pivotal point within the whole debate around object migration. The ICOM definition of a museum has been reviewed a number of times since ICOM's formation in 1946. This is because the museum is an ever- changing place and museums come in different sizes and forms with a diversity of functions. Liviu Razvan and Valentine Kiss describe the museum as a living entity that cannot be blocked in its development.[277] Currently, there is a newly proposed museum definition still under discussion.[278] However, to avoid the conventional ICOM definition of a museum, it is easy to understand the museum through its functions. These include collections, stewardship, education in that it is a lifelong learning entity, contributes to economic development and many more. At the centre of all these is the responsibility to serve the community.[279]

---

[274] Jeremy Silvester, "Museum Objects, Memory and Identity in Namibia," 24.
[275] Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism,* x.
[276] Ellen Ndeshi Namhila, "The Hendrik Witbooi Diaries: From War Booty to Memory of the World Treasure," *Historical Judgment* 1 (2019).
[277] Virgil Stefan Nitulescu (ed), *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019): 12.
[278] Virgil Stefan Nitulescu (ed), *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019): 5–6
[279] Chi Thien Pham, "How Museums Identify and Face Challenges with Diverse Communities," 108.

The pertinent issue is to understand if there were any museums in Africa during the early migrations or before the establishment of the modern museum by the colonisers. This also applies to why we refer to this body of collections as a museum that was migrated and if this meant uprooting a whole museum and its collections from Africa to Europe. While it is clear who the perpetrators of this trade are, one still wants to know if they knew that they were uprooting the African museum and restructuring it in foreign lands where it was no longer visible and representative enough of the African culture and way of life. Could we still view it as an African museum once relocated in a cosmopolitan country? It is important to know where these collections are currently and the knowledge, information and stereotypes they convey of Africa and Africans if they are on display. What misinterpretations or misrepresentations do they portray? If they convey any knowledge, could this knowledge be said to be shared and shared equally? Is it shared with the country or community of provenance or the global community?[280] This also includes the way the collections were displayed, particularly by foreigners who did not have first-hand information about how they were used. All these questions lead us into the investigation of the African museum as against the Western museum and its development.

In this way, the study seeks to demonstrate that the migration of cultural material from Africa to the Western world does not also undermine the fact that Africans also had their own ways of preserving culture. Much as this cannot be equated to modern museum concepts, it demonstrated African ways of preserving culture for future generations. This is referred to as the African museum for the purposes of this study. This was in revered sites, sacred groves, ceremonial sites, old dwelling places, rivers, hills, forests and institutional centres and artefacts for rituals and ceremonial purposes that amounted to a traditional museum. These varied for different cultures, ways of life and localities. This led to the development of restrictions, veneration and protection for handling and access to these sites and artefacts, which has now been overridden by the modern museum.[281] In the context of precolonial mobility, value and ancestral presence was often vested in landscapes rather than objects. This link with the past kept people's memories of the past alive and evoked strong emotions.[282] This African museum had local curators from the community in attendance, chosen on the basis of lineage, seniority,

[280] George S. Mudenda, "Exhibiting Africa: Contemporary Perspectives on Representation of Culture in Museums," An unpublished paper presented at a *Colloquium, Osaka, Japan, 2012*.
[281] Chi Thien Pham, "How Museums Identify and Face Challenges with Diverse Communities," 109.
[282] Botswana National Museum, "African Landscapes and Heritage," *The Zebra's Voice* (1985): 4.

spiritual calling, prowess, and experience. Custodianship could also be passed on from father to son, mother to daughter, elder to elder, from expert to expert, and from spiritual medium to another.

The quest here is to find out what this traditional African museum really is. The traditional African museum is associated with being in Africa and according to Kiprop Lagat the museum concept in the African sense is very broad, entailing the history and culture of a kingdom, the shrines, the paintings by early communities, the landscapes.[283] Kwame Amoah Labi talked about the African museum as embodied in traditional methods of conservation and display. This applies to the art and regalia of royals, which in most cases was associated with issues of spirituality and governance before the introduction of the Western concept of a museum. He gave the "Asante royal stool" in Ghana as one such possessions. This African museum is reflective of African culture and way Greenblatt, Stephen. "Resonance and Wonder." In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, edited by Ivan Karp and Stephen D. Lavine. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.

of life.[284] These African museums were found among traditional African societies and most precolonial communities. These societies also kept cultural objects in their homes, such as artworks in the form of clay pots, hide purses, stools, baskets etc. These could be passed on from one generation to another for posterity as done in the modern museum. These artefacts were used for normal domestic use, rituals, special ceremonies and some just for beauty and prestige. The objects were a true representation of the owner communities and carried the community's identity. Today in the modern African museum, the artefacts are assembled together from different parts of the country or globe in a modern building and under the care of professional curators and this has in some way led to the alienation of the objects.[285] However, the above cultural setting was destabilised when Christianity condemned objects and practices as heathen, which resulted in the discarding and abandoning of this way of life.

The traditional or precolonial African museum just like the classical museums in Europe was either individual (as in private collections belonging to aristocrats and some important

---

[283] Kiprop Lagat, "The Hazina Exhibition. Challenges and Lessons for International Museum Collaboration," in Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe: A New Field for Museum Studies, eds. Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere (transcript-Verlag, 2018), 137.

[284] Kwame Amoah Labi, "New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa. The Examples of PREMA and Other Initiatives in Ghana," in *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe: A New Field for Museum Studies*, eds. Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere (transcript-Verlag, 2018), 165.

[285] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms & Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, 96–69.

members of society)[286] or communally and family oriented.[287] These sacred objects were inherited but remained active as part of rituals, ceremonies, cultural festivals and were in some instances kept hidden rather than displayed as it is in the modern museum. This explains the secrecy in some of African practices. These precolonial African museums could be likened to heimat museums, town museums and village museums as found in other parts of the world. Heimat is a German concept that denotes the relationship of human beings towards a certain social unit. The term carries a positive social connotation and is expressed with terms such as home and homeland. It is about human identity, people are tied to their heimat by birth right, language and childhood.[288] This analysis accords with Annette Weiner's notion that some of the objects from the background described above are inalienable and cannot be transferred or removed from their cultural and historical context. They have "symbolic, spiritual and economic powers tied to the owner communities and families".[289] Their value can, therefore, only be understood, explained and interpreted by the original owners. While the physical transfer can be effected, the meaning of the material remains where the roots are and with the owner communities. Most of the in-depth explanation remains where the roots are. This also explains why African communities felt that the collections had been taken away from them, and they could therefore no longer identify with them once they were housed in modern museums. In support to this thinking, Chi Thien Pham felt that communities have a legitimate moral right and ownership in museum collections. This points to the tight bond that exists between the museum and owner communities.[290] Furthermore, it explains how the European communities could not identify with the foreign objects in their museums except as curios and for aesthetics. Examples are the *vigango* figurines, which were repatriated back to Kenya after being stolen by a tourist from the USA. These are figurines are used for ceremonial purposes in burials by families and were a unique part of the culture of the Mijikenda people of Kenya. According to sources from the family and community that lost the figurines, their absence brought calamities to the family. Hence, their return was critical and it signalled some form of closure and a healing process for the family and community.[291] The *vigango* and their

[286] Kostas Arvanities and Louis Tythacott, *Museums and Restitution: New Practices, New Approaches*, 2.
[287] Dawson Munjeri, "Possibilities for Self-Financing of Museums," *ICOM Newsletter: What Museums for Africa* (1992): 63–64.
[288] Siegfried Lenz, *Heimat museum*, (Berlin: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2006).
[289] Annette Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping While Giving*, 2.
[290] Chi Thien Pham, "How Museums Identify and Face Challenges with Diverse Communities," 108.
[291] Annette Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping While Giving*, 2. See also George S. Mudenda, "Exhibiting Africa: Contemporary Perspectives on Representation of Culture in Museums."

contextual cultural background would in this sense constitute part of the collections of the African traditional museum.

The classic museum on the other hand originated among the Greeks and Romans, advanced during the early medieval times, and was revolutionised into a modern research and scientific institution during the enlightenment and renaissance periods. The early Greek and Roman museum curators kept public collections for their aesthetic, historic, religious and magical importance. However, they thought of the museum in different ways than we do today: Their collections were for private individuals and their families only, and not for research and exhibition. Gunther Wessel talked about curiosities in ancient times collected by aristocrats.[292] These classical museums were valued for their "monolithic immutability", and their purpose was civic pride.[293] The enlightenment museum on the other hand thrived on scientific discoveries, collections from the early trade expeditions, missionary collections and was to develop further during and after the colonial period through curatorial and punitive expeditions. Louis Tythacott and Kostas Arvanities argued that the public museum today is a modern creation: The early museum of the 16–17th centuries was scholarly and the aristocratic collections of the Renaissance reflected unequal global power.[294] Even though the modern museum replaced these traditional and classical museums during the enlightenment period, for a long time there was no pronounced change. The conceptual shift in the museum only came in the 20th century and was revolutionary. The museum abandoned its traditional isolationist policy. It became public and was funded from different sources, while it still retained its preservation, collections and research identity.[295] While during the earlier collecting documentation was minimal and limited to engravings, diaries, and newspapers, today proper documentation is done during collecting. Provenance research is also a priority to fill up the information gaps left by past collectors.[296]

In conclusion, the classical museum was generally reflective of intellectual explorations, which later expanded to general notions of civilisation, empire and conquest. On the other hand, the traditional African institution was limited to local traditional cultures, passed on from generation to generation and without scholarly inclination as such. Rather, it was more of a

---

[292] Gunther Wessel, "Dealers and Collectors, Provenances and Rights: Searching for Traces," 1.
[293] Edward Alexander, *Museums in Motion: An Introduction to the History and Functions of Museums*, (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1997), 7.
[294] Kostas Arvanities and Louis Tythacott, *Museums and Restitution: New Practices, New Approaches*, 2.
[295] Simon Knell (ed.), "Altered Values: Searching for a New Collecting," 7.
[296] Gunther Wessel, "Dealers and Collectors, Provenances and Rights: Searching for Traces," 1–2.

heritage-inclined institution. It was also a link with the spiritual world of the departed because they were believed not to have died but moved to another level of existence where they still watched over the family and community. Hence, there was a lot of intangible cultural heritage surrounding the traditional African museum and its artefacts, which made it a very interesting institution for study. In reference to the given example of the *vigango* figurines: To the outsider they were just wooden statues, while to the communities of provenance they were grandfathers, a link with the world of the dead. They also watched over the family and community. With all this said, the museum has over time evolved as an institution. This is reflected in its ability today to present these original historical objects and intangible cultural heritage as "a unique feature of the socio-political realities of the colonial era and its impact". This then makes the museum an invaluable source of reference in order to understand the past, present and future.[297]

In this ladder of the development of the museum as an institution, there is also the postcolonial museum, roughly from the movement for independence and liberation to the present, which covers both African and Western museums. From the 17th to the 21st century period there are therefore, two major kinds of museums. The museum representing colonial and imperial interests reflected in its collections, which could be in the colony or in the imperial power centres and universities. This first type of museum represents the colonial migrated collections that are being restituted today or are proposed for a shared heritage and collaborations. The second type is the museum of the post-colony, usually, but not always, for nation building and those of local communities. The two distinct types are mostly national museums and community museums as found in Botswana today. The different collections, in particular the transfer processes for the artefacts found in these museums, depended on which type of museum this was as per the above given distinctions. For example, no punitive expedition collections would be found in a community museum, unless started by a colonial power and to serve its interests. The second category of museums would then be the current museum, which is faced with the current pillages, smuggling and looting of artefacts by smugglers and syndicates, professional dealers and auction houses. This therefore presents a synopsis of the evolution and periodisation of both the African and European museums, the precolonial migrating of objects as well as the contemporary scenario and illicit trafficking of objects. Contemporary discussions are on the decolonisation of the museum and reinventing of a new museum. In fact, a lot of revolutionised museums have been coming up in different shapes,

[297] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 13.

projections and disciplines. Madalina Liana Iacob introduced a different set of museums as seen today in European urban spaces: The "niche museum". They are generally small, according to her, and meant to make an object known and to become a part of history or intangible cultural heritage. They use small spaces, are private projects, could be borne from a person's passion, have a story to tell, and can also reflect contemporary history and culture. This museum has the unique capacity to shape the immediate contemporary society with its focussed documentation through smart phones. One such museum is the Vasa Museum in Stockholm, based on a salvaged ship.[298] The niche museum has the capacity to capture a niche for both the visitor and heritage managers. Some more examples given by Iacob are the Perfume Museum of Bucharest, the Chocolate Museum in Hamburg, the Clock Museum of Zurich, and others.[299] This goes to show the different shades to museum development and evolution. The developments in the museum field are also in response to global socio-political changes.

African scholars have for a long time emphasised the fact that the migrated objects have been made to misrepresent their original owners and that they were irrelevant to the local environment and communities that hosted them. According to George Mudenda, the dialogue and contemporary viewpoint on the depiction of cultures in museums, especially those exhibiting African collections, justifies misled views of Africa by cosmopolitan curators and those that visit these exhibitions and learn from them. This is because within Africa there are many countries and peoples, which cannot be exhibited in one single exhibition or showcased by any other exhibitor or curator. Curators who exhibit African objects do so from a Western perspective. What should be born in the minds of curators as they exhibit African objects outside Africa is that they cannot represent these different cultures in one exhibition.[300] This justifies the point that the museum space is a hybridity and interaction of different cultures. Each one of them needs to be presented in its own special way.[301] Examples from recent exhibitions are the exhibition by the Berlin Museum of History in 2017 themed *German Colonialism: Fragments of Past and Present*. It focussed on the German colonial ideology in all its different colonies. German's colonial dealings with different African countries (Namibia,

[298] Virgil S. Nitulescu (ed), *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019): 14–15.
[299] Virgil S. Nitulescu (ed), *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019): 15.
[300] George S. Mudenda, "Exhibiting Africa: Contemporary Perspectives on Representation of Culture in Museums," An unpublished paper presented at a *Colloquium, Osaka, Japan, 2012*.
[301] Christopher Whitehead and Francesca Lanz, "Museums and a Progressive Sense of Place," 20.

Togo, Tanzania, Uganda/Rwanda, Ghana, New Guinea etc.) were put together in one exhibition, including that of other ex-colonial states in other regions. This cluttered the exhibition and did not give space for each African colonial case to be dealt with on its own merit.[302] Ulrike Kretzschmar observed that "the exhibition cannot claim to be complete and it is too broad because it includes too many objects (more than 5 000) and from many different countries". According to him, the exhibition marks a breakthrough in the discussion of German's colonial history, its reappraisal and provenance of the collections and should lead to more topical and critical debates and exhibitions in the future.[303] This should lead to a more focussed thematic exhibition on German's colonial dealing with a given colony, ethnicity or activity.

Another case is the recent exhibition by the Weltmuseum Wien in Austria, themed "A Colonial Thing". All the detail about different African collections was put in one exhibition and as a result the dealing with each case did not come out clearly or in detail.[304] The exhibitions were good and they presented a good knowledge base, but would have been more informative and interesting if each case had been presented as a separate exhibition and not just a blanket statement on colonial collections. However, the fact that there was a scholarly examination of the two exhibitions, which resulted in publications and included scholars from some places of origin, is an indication of a shared responsibility. It is also hoped that this is a positive move towards reconciliation and the formation of new identities through the understanding of present and current debates and challenges.[305] This is also a step towards informed co-curated thematic and scholarly exhibitions in the future.

If a curator plans to put up an exhibition of African objects, they have to be mindful that the museum motivation is not necessarily the same as that of the objects.[306] According to Nandy, "India is a web of diverse cultures and every community has its own unique history and cultures".[307] Ezio Bassani also supported this view by indicating that McLeod as a collections curator for the British Museum also believed in the individuality and uniqueness of African cultures.[308] In conclusion, it is important to note that exhibitions are a contested terrain because

---

[302] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*.
[303] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 10–11.
[304] Joy Slapping and Claudia Augustat, "A Colonial Thing Booklet."
[305] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 12.
[306] George S. Mudenda, "Exhibiting Africa: Contemporary Perspectives on Representation of Culture in Museums."
[307] Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*, 120.
[308] Ezio Bassani, "Foreword," in *Collecting for the British Museum,* Malcolm McLeod, (London: British Museum Press, 1993).

they misrepresent the owner communities. This is mostly prevalent in those exhibitions that are found in cosmopolitan museums. They have to include the communities of provenance in order to be authentic. The misinterpretation and misrepresentation of African objects that are in the diaspora by curators is also exacerbated by the fact that during the time of collection, before, during and after the colonial period with most of the collections, as indicated earlier, there was very little documentation and sometimes none at all. According to McLeod, objects could move from one owner to another before finally being sold to a private collector or deposited at the British Museum. In most cases no provenance research was done while they fetched exorbitant prices. The "lack of detailed contextual information for museum objects greatly lowered their value for scholarship", which is one of the areas of concern for this study regarding the migrated artefacts.[309] Looking at most of the collections in cosmopolitan museums, it is clear that collecting to them was in McLeod's words, more "a reflex action than something driven by intellectual inquiry". The aim was to get, to sell, and to keep, and information and research was not the main agenda. All the gaps were left to some unknown future generation to close up.[310] This is perhaps the generation referred to here, which is now dismantling borders and talking collaboration between museums and provenance research. Many scholars of heritage agree on the point of the lack of documentation by the early collectors. It was also because of this situation that the British Museum begun to appreciate that it should establish new ways of collecting to obtain well-documented and comprehensive collections.[311]

I further examine the current methods of exhibiting material culture in museums. It is important for the exhibiting curator to examine the two distinct models by Stephen Greenblatt, in examining the exhibition of ethnographic material. Greenblatt introduces what he termed "resonance and wonder" in exhibitions. The discussion of the migrated artefacts during the early days of the colonial museum turns the museum into a temple of wonder and cultural reflection. "Resonance and wonder" were the alternative models of the museum during the period of migration for colonial collections.[312] It was therefore important that objects in the diaspora that are displayed in museums represent these two characteristics. The aim is to move

---

[309] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 20.

[310] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 21–23.

[311] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 23–24. See also Philip Jones, "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," 125.

[312] Greenblatt, Stephen. "Resonance and Wonder." In Ivan Karp and Stephen D. Lavine. 1991.

from the traditional and colonial stance of these objects being for wonder and aesthetics into the idea of well-researched, authentic and educational displays of collections. This would also call for provenance research so that the Africa that is exhibited is not misrepresented. However, in the contemporary setting, wonder would only come in where provenance research has not been done, as was the case then.

With all this said about the museum in Botswana, the trafficking occurred over a very long period of time through the same channels already tabulated and it covered both of the two distinct periods of museum development. It was aggravated during the colonial era, where and when it was done on a more official basis. This opened a wide window for the migrated museum; a move that has left a scar up to this day and is not easy to erase or reverse.[313] Moreover, today the ongoing discussions between European and African museums are focussed on the best way forward for the same diasporic collections. It should be noted though that this migration of cultural materials was not a policy issue for the British colonial government under whose protection Botswana, the then Bechuanaland Protectorate, fell. It would also be right to believe that the same applied to other colonial powers such as the Spanish, French, Germans and Portuguese. The scramble for colonies was not a deliberate move to get cultural property. The movement of objects arose out of another. One could also say it is a set of circumstances that allowed for the trafficking of cultural materials to take place. The position of the colonial government in Botswana particularly was not to invest money in the colonial project unnecessarily, since the Bechuanaland Protectorate was considerably poor and could not generate its own resources. This, however, did not stop interested individuals from investing and establishing museums and galleries in the mother country and migrating heritage from the local communities. As it were, this only applied to activities of collectors and colonial officials instigating the transfers and migration of objects and should be viewed differently from the illegal and criminal activities in which objects are stolen in the contemporary era.

For example, a collector such as Charles Darwin, who incidentally visited Cape Town, would not have written the *Origin of the Species* if it were not for his taking samples of flora and fauna. Meanwhile, he did this because of Britain's ability to control the oceans and various colonies. So, colonialism was important to some scientific advances, which dominated stages

[313] Botswana National Museum, "The Migration of Cultural Property in Botswana," *The Zebra's Voice* (1985): 5–6.

in the development of European museums. This was an age of scientific discoveries from the new lands. Ulrike Linder talked about German colonialism as rooted in the context of race relations and the 'othering'. He relates this to the concept of social Darwinism and how it even used biology to justify the race relations of the colonial period.[314]

However, as already indicated, this must be distinguished from looting, the spoils of war, pillaging, and criminal smuggling of objects that is happening in Iraq, Mali, Egypt, Syria and other countries faced with political strife and hunger today. Stolen objects are more likely to be easily returned than those that were obtained through a colonial setting. The latter allowed for the migration of objects from colonies to the master country. This could explain why the 1970 Convention by UNESCO does not allow for discussions of objects secured before 1970. The Convention was established to fight illicit trafficking and given that most of the objects were migrated before 1970, a lot of the collections in the global North are not covered. This creates a gap in the protection of colonial objects. Dealers sometimes lie that they are trading in goods acquired before 1970. Museums and governments have no control over this trade because it involves dangerous networks.[315] The collectors have also evolved and are more sophisticated and apply legal protection to their trade. The dealers and the trade in cultural property today, as compared to the other collecting discussed in this chapter (missionaries, scientists, travellers, traders etc.) have also evolved and now operate at another level. They are more sophisticated than before as they trade through newspaper columns, the internet and online auctioning. They believe they have rights and that theirs is a legitimate trade, even though the illicit trafficking is exacerbated by the market they provide for the migrated objects. In 1993, they founded the International Association of Dealers in Ancient Art, mostly for dealers in the US and Europe. It is meant to stand for the rights of dealers, collectors and museums (metropolitan museums, the so-called universal museums) to acquire, donate, sell and own art from yesteryear.[316] According to Neil Brodie, it is online networks for selling that sustain and grow the trafficking in cultural property and expands it to all corners of the world. He gives the Trocadero online market place as an example. It is this high demand that compels dealers and middlemen to sell fakes sometimes.[317]

---

[314] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 16–25. See also Christian Geulen, "World Order and Racial Struggles. German Colonialism," 33. (He talked about the racial orders in the colonial history of Germany that was dominated by the concepts of the 'self' and 'other').

[315] Gunther Wessel, "Dealers and Collectors, Provenances and Rights: Searching for Traces," 3–8.

[316] Gunther Wessel, "Dealers and Collectors, Provenances and Rights: Searching for Traces," 1.

[317] Neil Brodie, "The Internet Market in Antiquities," 11.

3.2 A FOCUS ON THE COLLECTORS

At the centre of the conversation about migration of objects, restitution and the proposal for a shared heritage is the figure of the collector. It is the collector who instigated the migration of cultural property. Therefore, the collector is pivotal point to the debate on the migration of cultural property. The examples here are from other areas of collecting and more emphasis is placed on the three case study countries and the British Museum. The focus on Malawi is because of the high concentration of a European presence in the area during the colonial period. The concentration on Nigeria and Malawi is also because the area of cultural migration is still a grey area in Botswana and in the future the example may be followed in handling cases of restitutions and collaborations. For some of the collections found in cosmopolitan museums and the early museums in neighbouring country, such as the South African Museum in Cape Town and Museum Africa in Johannesburg, there is the challenge of identity politics in the context of which nation state they belong to. Most of the objects found in these museums are labelled as "Bushman", "Kalahari" or "Tswana", and this makes it difficult to know whether the objects are from Botswana, Namibia or South Africa. The three countries share communities and borders as well as landscapes, so that the national identity of the objects is a serious challenge.

Larissa Forster provides an overview of collectors and the different objects brought into German museums, particularly in the German colonial perspective.[318] Most of the collecting expeditions targeted or focussed on specific or given areas at a given point in time. Apart from individual collectors, there were instances where companies, medical schools, hospitals and churches collected for different reasons, and all these collections ended up in European museums.

One good example of the museum as a collector is the British Museum. Collections at the British museums are divided or categorised according to the period and area of collection at a given time. Some of these are from the Ashanti, Timbuktu, Benin, Congo, Ethiopia, Egypt etc. There were many such collecting expeditions in the 1800s, particularly by the British Museum.[319] In the same way, the Anthropology section of the British Museum hosts the Africa section and many other thematic sections. Almost all African countries have collections in the

[318] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 154.
[319] Peter Hamil (Curator at British Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015.

Africa Section of the British Museum, and even more so if they were part of a British colony. This also goes for Asia, America and the weaker and poorer European countries, such as Greece, Turkey and Poland. The Anthropology section is more about ethnographic collections, research and publications on the different collections.[320]

It was after reaching the European market that objects were redirected to the US. Jonathan Fine gave objects from the Bamum Kingdom in Cameroon as one example. The Bamum produced specifically for the European market and succeeded in making their kingdom a centre for artistic production. These were popular in Germany, France and later North America.[321] Sylvester Okwunodu Ogbechie talks of the development of an African art market in New York and other parts of the US. This attests to the fact that after the European market was saturated, the American market was established.[322] The following subsections summarises the different collectors, methods of collecting and reasons behind the collecting.

3.2.1 Scientific Expeditions

This was a key way of migrating objects throughout the different periods of transfer. Besides exploration of the land, people, and new specimens, scientific expeditions were meant for the collection of cultural property. The European museum was popularised by the number of scientific discoveries and curios from the new and discovered lands of Africa, the Americas and Asia.[323] The explorers, scholars, researchers and travellers who first made contact with African communities collected for curiosity and study, and they took things back home to share with other scholars and communities and to show off their achievements. However, there was limited equal exchange and reciprocity if any in this process of migration. Records on the Botswana meteorites in Germany indicated that they were bought from "natives" at Kuke (which is in the Kgalagadi). One, therefore, wonders how equal the exchange was and if the price paid to the natives, who are probably Basarwa, was of equal value. They also collected scientific specimens in the form of fauna and flora and rock formations (meteorites). Kwame Amoah Labi also talks about an early collection taken to the British Museum from Ghana (The

[320] Peter Hamil (Curator at British Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015.

[321] Jonathan Fine, "Obscure Objects of Desire," in *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets*, eds. Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald, (De Gruyter, 2018), 153, 165.

[322] Sylvester Okwunodu Ogbechie "Mathias Komor and the Market for African Art in New York" in *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets*, eds. Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald, (De Gruyter, 2018), 167.

[323] Cullen Young and Kamuzu B. Hasting (Eds.), *Our African Way of Life*, (Blantyre: Central African Limited, 1946). See also Cullen Young and Kamuzu B. Hasting (Eds.), *Our African Way of Life*, (1946; reis. Blantyre: Central African Limited, 2008).

Gold Coast then) for scientific exploration.[324] In most cases the specimens did not come back. This also did not in any way commit the collectors to any friendship with the local communities: There was no bond or guaranteed return to their place. The next visitor was bound to be a different one, hence there was no form of reciprocal exchange. One noteworthy character is the German scholar Leonard Schultze who collected for German institutions. He collected scientific, archaeological, ethnographic as well as human bodies for anatomical explorations. Scholars collected from colonies as well as non-colonies, and they were in business and sometimes could not confine to their services to their countries of origin.[325] This explains why scholars such as Torday, who was Belgian, ended up collecting for the British Museum.

3.2.2 Missionaries

During their first explorations, missionaries also collected artefacts to prove points back home and to share their discoveries, recruit colleagues and lobby their governments for support. For example, after his first expedition, David Livingstone invited the church to occupy the area in order to drive away the Arab traders and stop the slave trade. Scholars and teachers of Lovedale in South Africa who went to Nyasaland later did so to complete Livingstone's mission to convert, protect and civilise the Africans.[326] This is supported by John Comaroff and Jean Comaroff in their exploration of colonial evangelism and modernity in South Africa. They trace the socio-economic and political developments of today's South Africa back to these early determinative encounters. According to them, "the relationship between the British evangelists and the Southern Tswana stimulated multifaceted exchanges of goods, signs and cultural markers and this also had a lasting economic and socio-political impact in England".[327]

Due to these encounters, many objects found in museums abroad were migrated by missionaries. Even the first European museums were made popular by the number of scientific discoveries and curios from the new and discovered lands of Africa, the Americas and Asia and migrated partly by missionaries.[328] Some good examples are the weaving loom from

---

[324] Kwame Amoah Labi, "New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa," 168.
[325] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 54–56.
[326] Donald Fraser, *The Story of Our Mission—Livingstonia*, (London: The United Free Church of Scotland, 1915), 3.
[327] John L. Comaroff, and Jean Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution: The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).
[328] Cullen Young and Kamuzu B. Hasting (Eds.), *Our African Way of Life*, (1946). See also Cullen Young and Kamuzu B. Hasting (Eds.), *Our African Way of Life*, (2008); Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 155.

Malawi's Lower Shire region and a host of artefacts migrated by David Livingstone and his peers, now found in the National Museum of Scotland. The weaving loom was a common artefact used by communities of the Lower Shire region of Nyasaland to weave. David Livingstone undertook expeditions to Central and Southern Africa before finally settling down to his missionary work. On both expeditions he collected artefacts to show his government and countryman, lobby for support and to mobilise them on civilising missions to African communities through Christianity and for commerce. Rebekka Habermas addresses the role of missionaries in colonial history and their contribution to the migration of collections from the local communities.[329]

As a result of the presence of the many artefacts migrated by David Livingstone and his peers, the National Museums of Malawi and the National Museum of Scotland have entered into a collaborative relationship in order for Malawians to share and have access to their cultural property in Scotland.[330] In this way, what was transferred through theft, exchange and/or gifting is now being shared, even though it is not clear whether this is sharing on an equal basis. The point to be demonstrated is whether this is equal sharing, equal access and equal ownership over these objects.[331]

Livingstone's expeditions also explain the presence of artefacts from Botswana at the National Museum of Scotland (Appendix A), which still have to be investigated to establish whether they were also migrated by Livingstone. Livingstone did a lot of missionary work among the Tswana and traversed many regions in Botswana on his way to his mission stations in South Africa, Zambia, Nyasaland and other places. One of the local monuments in Botswana is named after him because he had a station there: the Livingstone Kolobeng Monument.

Rev. Willoughby of the London Missionary Society in Botswana collected objects for the South African Museum, Cape Town. The same collections at this museum are recorded as having been collected by him and are referred to as the Willoughby Collections today. There is also evidence of his pledge to the Director of the South African Museum to supply the museum with artefacts from Botswana. The missionaries played on the trust of the locals and the converts to get collections for free or at a small price. Once again, the communities clung to the relations they had with these local colonial officials and missionaries to give away their

---

[329] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 54–57.
[330] P.A. Cole-King, *The Livingstone Search Expedition, 1867*.
[331] P.A. Cole-King, *The Livingstone Search Expedition, 1867*.

cultural property. One outstanding thing about the missionaries is that they wore many hats besides their missionary work. Willoughby for one founded Tiger Kloof College in South Africa, which served both South Africa and the neighbouring states. He was also a researcher and scholar and wrote books on Tswana customs and beliefs. Some of the material evidence collected, as evidenced by his correspondence with the South African museums, on traditional healing was to authenticate his research findings.[332] Most missionaries collected objects that were associated with local traditional practices as done by Willoughby and the Finish missionary Martti Rautanen. Rautanen was responsible for uprooting the Namibian Kwanyama power stones that ended up in a Finnish museum.[333]

According to Rutherford, Willoughby was a bridge builder who tried to bring Europeans and Africans together through his documentation and migration of collections.[334] However, one then wonders how equal the flow of objects and information was. From the point of view of collections, he remains a perpetrator and a contributing factor to the large presence of Botswana collections in Cape Town, Europe, and the US.

Another missionary method of migrating African cultural property took the form of condemnations of African culture as heathen and barbaric. As a result, African communities started giving away their cultural objects willingly. This exchange or method of collecting was not mutual and was not reciprocal between the two camps.[335] Comaroff and Comaroff support the observation that the African culture was said to be heathen. They demonstrate how the colonial attempt to 'civilise' Africa overtime transformed both the coloniser and colonised. This in turn created a fusion of cultural systems and strong global forces whose repercussions persist up to this day.[336] This also explains Fanon's conclusion that in the assimilation system, which obviously followed the condemnation of the African culture as heathen, you had to either turn white or disappear. Here, he sees the black person as objectified by the colonial master in the colonial situation and culture, just like the migrated collections and the human remains that ended up displayed in museums as objects. It was an impurity to be a colonised people. Local

[332] John Rutherford, *Little Giant of Bechuanaland: A Biography of William Charles Willoughby*, 238.
[333] Jeremy Silvester, "Museum Objects, Memory and Identity in Namibia," 24.
[334] John Rutherford, *Little Giant of Bechuanaland: A Biography of William Charles Willoughby*, vii.
[335] Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015. See also Susanne Peters (eds.), *Directory of Museums in Africa*. (London: Kegan Paul International, 1990), 3;. Edith Ekunke (Director of the National Museum in Lagos) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[336] John L. Comaroff, and Jean Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution: The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier*, 612.

customs and their foundations were destroyed because they were in conflict with a civilisation, which imposed itself on the colonised.[337]

3.2.3 Trade Expeditions

The first African encounter with the Arabs and Portuguese traders was based on trade, and this also led to the transfer of objects, exchanged through trade or other means. However, the reciprocal aspect and equality of this exchange also needs investigation to establish the nature of relations that developed. The trade in slaves alongside the trade in cultural property clarifies the presence of the black population in the diaspora. Meanwhile, the trade in objects elucidates the presence of cultural objects in foreign museums and art galleries. This is also a signal that the transfer of material cultural goes way back to the slave trade era and even before. Sometimes force was used to acquire slaves, artefacts and other resources, hence these transfers were not based on equal exchange. This talks to the concept of the "lesser savage", a tool used by European powers to fight and subjugate local communities. Hendrik Witbooi was made to sign a treaty by the Germans agreeing to help them fight fellow Namibians (a move he regretted later and withdrew).[338] This explains why Nicholas Thomas concluded that "colonialism is a complex ongoing cultural process in which dominated populations are represented in ways that play upon and legitimise racial and cultural differences".[339]

In Mack's view, the colonial period had to follow this 'free trade' period and it encouraged the free migration of cultural property. This was worsened by conquest and punitive expeditions.[340] Trade and punitive raids therefore went hand in hand. After the traders reported back home about the abundance of materials in certain areas, governments usually started focusing on the area and followed up with punitive raids to amass objects, subjugate, and later impose colonial rule.

3.2.4 Curatorial Expeditions

Whole expeditions by curators or keepers and other museum personnel were undertaken into different parts of Africa to collect artefacts. Known examples are expeditions for the British Museum, the South African Museum, the Museum of Natural History in Bulawayo as well as

---

[337] Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks,* trans. Charles L. Markham (London: Pluto Press, 1968), 100–110.
[338] Dag Henrichsen, "Cape Cross? African Places—History and Stories," 19.
[339] Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture—Anthropology, Travel Culture and Government*.
[340] John Mack, *Africa and its Cultures*, 66.

by German scholars and curators and other commissioned individuals from Europe. The drive behind the expeditions was to expand the collections of these metropolitan museums so that they could represent discoveries from all corners of the globe. The expeditions were meant to collect from diverse communities, and thereby create leading research and collecting institutions of the world, as is the case of the British Museum and the Smithsonian Institution.

While some curatorial expeditions took place before and during the colonial period, some still continued even after independence with the consent of new governments and curators. The British Museum indicated that quite often their collecting, particularly in the contemporary period, was with the permission of postcolonial African states. The local curators even after independence in their postcolonial museums had their own post-independence pre-occupations and were more than willing to assist curatorial work by the British Museum and provide export certificates.[341]

Besides curatorial expeditions, the British Museum and all these early museums also used other avenues to accumulate objects. Besides commissioned collectors buying from the art market and dealers, there were also those who voluntarily surrendered their collections to the museum, those who loaned the museum either permanently or temporarily, and those who bequeathed collections to the museums. Some of these collections have been named after these individual collectors or those associated with the collections. One such collection at the British Museum is the Sloane Collection, which is dominated by art pieces from Africa, even though Sloane, the collector, still had pieces from all over the world, representing his travels. The Sloane Collection represents ancient traditions and were mostly collected before 1753. This was the age of "intellectual arrogance" in which scholars competed through their intellectual prowess.[342]

Another notable collector was Emil Torday. Torday was an independent Hungarian Ethnographer who did work in Africa between 1875 and 1937. He collected from Central Africa in Zaire (DRC today), which was under the Belgian rule. His collections are at the British Museum and still referred to as the Torday Collection. Torday first travelled among Africans as an official trader, and later he led expeditions and documented the people and objects he collected. According to John Mack, Torday also took some photographs for the

[341] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 60.
[342] Hermann J. Braunholtz, *Sir Hans Sloane and Ethnography*, (London: British Museum Press, 1970), 17.

illustration of his collections and to authenticate his accounts. The only challenge with his documentation, however, has been the corrupted use of local names and terms, a common mistake by many other colonial officials and scholars.[343] Torday collected during the time when Africa was still being referred to as 'The Dark Continent'. It was in the same vein that he was appointed an official to the Congo by the Belgian government. During his assignment in the Congo, he travelled to all parts of the country, collected, and researched. In 1904 he connected with the British Museum and that is how his collections ended up there. Most of the collections from this region found at the British Museum were collected by Torday. The region was dominant in wooden objects, ivory, and crafts covering diverse aspects of human life.[344]

3.2.5 Scholars and Researchers

Before the independence of many African states, there were many outsiders devoted to the study of local peoples and the migration of objects took place during these scholarly visits. Scholars were from different parts of the world, while African scholars also did research from their different institutions of study and duty.[345] Apart from scientists, there were anthropologists, historians, and archaeologists; they also studied landscapes. According to Kings Phiri, a retired professor of history from the University of Malawi, the colonial administration did not emphasise the cultural side of life. However, alongside all the research done, a lot of cultural material was taken back to Europe. Phiri talked about the number of anthropologists doing research in Africa and how they removed human remains in the process. He thinks that this explains the current repatriation of human remains by Ghanaian and Tanzanian communities for reburial, royal honour, rehumanisation and re-unification in the spiritual world.[346]

In the same light, some objects were removed illicitly by researchers for many different reasons. Some were declared and permission were sought to take them out with a promise to return, which was never done. For example, the first precious stone samples after the discovery of the Debswana diamond mine were taken to Wits University for further research and analysis. These never came back, and they are now part of Botswana's diasporic collections at Wits. In

[343] John Mack, *Emil Torday and the Art of the Congo*, (Washington: University of Washington Press, 1990), 5–7.
[344] John Mack, *Emil Torday and the Art of the Congo*, 11–16.
[345] Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[346] Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015. See also Margaret Read, *Children of Their Fathers: Growing Up Among The Ngoni of Nyasaland*, (London: Meuthuen & Co., 1959).

2018, there was prediction of the fall of some lunar formations in the Central Kgalagadi Game Reserve. Research parties of experts from different countries, including Botswana, hastened to the Central Kgalagadi Game Reserve. By the time they got there, a meteorite collector had already been there posing as a researcher and had left immediately. The suspicion is that he must have found something and left with it before being discovered.[347]

3.2.6 Punitive Expeditions

These were common among imperial powers, and were mostly undertaken by military force to carry out punishment or restore order on resisting and rebellious communities and states. The subdued groups would in the process lose their cultural property as soldiers plundered for the imperial power. Many documented artefacts at the British Museum indicate that soldiers collected them during punitive expeditions. Many such collections at the British Museum were from Ethiopia, collected in 1866, 1939, and 1928 during punitive raids against the Ethiopian people. As a result, Ethiopia has one of the largest collections at the British Museum.[348] Some of the objects collected from punitive expeditions by British soldiers were sold in public auctions and the British Museum bought these. Objects from Benin and Nigeria in 1897 were collected through this method.[349] The Hendrik Witbooi bible, diaries and some of his other treasures were collected through a punitive raid against the Nama people of Namibia by German soldiers in 1893. This attests to the displacement of the heritage of the Nama people.[350] Bénédicte Savoy and Charlotte Guichard supported this argument by pointing out that looted objects went through many different stages, particularly the looting of royal courts. They moved from being royal court possessions or regalia to looted objects that went into the Western market and were finally deposited in museums as ethnographic displays.[351]

Jonathan Fine gave an extensive view of collecting by different forces in Africa and how this is reflected by the African collections found at his museum. Fine is the curator for African Collections at the Berlin Museum of Ethnography (Staatliche Museums of Berlin), founded in the 1880s. Most of the artefacts housed in this museum are from German ex-colonies. Royal collections were given as gifts and some were looted during punitive expeditions. German

---

[347] Nonofo Mosesane (Chief curator, Botswana National Museum) in conversation with the author, 2017.

[348] Peter Hamil (Curator at British Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015. See also information from the British Museum Website; Christopher Spring, *Africa: Arms and Armour*, (London: British Museum Press, 1993).

[349] John Mack, *Emil Torday and the Art of the Congo*, 27.

[350] Dag Henrichsen, "Cape Cross? African Places—History and Stories," 18–19.

[351] Bénédicte Savoy and Charlotte Guichard, "Acquiring Cultures and Trading Value in a Global World," 8.

experts also collected a lot, mostly before World War II. Most of the collections are from West or East Africa, with a little from Malawi, South Africa, Lesotho, and Swaziland. Curatorial expeditions also followed later to collect, particularly from the colonies of Togo, Southwest Africa, Tanganyika, Cameroon, Rwanda, and Burundi. Some of the collections were bought from auctions in London and elsewhere, explaining the presence of collections from non-German colonies. Through their gifting, African royals gave some of their most prized artefacts in this museum to the German kings, but some of the collections were acquired through punitive expeditions.[352]

Italy is another example of the play by different collectors and the diversity of the collections amassed. This can be seen during a visit to the Museum of Culture (MUDEC) in Milan. The museum has a lot of African collections, including a large collection of copper bracelets raided from West Africa and to be melted in a foundry but ending up in a museum instead. Most of the collections at the museum are from North and West Africa and from private individuals who donated or sold the collections to the museum. The storage at the MUDEC Museum is organised according to the geographical locations of collecting and material. One of the important donors was a doctor who stayed and worked in Africa and who bought from local artists and gave his collection to the museum. The museum has curators on the African collections that do all the research on the objects in the African collection.[353]

An analytical reflection on the different collectors and the different methods employed to collect reveals that, through this migration, the artefacts were taken from their cultural context where the locals had used them for different communal, spiritual, ceremonial and personal functions. These were instead displayed in museums and art galleries for public viewing and amusement. Some moved completely from private spaces, where their use was revered and were only used once in a while for rituals, to be used in public spaces where they lost their spiritual meaning. Some of the artefacts were exhibited in public galleries while some were put up at auctions for sale, which is one method the British Museum used to acquire some of its vast collections.

Even after independence and in cases where ex-colonial masters undertook expeditions, there was still no equality in encounters and the exchange was not balanced. While the collections

[352] Jonathan Fine (Curator, Staatliche Museum of Ethnography) in conversation with the author, 2016.

[353] MUDEC Museum, "Documentation Information on African Collections at the MUDEC Museum of Culture," (Milano: MUDEC, 2016 July).

were to be shared with the whole world in accordance with the notion of universality, the source country still had no access and was not acknowledged as an equal partner or owner by the recipient museums. Any mention of them was in the indication that the collecting institution had managed to diversify its collections and to traverse undiscovered territories to collect. According to the different communities of provenance interviewed in Malawi, South Africa, Botswana and Nigeria, the universality component as perceived by UNESCO/ICOM is not based on equality and will relegate the African partners to a second position in the partnership, while the current owners of the collections dictate the terms and conditions. According to Prince Shyllon, an art collector and lawyer from Nigeria, the sharing proposed by the British Museum is not enough and not fair because it does not give the African partner due respect. The African partner is also not given the dignity and the much-deserved superior title as the legal owner of the objects. The African owner or partner has to be in control but does not have equal control.[354] An equal partnership with the British Museum and the many other potential European partners in the proposed collaboration might be sought, rather than the second position relegated to African museums in the collaborations so far.[355] The proposed sharing by UNESCO here is the contemporary form but lacks fairness and equality, friendship and reciprocity as espoused by Mauss. It did not build harmony and social bonds.[356] It is only now with the cultural reawakening among African states that they realised that what really belongs to them is in fact in foreign museums and not their own museums. They have not been acknowledged as co-owning the cultural property and this in turn is wrongly interpreted and out of context. This deprived the African museum of its prized collections and rendered them a lower position on the international museological ladder. The finest pieces are in foreign museums and the highest number of collections is also in foreign museums. Even the highest amount of research findings on the same collections is in these foreign museums.

Moreover, a good number of the modern African museums that carry some of the remaining collections are based on collections assembled during the colonial era, essentially for the benefit of the colonisers. Objects were amassed from communities and deposited by generous European collectors at these local colonial museums. The principle guiding their selection and display was that practised in Europe. Buildings erected to house these collections were also of

[354] Prince Shyllon (Art collector and lawyer, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[355] Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[356] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms & Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, 96–97.

European design and architecture.[357] Collections were now moved from the communities and assembled together for display in modern structures under the curatorship of trained personnel. This was, however, to continue perpetuating the alienation of the collections from their original owners and communities of provenance. The above conclusions add to the argument by Savoy and Guichard that the objects were collected for monetary value and the rarity, uniqueness, and aesthetics, not for the qualitative and cultural value of the objects.[358] This rendered the African modern museum an isolated institution, not popular and not frequently visited by the local communities. Jeremy Silvester echoed this sentiment by saying that "the current scenario forces Europe to reflect clearly as to whether they still subscribe to the unethical way used to collect, the stereotypes or to develop new relationships with the countries and communities of origin".[359]

It is this relocation in cultural material that constituted the migration of the African museum to Europe. It is also a clear indication that the modern museum in Europe was greatly enhanced by collections from Africa. Emanuel Charpy discussed the legality and illegality of the cultural migrations and the shifting focus to the universality of heritage and its shareability. She equates the problem of illicit trafficking to other organised transnational crimes and trades.[360] This is an indication that this trade is illegal, which explains the need to investigate this illegal trade by the thesis. This also justifies the need to have some of the material returned back because of the illegality of the transfers.

Natasha Eaton gave a narration of the development of the trade since 1947 and how it affects different areas of the globe as well as its lucrativeness. This period immediately after World War II marks the highest point in the imperialist colonial epoch.[361] The migrated museum becomes not only a communal or national activity, but also a global phenomenon that developed into a universal activity. According to Jeremy Silvester, the growth of the market for cultural property and the migration thereof goes with the enabling environment of mass tourism and is exacerbated by the absence of national legislation to curb such and to allow for punishment to the perpetrators. He concluded that the illicitly trafficked objects are removed

---

[357] Susanne Peters (eds.), *Directory of Museums in Africa*, 32. See also Bogosi Moreetsi, "Countries May Demand the Return of Collections," *The Zebra's Voice*, 26, no. 1 (1999): 26.

[358] Bénédicte Savoy and Charlotte Guichard, "Acquiring Cultures and Trading Value in a Global World," 7.

[359] Jeremy Silvester, "Museum Objects, Memory and Identity in Namibia," 23.

[360] Manuel Charpy, "Trading Places," in *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets*, eds. Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald, (De Gruyter, 2018), 74–76.

[361] Natasha Eaton, "Colonial Iconoclash," in *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets*, eds. Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald, (De Gruyter, 2018), 32–43.

from their context and are equally not situated in their foreign and historic environment, which could be a museum or art gallery. Some end up stored in storerooms for years.[362] Investigations by these experts provide some answers to the core questions addressed by this study. They provide answers to who the perpetrators are and the living cases for restitution. They also provide details of the different ways of migrating cultural property and shed light on the alienation and in-alienation of the migrated objects.

Moreover, the state of being a colony created a perfect environment for the transfer of objects from colonies to the master country. The state of being a colony in this sense meant being under a metropolitan power and a superior power, which had both economic and political control over the lesser state. While the domination was primarily to control resources, other aspects related to the environs of the colonies such as cultural artefacts also became victims to the domination.[363] Colonialism was marked by exploration for territories, resources as well as material culture.[364] This in a way explains the unequal exchanges in the transfer of cultural property throughout all the different exchange processes.[365] It is also probably why some heritage managers are still sceptical about sharing. In this context, the colonial encounter has had far reaching consequences. As a matter of fact, a lot of cultural property was lost to the colonial masters through all the different processes described above.

3.2.7 Case Studies

3.2.7.1 Malawi as case study

In Malawi there are many records detailing scientific research by various scholars in Central Africa during the federation years. The records used to be accommodated by the Central Archives and were later redistributed to the archives and Central Registry of Nyasaland in 1926. These were the Governor's records about the collecting and research expeditions taken by British Museum officials. The Natural History section of the Museum took one such expedition to Lake Nyasa and the hinterland in the 1930s to research and to collect specimens of dinosaur fossils and reptiles. The *Natural History Magazine* Vol. III, No. 19 of 1931 was compiled as a follow up to these expeditions. The Trustees of the British Museum published

[362] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network," 111–115.
[363] Philip Curtin et al., *African History: From Earliest Times to Independence*, 372–376.
[364] Merriam–Webster, "Colonialism," (Com: Merriam–Webster, 2018).
[365] Philip Curtin et al., *African History: From Earliest Times to Independence*, 372–376.

this because all the collections and findings were taken to the British Museum. These scientific investigations by the British Museum were centred on Nyasaland and the Lower Shire area. The expeditions comprised comprehensive teams of experts, such as an experienced African geologist Dr Parkinson and an archaeologist F.W.H. Migeod, who also looked at rock art and paintings.[366] The research also covered Tanganyika, Kenya and Uganda. All this was done with support from the Trustees of the British Museum. The British Museum expeditions were in most cases assisted by local colonial officials, the white settlers, "trained natives" and the colonial government, which even availed a steamboat for navigating Lake Nyasa and the Shire River.[367] The team also made botanical collections and reptile collections.

While the British presence was visible in Malawi, European powers had different spheres of influence, and sometimes they competed for a prime area. For example, the Germans and the British focussed on Central Africa, Nyasaland, Tanganyika and Southern Africa while the Portuguese were in Mozambique and Angola.[368] Between 1909 and 1911, three expeditions were also sent from the Berlin Museum to Nyasaland or the land which by then was German East Africa to research and collect. All the collections were later exhibited at the Berlin Museum. Hence there were a number of forces exploring this region. John Mack indicated that:

> This era of collecting and wanting to be supreme in collecting, collecting the best in the remotest areas was just "The Scramble for Africa" in terms of cultural property amassment and spheres of influence the same. This explains the evidence of fierce competition with the Germans, the Portuguese and other parties over who researched more, had the best findings and collected more, also the rarest pieces.[369]

It was only after the end of World War I, when territories under German influence fell under British rule, that the later engaged in independent and competition-free expeditions. From then on, many British expedition teams started visiting Nyasaland, Tanganyika, Kenya and Uganda to collect and excavate. This finally led to the founding of the British Museum East Africa Fund. The expedition team members were mostly curators from the British Museum.

Another key player in the history of collecting in Malawi is David Livingstone, and this goes beyond his work as a missionary. When he arrived in the Shire region of Malawi, trade in slaves was rife. He was touched and he started lobbying for the intervention of his government to help

---

[366] The Governor's Records, "Expeditions by British Museum Officials," (Natural History Section, 1930), 98.
[367] The Geological Survey Department, *Natural History Magazine* III, no. 19 (1931): 98.
[368] Donald Fraser, *The New Africa*, (London: Edinburgh House Press, 1927), 67.
[369] John Mack, *Emil Torday and the Art of the Congo*, 27.

put an end to the slave trade. He opted for the promotion of trade in commodities and in free trade instead. The slave trade was exacerbated by wars among African groups. The supreme groups sold the defeated ones into slavery.[370] That is evidence of the existing links between the two trades, that of objects and of human beings and also that the trade in cultural property has come a long way. He was able to free some of the slaves and took them to Lovedale College in South Africa. He managed to negotiate with the Yao and Chewa chiefs to stop the slave trade. Livingstone helped facilitate the transition from the slave trade to free commerce and at the same time invite more white missionaries to settle in the Shire/Lake Malawi region. These also included traders, travellers, hunters and researchers. He was therefore a key player in instigating the collecting of objects through all those that he invited until his death in 1873.[371]

This does not, however, mean that David Livingstone is the only missionary that facilitated the migration of cultural property. There were many other characters such as Robert Moffat and Rev. Willoughby. There were many such missionaries in many regions of Africa and from different denominations. It is only because of the many Southern African countries that Livingstone traversed, the monuments and towns named after him, and the ensuing collaborations that came up as a result of him, that David Livingstone seems to have an upper hand in the discussion. Even the team led by Cullen Young that was sent by the Royal Geographical Society to investigate the death of Livingstone did research and collected artefacts and specimens.[372] As a result of the link created by Livingstone, the Church of Scotland also researched Africa. The Fraser family in Scotland also undertook a many expeditions and research in Africa, and they should also have some collections and have a lead on what was collected and where it is today.[373] The quest, however, is to establish the link between Donald Fraser, a colonial official in Nyasaland, and the Fraser family in Scotland. This constitutes another grey area open to investigation.

A report by P.A. Cole-King of the Malawi Government Department of Antiquities highlights the number of expeditions that were taken by colonists into the interior and their interaction with black communities in Nyasaland. The expeditions were for investigations, research and collecting cultural property to take back home or to established regional sister museums. There are a number of objects from Nyasaland at the Iziko Museums, which demonstrates the

[370] Chichiri Museum, Documentation records for "David Livingstone Exhibition," (Blantyre: Chichiri Museum, 2015 October).
[371] Chichiri Museum, Documentation records for "David Livingstone Exhibition," (Blantyre: Chichiri Museum, 2015 October).
[372] P.A. Cole-King, *The Livingstone Search Expedition, 1867*.
[373] Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.

exchanges between the colonies and the protectorates, the network of research and the dominance of early regional museums. The three key missions along the Shire River invited by Livingstone brought white people to the area. These in turn studied the different peoples of Nyasaland and collected the cultural property that is today found at the National Museum of Scotland, the British Museum or other European museums.[374]

Sources also point to specialised studies that allowed for the removal of cultural property. These were studies mostly by anthropologists who could stay for long periods. Alongside this, they collected cultural artefacts and sent them back home. Colonial officials and missionaries from the same region assisted anthropologists. One missionary station could cover a wide region. This explains why research publications and collectors covered North and Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Tanganyika, Mozambique and the Transvaal.[375]

In all the different modes of transfer for cultural property, colonial officials had a very strong hand in aiding or facilitating cultural migrations. Some of the agents of the migrations, like David Livingstone, wore different hats. One such character was Rangeley, a District Commissioner in Malawi. Rangeley's papers indicate that he was an anthropologist, historian, colonial administrator and missionary. He contributed through his narratives and personal documents on the culture and history of Nyasaland's peoples. Rangeley's focus area was missionary work, commerce and the establishment of the British Empire. As a result of his work as a colonial officer, he managed to make extensive explorations and wrote books on the local people. Collecting was obviously a part of his local travels and research expeditions. All the collections went to England and to colonial regional museums. He travelled extensively in Nyasaland, looking for plants, rock paintings and archaeological remains. He published in journals back home as well as the *Nyasaland Journal*, and he also founded the Society of Malawi in 1946, also referred to as the Nyasaland Society. So, just like Livingstone, Rangeley was instrumental in researching and collecting in Malawi. Rangeley collected a lot of cultural material from the Ngoni and Yao.[376]

Africans were later invited to document their own history and culture, mostly after independence. At the same time in the UK, there were special organisations and institutions interested in African issues, both history and social issues. Scholars from these institutions and

[374] P.A. Cole-King, *The Livingstone Search Expedition, 1867*.
[375] P.A. Cole-King, *The Livingstone Search Expedition, 1867*.
[376] P.A. Cole-King, *The Livingstone Search Expedition, 1867*.

those that were commissioned came in large numbers to research and to collect, and Nyasaland was one of their focus areas.[377] A period of renaissance in writing about African history, culture and ways of life began. That is why societies and publishing houses were established in Malawi and other African countries and in Europe to promote the documentation of Africans from all angles.[378] The formation of the Society of Malawi by Rangeley around the same time (in 1946) places it in a good position to have a lot of records on the early history of Nyasaland and periphery. The society facilitated the establishment of the Museum of Nyasaland, whose artefacts were later given to the current Museums of Malawi. Today, the society occupies an old historical building and runs an archive and a library. The Society of Malawi exists to further scholarly interest in Malawi and to help preserve Malawi's history and cultural heritage.[379]

There were many such characters in many African countries and they worked in close cooperation, exchanging notes and collections. Interestingly, most of the names, such as D.K. Oldman and the Christy Collection, connected to the collecting in Malawi (Nyasaland), Botswana, and the South African Museum in Cape Town also feature in association with some collections at the British Museum. This is evidence of the link between the neighbouring colonies and the colonial master. Rangeley worked closely with other scholars such as Thomas Cullen Young,[380] Desmond Clark,[381] and many others that are mentioned in connection with the many different collections found in the early museums of the region and those of the global North. Rangeley and the others were therefore instrumental in the promotion of the mother country as well as the establishment of earlier institutions (museums) in their respective areas of operation.[382]

The Cox Collection of Malawi was migrated in the same way by the Cox brothers, plantation farmers Theodore and Victor. They collected over many years and transferred objects to England. The collection was later migrated to the US by one of the family members where it ended up at the Whatcom Museum in Bellingham. After gaining independence, the government and intellectuals from the country started asking for its return. The repatriation was realised in

[377] Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[378] Cullen Young and Kamuzu B. Hasting (Eds.), *Our African Way of Life*, (1946). See also Cullen Young and Kamuzu B. Hasting (Eds.), *Our African Way of Life*, (2008).
[379] Lovemore Mazibuko (Director, National Museums of Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[380] Thomas Cullen Young was a Scottish anthropologist and missionary who did work in Malawi.
[381] Clark was a scholar who did work in Nyasaland and the two Rhodesias, and he also features in the Botswana collections and history.
[382] Donald Fraser, *Winning a Primitive People: Sixteen Years Work Among the Warlike Tribes of the Ngoni and the Senga and Tumbuka Peoples of Central Africa*.

1989 through the facilitation of a Malawian ally in the US, Dr Donal Brody.[383] The collection is referred to as the Cox Collection and is now with the Chichiri Museum in Blantyre.[384] Like all other collections by individuals, it is referred to by the name of the collector. Some of the collections were transferred by David Steward Mogg, a Central African historian, author and researcher who specialised in Malawian history. He collected a lot of objects during his travels in the country. He collected for private use and later donated his collection to museums and universities, but most of the collections were later returned to Malawi.[385]

Another important point of reference in the Malawian colonial collections' history is Margaret Reed. She studied the history of the Ngoni people of Malawi (writing two books) and some collections were amassed during her research travels and transported to both sister colonies and institutions in the UK. According to Thomas Cullen Young, the first white people in Malawi were whites from the UK. The earlier Arabs were traders and were trading from a different coastal base. Hence, apart from the sister colonies, most of the cultural property went to the UK, which explains why this study has chosen the British Museum as a reference point alongside the enquiry on Nigeria, Malawi, South Africa and Botswana

Desmond Phiri offered a reflection on the different scholars that worked in Malawi. The question that he asked is "what and how much cultural material did they take from Malawian ethnic groups?" Cullen Young was a resident scholar and a missionary working in Malawi. The same applies to Mrs Windbush, who was another key player, scholar and resident collector. While individual scholars visited the area, there were also many other expeditions supported by companies, educational institutions and universities that went into the interior of Africa. Some were through an order from the master country, Britain. One expedition worth noting is the Leaky[386] expedition sent to collect and research, which also covered Malawi.[387]

Cultural migrations, the underdevelopment of the African museum, and the enhancement of European museums and those that they established in the colonies are key developments in the Malawian colonial story. The Malawian museum's ex-director, G. Kumwenda argued that the Malawian museum situation was different. According to him, this is because Malawi did not inherit any museums from the colonial regime. Most of the objects collected in the early years

---

[383] He was a friend of President Kamuzu Banda and wrote his biography, having lived in Malawi for many years before relocating to the US.
[384] Mthotha C. Tamonda, "The Cox Collection; Museums of Malawi and the Politics of Repatriation 1892–2016."
[385] Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[386] Richard Frere Leaky was a Kenyan paleoanthropologist and was to become the Director of the National Museums of Kenya.
387 Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.

had been deposited in museums abroad or in neighbouring states. According to him, the highlights in the development of museums in Malawi, particularly after independence, were to engage in a programme of awareness by the museums. They revised their storage system and created more storage space for all the new collections from the communities because of the awareness exercise. The other strategy was to benchmark with neighbouring country museums for new awareness programmes, such as the Mobile Museum Programme of Botswana, which had proved to be a success and was admired by other African countries.[388] This is the same route taken by the Botswana National Museum. Since Botswana did not inherit a colonial museum, after initiating its own Museum, the country started with awareness campaigns for the community through *kgotla* meetings and the Mobile Museum Programme. This was meant to create awareness, teach Batswana about the museum and for appreciation and interests in the new concept and institution.

3.2.7.2 Nigeria as case study

It is the large presence of Nigerian artefacts observed on visits to the British Museum that prompted the enquiry into Nigeria as a case study alongside the Botswana story. The visit to Nigeria for the research was undertaken in December 2015. The enquiry was mostly based on oral interviews with government officials from relevant ministries as well as heritage managers from the museums and other heritage institutions, art collectors and heritage specialists. Based on a summary of Nigerian objects at the British Museum, Peter Odey, the Deputy Director of the Nigerian Commission of Museums, indicated that as a way of implementing the two ratified conventions, the Nigerian government tried several options for the return of its cultural property. According to him, this was first through confrontation and later legal action, but all these failed. The government then devised another strategy. In 2010, it established a Repatriation Unit, headed by Mr Odey himself. The unit is charged with the responsibility to coordinate efforts of repatriation of Nigerian objects abroad. However, since its formation it only managed to take off in 2012. Through this unit, the Nigerian government has embarked on a new culture of collaboration with all European and American museums that have its collections.[389]

---

[388] M.G. Kumwenda (ex-director for the Museums of Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[389] Peter Odey (Deputy Director of the Nigerian Commission of Museums) in conversation with the author, 2015.

Odey highlighted that the Nigerian museums have so far had dialogue with museums abroad that are keeping Nigeria's cultural property, more especially the Benin bronzes and crafts, namely Switzerland, Chicago, Berlin, Austria, Germany, the Netherlands and the British Museum. All the discussions have so far yielded results. The museums under discussion have agreed to release some of the finest pieces for exhibition in Nigeria. The concerned countries also agreed to help intercept traffickers holding Nigerian objects in their cities and borders and to repatriate these objects to Nigeria. So far, since the beginning of this exercise, about 100 objects have been returned to Nigeria; this is a success story.[390] According to Edith Ekunke, the Nigerians have had exchange exhibitions with these countries, staff exchanges, and travelling exhibitions. They have also had workshops on how to chart a way forward for a shared ownership. However, with the change of leadership in the Nigerian museum setting, all these efforts have been stalling.[391] This is lamented by Nigerian museum curators because they appreciated the progress made towards restitution, dialogue and collaborations initiated by the former directors.

Ekunke maintained that there has been much effort to follow up on Nigerian collections in the diaspora by the former Director General of Museums, Professor Epkweyo. The Director General tried to retrieve some of the artefacts from open markets abroad and some were seized at airports and borders. He also bought Nigerian objects from individual traffickers and dealers. Contact and dialogue was opened with many museums and as a result some museums abroad have returned some of the artefacts. All these are quite recent cases involving traffickers and the Nigerian government. This involves objects taken through vandalism, break-ins in at museums, and illegal excavations. Some of the traffickers in the Nigerian case are insiders, citizens and curators who know the value of these objects in foreign markets. This is exacerbated by the fact that there are good markets abroad. As a result, locals buy objects cheaply from the communities and smuggle them out of the country for sale abroad.[392] Some of the Nigerian objects in foreign museums were therefore taken by fellow Nigerians.[393]

The Nigerian government is now working on establishing an inventory of the diasporic objects to act as a guide in the quest for the return of its cultural property and the opening of dialogue. Minin Alhaji Nagya, the Deputy Director of the National Library, also thought that other

[390] Peter Odey (Deputy Director of the Nigerian Commission of Museums) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[391] Edith Ekunke (Director of the National Museum in Lagos) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[392] Edith Ekunke (Director of the National Museum in Lagos) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[393] Edith Ekunke (Director of the National Museum in Lagos) in conversation with the author, 2015.

African countries need to develop a road map of the entire heritage that is in the diaspora. This will help in the justification of a budget by governments and museums for the fight against the illegal transfer of objects and their repatriation. The Nigerians have even put some of their collections online for ease of access.[394] Edith Ekunke indicated that alongside restitution is the awareness raising done by ICOM and UNESCO. That is why now it is not easy to openly sell objects in international markets. Dealers have to exercise due diligence and authenticate information before acquiring objects. According to Ekunke, all the efforts at restitution in Nigeria are making an impact, even though it is not complete. The developed export certificate is also quite effective.[395] The export certificate is signed by the museums before individuals can be allowed to export anything of cultural value outside Nigeria. The National Museum in Lagos has provided an office for the export certificate and the signature is appended by museum curators and administrators. All the other museums in the country have the same certificate and can sign to allow for transparency.[396]

However, despite all the declarations by museums that hold Nigerian heritage, some people, such as Prof. Okonkwo of Ghana, still feel that the European and American museums are not declaring everything they have. Prince Shyllon shared this view and according to him and from his legal point of view (as a lawyer by training), African countries should ascertain where the collections are. This should be followed up by opening dialogue with the current owners and making them agree that the Africans have legal ownership of the collections and that title deed belongs to them while the host countries have equitable ownership. This should be followed by financial funding from the cosmopolitan power or concerned museum for the development of contemporary African museums. This is a museum of an acceptable and universal standard so that the heritage managers can continue the legacy of best practice for the returned collections. In this way, the African museum could get out of the shame of underdevelopment and the maintenance trap that has engulfed some of the museums as a result of colonialism.[397]

Through all the efforts by Nigeria, some countries have already submitted the collections they have and their numbers that is originally from Nigeria. Some of the repatriated collections are

[394] Minin A. Nagya (Deputy Director, National Library, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[395] Edith Ekunke (Director of the National Museum in Lagos) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[396] Edith Ekunke (Director of the National Museum in Lagos) and Jafaru Y. Dauda (Director of Research Planning & Publication of the National Commission of Museums, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[397] Prince A. Shyllon (Art collector and lawyer, Nigeria) and Folarin Shyllon (Law professor at the University of Ibadan) in conversation with the author, 2015.

at the National Museum in Lagos. Following is a list of some of the repatriated objects displayed at the Lagos National Museum:

- Bronze memorabilia, seated bronze, bronze Oba head, bronze head with cowrie, bronze head
- Bronze plaque, bronze memorial head, bronze helmet head, bronze tripod figure, bronze queen bush, bronze Oba head, ivory tapper (irokifa), ivory head, terracotta ritual pot, terracotta Ifa head
- Wooden gelede mask, wooden fertility figure, bronze queen head, wooden ayo game, ivory tapper (arokeifa), ivory plaque, bronze leopard face, bronze ritual pot, fly whisk, bronze hunter
- Wooden figure, wooden slave figure, bronze alter ring, bronze plaque, bronze pendant, bronze figure, a Portuguese soldier, an aquamanile leopard, A ritual platform with …, a bronze python, a bronze flute, an aquamanile bronze, a bronze memorial, a bronze plaque
- A Benin messenger, a bronze kneeling female, an aquamanilla leopard, a bronze Benin chair, a bronze bell, an Igboukwu bronze bowl with lid dated 13/03.13, but it is not clear as to whether this was the documentation date or date for return of the object. There is also no indication of where the objects were coming from and perhaps the background to the return process.[398]

A good example of the migrated objects of Nigeria is the Benin bronzes, many of which are in the British Museum. According to Torday, "in 1800, the Benin Empire was a hot bed of artistic skills and the British wanted a piece of it". As a result, in 1887 British trading expeditions were sent to the Benin Kingdom and they destroyed and looted many treasures particularly the bronzes.[399] The trading, curatorial and scientific expeditions into the Benin Empire were not meant for reciprocal and equal exchange. This was therefore a completely different type of object transfer and nothing compared to that which existed among the precolonial societies, which was meant to build relations and bonding among communities.

Even today the Benin bronzes stand out as the most prized trafficked objects of that period, simply because the early Benin Kingdom was one of the most powerful states, which was later conquered by the British through force. As a result, artworks were taken by the British for the

[398] Lagos National Museum, Museum Documentation on Colonial Collections, (Lagos: Lagos National Museum, 2015).
[399] Barbara Plakensteiner, *Benin: Kings and Rituals: Court Arts from Nigeria*, (Chicago: Chicago Press, 2008).

British Museum and others. The main focus for many of the punitive raids organised by European powers, more especially the British into the Benin Kingdom, was to loot the Benin bronzes. However, lately, there have been conversations between Nigeria and these countries and museums that house the bronzes, and agreements to collaborate towards the future promotion and protection of the bronzes, if not to return them, have been made.[400] Rassool, however, maintained that the partnerships with African countries and museums have been a strategy by cosmopolitan museums, such as the British Museum, to counteract the demands for repatriation by African countries. The partnerships were packaged with training, temporary loans of the colonial objects and exchange exhibitions, and this still perpetuated relations of dependency. Unfortunately, the emergence of these partnerships put an end to earlier partnerships through the SAMP, AFRICOM, Centre for Heritage Development in Africa, and Prevention in Museums in Sub-Saharan Africa.[401]

The issue of internally instigated migrations is a historical one because of the economic pressure on the citizens and a result of the historical economic imbalance between the global North and the global South resulting from colonialism. Because Nigeria is a seaport country, particularly the Lagos and Port Harcourt harbours, there has been easy access by foreign powers and this explains the high number of objects abroad and particularly at the British Museum. Through the contact led by the early traders, the Arabs and through the slave trade, the illegal movement of cultural property was initiated. The worst problem for the Nigerian state was therefore easy access from the sea by the foreign powers. The richness and splendour of the early Kingdoms of the Ife, Benin, Ogun, Osono, which carried with them a lot of wealth and treasurers, exacerbated the interest and trafficking of the cultural property by outsiders.[402]

However, all efforts by the Nigerian government to the combat the illegal transfer of cultural property, restitution, dialogue and collaborations are commendable. Other African states such as Botswana could learn from their example. The Restitution Unit, Export Certificate, online collections, and the inventory of diasporic collections are all milestones.

---

[400] Peter Odey (Deputy Director of the Nigerian Commission of Museums) in conversation with the author, 2015.

[401] Ciraj Rassool, "Building a Critical Museology in Africa," in *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe*, eds. Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere, (Bielefeld: transcript-Verlag, 2018), xxii.

[402] Global Security.org, "Nigeria—Early History," https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/nigeria/history-01.htm. These early states included the Yoruba Kingdoms, the Edo Kingdom of Benin, the Hausa Cities and Nupe. These were complemented by numerous other smaller states.

3.3 THE BRITISH MUSEUM

The British Museum is one of the first and most advanced museums in the world, founded in 1753. It has a diverse and rich scope of colonial holdings. Over the years, it has been able to purchase very rare pieces of material. It has also been able to buy ahead of the market and to collect in areas that no scholar, commercial investigator nor European competitor had reached before.[403] This is a prestigious position that the museum has enjoyed for decades. This explains why the call for the decolonisation of the museum, the debates around the restitution of cultural property as a way of correcting colonial wrongs did not sit well with the British Museum. The counter action that followed from many other European museums was to start posing as having collected for humanity, universality and that this was a shared heritage.[404] This explains partnerships with many African museums and other parts of the world from which its collections came, as discussed by Julie Hudson [405]

According to McLeod, a resident curator, the British Museum is an institution that collected materials to aid the comparative study of cultures around the world. This explains its focus on collecting from many different areas besides Africa. But by default, the collections have over the years moved from this comparative study material to curios, now attracting millions of visitors or tourists. Meanwhile all these treasures had originally been made for different magical, religious, political, historical, spiritual and social purposes by their respective communities and not for aesthetics and curiosity.[406] During its heydays of collecting, the British Museum acquired more objects every year than any other major museum in the world. This explains why the British Museum has been a pivotal part of the enquiry into the migrated museum in this study. It is a good reference point in the study for the migration of cultural property.

3.3.1 A Synopsis of African Collections at the British Museum

Anglophone African countries have more collections at the British Museum than Francophone ones, but there are exceptional cases such as Mali. The collections are mostly from the British

[403] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 15–16.

[404] George Okello Abungu, "Connected by History, Divided by Reality. Eliminating Suspicion and Promoting Cooperation between African and European Museums," in *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe: A New Field for Museum Studies*, eds. Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere (transcript-Verlag, 2018), 33. See also Ciraj Rassool, "Building a Critical Museology in Africa," xxi.

[405] Julie Hudson, Senior Museum Curator, British Museum in conversation with the researcher

[406] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 10–12.

Empire or spheres of influence. The sample countries are represented by Nigeria, Malawi and South Africa. Nigeria has one of the largest collections at the British Museum, while South Africa and Malawi also have a sizeable number of artefacts at the British Museum. The synoptic view of African collections at the British Museum is meant for contextualisation and comparative analysis of the three sample countries and Botswana. This is to draw a special focus to the display of object migrations and the different players. Surprisingly for Malawi, it has a fairly small number of collections at the British Museum as indicated in the survey below. I believe there would be more in Scotland.

3.3.1.1 Malawi

Malawi has a documented number of 1 184 artefacts, including collections by Sir Henry Christy, Sir Harry Hamilton,[407] John Kimberly, and the Livingstone expeditions. The Henry Christy Collection of Malawi is a special collection by Christy, who collected in many parts of Africa and all over the world.[408] There is, therefore, a huge number of collections from Africa by Christy hosted by the British Museum. These were donated to the Museum when he died. In some instances, however, it is not clear where the objects were from because the area and scope of collection covered many countries at a time and the cultures were the same among neighbouring African communities and countries. For example, an expedition to Nyasaland would cover Tanganyika, Kenya, Uganda and sometimes the two Rhodesias as part of the Federation. In this case, what belonged to one country was mistakenly documented under another. Some of the objects were documented in groups and hence the totals could be much bigger than what is given. This justifies the current drive to do provenance research on these colonial holdings. This is to get past the "politics of identification", which is a problem faced by many of the global North museums holding these colonial collections.[409] Some of the objects were taken from slave caravans, either abandoned after being defeated, particularly in British Central Africa. There is an outstanding collection from the Yao people of Malawi, even though they are a shared community, which results in objects being registered under other countries while they are originally from Malawi.

---

[407] Hamilton is one of the scholars who did research in Malawi during and after the colonial period.

[408] British Museum, Documentation records on Botswana & African Collections at the British Museum. (London: British Museum, 2015). Also refer to the British Museum website: https://www.britishmuseum.org/

[409] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network. 'Museum Collections make Connections' between Europe and Africa: A Case Study of Finland and Namibia," 119.

3.3.1.2 Nigeria

Nigeria has a record of around 13 000 cultural artefacts, mostly from the Igbo and other peoples. However, some artefacts are not specified according to country and are just labelled as Africa, and it is not clear which country they come from one and only a guess. For some, it is not even clear whether they are from Africa or Asia. According to Peter Hamil, a curator at the British Museum, the large Nigerian collection is because of the large presence of the British in Nigeria by the close of the 19th century. This presence was marked by colonial officials, scholars, researchers, and anthropologists who came to research and collect. Some of the artefacts were either donated to the British Museum or sold. Some went to the museum as samples for further research and analysis and were never returned.[410]

3.3.1.3 South Africa

There are 5 080 artefacts from South Africa. This covers objects produced by Sotho, Tswana, Ndebele, Zulu, Venda and other peoples. Collaboration with the British Museum on specific projects or collections is now in the pipeline. The focus group by the collectors in South Africa was the Zulu, and this is evident from the higher number of Zulu objects.

3.3.1.4 Zimbabwe

The British Museum has 2 112 artefacts from Zimbabwe, mostly from the Shona people. These are colonial collections ranging from 1945 and 1949 and from the Cecil John Rhodes era. Some were collections from the Great Zimbabwe era by scholars dating as far back as 1905. There is also evidence of collections from medical schools, probably taken abroad for further analysis and research by school officials; these are also from the Shona. This is probably where there were more missionary work and colonial intervention in the 1880s. But since Zimbabwe has an early museum history, such as that of natural history, at least some of its collections, including that of neighbouring countries, went into its own museums.

[410] Peter Hamil (Curator at British Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015. See also information on the British Museum Website: : https://www.britishmuseum.org/

3.3.1.5 Namibia

Namibia has 349 objects at the British Museum that come from its different peoples. Silvester, however, has a slightly different number of 313 through his Africa Accessioned Network Research.[411] The small number is probably because it was a German territory at the beginning, and hence, a German area of collecting. This would explain the return of a high number of its collections, including human skulls, by the Germans in recent years under the global restitution initiative and decolonial agenda.

3.3.1.6 Kenya

Kenya has 4 939 artefacts at the British Museum, and these are mostly colonial collections from groups such as the Masai, who were a great attraction to white settlers and visitors. The collections date as far back as 1885. These were collected by different individuals and later through curatorial and punitive expeditions. It is highly probable that the latest collections are from recent collaborations between the British Museum and the National Museums of Kenya under the British Museum Africa Programme. Some collections were done after independence through curatorial expeditions and with consent from the government and museum leadership and curators.

3.3.1.7 Tanzania

There is a record of 2 960 objects from Tanzania at the British Museum. This is colonial collections going back to the days of Tanganyika around 1904 and 1914. The collecting was done by colonial officials, through punitive expeditions such as in the Maji wars and through curatorial expeditions. The collecting and the collections also reflect Swahili culture. Tanzania like Kenya reflects a high number of ear ornaments from the Masai. However, as a colonial sphere of the Germans, many of its collections are found in German museums, as reflected by the dinosaur project at the Berlin Museum of Natural History.

3.3.1.8 Mozambique

There are 497 artefacts from Mozambique reflected on the British Museum website. These are colonial as well as modern art collections from 1954 through the period of civil war to the

[411] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network," 112.

present. The collections are from different groups found in Mozambique, including the Makonde who are well known for their wood carvings. There is, however, also evidence of inaccuracy in the total numbers, which could be because of border communities and having been reflected under similar ethnic groups in other countries, for example, the Yao in Mozambique and in Malawi. Some artefacts are counted on the wrong side and this renders inaccurate records as total numbers of artefacts at the British Museum from given countries.

3.3.1.9 Ethiopia

There are a total of 1 793 artefacts from Ethiopia at the British Museum. These are colonial collections with objects dating as far back as 1866, 1928, and 1939. These were collected by the military through punitive expeditions and in other ways, including colonial officials and private collectors. Some of the collections are also from Zanzibar. Outstanding among the Ethiopian collection is the Williams Harold Ingrams Collection that were obviously collected by Harold Ingrams.

3.3.1.10 Sudan

Sudan has about 10 327 objects at the British Museum. These were excavated from the Nubia region and the Ottoman Dynasty. They were donated to the British Museum as part of the Christy Collection. The Sudan Archaeological Research Society also donated some of the artefacts. The Sudanese collection comprises some Shilluk figurines from the Shilluk Kingdom of the White Nile in South Sudan.

3.3.1.11 Ghana

Ghana has 8 734 artefacts at the British Museum, and these are dominated by gold pieces that go back to the period when it was known as the Gold Coast. The collections date back to 1864 to 1915 and from contemporary times. Outstanding is the Armitage Collection. Armitage was a colonial army officer that used punitive raids to collect. The collections are mostly from the Asante region. Individuals, companies also collected from the Asante and other ethnic groups. Kwame Amoah Labi talked about such collections and specimens going from the museum of Achimota, Ghana, to the British Museum for scientific analyses.[412]

[412] Kwame Amoah Labi, "New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa," 165.

3.3.1.12 Uganda

There are 3 023 artefacts from Uganda collected by William Leonard Stevenson and bequeathed to the British Museum in 2001. But there are also collections from other individuals and expeditions, which had also covered Nyasaland, Tanganyika and Kenya, dating as far back as 1932.

3.3.1.13 Congo DRC

There is a record of 8 321 objects from the DRC, mostly from Pigmy communities and collected around 1948. John Mack, a colonial official scholar who later worked for the British Museum, also purchased some collections. Some of the collections are from other ethnic groups such as the Abunda, covered by the 1909 Christy Collection and more recent collections. Quite a good number of collections at the British Museum from the DRC are from medical school museums in Africa; school officials and students probably took these for further analysis and research in the UK. There is also the Tote collection, collected by an anthropologist from Sierra Leone, and the Torday Collection by Torday, a Belgian scholar who collected from the same area for the British Museum.

3.3.1.14 Zambia

Zambia has a record of 2 260 artefacts at the British Museum. There is the D.K. Oldman Collection, which also covers other Southern African countries, including Botswana, collected in 1949. Dominic Oldman researched, collected from and documented the African countries he covered, and his collections were later purchased by the British Museum. His Botswana collections went to the South African Museum, Cape Town. His Zambian collections found at the British Museum are from the Kalombo Falls and from groups such as the Bemba, Lozi, and Ngoni. There is also the Corbeil J. Jacques Collection, sold to the British Museum in 1972. Amongst the collections are also exchanges from the Rhodes Livingstone Museum, which is a fairly early museum, in 1937 to 1961, done in collaboration with the British Museum. There are also donations from the Welcome Historical Medical Museum known as the Welcome Collection, as found in many other African country collections. The artefacts are just general and not related to any particular subject of enquiry or ethnic group. Some of the objects were collected by colonial government officials and white settlers. There is also a few from Southern Rhodesia and the South African Museum, Cape Town, and the University of Cape Town (UCT). The collections from Zimbabwe could signal collaborations and exchanges with the

Natural History Museum of Bulawayo since it is also an early museum. The two countries have shared communities and this could also explain collections from Zimbabwe.

3.3.1.15 Egypt

Egypt has on record 95 362 artefacts. This is so far the largest collection from Africa, followed by Nigeria and the DRC. The numbers also demonstrate the point that North and West African states were the most affected by the cultural migrations as well as postcolonial illicit trafficking. The Egypt Exploration Society donated some collections to the British Museum; these are mostly from ancient Egypt. Well-known archaeologists and armatures have excavated the most recent collections from Egypt. The excavations covered the Nubian era and the late Christian period (from Early Stone Age). These were in some cases collected by companies such as R. J. Moss and Co. from 1890 and 1901, but later given or sold to the British Museum. The companies were sometimes commissioned to collect on behalf of the British Museum.

3.3.1.16 Zanzibar

There is evidence of ethnographic objects such as stools taken from Zanzibar

3.3.1.17 Sierra Leone

Sierra Leone has quite a sizeable number of artefacts at the British Museum. These include figurines from the Mende people.

In summary, Nigeria as a coastal state has recorded some of the earliest contacts with the outside world. The earliest contacts were with the Portuguese explorers. The earliest objects in the British Museum are from that era, and these objects are from Sierra Leone, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Benin and Ghana. These included sculptures, pottery etc. There were also objects from excavations of the many shrines in Nigeria, which were done illegally, and many treasures were taken through looting and punitive expeditions. There is a representation of different objects from the West African region at the British Museum, including ivory and textiles from Cameroon and arts and crafts from Guinea-Bissau.[413] From the DRC, Angola and Gabon there is figurative sculptures. Masks and textiles are also a prominent feature in the cultural heritage of West Africa. All the artworks communicate and represent many life situations and activities

[413] John Mack, *Africa and its Cultures*, 109.

in the life of the West African communities such as birth, initiation, death, marriage and others. The West Africa collections reflect metal working and blacksmithing as a prominent trade in the region, explaining the Benin bronzes and the reference to the Benin Kingdom as a hot bed of artistic skills.[414]

On the other hand, the East and Southern African block as represented by Madagascar, Mozambique, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Sudan, Zanzibar also has an early history of contact with the outside world. The best and earliest collections from Mozambique, for example, came from the first contact with the Portuguese. There is also eminence of rock art and animal imagery in Southern Africa. Traces of these have been found in Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa and Tanzania. Ostrich eggshells on the other hand dominated in Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Malawi and Lesotho. Uganda, on the other hand, is mostly known for body art and textiles.[415] The entire heritage is represented at the British Museum and can obviously also be found in other European museums.

3.4 BOTSWANA COLLECTIONS IN EUROPE AND THE US

While in some countries there are well-recorded cases of how the collections were migrated to Europe, in the Botswana scenario this is not the case, most probably due to the late introduction of the museum. It is only now, with the international focus on illicit trafficking, that a number of cases and declarations are coming up. These have happened through universities, museums, and private companies. One such recent declaration concerns the Botswana-Willoughby collection in the UK. Even the other colonies that did not have colonial museums do not have much documentation of heritage during the colonial period. According to Phiri, more activity in documentation and collecting applied where the colonial officials had established regional museums. But this was always after filling up the collecting needs of the mother country museums, universities, and other institutions. This was a common pattern in many African colonies. The museums were started by the colonisers and they followed the collecting and curation patterns of museums in the mother country. Locals only worked in these new museums as assistants.[416] The method of acquiring, as indicated earlier, sometimes included simply taking, unequal trading, stealing, gifts, bribing, and armed force. The El Negro case of

[414] John Mack, *Africa and its Cultures*, 156–157.
[415] John Mack, *Africa and its Cultures*, 190.
[416] Kings Phiri (retired professor of history, University of Malawi), in conversation with the author, 2015.

Botswana is an instance of the unethical collection of human remains.[417] While traditional African museums have been robbed of their heritage, the collections became culturally decontextualised and alienated for the recipient museum communities. The metropolitan communities did not feel attracted to collections from foreign cultures. Even though the collections are a reflection of an important historical stage, that of colonial and imperial history, the collections are still culturally irrelevant to the host communities. In close analysis, postcolonial scholars of heritage have concluded that foreign collections in metropolitan museums could therefore not be used for deliberations and learning. Their important role was aesthetics and as curios.[418]

In instances where there were attempts at interpretation and provision for debate, alterity was usually displayed around issues of race, subjugated people, tolerance, and bringing enlightenment to the primitive. This generally distorted the presentation and even names were corrupted. One example that stands out as having been a much more representative presentation by the Smithsonian Institution was exhibition *African Voices*. It was a co-curated project, and as a result of the co-curation, the exhibition turned out to be a successful, representative, and properly curated exhibition. This is as compared to other exhibitions done by multi-collection museums such as the Louvre and the British Museum. According to Yoshida Kenji, the African artists and curators who attended the exhibition were happy with what they termed the dialogue enabled by the Smithsonian.[419] The other exhibitions either required the involvement of the communities of provenance, misrepresented or used their own uniformed and stereotyped presentation. In 1989, the Centre for African Art in New York sponsored *Artist/artefact: African Art in Anthropology Collections* and it proved to be a challenging display. The 1989 exhibition *Into the Heart of Africa* held at the Royal Ontario Museum also sparked a controversy.[420] The *African Voices* example proved to be a good model, particularly in the contemporary situation where the conversations among museums of the global North and the global South are around issues of co-curation and the involvement of experts and communities from countries of origin.

This section looks at the database of Botswana's collections that are in the diaspora. This is a reflection of well-known cases, reported cases, and those that are on record. However, of note

[417] Winani Thebele-Kgwatalala, "The Evolution and Development of the Museum in Botswana towards a Heritage Institution," 69–70.
[418] Winani Thebele-Kgwatalala, "The Evolution and Development of the Museum in Botswana towards a Heritage Institution," 64–65.
[419] Kenji Yoshida and John Mack (ed.), *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?*, 2.
[420] Kenji Yoshida and John Mack (ed.), *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?*, 158–164.

is that a huge number of collections abroad have not been recorded, simply because they are not known, no testimony has been made about them, and no record has been found on them. These could be with museums, galleries, individuals and families, having been contemporarily acquired or having been passed on from generation to generation. While some collectors have chosen to surrender their collections to museums at some point, some have chosen to leave them to families. Some have not been recorded because museums that house them have not been open about them for reasons best known to them. Some have just been stacked by collectors and families and forgotten, while some disappeared due to natural disasters. Silvester lamented the fact that "many cultural objects from Africa are entombed in storage vaults of museums in Europe and somewhere else in the world".[421] This is a lot of heritage in the form of objects or records, diaries, memoirs, books, souvenirs; invaluable heritage that is irreplaceable.

Like Nigeria, some African states are contemplating, have created or are creating databases on stolen works of art. A good example is the South African case as emphasised by Christa Roodt and Bernadine Benson in their article on *Databases for Stolen Works of Art.* The article examines databases for stolen art, particularly in the South African post-apartheid era. The authors argue in favour of a centralised database for South Africa because this would assist the market as well as law enforcement structures.[422] They also propose the development of inventories and databases in South Africa and other countries. According to them, cooperation and sharing databases is crucial and could increase compliance with international standards and due diligence. Many heritage managers in the SADC region have been asking for the same. Compliance with the above proposals could help reinstate the integrity of the trade in cultural objects. Access to databases for reference by dealers, law enforcement officers and customs in the investigation of stolen art works and repatriation cases would be easier.[423]

There is also an urgent need to create a diasporic map of Botswana collections abroad so that it can work as a guide for the country and help justify support to museums by government in the future. As a result of the unfortunate situation of loss of cultural property, unrecorded cases, and damaged and lost objects, the survey on Botswana's collections in the diaspora will not be completely reflective of the entire heritage that is outside Botswana's borders. The hope is that

---

[421] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network," 112.
[422] Christa Roodt and Bernadine Benson, "Databases for Stolen Art: Progress, Prospects and Limitations," *South African Crime Quarterly* (2015): 52.
[423] Christa Roodt and Bernadine Benson, "Databases for Stolen Art: Progress, Prospects and Limitations," 52.

for as long as there are collections outside Botswana's borders, fresh records and information will keep coming up for many years to come. The survey will therefore only act as a guide to Botswana's cultural diasporic dispersion. Contested cases will be added to the list, but will only be part of the record after resolution of contestations. Below is a reflection of Botswana's diasporic collections, and details of the collections, their migration and value are given for each case study. This section agrees with some of the lists in this thesis's appendices from museums that have been forthcoming in sharing their Botswana collections lists for the purposes of this study. These museums include the Livingstone Museum in Zambia, the National Museum in Seattle, the Smithsonian Museum of African Art & History, the International Slavery Museum of Liverpool, the British Museum, the Banyoles Museum in Spain, the National Museum in Scotland and the Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum of Cologne.

Here is a list of the know Botswana collections and artefacts in other countries:

- The Swedish Ethnografiska Museum has collections from Botswana, particularly Basarwa artefacts, and there is talk that other Scandinavian museums do too, even though I have not received a list from them. The Stockholm Museum of Ethnography provided a count of 358 objects from Botswana through research by the Africa Accessioned Network Project.[424]
- The Vanersborg Museum in Sweden has collections of birds from Namibia and a few from North Western Botswana. These were collected by the Swedish traveller, researcher and scholar Charles John Anderson, and he gave the bird collection to his hometown Museum of Natural History in Vanersborg. His notes are published in his book titled *Notes on the Birds of Damaraland and the Adjacent Countries of South West Africa.* This was published five years after his death in 1867.[425]
- A Museum in Germany/Munster (*Institute de Planetologie, Wilhelm, Klemm Street, 10, 48149)* houses meteorites from Kuke in Botswana. This was first revealed by experts on meteorites, Dr Ronnie Mackenzie, Mr Paul Botha and Mr Dirk Coetze. These were taken between 1998/99 and are worth USD 5 million. According to the available documentation, "the 11 lunar pieces were purchased from natives", who in this case are the Basarwa people of the Kgalagadi. This article was covered by *The Star* newspaper on 12 January 2010.[426] This revelation came about on the occasion of the expectation that a similar occurrence was

[424] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network," 113.
[425] Charles J. Anderson, *Notes on Birds of Damaraland and the Adjacent Countries of South West Africa*, eds. John H. Gurney, (London: Taylor and Francis, 1973).
[426] Ronnie Mackenzi, Paul Botha and Dirk Coetze, Documents records on Botswana meteorites in Germany, (2005).

going to take place in the Tuli Block in Botswana. This brought a number of experts on meteorites and geological formations to the area, who then shared the news about the presence of Botswana's meteorites in Germany and then availed some documentation on the same.

- The Museum of Natural History in Berlin has scientific collections from Namibia and a bit from the Botswana Kalahari areas bordering Namibia and South Africa. The collector was Leonard T., and according to Holger Stoecker, these were "just a few specimens from the Bushmen/Basarwa" of Botswana.[427]
- There are collections at the Berlin Museum of History because the British Museum records show that they exchanged something from Botswana with this museum. The research study has not been able to establish what type of specimen it is.[428]
- There are Botswana collections at the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum in Cologne, Germany. The Joest Museum provided a list of their Botswana holdings (Appendix 2). It will be worthwhile to explore other museums in Germany for the same because there is a likelihood that they could also have covered Botswana in their regional collections from their ex-colony, Namibia. Some of the known museums in Germany with African/Botswana collections are**:** Dresden Museum of Ethnology, Berlin Natural History Museum, Berlin Museum of History, the Museum in Cologne, Munich museums and the Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum, the Institution de Planetoria in Munster. This is just to give a rough idea of what a given country could have and the number of objects that are held outside.
- The National Museums of Scotland has a record of 47 artefacts from Botswana, which includes a wide range of objects. The acquisition dates range from 1854–1996. These were transferred from Edinburgh University collections. The majority of the collections were acquired through donations or sale between the late 19th and 20th centuries. Donations were mostly from missionaries and researchers. Some artefacts were acquired through military donations, perhaps acquired during punitive raids against the Nama and Herero who fled from the German genocide in Namibia into Botswana. David Livingstone established a Mission Station at Kolobeng in Botswana, and this would explain the existence of collections from Botswana at the National Museum of Scotland. According to the Senior

[427] Holger Stoeker, Curator, Natural History Museum in conversation with the author
[428] British Museum, Documentation records on Botswana & African Collections at the British Museum. (London: British Museum, 2015).

Curator at the Museum, Sarah Warden, this collection does not have any systematic research done on it (See Appendix 2 for the list).[429]

- There are collections at the Banyoles Museum in Spain that were part of the El Negro display collection: a spear, bow and arrow and many more items that have not been mentioned in the El Negro case and documentation.[430]
- There are Botswana collections at the International Slavery Museum and National Museums of Liverpool in the UK. These comprise mostly ethnographic objects (See Appendix 2 for the lists).
- There are collections at the Brighton Museum & Pavilion and other South Eastern museums in the UK. These were transferred by the missionary, Willoughby. Some of these collections are found at museums in Kent, Sussex and Woolwich, where he spent most of his time when in Europe. There are also some missionary records at the University of Birmingham, and SOAS library (See list in Appendix 2).
- The South Kensington Museum probably has collections from Botswana because records at the British Museum show that it donated Tswana artefacts to the British Museum.[431]
- The Kew Botanical Garden will also have objects from Botswana because they have also donated some artefacts from Botswana to the British Museum, as shown in the British Museum records.[432]
- There are Botswana collections at the newly reconstructed Weltmuseum Wien of Anthropology in Vienna, Austria. The museum was established in 1876 at the Hofburg Palace and houses more than 400 000 ethnographic objects from Africa, Asia, Oceania and America. There is evidence that the collector Rudolf Poch, an anthropologist, collected from the Ngamiland region of Botswana and in other neighbouring states. Amongst his collections at the Weltmuseum Wien, there is even evidence of pictures of Herero women of the Tsau village in the Ngamiland District of Botswana.[433]
- There are about 412 artefacts from Botswana at the British Museum. Most of the collection is visuals or modern art collections from exhibitions and artists in Botswana, purchased by the British Museum in recent years. These are from artists such as Anne Gollifer, Velias

[429] Sarah Warden (Senior Curator, National Museum of Scotland) in conversation with the author, 2017.
[430] Bruce Bennett, "Dead Bodies on Display: El Negro in Cross-Cultural Perspective."
[431] British Museum, Documentation records on Botswana & African Collections at the British Museum. (London: British Museum, 2015).
[432] British Museum, Documentation records on Botswana & African Collections at the British Museum. (London: British Museum, 2015).
[433] Joy Slapping and Claudia Augustat, "A Colonial Thing Booklet," 8.

Ndaba, Mokwaledi, Rantefe Mothebe, Dada of Kuru, and Varien Edwards. There are also a few pieces from the Christy Collection dating as far back as 1910. Some of the objects came from collection houses and auctioneers and some were attachments from the London Missionary Society Church. Amongst the collections are a few pieces from the Basarwa. Some artefacts came from expeditions by colonial officers and missionaries to neighbouring countries and to the protectorate itself. It is worth noting the Gordon H.S. Collection from the Tati Co., Francistown, in 1948. Some of the collections were from Dominic Oldman, who was also a collector and whose artefacts were bought by the British Museum when he died. Some of Oldman's collections from Botswana are at the Iziko Museums in Cape Town. There is evidence of the Welcome Collection by Henry Welcome, which was purchased by the British Museum when he died. All these collections by the different individuals had artefacts from Botswana and neighbouring countries. Some of the Botswana collection went to the British Museum via the South African Museum in Cape Town. Records show that some of the Botswana artefacts at the British Museum came from other museums in Africa and Europe, such as the Kew Botanical Gardens, the South Kensington Museum, the South African Museum, and UCT Collections. Most of the emphasis during collection was on the Basarwa objects, but there also a few pieces from other ethnic groups. In recent years, the collecting was done for specific exhibitions done by the British Museum and in order to fill gaps in collections or thematic exhibitions, such as the textile exhibition collected in Tunisia and Madagascar. This is all contemporary objects with more emphases on modern African art, and this explains the collections from Botswana on art.[434]

- There are collections at the Seattle Museum in the USA (see Appendix 2 for list).[435] According to the curators at the Seattle Museum, there is no evidence of how the collections were acquired and by whom.
- There are also objects from Botswana at the Smithsonian Museum of African Art. According to Christine Mullen Kreamer, a curator responsible for these African holdings, a lot of Botswana baskets entered the US in the mid-1970s and 1980s. The Smithsonian baskets were donated by Rick Davis, a Peace Corp volunteer in Botswana who later became the Director of Botswana Craft. Botswana Craft is a parastatal that encouraged and

[434] Julie Hudson (Curator of the Africa Section, British Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[435] Pam McClusky (Curator, African Pacific Art at the Seattle Museum) in conversation with the author, 2017 August 18.

empowered villagers to produce baskets and then purchased from them for sale at the Botswana Craft and also distributed them worldwide. The documentation on the credit line at the Smithsonian indicates that the objects were a "gift of…", but there is no formal gift agreement. Records might have been lost though because this was a time when this Museum was transitioning from a private entity and to joining the Smithsonian. Yet, this could be a sign of an illicit object migration pipeline between the Botswana Craft and museums in the global North. There is a list of different types of baskets from Botswana, totalling 128, and one Basarwa apron (see Appendix 2 for list).[436] Evidence from past collaborations also indicate that there are Botswana collections at the Smithsonian Institution. There is also a host of art collections at the Smithsonian American Art Museum, some that migrated years ago and some in the contemporary setting. Frank Marshall also made reference to these. He made portraits of Botswana's heavy metal enthusiasts in Botswana, which are also deposited in the US. The America Art Museum has also done exhibitions featuring some art works from Botswana in 1978 and 2014/15.[437] The quantity of Botswana collections at the Smithsonian is not known and must still be established through more organised contacts, visits, and documentation. Prof. Kings Phiri supported the idea that the Peace Corps has aided in the migration of cultural property for years. According to Phiri, after independence, the trafficking came in the name of voluntary service. These people worked among rural communities, became very close to people, and in the process and in the guise of trust, they collected a lot of cultural property. They pretended to be very friendly and to have the interest of the people at heart, but in the process, they looted and took the collections back to their countries.[438]

- The Willoughby Collections at York University Museum are part of the precolonial, colonial and postcolonial cultural and archival deposits on Botswana. After his missionary work in Botswana, Charles Willoughby relocated to America, where he lectured in a mission school. This explains his collections at York University.[439]

[436] Christine Mullen Kreamer (Interim director & senior curator, Smithsonian National Museum of Art) in conversation with the author, 2017, August 24.
[437] Frank Marshall, "Heavy Metal Display in Botswana," (Archival Giclee Print, National Museum of African Art, 2010).
[438] Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[439] Barry Morton, *Pre-Colonial Botswana: An Annotated Bibliography and Guide to the Sources*, (Gaborone: Botswana Society, 1994), 67.

- The Louvre has images of rock art paintings from the Tsodilo and Tswapong hills in Botswana. This is evidenced by the publication by the Louvre on Tsodilo titled *The Louvre of the Desert: The Impressive Rock Paintings of Tsodilo, Botswana* by Wu Mingren.[440]
- There are collections at the Snite Museum, at the Notre Dame University, where they have a Herero headdress and many other objects.
- There are collections at the Denver Museum of Nature & Science in Colorado, USA. This museum has 104 dioramas reflecting a collection of species from all over the world, including Botswana. It has some of the finest displays in the museum world, and one of the display halls, which carries natural history specimens from Botswana, is the Helen K. and Author E. Johnson Botswana Africa Hall. According to Rene O'Connell, the Image Archivist at the Denver Museum, the museum collected extensively from Botswana in 1969 and in 1974 through deliberate curatorial expeditions. There is photographic documentation of colour slides detailing the two expeditions. They collected mammals; foreground materials used in the dioramas as well as moulds made of termite mounts.[441]

In conclusion, it is clear that different methods of collecting and collectors have been involved in the migration of Botswana's diasporic collections. Some migrations were done without the focussed intention to steal heritage. Sometimes the intention was to just take and share with friends back home, but this constituted the migration of culture. No matter what the intention, the migration or collecting was not legitimate because there was no permission to collect as one would do with a research permit when researching. Savoy and Guichard observed that before the migrations, the objects were negotiated (between the buyers and the communities and also between the buyers and the auctioneers in the art market). But with time we see the same objects evolving from being commodities into cultural or ethnographic objects found in museums. This makes tracing their provenance complicated, which is why scholars feel that the history of these colonial objects is entangled.[442]

3.5 BOTSWANA COLLECTIONS IN OTHER AFRICAN COUNTRIES (SADC)

Evidence from the Iziko Museum of South Africa and the Natural History Museum of Bulawayo, Zimbabwe make it clear that there are more collections from Botswana in

[440] Wu Mingren*, The Louvre of the Desert: The Impressive Rock Paintings of Tsodilo, Botsw*ana, 2016
[441] Rene O'Connell (Image Archivist, Denver Museum) in conversation with the author, 2018.
[442] Bénédicte Savoy and Charlotte Guichard, "Acquiring Cultures and Trading Value in a Global World," 6.

neighbouring countries. Even collectors from the British Museum, such as Danto, collected natural history specimens from the Ngamiland area and deposited it in neighbouring country museums. Some pieces have found their way into the British Museum. Hence Botswana's dialogue on restitution or a shared heritage should be with the neighbouring colonial museums as well as the British Museum and other metropolitan museums.[443]

The migrated museum collections therefore cover two intertwined processes: One of the local colonial museum buildt in the image of the colonial metropolitan country and one of collections, presumably more valuable, in the museums of Europe and anywhere else. It is the aim of the research to establish the link or inter-exchange from local colonial museums to metropolitan museums and vice versa. Colonial officials started most of the early museums in Africa, while those established after independence, such as in Botswana, were mostly started by local elites. The first successful museum initiative in Botswana was started with little or no resources and was a postcolonial initiative. Before then, the only option for the colonial officials and white settlers was to move anything of aesthetic and cultural significance to foreign museums. This could be in the mother country or other imperial museums on the continent or in the region. There was the option to give neighbouring museum curators and those from the master country permission to carry out research work and to collect from poorer or less capacitated colonies, which was the case in the Bechuanaland Protectorate. This explains the quest to do an enquiry in Malawi, one of the sister colonies, and in South Africa. The South African Museum of Cape Town was one of the earliest museums in the region and acted as a repository for many African state collections. The reason for extending the enquiry to South African museums was also because Botswana's protectorate history is so intertwined with that of South Africa, with the area being run from Cape Town and at Mafikeng at some point. The two sampled countries should make a representation of neighbour colonies, while Nigeria is to give the continental context. Through this process, the study should be able to establish a more representative record or inventory of the cultural heritage from Botswana that is in neighbouring country museums and the general pattern of object migrations.

In the ladder of museum development in Africa, the most active stage in object migration was the colonial period. During this stage, all these early museums were established by the colonisers, and the free movement of objects from one part of the continent to the other and to

[443] Winani Thebele-Kgwatalala, "The Evolution and Development of the Museum in Botswana towards a Heritage Institution."

Europe was instigated, as indicated by the given examples of instigators and the different sets of collections given to different museums during that period. The following sections summarises collections found in neighbouring country museums and the history behind the collecting.

3.5.1 Museum Africa in Johannesburg

Museum Africa in Johannesburg is one of the earliest and largest museums, dating as far back as 1935. It falls under the City of Johannesburg Flagship Museums, including those in Soweto. It has a lot of specialised collections and it also makes money from its image collection, which is sold for use in books, films, documentaries etc.[444] Its collections also have objects from Botswana, Namibia, Zimbabwe and many other African countries. According to Diana Hall of Museum Africa, during the early collecting days, local people as well as whites sold cultural wares to a company called African Magic, and the Museum then bought from the company. Hall also talked about the special collection from the Basarwa collected by Doctor Louis Fourie, an amateur anthropologist who worked in Namibia and also collected in Botswana and South Africa. Fourie was even associated with the collection of human remains for anatomical exploration. Some of his collections were deposited at the South African Museum. Most of the collection was from Namibia and a number of items came from Botswana. It is referred to as the Fourie Collection, were collected between 1916 and 1928, and comprises around 3 000 objects.[445]

3.5.2 University of the Witwatersrand

There are Botswana collections at the University of the Witwatersrand. These are fossils collected from the Orapa mine, found during the initial stage of the mine, and the experts there then, because they were foreigners, took the collections to Wits. This was probably for further research and analysis and one wonders why these were not deposited at the National Museum or the University of Botswana and if the government was notified about the intention to take them out of the country.[446]

---

[444] Diana Hall (Collections Manager at Museum Africa) in conversation of author, 2015.

[445] Ann Wanless, "The Fourie Collection of Khoisan Ethnographica: Forming an Archive," *Journal of African Studies* 36, no. 1 (2010): 23–24.

[446] Nonofo Mosesane (Chief curator, Botswana National Museum) in conversation with the author, 2017.

3.5.3 South African National Library

The only copy of Botswana's early newspaper *Naledi ya Batswana* is held by a library in Pretoria. In the South African National Library digitisation project, the recordings showcase newspapers from the colonial period from both South Africa and neighbouring countries. The newspapers are listed as the second item.

3.5.4 Livingstone Museum in Zambia

There are Botswana collections at the Livingstone Museum in Zambia (See Appendix 2 for list).

3.5.5 Natural History Museum of Bulawayo, Zimbabwe

There are Botswana collections at the Natural History Museum of Bulawayo, Zimbabwe. The museum has a large collection from Botswana, deposited during the colonial period. These comprise archaeological, natural history, art and ethnographic artefacts. These were collected through curatorial expeditions into different areas of the Bechuanaland Protectorate to research and collect. The museum has publications resulting from research works in and on Botswana. There is particularly a large collection of mammals and birds at the Bulawayo Museum that are from Botswana and other Southern African countries, according to sources, one of the museum curators, Austen, led an expedition to Maun in the Bechuanaland Protectorate for a collection of birds during the 1950s.

There is also evidence of networking among the colonial museums in Southern Africa with museums abroad. The network included German, Portuguese and British museums. The association involved the exchange of collections and exhibitions, which explains the existence of collections from Botswana at the British Museum and other European museums. These included arts and crafts, archaeological and natural history specimens. Fraser alluded to a similar body of museums in the region, the Southern African Museums Association, which encouraged networking between the regional museums from the 1970s. The association are the

reason for the exchange and transfer of cultural material within the region and abroad (Refer to Appendix 3 for the map indicating where collections from Botswana are in the diasporas).[447]

3.5.6 National Museum of Namibia in Windhoek

There are Botswana collections at the National Museum of Namibia in Windhoek.

3.5.7 Iziko Museums in Cape Town

The Iziko Museums in Cape Town stands out as a unique case in the region and the continent. It does not only hold collections from Botswana but from the region as well as other parts of the continent. There are ethnographic collections, archaeological artefacts and human remains at Iziko Museums in Cape Town. A survey of the collections at the Iziko Museum of Social History indicated artefacts from the 1950s collected from Basarwa by James Chapman, who was a South African explorer and elephant hunter. He also collected from the Herero of Namibia and Botswana as well as from the Shona and Ndebele of Zimbabwe. His other objects are from Mengwe in Botswana (among the BaKalanga), and were all collected in 1911. There are artefacts from the Kalahari San from a trader in Mahalapye in 1906 whose name is not mentioned. Some artefacts were given as gifts or found abandoned in ox-wagons. There are also artefacts from Kanye and Gaborone collected in 1918. It is not clear whether some of the objects are from Basarwa in Botswana or neighbouring countries such as Namibia that have Basarwa as well. There is Basarwa hunting equipment from the Kalahari in 1913; most of the objects were brought by individuals, and it is not clear whether they were researchers, travellers, hunters, mining prospectors, anthropologists, or traders. Some of the objects were, however, bought by the South African Museum and UCT collecting expeditions by curators. There is evidence of objects collected in 1892 by Alston and given to the UCT and South African Museum as gifts. Some objects were confiscated from Basarwa who were on the wrong side of the law. There is also evidence of collections brought by pastors who had been traversing the areas spreading the word of God in the 1920s and 1970s. This would probably explain the Bushman and Relics Acts in both Botswana and South Africa, due to the volume of trafficking in Basarwa artefacts. These were the most prized artefacts by then, and even

[447] Fraser, Donald. *Africa Idylls.* London: Service & Co., 1925.

McLeod of the British Museum alluded to that. Some of the Basarwa objects came from the Basarwa in South Africa, Botswana and Namibia. It is therefore, never clear as to whether the artefacts belong to Botswana, South Africa or Namibia.[448] The issue of the pastors who donated objects from their missionary travels in Botswana refer to the Willoughbys, Robert Moffat, and David Livingstone as some of the well-known missionaries who worked in the Bechuanaland Protectorate.

There is also a collection of Sotho-Tswana objects, and this is also because of the existence of shared communities, but some of it is specifically from Botswana, collected as far back as 1907. The Reverend Willoughby collected some objects from around Serowe, Tswapong and Chadibe, while some of the objects from all corners of the country were collected by Isaac Schapera and Collin Blackbeard, who collected mostly from Bangwato and Batawana. Willoughby also collected objects from the Mazezuru of Serowe. There are also some notable collections from research and collecting expeditions, as recent as 1962, from the Barolong, Shoshong, Bakhurutshe, Kanye, Batlokwa of Gaborone, Mahalapye, Palapye, Mazezuru of Peleng in Lobatse, Bakwena, Ngamiland District, Basubiya, Baherero, Hambukushu, Bakgalagadi, Batswapong, Bakgatla of Mochudi, Balete of Ramotswa. some objects simply have 'Tswana' written on them and it does not specify which Tswana group and country it comes from, since there is also the issue of shared communities between South Africa, Namibia and Botswana. The issue of uncertain origin of artefacts is a problem also faced by the British Museum and other European museums. Bangwato, Basarwa, Bakgatla have the highest number of collections at Iziko, dating back to 1916, and were probably collected by Isaac Schapera. Shaw of the Palapye area was also a notable collector who migrated artefacts from Botswana to Cape Town.[449]

Most of the Botswana collections are at the Iziko Museum of Ethnography, one of the museums in the flagship that has benefited from the vast collections of the South African Museum. There are also Botswana Herero collections from the area of Sehithwa, Toteng, Xangwa in the Ngamiland area that were collected by Malan. A small percentage of the Malan collection is from the Himba, Ovambanderu and Ovambo of South West Africa (now Namibia), collected from 1973–1974 and 1980. Some objects from the same groups came from Schapera, and all

[448] Iziko Museum of Social History, "Documentation Records of Botswana Collections at Iziko Museums." See also Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*.
[449] Iziko Museum of Social History, "Documentation Records of Botswana Collections at Iziko Museums."

it was loaned to the UCT and South African museums.[450] There is also evidence of a link between the Weltmuseum Wien scholar Rudolf Poch and the South African Museum in Cape Town, and there is a possibility that he may have deposited some of his holdings from the Herero and other Ngamiland communities in Cape Town.

Another notable collector of the Botswana objects at Iziko was Thomas Baines, and in 1981 his collection was given to UCT. Baines was an English artist and explorer. It would seem that Baines's presence in Botswana was significant given the number of places associated with his name such as the Baines baobabs, a monument, and Baines' Drift, a border post in the Tuli Block in Botswana. This would mean that he travelled and collected in Botswana too.

It is therefore evident that there is a large collection from Batswana groups, collected by different scholars and loaned and deposited at the South African Museum and UCT. Some of the objects were purchased for exhibitions, such as a variety of baskets, pestles, bows, arrows, nets, clay pots, and adzes. While there were many individuals who collected, there are some that stand out, such as Isaac Schapera, Thomas Baines, Rev. Willoughby, Clark, Sharp and Malan. This is because of the number of objects they collected that are housed at the Iziko. While most of the mentioned characters were British citizens, they came from different backgrounds: Some were private collectors and dealers, and some were colonial officials that collected objects during official trips and private trips.

There are also records of exchanges and collaborations with other early Southern African Museums from the British Empire such as the National Museum of Southern Rhodesia in about 1939. Some collections came from the Institute of Race Relations in 1882 and all of the discussed collections were given to the South African Museum and the UCT.[451] The collections at the South African Museum and UCT show a different set of collectors as well as collections. There is a whole collection from postcolonial nations, probably indicating that there were no border restrictions. But it is also an indication that trade and cultural migrations continued from the precolonial period right into the contemporary era. The artefacts from the Tswana groups and from different areas were collected as recently as the 1980s and complemented the earlier Taylor expeditions of the 1960s. The collections done in 1960 from the Hambukushu of Shakawe, Gumare, Okavango Swamps, Maun, Seronga, and the Caprivi Strip and other parts

[450] Iziko Museum of Social History, "Documentation Records of Botswana Collections at Iziko Museums." See also Johannesburg Museum, "Documentation Records on Botswana Collections at Johannesburg Museum," (Johannesburg: Johannesburg Museum, 2015).
[451] Iziko Museum of Social History, "Documentation Records of Botswana Collections at Iziko Museums."

of Namibia were bought by the South African Museum and UCT in 1979. This included collections from the Wayeyi (Makuba) of Namibia and those of Botswana residing along the Boteti River corrupted as 'Botletle'.[452]

Wilhelm Bleek, a German Linguist based in Cape Town (1827–1875), collected many Basarwa artefacts in the 1800s, and according to the records, most of the artefacts were from the Kalahari and places such as Gaborone, Serowe, Kanye, Mahalapye and Gantsi.[453] Whole expeditions from the South African Museum and UCT also went into the hinterland to collect, since there were no effective boundaries then. The scope of collecting for the South African Museum then was Southern Africa, even though there is still a lot from all over Africa at the Iziko Museums. Some of these private collectors deposited directly to UCT and the South African Museum, but some kept private collections and later they or their families when relocating donated to the two institutions. Some notable collections from Bakwena were collected by J. Knobel and presented to the two institutions in 1981 for sale, as loans and as gifts. Dr Hann collected in 1896 in the same way, while D.F. Bleach purchased a lot of objects that are now at the Iziko Social History Museum.[454]

There is also a notable collection at the Iziko Museums from the BaKalanga of Botswana, specifically from Kalakamati, Domboshaba hill, Sekakangwe, and BaKalanga of Serowe, acquired through collecting expeditions by the South African Museum in 1962 and 1985. Some of it is from the Shona and Karanga of Southern Rhodesia, dating as far back as 1948, and from the Kalanga of Northern Rhodesia (which is Zambia today). Some earlier collections from the BaKalanga were purchased from Rev. Willoughby and others, dating as far back as 1892. Hence, there are a lot of objects from the BaKalanga from the Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana. There are also objects from Manyikaland, which is in Mozambique today.[455] Records also show that there is a basket made for sale to the Tswana groups by Basarwa, which is an indication of trade in the Bechuanaland Protectorate during the colonial period. Schapera

[452] Iziko Museum of Social History, "Documentation Records of Botswana Collections at Iziko Museums." See also Johannesburg Museum, "Documentation Records on Botswana Collections at Johannesburg Museum."
[453] Wilhelm Bleek (1827–1875) was a German linguist who studied South African languages, particularly the Bushman. He partnered with Lucy Lloyd, a British folklorist, and produced the famous Bleek and Lloyd Archives of San Languages. Some of his works include "Specimens of Bushman Folklore" and "A Comparative Grammar of South African Languages".
[454] Iziko Museum of Social History, "Documentation Records of Botswana Collections at Iziko Museums." See also Johannesburg Museum, "Documentation Records on Botswana Collections at Johannesburg Museum."
[455] Iziko Museum of Social History, "Documentation Records of Botswana Collections at Iziko Museums."

also collected to contribute to the research on Basarwa by the South African Museum and UCT around 1917 and 1918, and the objects were later given to the Iziko Museums.

The main reason for the transfer was because there was no museum in Botswana then, and today the quest is that Botswana should have access to the research information and the objects. Besides all these collections that went to Cape Town, a good number of objects were presented to outside institutions, particularly in Europe by scholars as exchanges, for sale and for further research and were never returned. This did not apply to collections from Botswana only, but to neighbouring colonies and other parts of the continent and the globe.[456]

As indicated in the above examples, collections from Botswana were migrated to neighbouring museums because they were settler colonies and had museums established by then. Because of this background, these settler colonies did not lose much heritage to neighbouring colony museums except to the master country museums. Botswana, on the other hand, was a protectorate, and thus not quite a settler colony, which is an important distinction for the purposes of this study. This does not, however, invalidate the study's central point about the migrated museum, but does inform what kinds or types of museums existed in the colonial states and to what degree they approximate the modern museum and migration of cultural property.

Some issues of concern, though, are whether the discussion about collections in the diaspora, repatriation and the option to share also applies to the collections in the neighbouring countries. Even though this is a local African scenario, it still has colonially initiated museums.: In the Southern African regional context, the objects were taken out of their cultural setting. There is a diversity of neighbouring country collections at the Iziko Museums that needs to be connected with the communities of origin. Would the question of irrelevance to the receiving communities also apply to the communities in South Africa or Cape Town, who host the collections? Should the current interchange between European and African museums on cooperation and the decolonisation of museums not be extended to the neighbouring country museums then? Academics have raised these concerns, particularly at the University of Botswana, and they have come with current international conversations on the repatriation of collections to Africa. The thinking is that just like in the mainline museums, the collections are out of context and

[456] Iziko Museum of Social History, "Documentation Records of Botswana Collections at Iziko Museums." See also Johannesburg Museum, "Documentation Records on Botswana Collections at Johannesburg Museum."

the local communities cannot identify with them, so they are just curios and for aesthetics. They are either better off returned to the countries and communities of origin or managed collectively in collaboration with the giver communities. This would raise the issue of continental and regional collaborations in Africa as informed by the given trend in colonial object migrations.

It is notable that there is evidence of networking and linkages between the Botswana collections in the neighbouring states, such as Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe, and those at the British Museum. Some of the collectors are the same characters who collected in Malawi and Zambia for the British Museum, such as the Welcome Collection and Dominic Oldman, and this is evidence of the network in object migration during the colonial period. It demonstrates the link with the neighbouring colonial museum and the colonial master.

Narrowing down the case to the national scenario, there are collections presently held by the Botswana National Museum that belong to diverse communities in the country. The sentiment among the regional museums and the respective communities has been to return these collections to them. Perhaps their case should be seen in light of the argument about the irrelevance of the collection to the hosting community. Consideration should therefore be given to both national and regional migrations and conversations initiated with a view to return. It is also important to find out how the communities of provenance feel about these migrated collections. A good example in Botswana is the Bakgatla drum currently housed at the Botswana National Museum, and the Gambule people (North East District) and the artefacts found during the construction of the Ntimbale dam. The environmental assessment was done by officials from the National Museum and all the findings were taken to the National Museum in Gaborone. I argue that the possible return of these collections to the Gambule people should be based on the fact that they have a right to this heritage. It is their right as human beings to have access to the objects or to have them returned. This is a case of internal illicit trafficking or the illegal migration and illegal ownership of cultural property, and it therefore warrants repatriation.[457]

[457] University of Botswana Seminar Presentation, "Views from the Discussions," (Gaborone: University of Botswana, 2016). See also Nonofho Ndobochani, "Incorporating Community Cultural Values in Archaeological Impact Assessment Process: A Case of Dikgatlhong Dam and Dukwi/Mowana Projects," (MPhil Thesis, University of Botswana, 2009).

3.6 CONTEMPORARY CASES OF TRAFFICKING

UNESCO, ICOM, the UN and Interpol have joined hands with the international museum fraternity to fight against the illegal migration of cultural property. Their concern was the unending trade in cultural property that has evolved to involve theft and profitable business. They have developed related conventions, protocols, security strategies, organised trainings and awareness forums to capacitate museums. They have also gone a step further to fund activities on the ratification of related conventions as well as implementation exercises. The 1999 Second Protocol to the 1954 Convention was initiated to specifically address and fund issues of contemporary looting and vandalism of heritage during wars. The protocol also addresses issues of humanity and heritage as a human right and a shared responsibility by the international community. An example of the discussed intervention is the 2014 Syrian case in which the UN appealed to the warring factions in the Syrian civil war to spare the country's cultural heritage. It lamented the prevalent looting and damage at historical sites within the conflict zone. A statement of appeal was made by the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon, UNESCO Director Irin Bokova and the Syrian international mediator Lakhdar Brahimi to the factions to stop the destruction of Syrian heritage. They condemned the use of historic sites for military, ideological and economic uses that led to the destruction of world heritage sites such as Palmra and Cadres Chevaliers. The same happened in Egypt, Libya, Nigeria and other countries.[458] In the Syrian case, archaeological sites were looted and the illegal sale of objects increased. The UN therefore cautioned all countries, professional organisations, dealers and tourists to exercise due diligence when buying from craft markets. This was an appeal for a shared universal responsibility towards the safeguarding of Syria's heritage. Alerts have also been done for other areas in the world.

In the same way, museums, member states to the conventions and the international community are urged by these organisations to exercise caution when buying illegally imported and/or exported goods offered for sale. Quick sales are very common in markets during times of conflict. The destruction of heritage also destroys the identity and history of the local community. It affects those involved in conflict situations and all humanity, it damages the foundations of society, and it is not easy recover.[459] This explains why the looting and

---

[458] *Botswana Daily News*, "Syria's Cultural Heritage in Peril from War and Looting," (2014).

[459] *Botswana Daily News*, "Syria's Cultural Heritage in Peril from War and Looting," (2014). See also France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*.

trafficking done before, during and after the colonial period is still a thorny issue. The void created and the damage is still visible. It is also important to note that in the contemporary period, the different causes to the movement of the cultural material have expanded from explorers, white settlers and colonial officials. It now involves thefts, plundering and looting by many different perpetrators such as researchers, students, dealers, heritage practitioners, collectors, Peace Corps volunteers, and many others. It now includes corruption with the assistance of museum officials, and illicit trading with the help of archaeologists, anthropologists, and historians to criminal syndicates and auctioneers. A whole vicious cycle and a complex network of locals as well as international individuals dominate this trade. The illegal transfer of cultural property is a rapidly evolving security problem in museums, law enforcement agencies and states, which needs thorough and proper documentation. Whole criminal syndicates are driving the transfers as lucrative businesses. Invaluable cultural resources and antiquities from African countries are at the centre of large international smuggling syndicates.[460] Whole archaeological sites have been destroyed in the North and Western African countries, which are the most affected. Few objects remain in their countries of origin, while the finest pieces, such as the Benin bronzes, are found in major museums and private collections in Europe, America, and of late, in Asian countries such as Japan and China.[461]

Different views have been advanced regarding these local officials who are involved in this trade: Firstly, they turn a blind eye to the trafficking. Secondly, they are helpless to do anything about it. Thirdly, in most cases such as Botswana, there has been a delayed focus on the problem and appreciation of its implications by both heritage managers and government. This probably have been due to lack of awareness and the absence of an administrative, legal and policy framework on culture and heritage. Fourthly, museum officials, sometimes due to poverty, low salaries, and civil strife, are tempted to deal in the illegal sale of cultural property. They accept bribes as a means of survival. Many examples have been cited in countries such as Zimbabwe, Nigeria and Malawi. It was easy to smuggle objects out of countries with the help of customs officials, border guards, museum officials and politicians in newly independent states. This helped strengthen the belief by dealers and collectors that national laws on

[460] UNSECO Forum on Memory and Universality, "Museums, Memory and Universality," in Witnesses to History: A *C*ompendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects, ed. Lyndel V. Prott, (Paris: UNESCO, 2009), 58.
[461] UNSECO Forum on Memory and Universality, "Museums, Memory and Universality," 58. See also Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics."

antiquities were just a formality.[462] On some occasions, migration officials are given tips while in other cases they do not know that it is illegal to smuggle cultural property and they allow the smugglers to pass. This justifies the need to capacitate and create awareness among them. To tighten security at entry points in order to complement the efforts of border officials (tighten law enforcement) and to put in place proper legislation to legitimise all these efforts.[463] Legislation also gives law enforcement agencies (Interpol, police, defence force and border officials) the authority to carry out their work to combat, prevent and enforce compliance in all respects. This could also go with the use of export certificates as in Nigeria and those proposed by the World Customs Union and WIPO. All these proposals complement what Clément Etienne, the UNESCO Director for the Pacific, said on the need for signing the 2005 Convention by the Pacific nations. He emphasised the need for proper domestication by governments and all relevant structures to safeguard heritage against traffickers.[464]

Etienne reiterated that "intangible cultural practices such as dance, music and language were also under threat of being trafficked or deformed as the Pacific became more exposed to modern global culture".[465] Once trafficked, the cultural practices would be changed and would lose their spiritual essence. True to his fears, some of the cultural expressions elsewhere have lost their traditional posture. Ceremonial and spiritual dances such as *wosana* in Botswana are now used for competitions by young people and no longer a revered cultural performance used by the community to communicate with the rain deity, *Mwali.*

Young Botswana artists today mix traditional dance with *kwaito* and house music into a whole new concoction best suited to today's young mind. Also, as indicated by Etienne, South African artists have copied traditional music from Botswana and modified it. It is at another level and one would believe that it originates from them and it has lost its local cultural and spiritual traits.[466] This would also apply to issues of copy right and intellectual, because if the music had been patented, then Botswana would be in a position to claim copyright to this traditional music now claimed by South African artists. The trafficking or borrowing of other people's culture (intangible cultural heritage) for economic benefit and pleasure takes us back to what the Sarr & Savoy Report has said in reference to the colonial collections in European museums: "The

[462] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 16–17.
[463] Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects," 193.
[464] Clement Etienne, *Botswana Daily News*, "Pacific Cultural Heritage under Threat," 28 -30.
[465] Clement Etienne, *Botswana Daily News*, "Pacific Cultural Heritage under Threat," 30.
[466] Clement Etienne, *Botswana Daily News*, "Pacific Cultural Heritage under Threat," 29-30.

objects were disconnected from their origin". They also refer to the whole process of migration as the "intellectual, aesthetic and economic appropriation of African culture".[467]

The risk is that old performances get completely swallowed up by the "new creative performing arts". Étienne pointed out that it loses its content and its spiritual meaning. According to him, governments must devise ways of protecting this heritage for posterity.[468] Just like the colonial objects in the global North, the intangible cultural heritage is an intrinsic part of the Africa culture that needs to be safeguarded.[469] The above analysis is talking to the issue raised earlier about whether this is cultural property as in history, local and living cultures and practices or as in objects only. It is clear that this is much broader than only collections and human remains.

Libya also presents current cases of illicit trafficking and destruction of heritage. Different cities, religious monuments and shrines have been attacked by Islamic groups (the extremists). This opened a window for traffickers in a country where many forces are at play.[470] Some items are destroyed for ideological and religious reasons, while dealers and traffickers loot for the market and extremists sell to fund guerrilla activities. Therefore, there must be concerted effort by the Libyan government, heritage managers/museums, the international community and international organisations to fight the problem. This should be done because of shared heritage and people's right to their heritage.

It is the state of vulnerability described above in Africa and the attractive and rich cultures buried in former empires such as Timbuktu in Mali and the Pharaoh burial system in Egypt, the Buganda Kingdom, the Benin Kingdom, the Rozvi Kingdom, Mwene Mutapa, the Shilluk Kingdom of South Sudan, the Zulu Kingdom, the unique and rich culture of the Basarwa or '"Bushmen' that attract the traffickers. After independence and in the contemporary years, some of the objects from African countries left the continent through collaborations between the local museums and those abroad.[471] The following list describes contemporary methods of transfer or migration of cultural property:

- *Illegal excavations*: The illegal excavation of archaeological sites is one method of transfer, which features quite a lot in the contemporary period, even though it has a long history.

[467] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 7.
[468] *Botswana Daily News*, "Pacific Cultural Heritage under Threat," 29.
[469] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 4
[470] *Botswana Daily News*, "Libya Loses Historic Statue," no. 210 (2014, 11 November): 17.
[471] D. Kumwenda in conversation with the author, 2015.

Illegal excavations have continued with much vigour even after the independence of many African countries. These go hand in hand with robberies of cultural property. Through the same process, archaeological sites in Mali, Egypt and Benin have been looted of artefacts by unknown object scavengers. In this process there was no exchange and no gift giving, hence the reciprocal part and sharing at a local or traditional level was not there. This method of object migration is pure theft and the stolen goods are now a shared universal property as per UNESCO's understanding (if sold to museums), unless they are in private homes. The process has evolved from looting, theft and illegal excavations to a shared heritage. The excavations are often done by researchers and scholars and are sometimes aided by local museum officials. The vulnerable North and West African countries have been prone to this method of trafficking, probably because their geographic location is closer to Europe. This undertaking has taken advantage of political unrest in the North and West of Africa. Some of the thefts and illegal excavations were even done during the night to avoid attracting public attention and confrontation by the police and the public. At the centre of this method of transfer are international criminal syndicates; through their pipelines, objects move into auction houses, museums, galleries, private collections and laboratories. In this method of transfer only the UNESCO notion of sharing would apply finally when the objects are in museums and galleries. Otherwise, there is no form of exchange or reciprocity at the time of transfer; it is simple theft with no obligation what so ever.

- *War and Political Unrest*: Today the most common method of object transfer is plundering during war, strikes and demonstrations. Heritage sites are targeted deliberately, destroyed and the artefacts stolen. Living examples are the Syrian war, as mentioned earlier. Iraq, Mali, Nigeria, Libya and Egypt have also been affected in the same way during their civil wars. It is now believed that some of the acts mentioned earlier are politically, spiritually and racially motivated. The artefacts are sold for personal gain and to fund political and rebel groups.[472] Obviously there is no equal sharing, no reciprocity and no promise of friendship in this method of cultural migration. There is also no consent from the owner communities and institutions, but rather a ruthless method used for self-gain.

[472] Edith Ekunke (Director of the National Museum in Lagos) in conversation with the author, 2015. See also *Botswana Daily News*, "Syria's Cultural Heritage in Peril from War and Looting," (2014); *Botswana Daily News*, "Libya Loses Historic Statue," no. 210 (2014, 11 November): 17.

Heritage in Danger discusses unrest and looting in Egypt and how this led to thefts at the Cairo Museum and other archaeological sites throughout the country. In the whole fiasco, other thefts, losses and damages were not reported, which is the case in many other theft situations, particularly in Africa, not excluding Botswana, throughout the migration period. Stefano Manacorda and Duncan Chappell advocated on the migration of cultural property in the contemporary setting to expose the illegality as against the non-legality of the trade. They are a reflection of complementary efforts by dealers, art specialists, heritage managers and experts from international institutions such Interpol and UNESCO to talk about the problem and propose a solution.[473] It is this challenging history of colonial race supremacy, cultural migrations, wars, natural disasters, and the plundering and looting of Africa's heritage that accounts for the current state of "economic inequality, continued political instability and humanitarian tragedies".[474]

- *Volunteer interventions and international cooperation*: In Botswana the most contemporary mode of cultural migration is volunteer interventions, and international cooperation. An example worth scrutiny is the Japanese International Cooperation Agency. If followed carefully, all the cultural exchanges by the Japanese International Cooperation Agency somewhere somehow reflect a number of artefacts slipping out of the country.
- *Tourists and tour operators*: Another unnoticed avenue of cultural migration is the tourists and tour operators, particularly foreign ones based in South Africa. It is a vulnerable situation where the tourism industry is partly operated from South Africa. This concern was even brought up by the communities through the awareness exercise to the ratification process of the three UNESCO conventions by Botswana.[475]
- *Researchers*: Yet another avenue for cultural migration in Botswana is researchers. These people spend months camping in certain areas to observe certain patterns and behaviours of fauna and flora, get close to the people, and collect in the process. They also take some objects under the pretence to do further analysis in laboratories and learning institutions back home, and these are never returned and are forgotten. Similarly, in this method of transfer in cultural property collections there is no sharing, no reciprocity, no developing bonding with the communities of origin since these are collected secretly.

---

[473] Stefano Manacorda and Duncan Chappell, *Crime in the Art and Antiquities World: Illegal Trafficking in Cultural Property*, 1–2.

[474] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 2.

[475] National Reference Committee for the Ratification of UNESCO Conventions in Botswana, "An Unpublished Report on Community Awareness on UNESCO Conventions and the Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Property," (Gaborone: Botswana National Museum, 2014).

Given all the above arguments about the museum institution and the migrated collections, it is important to note that the museum as an institution has never been static. Its role and face have always been evolving, depending on historical developments by empires. Even today, this role is still changing so that the museum remains relevant and is seen as contemporary. Some of the current global developments include a new attention to human rights, decolonisation, social equality, justice and reconciliation. This also includes the involvement of local communities through dialogue and active participation.[476] At its Annual Meeting and Museum-Expo in St Louis, Missouri in May 2017, themed *Gateways for Understanding: Diversity, Equity, Accessibility and Inclusion in Museums*, the American Alliance of Museums highlighted the role of museums as "pillars of healthy communities and ideal places to enhance understanding".[477] According to Meagan Petterson of the Alberta Museums Association, museums today should decolonise, redefine themselves and come up with new and relevant educational programmes. This should be a museum that builds understanding among communities, the government and the international community.[478] This should be to deal with current global issues such as the discussed trafficking of cultural property.

According to Alissandra Cummins (former ICOM President), in order to stay relevant, the museum today has changed focus; it is no longer about objects, but about communities. Hence, the focus is now more about human migrations than object migration, and that is why this research study devoted a chapter to the study of human remains and human migrations and their restitution.[479] According to Sheryl Jones of the National Institute of Culture in Belize, museums are acting as agents of change by getting involved in human rights issues and repatriation.[480]

---

[476] *Viv Golding and Jenny Walklate (Ed), Museum and Communities, 2018*

[477] American Alliance of Museums, *Annual Meeting and Museum-Expo Gateways for Understanding: Diversity, Equity, Accessibility and Inclusion in Museums, St Louis, Missouri, 2017 May*.

[478] Meagan Petterson, "Museums and Communities Today," Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial General Meeting*, (Calgary, Canada, June 2017).

[479] Alissandra Cummins, "Decolonised Museums and Indigenous People," Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial General Meeting*, (Calgary, Canada, June 2017).

[480] Sheryl Jones, "Museum as Agents of Change and Human Rights," Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial General Meeting*, (Calgary, Canada, June 2017).

CHAPTER 4
EXPATRIATION AS ALIENATION

The concepts of expatriation and alienation were developed in relation to slavery but are also fit for thinking through the migration and restitution of cultural property. While we transfer cultural property to foreign countries, the slave was expatriated or banished into a foreign land. In as much as Annette Weiner talked of alienable and inalienable possessions in relation to objects, slaves were in a similar fashion alienated from their countries of origin.[481] Together these concepts—repatriation vs expatriation and inalienable vs alienable—point to the strong relation between human migrations and the migration of cultural objects. This justifies the need for an academic reflection on the migration of cultural property alongside that of humans, which in this case is not just the slave trade and the migration of human remains. While repatriation today is in the form of human remains, immediately after the abolition of the slave trade it also took the form of repatriation of communities to Sierra Leone and other places in Africa. Examples of repatriation in Botswana are also discussed below.

The process of human migration, whether peaceful or forced, has today been reincarnated in the debate about human remains. The situation of human remains involves individuals who migrated in their dead state for anatomical reasons, those who were taken alive for parade and amusement and study, and those who migrated for diverse reasons and died in foreign lands. The link with migrated cultural property is where human remains find their way into museums and are displayed alongside objects. It is this display that has of late created debates alongside the issue of migration through slavery as alienation.

Moreover, the display of human remains has been at the centre of the debates between museums of the global North and the global South. Among other things, the decolonial concept tackles the problematic inheritance by museums in Europe of collections of human remains assembled during the 19th and the early 20th centuries. These human remains were looted from communities of Indigenous peoples across the globe, taken without consent and in violation of local beliefs. The questions often asked today are: Who has the right to keep the bones of others as artistic or scientific spectacle without the knowledge or acknowledgement of their descendants? Were they bought, plundered, offered or a part of a common practice of 'investment' as seen in the 19th century? Were they auctioned, exchanged, or donated to

[481] Annette Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping While Giving*, 1.

museums? Are they objectified as museum collections and what does this display say to the relevant ancestral and cultural frameworks? Should museums alone determine their fate as touristic attractions to be gazed at, photographed, and subject to having their image circulated worldwide online, including on social media? These critical questions are explored through many different approaches currently invoked by museum curators, experts in heritage, lawyers, politicians, and academics. They use forums such as public talks, the media, exhibitions, public performances, and video installations in which people share their thoughts and feelings about this display of human remains and academic research.[482] The feeling of the descendants of those displayed in museums can be found in the Sarr-Savoy Report when it refers to "the pain of those conquered, those who lost cultural property, and those whose ancestors are displayed in museums, the hatred and the angers". The conclusion is that this is a problem that can no longer be ignored by the global North.[483]

According to Larissa Forster, collections of human remains are a "challenging heritage" or "sensitive heritage".[484] There is therefore a need for diverse reflections on encounters with these collections to critically explore the histories of violence and dispossession that are disclosed in these diasporic gatherings of bones and the problem of their current display in public spaces. There is also a need for dialogue leading to their return back to places of origin, particularly with communities of origin. This has to take into cognisance the traditional belief systems of Indigenous peoples.[485] According to the French foreign minister Jean-Marc Ayrault, human remains are some of the inalienable museum possessions that should never really have left their ancestral lands.[486] This is why this study explores this component of heritage alongside that of objects in this chapter.

Talking of traditional belief systems, Paul Turnbull laments the fact that reburial of their repatriated ancestral remains in the traditional way has been difficult for the Australian Torres Islanders because their traditions have been destroyed by colonialism. This also applies to the loss of ancestral land in which they could bury the remains. This really makes their case even more complicated compared to other parts of the world. Another problematic issue for the

---

[482] Filipa Cordeiro and Rui Mourao, *Time of the Huacas*, (Lisbon: Rough'Nough, 2018), 29.

[483] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 7.

[484] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 160. See also Winani Thebele, "The Reinvention of the Museum into a Cultural Hub in the African Context," *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019): 36–38.

[485] Wendy Black et al., "Who Were They? Repatriation and the Rehumanisation of Human Remains in Museums in Southern Africa," 310–313.

[486] Jean-Marc Ayrault, Speech on "Human remains as inalienable possession found in French museums," (2016).

Islanders is an unfavourable policy on repatriation, government control of repatriation cases, and the lack of contextual information and provenance on the human remains. This then calls for provenance research and delays the conclusion of cases. This really becomes a problematic heritage for poor communities who can only rely on the sympathy of scholars and others to help with provenance research.[487]

4.1 SLAVERY AS NATAL ALIENATION

While the main thrust of this thesis is the illegal migration of heritage, it also investigates the illegal trade in humans and human remains that happened through slavery and medical investigations or anatomical explorations. This is to contextualise the study within the broader context of illegal movement and transfers of humans and commodities and for comparative analysis, which looks at causes as well as the outcomes of repatriation, restitution, and the current conversations around the subject. The focus here, therefore, becomes human trafficking alongside the trafficking of cultural property. The migration of cultural objects is entwined with the migration of humans in the slave trade. The study thus seeks to establish the intimacy or the relationship between the two trades as a way of demonstrating their co-evolutionary discourse. The two trades have inadvertently run in parallel. This situation is still visible even today through the repatriation of human remains to communities, which is tantamount to the return of cultural property as interrogated by this research study. The double trade also demonstrates the double tragedy that befell colonised states through the migration of humans as well as objects, particularly in Africa.

Mr Jafaru Yunusa Dauda, Director for Research Planning and Publication at the National Commission of Museums**,** Nigeria, felt that the slave trade was closely linked with the trafficking of cultural property; hence, trafficking should also be abolished and return enforced at all costs.[488] However, there are also recent cases of human migrations and trafficking as seen in illegal human trafficking and the migration of people during political unrest, as seen in North Africa and the Middle East. During conflict, while humans migrate to safe places, cultural objects are smuggled out and sold in foreign lands. This is evidenced in a presentation made by Ralf Čeplak, the curator from the National Museum in Slovenia, in 2016 during the ICOM

[487] Paul Turnbull, "International Repatriation of Indigenous Human Remains and its Complexities: The Australian Experience," 6–7.
[488] Jafaru Y. Dauda (Director of Research Planning & Publication of the National Commission of Museums, Nigeria) in discussion with the author, 2015.

General conference in Milan.[489] The presentation was on the migration of people from the Middle East and North Africa during the recent political unrests in those countries. This is an issue of the migration of people set against the migration of artefacts. According to the curator, his museum had to put up a number of exhibitions on the subjects of human migrations in collaboration with the refugees in order to teach or convey a message of acceptance, tolerance, humanity, love and to share information with local communities. This is in line with Viv Golding and Jen Walklate's argument that the museum should offer "social resonance" by acting as a platform for exploring cases that affect the community. [490] This would talk to issues of trauma, genocide, pandemics, xenophobia, and migrations as tackled by the Slovenic Museum. This case shows how the Slovenic Museum tried to break the stereotypes and stigma levelled at the refugees. Many such cases are prevalent around the world, and even in Botswana a similar type of attitude is levelled against Zimbabwean immigrants. According to Čeplak Mencin, the initiatives by the Slovenic Museum were meant to make refugees feel welcome, accepted and appreciated. The involvement of the refugees and the creation of a platform for dialogue and exchange between the local community and the refugees were meant for cultural exchange between the locals and the refugees. This move talks to the construction of identities and cultural acceptance as expected from a decolonising museum today.[491]

On the issue of human remains and human migrations, it is relevant to consider how Fanon linked slavery, colonialism and the postcolonial present. He talked of black people de-alienating themselves from assimilation and colonial stupor, because, as he says, he is not a slave of the slavery that dehumanised his ancestors.[492] Sarr and Savoy lamented the fact that the dehumanisation of the 'other' went with the loss of cultural property, conquest, violence, imprisonment, killings, and deportation.[493] The discussion should take us back to the concept of alienation and inalienability, where some objects are being returned to places of origin because they should never have left. The enquiry here is into human remains, how they (were) migrated, and the need to repatriate them. Different cases in Botswana, Africa and the globe are investigated. According to Reinnette Stander,

---

[489] Ralf Čeplak Mencin, "The Role of the Museum Towards Immigrants and Refugees," Unpublished paper presented at the *ICME Seminar during the ICOM General Conference at the Memorial Museum in Genova, Italy, July 2016*.

[490] Viv Golding and Jen Walklate (eds.), *Museums and Communities,* 14–16.

[491] Mojca Račič and Ralf Čeplak Mencin, "Refugees are in Front of Our Doors! Endeavours by the Slovene Ethnographic Museum towards the Deconstruction of Stereotypes and Prejudice," in Museums and Communities: *Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, eds. Viv Golding and Jen Walklate, (London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019), 209, 229.

[492] Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks,* 223.

[493] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 8.

> The repatriation and restitution of human remains and heritage (objects) is especially controversial and challenging. To find a balance between scientific interests, ethical considerations and the interest of communities is open for a lot of controversy and it is doubtful that a solution will be that will keep everybody happy.[494]

The article *Chief's Head Returned to Ghana.*[495] addressed the subject of human remains versus cultural property migration. It discussed cases of trafficking of humans during slavery and gave the example of the return of a human head decapitated in the 1800s. The Ghanaian Chief Bonsu's head "was part of the anatomical collection of the Leiden University Medical Centre in Holland" The Bonsu case raises issues of traditional African belief systems towards the dead. This also applies to repatriations of human remains as discussed by Reinnette Stander. Her article directly contributed to my discussion on human trafficking during the slave trade. This is the trafficking of humans and human remains against cultural heritage, and the fact that restitution encompasses both the cultural and the human. The return is in many ways a correction of historical mistakes and an indication that the two epochs of transfers complement each other and are intertwined. This justifies the need to study the illegal transfers of cultural property alongside human trafficking and migrations. The El Negro case in Botswana and Sara Baartman in South Africa are good examples of this human trafficking, even though Baartman was migrated alive. However, as indicated in an exhibition on 'The Slave Trade at the Cape', hosted by the Iziko Slave Lodge Museum, the cultural diversity at the Cape is a result of the slave trade. This is reflected today in the different communities found in the Cape region. The different slaves in the Cape brought different customs and cultural wares, which resulted in cultural diversity.[496]

Another angle of looking at the human migration aspect would be to analyse Daniel Kipkorir's article *War Medallions Stolen*. This discusses war medallions that were stolen through a robbery at the Kitale Museum in Kenya in 2009. Some staff members were implicated, and this is another aspect to the loss of collections by museums, which is instigated by officers.[497] In the same way, humans were "migrated" into slavery by other humans, while humans also transferred cultural property. In the same way, curators have facilitated the illegal movement

---

[494] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects."

[495] Daniel Kipkorir, "*Chief's Head Returned to Ghana*," *AFRICOM Newsletter* 8 (2009/10): 20–21. See also Reinette Stander, "Legal Frameworks for the Management of Museums."

[496] Iziko Slave Lodge Museums, "Information from Documentation Records on Botswana Collections," (Unpublished documents at Iziko Slave Lodge Museums, 2015).

[497] Daniel Kipkorir, "War Medallions Stolen," 20.

of objects, have facilitated thefts, or have stolen to sell for profit. The human component, therefore, becomes two-fold: Humans being trafficked and humans instigating the trafficking of both human and cultural property.

Serena Nanda also contributed to the argument on human trafficking as against cultural property. She links the Robben Island Museum to apartheid and discrimination, forced displacement and suffering. Nanda reflected on the broader culture of trafficking human beings into slavery.[498] The insight provided by Nanda leads to reflection on Michael Taussig's concept of relations between ethnography and colonial history. The link between the intangible cultural heritage and collections to the colonial legacy of object migration and slavery becomes more pronounced. Taussig's conclusion complements the article by enriching the thematic discussion on racism and society, slavery and the illicit trafficking of cultural property.[499] Brumfield also attempted to link the past of human trafficking to the present and future dominated by cultural trafficking. According to Brumfield, in human affairs the present is intimately linked with the past. In this way, the connection between the histories of colonisation (the migration of collections and human beings from one part of the world to another) is the outline.[500] The package, therefore, contains human trafficking today, slavery, illicit trafficking of cultural property and the repatriation of both.

In conclusion, the work of slavery is summarised by a narrative on an exhibition at the Slave Lodge Museum (Iziko Museums of South Africa) that said the following:

> On arrival at the Cape, slaves had their names changed and this withdrew them from their cultures and languages. By renaming them, the colonialists stripped them of their family connections and personal identity as well as cultural identity. They had been snatched away from their families, friends and familiar environment and became property to strangers. They were purchased, transported and treated as objects or commodities".[501]

Sarr and Savoy complemented this discussion on slavery in their discourse on the possible repatriation of African heritage and collaborations. They talked about the deprivation of cultural heritage by those who suffer from extraction and were in turn transformed into a 'thing'.[502]

---

[498] Serena Nanda, "South African Museums and the Creation of a New National Identity," 380.
[499] Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*.
[500] Elizabeth M. Brumfield, "It's a Material World: History, Artefacts and Anthropology," 205–223.
[501] Iziko Slave Lodge Museums, "Information from Documentation Records on Botswana Collections."
[502] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 8.

This clearly summarises the concept of slavery as natal alienation.[503] A famous quote by O.R. Tambo addressing this concept reads thus: "Common struggles—hidden heritage, every age, each era carries both the burden of its past and the seeds of the future".[504] In this way, the slaves were objectified just like the migrated cultural heritage. They were alienated, snatched away from their cultural context and background as argued in the discussion about the migrated objects and human remains.

4.2 HUMAN REMAINS

The enquiry into human remains alongside cultural property is in cognisance of the concern about whether human remains are also cultural property. This includes their display in museums, their alienation from places of origin, and their inclusion in discussions of restitution. The question is brought about by the fact that human remains are found in museums and are objectified as collections. This is also because the two have been discussed alongside one another by heritage managers and curators. These are appropriate questions, particularly in Africa where beliefs on the handling of the dead are a sensitive matter. The treatment of dead bodies as objects becomes a problematic and sensitive issue. The argument made by South African scholars and heritage managers is that these bodies have been dehumanised through display in museums and should be rehumanised by removal from display, repatriation back to communities of origin, reburial or celebration through monumental graves. I have argued that "museums become painful sites for the Indigenous people because of the colonial stench in them, seen through the displayed human remains and objects collected through punitive expeditions". This explains why there is a need to reinvent the museum.[505]

Besides the presentation as heritage, the scientific description of human remains as understood by heritage managers is also relevant. Reinnette Stander indicated that,

> Human remains refers to all forms of material or remains of modern humans including; osteological material, whole or part of skeletons, individual bones or fragments of bones, teeth, soft tissue including organs, skin, hair, nail, etc. preserved or waxed or dried/mummified. Slide preparations of human tissue.[506]

---

[503] Orlando Petterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, (Harvard University Press, 1982).
[504] Iziko Slave Lodge Museums, "Information from Documentation Records on Botswana Collections."
[505] Winani Thebele, "The Reinvention of the Museum into a Cultural Hub in the African Context," 36.
[506] Reinnette Stander, "In line with the National Heritage Council's Position Paper on Repatriation of Heritage Resources," (Pretoria: DAC, 2011).

In summary, human remains are museum possessions of any of the things described by Stander. This could include remains deposited in collections for a wide variety of reasons and from very diverse events. However, there is also a component of unethically collected human remains, such as the collection of human remains solely for racial studies or collections done without the appropriate consent of families. These could be "human remains from recent graves of individuals who were known in life, or were from known communities".[507] The given example of Chief Bonsu of Ghana and the Nama/Herero skulls from Germany are such cases. Colonial specimens and artefacts fed into a colonialist vision of a wild people, which were non-European races, and this accounts for the dividing line between races during the colonial period and why African people were targeted for these anatomical explorations. This explains why in the colonial history of the Torres Straight Islanders, and anywhere else where there is a history of colonialism, there is the notion of 'us and them' based on the race relations of the era. European nationalism and colonialism are therefore seen as objectifying and exoticising both the cultural property and human beings in the colonies.[508] The 'they' or 'we' aimed at social groupings during the period under discussion became a shared national identity among all the peoples of the colonies.[509] This makes colonialism a crime against humanity that needs to be confronted through concerted efforts and as a shared responsibility. Carsten Nielsen discussed what he termed "ethical curation" as a new development in the museum today, where the ritual needs of spiritual objects as well as human remains in museums are addressed. The new narratives for these colonial holdings have led to the performance of rituals in museums in order to allow for a more authentic representation of the communities of origin.[510] During events at the Iziko Museum, Cape Town, local Nama communities are often called to perform rituals in order to appease the spirits of their ancestral remains still held by the South African Museum. Richard Handler concluded that "there is a need to analyse these discourses and to mark the new shift in anthropology, which was originally based on the study of the *primitive other* as against the *civilised self* to an all-inclusive and sensitive study of human [communities]".[511]

To this point the study demonstrated that the proposed returns today and the proposed sharing are meant for both human remains and cultural property. Of late there have been a lot of

---

[507] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects."
[508] Richard Handler (ed.), *History of Anthropology* (Volume II), (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997), 5, 11–12.
[509] Richard Handler (ed.), *History of Anthropology*, 14.
[510] Carsten Viggo Nielsen, "When Objects of Religious Significance Mediate Power," 90.
[511] Richard Handler (ed.), *History of Anthropology*, 3.

restitution cases of human remains, particularly in South Africa and in Namibia, which explains the ensuing debate by scholars about whether bodies are also heritage. Nagya of Nigeria believed that dead bodies are also heritage because of the cultural ways of handling dead bodies and their burial in Africa. Hence, there is a need to repatriate and to do provenance research on them through all the relevant records of their migration.[512] He argued that libraries, museums and archives should engage in projects that affect society and are relevant to society, such as those on restitution and the sharing of cultural property, records, human remains and communities. The National Museum of Australia has such inconclusive cases where over 700 human remains restituted from Europe are held by museums and have not been handed over to indigenous communities due to the lack of provenance research. The Namibian government also faced this problem following the return of human remains. If efforts to seek provenance fail, governments will have to decide whether these human remains should stay in the museum to await research or opt for mass and monumental graves.[513]

When using the example of the dynamism of the slave trade, the wrong instigated by migration and illicit trafficking of cultural property can be corrected, more especially if return and/or sharing are the solution. How does restitution and sharing become a solution in this case of the proposed return of human remains or people? Do we leave the cultural property where it is and make it a heritage for all, for universality and for humanity, as indicated by the former British Museum Director, Neil MacGregor in reference to the Greek Parthenon Marbles?[514] In the same way the African remained in America, UK and France as a global being after their displacement by the slave trade. The research takes into consideration the evolution and dynamism in history, from illegal human trafficking to object trafficking when faced with the option of a shared heritage. That is why Chapter 5 unpacks the concept of sharing so that the reader can dissect the different concepts of artefacts, history, human beings, human remains and living cultures. This is an indication that, when talking of sharing, we should view heritage in its broadness. In this case, objects found in museums today, which are proposed for sharing and universality, are heritage. History as in that of slavery and that of fighting for liberation are also heritage, and shared by many communities and countries as heritage. Living culture as in dances or songs exchanged, copied or stolen from one community to another are also heritage. All these

[512] Minin A. Nagya (Deputy Director, National Library, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[513] Paul Turnbull, "International Repatriation of Indigenous Human Remains and its Complexities: The Australian Experience," 11.
[514] Neil McGregor, Former British Museum Director in reference to the Greek pathenon marbles, 2014

are heritage, which should be celebrated, promoted, safeguarded, acknowledged, and linked or returned to communities of origin or shared with the world community as universal property.

In the same way, the scientific study of human remains and objects can provide important information about humanity's past that cannot be done discovered by other means. Newly discovered human remains and objects in museums and universities are important for future discussions and exchanging of notes. However, when dealing with human remains and objects in museums, it is important that research ethics are not compromised. This does not only include involving the descendant or related community in the research, but also in how the human remains and objects are treated by scientists and museum professionals.[515] Accordingly, the Swiss government has questioned the documentation and narratives of their non-European museum objects and has in some cases chosen to return them, particularly human remains and ceremonial objects. This is because today's relational ethics and best practice are focussed on the documentation and involvement of communities of origin.[516]

As indicated earlier, there many demands made to the South African government by families and compatriots to repatriate human remains of South Africans in other countries (those in museums and comrades who died in exile). However, according to Stander, in the absence of any policy document or guidelines and principles, these requests are being dealt with on an *ad hoc* basis.[517] She emphasised that the proposed policy by South Africa will focus on the following: Local repatriation of human remains; those located in other countries; military veterans located outside the national borders; and restitution of cultural objects such as funerary objects, sacred objects and grave goods. The heritage legislature in many countries, including Botswana, makes no clear provision for repatriations. In the South African National Heritage Resources Act, human remains are only dealt with as archaeological material, burial grounds or graves, or heritage objects. According to Stander, however, this is highly problematic as human remains cannot be dealt with as heritage objects and not all human remains have necessarily been under the soil to qualify as archaeological material or part of burial grounds or graves. Currently in Botswana there are not many cases of remains of individuals that are outside the country, but there are remains of individuals from Botswana in places such as the

[515] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects."

[516] Noémie Etienne, Chonja Lee and Claire Brizon, "Global Provenance: Revisiting Appropriated Heritage in the Light of Inclusive Partnerships in Global Provenance" Unpublished talk as part of *"The Exotic" exhibition at the Swiss National Science Federation on 28–29 January, 2021.*

[517] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects."

Iziko Museums, the USA and Europe.[518] This is in the absence of fresh cases that might come up in the future from foreign institution that might be holding remains.

Alongside the many different cases of repatriation of dead bodies and objects, there are also cases of repatriation of humans as in communities. Since independence, Botswana has witnessed the return of these communities from places of refuge to their places of origin. One is also reminded of repatriations at the end of the slave trade for those who felt the strong urge to return back to Africa to places such as Sierra Leone. The need to repatriate by communities is because of being displaced and detached from the place of origin. This includes relocation from a foreign land to a home, hence the reference to expatriation as alienation. Sarr and Savoy argued that repatriation has a lot of meanings, such as restoration to originality, to re-balance, and to put things back in order, which could lead to new relations and reconciliation between people.[519] The Baka-Nswazwi people were repatriated from Jecheni in Zimbabwe to Marapong in Botswana. Chief John Madau Nswazwi's remains were also repatriated in 2002 from Jecheni in Zimbabwe to Marapong. He died in 1960 after migrating to Zimbabwe with his people in 1948 due to conflict with the Bangwato regent, Chief Tshekedi Khama, who had the support of the colonial government. There is, therefore, possible repatriation of those who died in exile to join the rest of the group in the future.[520] In this case, during the earlier migration, there was pressure to leave the ancestral land leading to the expatriation and alienation of the Baka-Nswazwi, and this is what eventually made them want to come back to ancestral land. If this was a form of social death, repatriation becomes a form of revival and restoration.[521]

There is also the long-panning case of the Baherero and Ovambanderu who are repatriating from Botswana to Namibia after being displaced by the German wars and genocide in Namibia a century ago. A report by the Botswana Daily News indicated that they have expressed the wish to repatriate to Namibia and that since 2013 both governments have held talks regarding the issue. The paramount Chief in Namibia also expressed his wish to welcome his people. Most of the Ovambanderu and Baherero are found in the Ngamiland District of Botswana and in particular in villages such as Chanoga, Nokaneng, Tsau, Semboyo, Habu, Makakung,

---

[518] Morongwa Mosothwane, "An Account of South African Human Skeleton Remains at Three North American Museum Collections," *South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series* 11 (2013).
[519] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 29.
[520] Winani Thebele, "Current Status of Human Remains Collection in Botswana," Unpublished paper presented at the *Human Remains Management and Repatriation Symposium, Iziko Museums, Cape Town, 13–14 February, 2017*.
[521] Orlando Petterson, *Slavery and Social Death*.

Kareng, Bothatogo, Toteng, Sehithwa, Bodibeng and Komana.[522] Similar to alienated and inalienable artefacts, they have stated the need to go back to their ancestors as the main reason for repatriation. Scholars, however, feel that this is more for economic reasons than cultural and social. The underlying current really is the link with the origins, the ancestral land, particularly in an African cultural setting. This viewpoint cuts across the board for both human remains, communities and objects, particularly inalienable ones. Some Herero and Ovambanderu groups that migrated to Botswana during wars with Germany were repatriated back to Namibia between 1993 and 1994.[523] This does not rule out the future repatriation of the human remains of members of the group that died in Botswana.

Nama people also migrated into Botswana during wars with Germany in 1909. Their chief Simon Cooper died in Botswana and was buried at Katlwe Pan in Lokgwabe in 1913. In 2011 the two groups from Namibia and Botswana united to erect a tombstone for him and they have since united in the celebration of their culture through an annual cultural festival. This is one of the rare cases in which the communities have opted for the erection of a memorial site or monument instead of repatriation. However, this does not rule out the fact that both groups could in the future demand repatriation of loved ones back to countries of origin or closer to other members of the family. This is also in cognisance of the fact that the Nama in Namibia already have a genocide lawsuit against the German government. They are demanding the repatriation of human skulls belonging to the Nama found in German institutions and museums, the sharing of research findings from the anatomical explorations as well as reparations. Sarr and Savoy argued that usually the deep pain caused by colonial violence brings about the need and demand for compensation and reparations. Restitution alone is not enough in the circumstances and compensation is meant to repair the damage and relationship and is a symbol of apology, reconciliation, and acknowledgement of the truth.[524]

The Bangwato under Chief Mphoeng migrated to Mphoeng, known as Mphoeng's Reserve, in Zimbabwe in the early 1900s after being banished by the colonial government. The group later returned back to Botswana, but a small splinter group remained there. They still speak Setswana and use *dikgotla* and ward names as found in Serowe and they still have very strong links with those are back home. This does not rule out the fact that following the example of

[522] *Botswana Daily News*, 80, "Herero People Express Wish to Return to Namibia", (2017): 3.
[523] *Botswana Daily News*, 80, Herero People Express Wish to Return to Namibia", (2017): 3.
[524] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 40.

other exile groups, this community may in the future demand repatriation, including that of those who died and were buried in Zimbabwe.

The repatriation of El Negro's remains from a museum in Spain is also a notable story of the repatriation of human remains in Botswana. Neil Parsons wrote a detailed article on the El Negro case, indicating that "his display in a museum has raised questions about the representation of dead human remains in museum displays".[525] El Negro's return to Botswana is in resonance with President Macron's pledge that French museums would repatriate all their colonial collections to Africa. This has been hailed as a breakthrough for curators, African countries, and museums on the path to repatriation. It is also in recognition of the fact that other people's heritage, particularly unethical collections such as human remains, can no longer remain entombed or imprisoned in European institutions.

Other cases of the repatriation of human remains involve South African ex-combatants who were followed and killed by the apartheid regime in Botswana. Many of them are not documented and the repatriation was done based on bilateral agreements and arrangements between families and the two governments. One such case is that of Tiro Onkgopotse, a teacher at St Joseph's College in Gaborone, who was killed by the apartheid regime. He was buried at Extension 14 graves in Gaborone (since declared a monument), from where his family has since exhumed him for reburial in South Africa. These are cases of human remains that are not from museums but have also warranted reburial and rehumanisation in accordance with African ways of repatriating the spirit to the place of origin to join other ancestors. It is also a case of bringing healing and closure to those affected.

The subject of human remains and their repatriation is a challenging and emotional one, hence, the need to transform mindsets and the international cultural landscape. This explains the overarching conversation on reappraisal, reconciliation, healing and forgiveness. Examples are Canada's numerous cases of return of the bodies of Indigenous people as part of reconciliation. There are many registered cases of human remains displayed in museums as well as return cases the world over. For example, some human skulls of Nama/Herero people were sold by the German colonial government to the American Museum of Natural History, New York, where they remain to date. These are mentioned in their bitter case of genocide and redress

[525] Neil Parsons, "South African Origins of El Negro Near the Orange/Vaal Rivers, 1830," (Gaborone: University of Botswana, 2000).

against the German government.[526] This is as per the attached reflection (even though the date of 1824 as indicated in the quote below is questionable since there is no evidence of the sale of human remains in Namibia so early):

> Judge differs a ruling on Berlin-Namibia Case' (US Judge Swain) in a lawsuit by the Nama-Herero against the German Government to seek reparations for colonial genocide. The lawyers point out to a German Museum's sale in 1824 of genocide victims' bones to a US collector who subsequently donated them to the American Museum of Natural History in New York. The discussion between the two governments include demand for an apology, and promise of development aid.[527]

There is also a case of a skull from Zimbabwe at the British Museum. According to Njabulo Chipangura (a curator at the Mutare Museum), the skull belongs to Chief Chingaira, a hero of the first Chimurenga, who resisted British penetration into Eastern Zimbabwe around 1896 and was captured and beheaded. His cut head was then handed over to Britain as a symbol of power by the Crown and to make his people submit to British rule. A committee has been set up to spearhead the repatriation process led by curators from the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe.[528] The remains of two young Amerindians are also displayed by the Carmo Archaeological Museum in Lisbon, Portugal. The Museum has also been under heavy criticism due to this continued display of human remains.[529]

However, regardless of all the different cases, the main objective of repatriation and restitution is to restore the humanity of those communities who have been affected. It is therefore important that the process of dealing with human remains takes into account the belief systems and dignity of the relevant communities.[530] The documentation of the repatriation of dead bodies and communities to source countries is modelled around the notions of heimat, motherland or ancestral land and rootedness. This evokes or promotes feelings of nationalism and identities in the receiving states.

From the museum perspective, Wendy Black et al. emphasised that bodies in museums must be given due respect, and they should be handled by professional staff with awareness of current debates on the same. Steps must be taken proactively to bury the remains. Human remains must be isolated from the rest of the collections, particularly in museums, and stored

---

[526] S.-L. Goeiman, "Nama/Herero Lawsuit against Germany," *Nama Cultural Festival* (n.d.).

[527] *Botswana Daily News*, "Judge differs a ruling on Berlin-Namibia Case," 143 (2017, August 2): 26.

[528] Njabulo Chipangura (curator at the Mutare Museum, Zimbabwe) in conversation with the author, 2018.

[529] Oscar Roldan-Alzate, "Memory," *Unofficial Guide to Carmo Museums: Chancay Collection*, https://sites.google.com/view/otempodashuacasenglish/about/guia/essays

[530] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects."

according to best practice until reburial or repatriation is possible, with no access by the public.[531] In the same way, repatriation and restitution programmes must be open and transparent to accommodate possible returns to communities and families. Below is an outline of processes and procedures to be taken into account during requests for repatriation and restitution:

- "Status of claimants, the cultural and spiritual significance of the human remains.
- The age of the human remains, how the remains were originally acquired.
- The potential public benefit of the human remains.
- Whether this is unethically collected human remains, re-interment, spiritual repatriation.
- Communities and families have a responsibility to their ancestors to bring them back home to country or village of origin according to their customs, traditions and laws. The determination of who is involved in negotiations and consultations is made by the communities and families themselves.
- Communities and families should have access to and copies of all relevant documentation concerning their ancestral remains so that they also verify facts."
- Human remains should be returned expeditiously and in accordance with the protocols of communities and or families.
- Human remains should be treated with respect and dignity at all times by all involved.
- Communities and families are the rightful custodians of their ancestral remains and are the rightful owners of associated grave goods and should be consulted prior to any such property being returned. They should determine when and how repatriation should be undertaken.
- If the community desires to perform any cultural practices, rituals (as has been the case in Canada, North America) in association with human remains in a museum they should be allowed.
- A coordinated approach between all levels of government to facilitate the return of human remains to communities and families should be undertaken".[532]

Stander reminded us that in all of the above cultural protocols should be considered to enable the implementation of repatriations.[533] Many cases of human remains and community

[531] Wendy Black et al., "Who Were They? Repatriation and the Rehumanisation of Human Remains in Museums in Southern Africa," 310.
[532] Wendy Black et al., "Who Were They? Repatriation and the Rehumanisation of Human Remains in Museums in Southern Africa."
[533] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects

repatriations and their restitution have their origins during the slave trade, the colonial period, and the ensuing struggles for liberation. Moreover, the understanding is that the slave trade and the trafficking of human remains were a prelude to or rather gave impetus to the illicit trafficking of cultural property. This constitutes a "challenging history", a dark past in the life of humanity and of Africa that has to be faced by the perpetrators and those who were violated.[534] The South African historian Legassick and Rassool argued that the Bushman and Relics Act of 1911 was intended to halt the trafficking of human remains of Bushmen: "Local institutions and museums in Europe were eager to acquire types of specimens of, in terms discourse of the day, a primitive form of humanity. This was part of the scientific discoveries of the time, where humans of non-European origin were objectified and exoticised".[535] This is exoticised as in being transported and relocated to a foreign place, where they ended up on display in museums instead of being buried in the African understanding of joining the ancestors and the spirit being laid to rest.[536]

Introspectively, Tiffany Jenkins explored the return of human remains through her *Crisis of Conscience*. This is because the migration of humans or human remains involves both museum professionals and sometimes Indigenous peoples of former colonies. She gave the example of the return of Saartjie Baartman to South Africa in 2002, and indicated that the returns are at times therapeutic; they heal wounds of colonialism and other forms of discrimination.[537] It should be noted that returns can also open up new wounds and lead to reflections around the meaning of nationalism, unity, social cohesion, and discrimination. The return of an object and human remains as in Baartman's case can also destabilise a new social cohesion, such as a national identity and stability. It could lead a group of people or community to question their national identity or sense of belonging. This is what brought about contemporary trends such as 'truth and reconciliation' as seen in South Africa during Nelson Mandela's presidency. This has also been applied in Canada following the numerous cases involving the repatriation of ancestral remains and objects of indigenous communities. According to Bryan Stevenson, Black Americans have also adopted the idea of truth and reconciliation in their case of redress to the history of slavery and lynching.[538] The American case, however, are slightly different

---

[534] Dan Hick, The Brutish Museums, Pluto, 2021

[535] Martin Legassick and Ciraj Rassool, *Skeletons in the Cupboards*.

[536] Noémie Étienne, "Transaction and Translation," 15.

[529] Tiffany Jenkins, *Contesting Human Remains in Museum Collections*. See also Donald Fraser, *The Story of Our Mission—Livingstonia*, 3.

[538] Bryan Stevenson, "Truth and Reconciliation: Using Cultural Spaces to Change the Narrative," in *General Conference for The American Alliance of Museums Annual Meeting & Museum-Expo, St Louis, May 2017*.

when their condition is reparations, and in this case truth and reconciliation alone are not enough. This brings up the issue of provenance, which should serve as a blueprint to all the decisions on the fate of remains. Jenkins complemented Sarr and Savoy on the argument that returns open old wounds. The thinking is that restituting human remains or objects that were taken centuries ago is tantamount to re-opening the "old colonial machine", old wounds and "a file containing erased dark memories" for both the victims and the victimised.[539] As much as this is a dark past, it has to be faced by today's generation so that a new chapter can be written. This dark past should be opened to reconcile with it and bring closure.

As indicated in Chapter 2, the challenge in Botswana is the absence of policy to guide repatriations and to direct the management of human remains. There are no tools to protect against the illegal import and export of heritage.[540] The existing policies, i.e., the Monuments and Relics Act (reviewed 2004), only mention human remains in passing, which is not adequate. Even the above illustrated successful repatriation cases were only done through the use of the general customs rules and bilateral agreements between Botswana and the concerned countries. As a result, the Botswana National Museum and private archaeologists rely on international professional museum standards for the exhumation, repatriation, collection and management of remains. These are protocols such as the Vermillion Accord on Human Remains, the Tamaki Makau-rau Accord on the Display of Human Remains and Sacred Objects and the World Archaeology Congress First Code of Ethics.[541] They also draw from South African law or refer back to the colonial Act on Bushman Relics.[542]

Most of the human remains found in the Botswana National Museum collection and that of the University of Botswana were collected through the normal rescue method and through excavations. There is still need for policy to direct the handling of human remains. For ordinary local repatriations, this is normally negotiated with communities before relocation or reburial. However, a problem arises when there are contestations or when dealing with another country and there are issues raised, then there is no tangible legal structure to refer to. It is, therefore, imperative that the role of the museum in Botswana is visible, particularly in the development of proper and relevant domestic legislation on human remains. In many international cases it is the museums themselves that want to identify culturally appropriate solutions. In the

[539] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 15.
[540] Morongwa Mosothwane, "An Account of South African Human Skeleton Remains at Three North American Museum Collections."
[541] World Archaeological Congress, "World Archaeology Congress First Code of Ethics."
[542] Republic of South Africa, "Draft National Policy on the Repatriation and Restitution of Human Remains and Heritage Objects."

Southern African context, it is therefore, important to develop effective and acceptable mechanisms for the process of return. This should be done in collaboration with Indigenous people, governments and other stakeholders. Museums face a number of challenges trying to address these issues. These include the lack of institutional and government policies that would allow for repatriation, the lack of staff capacity and resources, inability to accurately identify the source communities for human remains, and the lack of funding for community consultation, engagement and education, repatriation and reburial. There is also a need to identify cultural appropriate solutions for the Southern African context in order to allow for the handling and repatriation at a regional level.[543]

There is, however, a current case through a partnership with Iziko Museums and the proposal to repatriate human remains to Botswana and Namibia. In 2016, the Commonwealth Association of Museums (CAM), Iziko Museums of South Africa, and the Museums Association of Namibia and the Botswana National Museum embarked on a project to develop policy and guidelines for human remains management in Southern African countries. The Human Remains Management and Repatriation Symposium, the initial forum for discussion, was held at Iziko Museums in Cape Town from 13 to 14 February 2017.

In the South African and Canadian cases, there has been progress in the development of policy for the same purpose and the hope is that the other two partners will benefit from the experience of Canada and South Africa. In South Africa, the South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRAH) formulates policy and legislation. This includes the formulation of repository standards. According to Mimi Seetelo, SAHRA always partners with the DAC for the repatriation of human remains.[544] Repatriation is a consultative process that involves stakeholders such as military, local municipality, government, community and families. Communities could also be involved in the conservation of the graves of those that are reburied, acting as curators or custodians. This is the case with the community of Mwajahane in Mozambique, Eduardo Mondlane's home village, where his clan gravesite has been used to promote a cultural village or open-air museum and is run by the community.

Reinnette Stander, as an officer at South Africa's DAC, argued for the above conclusions. According to her, the subject of repatriation of ancestral remains and objects is a legislative

---

[543] Wendy Black et al., "Who Were They? Repatriation and the Rehumanisation of Human Remains in Museums in Southern Africa," 317.
[544] Mimi Seetelo, "The Management of Human Remains and Development of Legislation in SA," Unpublished paper presented at the *Human Remains Management and Repatriation Workshop, Cape Town, 13–14 February 2017.*

issue. There is a need for a new precedent and legislation for sub-Saharan Africa so that efforts by different countries at legislation development in dealing with human remains complement one another.[545] She highlighted that the DAC has drafted a policy on human remains on which consultations with communities has been done. The plan is now do a workshop for stakeholders to share and consult for ownership and final approval before it is taken to parliament. In conclusion, she proposed the following**:**

- Erection of memorials as monuments for repatriated human remains, as is the case for the Chief Simon Cooper monument in Lokgwabe, Botswana, Eduardo Mondlane memorial in Mozambique, the South African Matola monument in Maputo, Mozambique (done in memory of ANC's fallen heroes).
- Museums, universities and governments should consider spiritual repatriations where applicable as is commonly done according to South African customs. They perform rituals and repatriate the spirit back home or to any preferred place. This is also reflected in their post-apartheid museums such as Freedom Park.
- Advisory bodies should be appointed by countries to deal with the issue of repatriation of dead bodies since it is a sensitive subject.[546]

The US adopted the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act in 1990, for example, to address cases of human remains and their repatriation, among others. It gave American Indigenous people the right to repatriate and participate in managing their own heritage.[547]

But should we keep human remains in museums, and should museums continue to actively collect human remains? There is need for a SADC statement on human remains. This will allow for a concerted effort by the region on the issue of human remains. This is in consideration of the fact that there are many shared communities, histories and landscapes between SADC states. Roksana Omar argued that SADC countries should collaborate in developing guidelines on human remains and their repatriation. Each individual country would also have to domesticate this through national policies. The ICOM Code of Ethics also deals with the issue in section 2.5 and 4.3 and proposes the use of DNA for identification of bodies. It also proposes

[545] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects."
[546] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects."
[547] Carsten Viggo Nielsen, "When Objects of Religious Significance Mediate Power," 90.

the use of mass graves for unidentified human remains.[548] The 1986 ICOM Code of Ethics addressed repatriations and collaborations by museums, communities and states. It accommodated for both curatorial and the religious interests of the communities of provenance.[549] Above all else is the need for provenance research in order to realise this and to authenticate cases.

The issue of human remains and communities is not only about repatriation, but also about acknowledging what happened and documenting it. It is also about restoration, reconciliation, forgiveness, collaborating and dialogue by institutions, communities, and finally, about reburial. This becomes a whole cycle with important historical pointers. The only obstacle is that there has been a delayed response to the subject of human remains and repatriation in Southern Africa. Meanwhile, in other parts of the world people have forged ahead. African curators delayed shaking off the colonial museum and its legacies and moving towards decolonisation. There were often struggles with inadequate funding and capacity, and it took time to reconceive into the current international context.[550] The current dialogue is fuelled by discussions around the world on illicit trafficking, restitution, reconciliation, forgiveness, and human remains and their repatriation. This has pressured African curators to address these global issues of concern since they also affect African museums and countries. The exercise is very expensive and needs a concerted effort by all stakeholders to afford repatriation. This applies to governments, heritage institutions and museums, universities, and the local and the global community. The only challenge for museums and curators is what to do with the repatriated human remains to avoid inconclusive cases such as the Australian and Namibian cases. These could be reburied, displayed in museums, or remembered through monuments.

One of the observations at the Human Remains Symposium in Cape Town was that the subject of repatriation, consultation, claims, and reburial of human remains demands constitutes a new museology and a new experience for African museums. It, therefore, calls for museum curators to be proactive and to follow the South African experience. There is also a need for a proper verification and authentication process for the claims because this involves a deep form of colonialism, a complicated and distorted history. Group repatriations, repatriation of royals (such as Chief Bonsu's head and the remains of Chief Mangi Meli of Tanzania) and those who

---

[548] Rooksana Omar, "Proposal for Legal Protocols and Regional Cooperation," Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.
[549] Carsten Viggo Nielsen, "When Objects of Religious Significance Mediate Power," 91.
[542] Kenji Yoshida and John Mack (ed.), *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?*, ix.

played a significant role in society and fought for freedom should procedurally be complemented by memorial sites and monuments. Canada is one country that has witnessed debates on issues of cultural and human migration as well as their repatriation and return. As such, it has had to come up with relevant legislation to deal with the issue. The research study draws from the Canadian example and its different cases of the return of human remains and the resultant legal structures put in place to address the issue. This was also meant to act as a guide to the collaboration between Botswana museums and the national museums of Namibia and Iziko Museums of Cape Town, South Africa. According to Richard Benjamin, the Director of the Slave Lodge Institutional Museum in Liverpool, reconciliation is a post-trauma expression. In his view, the Canadians borrowed the term truth and reconciliation from South Africa in order to address their numerous cases of Indigenous people and human remains migration. This has also affected the European scenario and as a result, there is currently a big campaign in Europe about decolonising the museum.[551] The Macron declaration also provided a spark to the current undertaking alluded to by Benjamin.

Janet Young of the Canadian Museum of History cautioned that the key process in the repatriation of human remains is consultation with the community. It therefore becomes a partnership exercise between the museum, government and the community.[552] Figmee Jacobs concluded that repatriation is about the restoration of dignity of the departed human being. That is why in South Africa they value the inclusion of traditional ceremonies (spiritual repatriation), the church and community in repatriation and reburial cases.[553] In reaction to all the issues surrounding colonialism, slavery, reconciliation, repatriation and redress to historical mishaps, a museum in Turkey decided to put up an exhibition in 2014 titled *Facing the Past; and Apology*. The exhibition provided a platform for the Turkish people to face a dark past and offer reparation and a new beginning into the future.[554]

Wendy Black of Iziko Museums in Cape Town reiterated that discussions on repatriations of human remains should be based on mutual respect and understanding. This is reflected through the collaboration between Iziko, Namibia and Botswana museums. Human remains are a

---

[551] Richard Benjamin, "The European Debate about the Decolonization of the Museum," Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.
[552] Janet Young, "Partnership with Government and Community," Unpublished paper presented at *the Human Remains Management and Repatriation Workshop, Cape Town, 13–14 February 2017.*
[553] Figmee Jacobs, "The Involvement of the Community in Repatriation," Unpublished paper presented at the *Human Remains Management and Repatriation Workshop, Cape Town, 13–14 February 2017.*
[554] Open Society Exhibition. Exhibition: "Facing the Past and Apology," (Turkey, 2014).

problematic heritage and their exportation and repatriation can involve anger, grief, relief and happiness. This, therefore, calls for collaborative curatorship and museology. It also calls for the celebration and promotion of heritage as a human right.[555]

In conclusion, it is incontestable that human remains in museums were unethically collected, because they were collected through unaccepted ways such as grave robberies and for use in anatomical research by scientists. These were then dehumanised and displayed in museums as objects and curios. The drive behind the collection of human remains in this manner was the idea of studying the 'other'. This was in most cases applied to the black person, who was used for comparative analysis to the white person and to some animal species to justify and authenticate their humanness. This led to the presence of black people's human remains in museums, particularly cosmopolitan museums. It was indeed an age of illicit trafficking in human remains. Human remains were excavated and transported to institutions of learning in African countries or in Europe. Ironically, while the earlier scientists were responsible for the dehumanisation of humans into collections, it is now the social scientists who are advocating for rehumanisation and the decolonisation process. Looking at the ongoing conversation globally around the subject, it is true that the rehumanisation process is "impossible no more".[556] It is important that the repatriation of ceremonial and spiritual objects of indigenous people be recognised. They should also be involved in the preservation of those that still remain in museums by being hired to work in museums, particularly those holding their collections. The other proposal is that they should have their own community museums and be involved in the management of their own collections. Both UNESCO and the UN recognise the rights of indigenous people, and the guidelines from the same protocol on the welfare of Indigenous people should therefore be followed.[557]

4.3 CULTURAL OBJECTS

The issue of return and repatriation also applies to cultural objects, and even the proposed notion of sharing is directed to cultural objects. That explains why there has been a concern as to whether human remains are also cultural property and a proposal to show how the two are

---

[555] Wendy Black, "The European Debate about the Decolonization of the Museum," Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*. See also Lyndel V. Prott, Witnesses to History: A *C*ompendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects.

[556] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 1.

[557] Wendy Black, "The European Debate about the Decolonization of the Museum."

connected. The preservation and migration of cultural objects complements the history and culture of communities.[558] Handler, speaking of Fanon, talked of "the memory of the history of race and racism in colonialism and the question of cultural identity".[559] In the same way, this study talks about the dislocation and alienation of cultural objects leading to the issue of concern today, which is multi-culturalism or cultural diversity, universality and the shareability of cultural objects and heritage.[560]

The destruction of archaeological sites and illegal trade in cultural objects has gone up in the last hundred years. This creates a dent in the history of Africa, violates the rights of the communities of provenance and greatly affects the development of museums.[561] The situation continues to today with the flourishing of the global North and the weakening of the global South. This justifies the global outcry and requests for repatriation of the African heritage. Africans derive a sense of pride from the proposed repatriation, universality, co-curation of this heritage and the representational posture assumed by these objects. They are a true expression of the creativity of the diverse communities of the mother continent and they reflect the brilliance and spiritual being of the communities of origin.[562]

In reaction to trafficking, countries have hastened to draft and adopt laws, ratified conventions, developed Red Lists and adopted codes of ethics. Such examples are Nigeria, Italy, the UK, Canada, and the US. Even international organisations such as ICOM, UNESCO, the UN, and Interpol have advocated their statements on cultural migrations and proposed solutions. There are also local initiatives by governments to protect heritage and return cultural objects and human remains, as pledged by President Macron of France in 2017. The positive benefits will obviously be slow because the repatriation process is complex.[563] Partners are not always true to their commitments; European countries, North America, Asia and Switzerland are often blamed creating a market for the illicit trade of cultural objects.[564] Antique dealers, auction houses, museums and collectors within these countries have been a great part of this object

[558] Reinnette Stander, "National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects."
[559] Richard Handler (ed.), *History of Anthropology*, 76.
[560] Anne Mayor, Vincent Négri and Eric Huysecom (eds.), *African Memory in Danger*.
[561] Anne Mayor, Vincent Négri and Eric Huysecom (eds.), *African Memory in Danger*.
[562] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 8, 39.
[563] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*.
[564] Anne Mayor, Vincent Négri and Eric Huysecom (eds.), *African Memory in Danger*.

migration and its benefits. How fair and equal, then are proposed collaborations and partnerships over this same heritage?

As part of the promotion of initiatives towards collaboration and a shared responsibility by Switzerland, a conference was held in Geneva in 2015 to address the subject of object migration. The contributions by museum curators, heritage managers and other experts, including representatives of the police, were published as a book. It brought together perspectives from Africa, Switzerland and Europe with regards to the migrated heritage that is in European museums. Reflections by researchers responsible for cultural objects of African origin were also incorporated. This included ethical reflections and updates on legislature linked to the migrated objects. Several initiatives at cooperation over these migrated objects are visible. Their aim is to devise the best ways to cooperate and untangle this difficult colonial problem in a way that leaves both camps satisfied.[565]

This cooperation and international dialogue in a way serves the notion of a shared heritage and responsibility. While this is an option for UNESCO and ICOM, the global community is also keen to know new places and learn about other societies. All these are reflected in the cultural objects found in museums when they embody their power to attract the visitor. Key concepts have come up around the notion of universality such as 'return to the source' or 'identity and dignity' and they all talk to the migration of cultural objects. The notion of 'return to the source' is related to that of renaissance, and I thus attempt to unpack it in light of what needs to be returned, to whom and why. This implies the relation between 'return to the source' and restitution, and of investigating if this is spiritual, cultural, or economic return. Moreover, the return is for the displaced in the diaspora, cultural property as well as human remains. I argue that return becomes a solution because of the issue of the irrelevance of the objects to coloniser societies. This also applies to humans in the diaspora. This accounts for the continued outcry about severe punishment (lynching) and racial inequalities among Black Americans that is still visible today. This was mentioned by Bryan Stevenson during his talk on the occasion of the Annual Meeting & Museum-Expo by the American Alliance of Museums in St Louis in May 2017.[566] According to Stevenson, this is because each level or class, i.e., state, nation, and ethnic group, keeps its own identity and this is reflected in cultural objects. In the urban centres as

[565] Anne Mayor, Vincent Négri and Eric Huysecom (eds.), *African Memory in Danger*.
[566] Bryan Stevenson, "Truth and Reconciliation: Using Cultural Spaces to Change the Narrative."

well as in the interior regions where the discriminatory culture of colonialism is still prevalent, the identity of Black Americans is a problematic issue.[567]

It is also important to interrogate the relation between notions of universality and the African diaspora. The diaspora, according to this study, refers to cultural objects, human remains and humans. This links up the migration of humans to that of objects. Within this context, the concept of restitution and the reference to 'return to the source' would apply to indigenous Africans and the cultural property that is in the diaspora. The return is therefore directed to both human beings and cultural property. It is this strong urge for return that led to the Black consciousness movements of the 20th century, such as Pan-Africanism and Negritude. This was meant to fight the supremacy of the culture of the colonial powers. Hence, 'return to the source' or restitution is a step towards redress and closure to an old chapter. This is a need enforced by social inconsistences between the colonised communities and the coloniser. Similarly, when 'return to the source' moves from the individual to a group, it becomes a 'liberation struggle'. The notion of 'return to the source' is a slow process broken down into ethnic and national demands. This is the demand for cultural objects by many different African countries and many other nations elsewhere in the world. The demand for return in this sense is not only to prove identity but also dignity.[568] This therefore presents the ultimate goal in the demand for restitution or a shared heritage where the 'other' is a problem.

Culture and heritage tourism is another line of approach to the promotion and the understanding of heritage and culture and it subscribes to the contemporary growth industries. The growing notion of heritage tourism is reflected through visitorship to heritage sites and museums. Many governments have now begun to support heritage because it contributes to economic growth through tourism. It is also tied to the concept of globalisation and sustainability. Heritage in this sense helps to build postcolonial identities, hence the current move and conversations towards decolonisation in Europe and in Africa. This is a quest to repair, restore and correct the disjuncture and wrongs created by colonialism to culture and history. Opting for heritage resolves the disjuncture of the global and universal heritage. This has led to the opening of new museums and sites, heritage trails and routes and the development of monuments. A good example is the current programme on liberation heritage or African Roads to Independence

---

[567] Bryan Stevenson, "Truth and Reconciliation: Using Cultural Spaces to Change the Narrative."

[568] Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture—Anthropology, Travel Culture and Government*, 62–96. See also African Information Services, *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*, (Monthly Review Press, 1973), 39.

initiated by the African Union and UNESCO. In this programme African countries recognised that they have a common history of slavery, colonialism and fighting for liberation, loss of cultural property, and loss of lives and identity. The history needs to be documented through archiving, museums and sites in order to be shared with the world and the young generation. Countries are required to document this history for the development of an African book with different national chapters detailing this epoch in the African history.[569] This is also a deliberate move towards a shared heritage as a shared responsibility and a goal towards the Africa heritage. UNESCO and the African Union created a concept document to act as a guide to African countries to implement this programme. A number of workshops have been convened on the same topic, and countries have collaborated with neighbours over shared communities, landscapes and histories in order to implement this. Those that gained independence through liberation struggles, such as South Africa, have even developed monuments in neighbouring states to recognise the liberation heritage route.

4.4 HERITAGE AND CULTURE AS TOOLS FOR RESTORATION

Heritage is a concept encompassing cultural objects, archaeological findings, intangible cultural heritage, scientific specimens, movable and immovable heritage, and other items. While heritage may be a contested concept, it acts as a tool for restoration and appears as a point of both identity and difference. It embodies our cultural identity, is a pivotal part of our lives, and therefore, has the power to connect and revive communities. For example, the return of countries' heritage, just like the repatriation of human remains, heals communities. It restores dignity to their history, culture and the spiritual realm.[570] Heritage therefore fulfils the role of being shared as a universal entity and as a key component for restitution. It has the potential to affirm diverse cultures and helps fill up gaps caused by colonial inequalities. In the universal context, heritage deepens our understanding and appreciation of others.[571]

Through heritage, we recognise the cadence of the anti-colonial discourse as seen through figures such as Steve Biko, Martin Luther King, and others. Colonialism is in this sense seen as a crime against humanity, which embodies human beings and their history, culture and

---

[569] UNESCO and African Union, "Roads to Independence: The African Liberation Heritage Programme."

[570] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 27–30.

[571] Michael Banton (ed.), *A.S.A Monographs 1: The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, (Tavistock Publishers, 1968), 1–20. See also Laurajane Smith, "Class Heritage and the Negotiation of Place," a paper presented at the *Missing Out on Heritage: Socio-Economic Status and Heritage Participation Conference*, *English Heritage, 2009.*

spirituality. The restoration of an African past restores us to humanity, hence the agitation for restitution of cultural objects, human remains and the option for a shared heritage. Restitution or identification with cultural objects that are in the diaspora and a shared ownership is tantamount to uncovering the past and it sets us free. Heritage embodies both inclusivity and exclusivity, between the forces of memory and forgetting. Scholars have argued that heritage is a 'memorial site'. There is simultaneity of past and present, and in this way, heritage acts as a tool for restoration. It restores to people and communities their dignity, identity and pride, hence the reference to heritage as a tool for reconstruction of identities.[572]

The adoption of the notion of heritage was, therefore, conceptualised around notions of redress and recognition of previously marginalised narratives and categories of heritage, intangible and living. This exercise was realised in the renaming of sites, towns, cities, and streets in many African countries, particularly after independence. It also embraced the notion of repatriation by most liberated nations from Africa and elsewhere.[573] Heritage is culturally rooted and it involves core identities requiring preservation and commemoration.[574] Illegal migrations, as in the migration of human beings, human remains and cultural objects, do not promote heritage but destroy it. This also applies to current trends of commercial exploitation. Heritage symbolises a past culture; a history that is brought into the present to act as a symbol of identity, is celebrated and cherished as a right. Culture or heritage is the magnet that draws other societies to our unique and special way of life. It therefore, cements relations between communities. The thesis, however, argues that where the other culture is destroyed or subdued, there is no relationship between two societies because it is not a reciprocal relationship. It has no exchange and appreciation of the other.

Another area of discussion addressing issues of colonial social relations, the loss of self and spirituality is that of 'assimilation'. Assimilation here is seen in relation to colonialism. Eduardo Mondlane[575] discussed the same complex situation of assimilation by African colonised communities at length. He felt that extreme colonialism entailing assimilation was a great test to the African culture Mondlane and Cabral of Guinea-Bissau believed in solidarity and the African culture as a tool for Africa's liberation. According to Mondlane and Cabral,

---

[572] Viv Golding and Jen Walklate (eds.), *Museums and Communities,* 13–14.
[573] Ciraj Rassool, "Building a Critical Museology in Africa," xxi.
[574] Philipp Schorch, "Sensitive Heritage: Ethnographic Museum, Provenance Research and the Potentialities of Restitution."
[575] African Information Services, *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*, 39.

even European fascists valued culture and saw it as a tool of resistance to foreign domination.[576] Meanwhile, Africans were at some point made to shun their own culture as barbaric. Their cultural heritage was taken from its own people to foreign lands. What impact did this have on the African people? The continued extraction of the dominated people's resources also took the form of the destruction of their cultural life.[577] Domination by the imperial power meant the destruction the culture of the colonised, hence the destruction of the fibre that helped bind them. This domination came in different shapes. Portuguese domination in Angola, Mozambique and its other colonies sometimes took a genocidal form, as did the domination of the Germans over the Nama and Herero in Namibia. In other instances, the coloniser succeeded in imposing its power and did not tamper with the culture of the dominated people. It could also mean the "harmonisation of the economic and political domination of the colonised people with their cultural identity".[578] This harmonisation approach was prevalent in the British settler dominated colonies of Kenya, Tanzania, South Africa and others. The Director of The Federal Capital Territory in Nigeria, Isa Jalo, felt that the loss of African culture was a result of negligence of cultural property by the elite. This was when they started shunning it as heathen in favour of the culture and religion of the colonial master (a case of assimilation). In his view, this period marked the highest point in the trafficking because African culture had lost its value in our eyes and we were ready to let it go. Even today, elites often attach little value to African cultural property.[579] Mondlane and Cabral made similar points about the elite, their assimilation, and negativity towards their heritage.[580]

The reaction of dominated African communities was cultural resistance to the imperialist domination. The cultural domination of the colonised reduced them to prisoners and exposed them to forms of racial discrimination. This is a situation of the domination of the imperial power against the cultural or spiritual endurance of a dominated people. It creates a situation of economic and political dependency and possible reciprocal considerations between human societies.[581] In most cases, there was no reciprocity, particularly in the political domination of a weaker group. This is as seen through the economic disparities between the global North and

[576] African Information Services, *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*, 39.
[577] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 7–8.
[578] African Information Services, *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*, 39 African Information Services, *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*, 39
[579] Isa Jalo (Director of the Federal Capital Territory Administration, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[580] African Information Services, *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*, 39.
[581] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 33.

the global South. There is also no reciprocity between Black Americans and the dominant regime.

The restitution of migrated objects and human remains within this context of colonial domination and assimilation comes as a form of national and cultural liberation. For example, the reciprocal relationship between the Portuguese traders and certain African kingdoms had a minimum basis for them understanding one another, hence, creating an element of mimesis. The fact that they were literally from different worlds led to them constructing images of each other as 'the other'. This was the process of alterity and 'othering' those engaged.[582] The long history of isolation, lynching and discrimination against Black Americans in the US also creates this situation of 'othering'.

In the context of colonialism and in most colonial African countries, the idea of 'a civilising mission' was the leverage behind colonialism. The idea behind the civilisation of African communities was the belief that God had created a better people whose duty was to uplift those who were less fortunate. The adopted posture of 'indirect rule' and racial segregation by the coloniser rested on racial separation and superiority. The reaction by the colonised societies in Africa was to turn culture into an instrument of political resistance. They affirmed their exclusive proprietorship of this domain and asserted its fundamental value beyond the defamations of colonialism. According to Eduardo Mondlane and Amilcar Cabral, culture was the only independent weapon at their disposal to offer resilience to the denial and unfriendliness of colonialism. This justifies why culture was such a powerful form of political resistance.[583]

Anti-colonialism was a cultural struggle much as it was a political one. Culture was used as an instrument to forge identities, as in the South African and Mozambican examples. Even the repatriated cultural objects and human remains are now used to forge identities for local communities. The aspect of universality is in this sense addressed by culture. The ICOM Newsletter supported this when reporting in 2017 that European countries met at the first ever G7 forum of culture in Florence to discuss the role of culture in global communication and the corresponding urgency of protecting cultural heritage.[584] Here culture is turned into an object of unification, and it is objectified as in the migrated museum and the illicit trafficking. The

---

[582] Philip Jones, "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," 123–125.

[583]. African Information Services, *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*. See also Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 39

[584] *ICOM Newsletter*, "Culture as an Instrument for Communication," (2017): 2.

objects were also a sign of European mastery over the world, and it symbolised European expressions, domestication, threatening the colonised with its power, and celebrating that power.

This explains the main anchoring of heritage in rootedness, origins, history, tradition, provenance and authenticity, which is now overshadowing the global concepts of restitution and a shared heritage. Instead of describing heritage as artefacts, scholars have therefore described it as 'a set of effects' and this has led to the discussion of the 'museum effect', hence the 'heritage effect'. The notion of heritage therefore works alongside other related concepts such as race, gender, nation, universality, culture, human remains and collections. In this way, the site of heritage becomes the site for an active cultural cycle, involving the present, the past, and the future. This is as seen through the migration and restitution of cultural objects and human remains. This is what sparks conversations on heritage by the global community today and what gives it potential in the postcolonial and the present. In this way, heritage is the central point in the proposed decolonisation concept for museums. It presents a rich set of opportunities for confirming and contesting settled identities, for example, through restitution and provenance that entails the 'self' and the 'nation' as against the 'other' and 'alterity'. Meanwhile, heritage refers us to a tangled web of present dreams and aspirations as reflected in the discussion on the migrated museum. It entails the wish to restitute, to heal, to reconcile, to share and to collaborate. It is in heritage (particularly through successful restitutions) that nations, communities and individuals remake themselves and also where past and lost forgotten ceremonies and rituals are reinvented and enacted.

In Botswana, this has taken the form of a mushrooming of cultural festivals by different groups as a way of reviving and celebrating their cultures. It is also revival through reinvented traditional music by the young. According to Michael Banton, this symbolically erases the sins of the past and new beginnings are achieved through heritage.[585] A good example is the stand taken by the German government by taking responsibility and accepting the blame for past evils and to express regret to the Namibian Nama and Herero communities for the genocide committed on their ancestors. This has also been evidenced by President Macron's pledge that

[585] Michael Banton (ed.), *A.S.A Monographs 1: The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, 135.

France will return the entire looted heritage in French museums back to Africa (West Africa). In this way, the self is invested in the African communities that had lost the heritage.[586]

The above on culture and heritage is an indication that the empirical study of the migrated objects and efforts to resolve the problem are now a global issue. This also reflects the new image of heritage as an international property or possession as well as a human right.[587] The true fact is that in the struggle for liberation, culture became a site of contestation against oppression, domination and marginalisation.

With the advent of globalisation, the colonial scenario reflected in the above has inevitably led to calls for the recognition and evaluation of culture. This justifies the need to reappraise the whole exercise of object migration and the misrepresentation that followed for centuries. It also talks to the transformation of the discourse towards restitution, globalisation, universality or shared heritage.[588] Michael Baton discussed the relevance of models of social anthropology to the histories and cultures of societies.[589] This thesis seeks to establish if these are applicable to the long history of the loss of Africa's heritage and the African story of cultural redress. It should at the same time explain the continued existence of a considerable number of cultural objects in the diaspora. The formula should also include the varied approaches taken by all the players to forge a way forward in finding a lasting solution. This is as reflected in the current dialogue between European and African museums and curators towards cooperation to decolonise museums. It also includes efforts by European countries to do provenance research on their colonial holdings and the initiated restitution cases.[590]

This commodification or objectification of the African culture is therefore found all over the world in the form of cultural objects, music, dance and dress. Natasha Eaton talked about the colonial "iconoclash" in reference to the display of Indian objects in cosmopolitan museums during the colonial period. She argued that the Indian objects displayed in European museums presented a "fascinating" case of aesthetics in spite of the fact that they were associated the violence of colonialism.[591] These are now part of global culture. Globalisation is a term synonymous with multiculturalism, and this also applies to sharing. This explains why you can

---

[586] Michael Banton (ed.), *A.S.A Monographs 1: The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, 135.
[587] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 3.
[588] Nick Shepherd and Steven Robins (eds.), *New South African Key Words*, (Ohio University Press, 2008).
[589] Michael Banton (ed.), *A.S.A Monographs 1: The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, 135.
[590] Laurajane Smith, "Class Heritage and the Negotiation of Place."
[591] Natasha Eaton, "Colonial Iconoclash," 32.

find a Zambian *chitenge* in the streets of New York today: The migration is still on today but in a different phase, that of universality. It is the same with the popular culture of today as in *kwaito, rumba, kwasakwasa,* which are all consumed in the name of globalisation, universality and a shared heritage. Even the International Museums Day theme for 2002 of "Museums for Culture and Globalisation" sought to address this issue of culture and globalisation and the international community.[592]

Africa has a rich and diverse heritage, which carries with it a lot of cultural material. This is reflected at the Africa Section of the British Museum and the many heritage institutions specialising in African cultural collections and studies. The universal distribution of African culture is clearly visible. The notion of a shared heritage therefore seeks to cater for the needs of Africans by allowing access and ownership to this diasporic heritage. That is, if this really serves the purpose and intention of the international community. This is a culture that has stood the test of time with its richness. It has also survived the rigours of colonialism, where it was being wiped out and condemned as paganism. It should be noted that culture is fundamentally reliant on reciprocity through its connections to societies and their settings. Culture replicates the spiritual frame of societies.[593] Hence, it is important to evaluate the universal posture of African cultures and to determine their contribution and related benefits. Culture has been the driving force in the fight for economic, political and social liberation by colonised communities. In relation to our topic of study, the African culture is embodied in the cultural heritage or objects that are found in the museums of the global North.

[592] International Museum Day was founded in 1977 by ICOM as an inclusive and participatory event to highlight the importance of museums as institutions serving society and its development. International Museums Day is traditionally celebrated on or around 18 May (*ICOM Newsletter*, April 2010).
593 Nick Shepherd and Steven Robins (eds.), *New South African Key Words,* 50.

CHAPTER 5
RESTITUTION

5.1 CONCEPTUALISATION OF RESTITUTION

Restitution represents a new phase in what we mean by 'museum' as well as to communities and governments. In Rassool's view, "while restitution entails return, it also points to a re-curation process of knowledge exchange, an active process of engagement and provenance beyond ideas of stewardship".[594]

According to international law, the reasoning for the restitution of cultural objects rotates around three points. First is the need to re-establish the lost spiritual and economic bond between people, their land and their cultural heritage. Migrated objects signified power and domination over colonised peoples and possession of their resources, while for the colonised peoples it meant loss of land, autonomy, and identity. Hence, the need to restore through repatriation. Secondly, repatriation is seen as restoring that which had been damaged by colonialism through acts such as discrimination and genocide. Thirdly, repatriation means recovery and a reinstatement of a collective identity for the ex-colonial communities as a process to decolonise. This is an indicator of moral and spiritual restitution. It also leads to closure and forgiveness between the claimant and the holding party.

This chapter therefore analyses the concept closer by looking at its challenges, successes and the way it is generally understood and applied by those that have been involved in restitution scenarios. The challenges to the whole process of restitution will be explored in the same context since this is bound to affect different countries in different ways for the simple reason that restitution is sometimes opposed to national interests. It is important to understand the complexities that go with the notion of restitution. Restitution can involve national interests as opposed to museological interests. The use of bilateral relations in restitution cases often compromises museological interests in favour of political interests. As in shared heritage, restitution is outside national boundaries and calls for compromises between nations, which often jeopardises museum interests. It is also important to discuss responses by African countries to the issue of restitution since they have been the hardest hit by colonial object migrations, illegal trade, and plundering. The focus will be on the case study countries Nigeria,

[594] Ciraj Rassool, "Building a Critical Museology in Africa," xxi.

Malawi, South Africa and the British Museum, while examples will be drawn from other countries in Africa and elsewhere in the world.

While the discussion here is restitution, the study refers to the notion of sharing. This is because the proposal is to consider both options as two components that have bearing on one another. Sharing, universality, collaboration and restitution are addressed as central themes or key important historical options that determine the future of African heritage in the diaspora. Nicholas Thomas stated that "historicized ethnographic explorations of the colonial experience are the most fruitful approaches to understanding colonialism's continued effects". According to Thomas, it is the presence of cultural materials from Africa in European museums that provides a language through which to discuss the colonial experience. These objects give modern-day Europeans an insight into what colonialism entailed and its repercussions.[595] According to the policy definition of the South African National Heritage Resources Act of 1999, repatriation means the return of heritage objects or human remains from another country to their country of origin.[596] However, this could also be within the same country, as is the case in Canada and some of the proposals by the community museums in Botswana as discussed earlier.

This chapter seeks to put a microscopic lens on the issue of restitution as an alternative theory to that of sharing and its dynamics. Particular attention is given to current debates on restitution and examples given from recent cases of restitution. In other words, the call for return is about objects taken away and those lost during conflict, colonial occupation, theft, illegal excavations, looting, and curatorial expeditions in the precolonial, colonial and postcolonial periods.[597] The expectation for return is a quest to partake in the complete management of the cultural property. It also implies ease of access by the country of origin to websites and collections, and sharing research, expertise, and capacity building. This could allow for the physical return and restoration of the objects to their former function in ceremonies and other cultural experiences. Larissa Forster argued that the process for return has to be preceded by provenance research. She agreed with Nicholas Thomas that through this postcolonial provenance research, the German colonial past, for example, has become more visible and can now "be renegotiated" and returns facilitated.[598] This explains the current cases of apology and

---

[595] Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture—Anthropology, Travel Culture and Government*.
[596] Reinette Stander, "Legal Frameworks for the Management of Museums."
[597] African Information Services, *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*, iii.
[598] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 160.

reparations, as in the Nama/Herero case in Namibia. Return, according to Kwame Amoah Labi, is inevitable because the management of the objects found in European museums by curators who are not familiar with their cultural background and far away from their natural environment has been a challenge. They are not viewed in the same way, and their interpretation is not the same.[599] While Gesa Grimme agreed with Larissa Forster that systematic provenance research has to be done, but she is also of the view that as much as returns have to be done, provenance research should be separated from return. There is, however, no clear reason why the two have to be separated. One could only speculate that maybe where there is no pressure to return, then the cosmopolitan museum after doing provenance research will have all the contextual information and can continue keeping and displaying other people's heritage.[600] Considering the current pressure and debates, this is bound to have repercussions.

Restitution as a concept therefore needs to be unravelled to understand the implications, expectations, and the consequences involved. Similarly, Mille Gabriel and Jens Dahl discussed the term repatriation in order clarify and understand its relationship to return or restitution of cultural property.[601] They allowed for a critical analysis of the concepts of repatriation, return and restitution against existing theoretical concepts of reciprocity as applied by this study. Their discussions contributed to the discussion in this thesis due to their similar line of approach and the relevance to the concept of restitution of cultural property. Besides their discussion on restitution, the authors allowed for a clearer understanding of the legality and illegality of transfers and migrations. They addressed questions such as what are the circumstances surrounding the transfers? What are the long-term implications or expectations to the parties involved?

A close analysis of the concept of restitution is therefore focussed on how restitution is conceived, by whom, for what and for whom? What happens when an object or artefact is to be restituted? Is this a gift or a loan? Temporary or permanent? For example, when faced with the question of restitution, the British Museum opted for permanent and temporary loans with the countries of origin.[602] Each of the cases or questions directly relates to the question of this

---

[599] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 166.
[600] Gesa Grimme, "Systematic Provenance Research on Objects from Colonial Contexts," Museum and Society 18, no. 1 (2020): 53
[601] Mille Gabriel and Jens Dahl (eds.), *Utimut: Past Heritage— Future Partnerships, Discussions on Repatriation in the 21st Century,* (IWGIA, 2008), 8–9.
[602] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 15.

thesis, which is whether the solution for the migrated museum, whether legally or illegally migrated, is return or sharing? The theme of restitution is broken down into sub-topics such as procedures for restitution, the negotiations, the morality of it, and continued access to an artefact by both the restituting party and the original owners. The thesis is also interested in establishing the involvement of states in this process of restitution. This is to establish whether governments act to make political capital out of such situations as insinuated by some of the cosmopolitan powers, such as Germany, when faced with cases of demand for restitution. It is also important to investigate what the impact is on the receiving public, the communities of provenance, and what the fate of the object is once repatriated. Where will the artefacts be displayed or used after restitution? Are they with the original community of origin? In this time of decoloniality and wanting to recreate the museum into a cultural hub and a space for healing and forgiveness, it is important to bring a sharp lens to the fate of objects once repatriated. This is to interrogate the notion of shared responsibility. One wants to know if a selected object is still treated, used, and revered in the same way as before it was migrated. If it was a ceremonial object, have other objects replaced it or has the culture and practice for which the object was made for since died?[603]

This debate about the sharing of cultural property was brought about by concern over the great number of objects trafficked from Africa to the outside world. This is a concern from African countries themselves as well as international heritage organisations such as ICOM, UNESCO, the UN, Interpol, UNIDROIT, the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the European Council and the international community. Source countries and international bodies had been embroiled in conversations and demands for repatriation by newly independent African countries. The call for return is about objects taken away during colonial rule as well as those that were lost during conflict, imperial occupation, theft, illegal excavations, looting and punitive raids; a good example is Mali.[604]

The South African Museum was established in 1935 and has multiple collections, including ethnography, archaeology, natural history, history, and art. The collections are from all over Southern Africa because that was the main focus of the museum's collections policy from the

[603] Jeremy Silvester and Napandulwe Shiweda, "The Return of Sacred Stones of the Ovambo Kingdoms: Restitution and the Revision of the Past," Museum and Society 18, no. 1 (2020): 30–39.
[604] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*, iii, ix.

onset. Most of the collections are from an earlier institution called the Museum of Man, which still appears in the documentation and coding of artefacts.[605] As a result, there is a representation of artefacts from different countries in Africa. Restituting this heritage will therefore require a number of processes to be observed, including dialogue with the different countries from which the heritage comes, reflecting existing bilateral relations. The state will spearhead the dialogue, although the museum will still play a significant role. Where there are laws and regulations on heritage, these will be applied. However, it is usually under the same circumstances that the needs of the state take the upper hand over those of the museum.

Meanwhile, scholars of museology have developed different views relating to the questions raised by this thesis on the issue of the return of cultural property. Larissa Forster believed that through provenance research, migrated collections are brought back to life, to action, and are returned back to communities of origin. There is also a possibility of contextualisation into contemporary setting and use.[606] Jeremy Silvester and Napandulwe Shiweda, on the other hand, reflected on the cultural impact of the return of inalienable possessions or sacred objects to now Christianised communities where the new generation are sometimes ignorant of earlier practices. What does re-encountering these objects that were a central part of their belief system mean to them, particularly in a situation where the role of sacred objects has changed over time? The two scholars wrote about the return of two sacred stones to Namibia from a Finnish museum: The power stones from the Ovambo kingdoms. They indicated that the return provoked renewed interest in precolonial practices by young Namibians, the media and politicians. This is particularly so for traditional leaders because it strengthens their traditional authority against the democratic government that has reduced their power.[607] The same situation prevails in Botswana in relation to traditional authority held by chiefs. In the same way, returns also stimulate contemporary cultural and political debates in countries of origin and universally.

Similarly, and as an answer to the above concerns, Paul Turnbull observed that in the context of international disputes, national interests can often take priority over the law or sometimes national laws do not include communal interests. As a result, the dispute can become emotional and unsolvable, as in the case of the restitution of Australian Aboriginals, Torres Strait Islander

---

[605] Diana Hall (Collections Manager at Museum Africa) in conversation of author, 2015.

[606] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 160.

[607] Jeremy Silvester and Napandulwe Shiweda, "The Return of Sacred Stones of the Ovambo Kingdoms: Restitution and the Revision of the Past," 30–39.

human remains, and the Greek Parthenon Marbles.[608] It is therefore true that in some countries, restitution is equated to national interests against museological interests. Since the discussed heritage is outside national boundaries, national interests are bound to take precedence, because the state has to take a leading role and make the final decisions. One wonders whether in these situations museological efforts towards restitution and the need for the enactment of relevant laws are not jeopardised and, in the process, endangers the heritage.[609]

The Director of Research Planning and Publication under the National Commission of Museums in Nigeria Jafaru Yunusa Dauda emphasised that the option of return should be dealt with realistically. Even the demands by owner countries should be realistic. Issues of capacity, space and resources should be considered. According to him, restitution can be problematic because many African countries do not have the storage space and capacity to accommodate collections from the diaspora. It is therefore better to collaborate with hosting countries and museums in order to share resources, expertise and skills.[610] This is to agree on the best ways to work together towards the preservation and protection of heritage. In Dauda's view, museums and countries should emphasise a diversity of options to our economies through heritage to raise support and a greater budget from government. In this way, the thinking of African countries would change and this could help the development of the cultural sector. This could also allow for the building of larger museums to accommodate both artefacts from home and those that are repatriated.[611]

According to Annette Rein Mainz, some of the returned objects help to fill up gaps in the history and cultures of African communities, families, clans, and states. They are the missing link because some of the finest pieces, which could only be made or manufactured by departed elders, are in foreign museums.[612] These could also be ceremonial objects, which are part of a greater cultural setting that was disrupted by the migration. In this way she explored issues of trafficking, restitution, human trafficking, and responses by African countries to restitution. This contributes to the main question about how the objects were transferred, their return and what this implies, and if sharing could be an option. Kwame Amoah Labi talked about regalia

---

[608] Paul Turnbull, "International Repatriation of Indigenous Human Remains and its Complexities: The Australian Experience," 6–11.
[609] Aedin Mac Devitt, "Heritage in Danger," *ICOM Newsletter* 63 (2010).
[610] Jafaru Y. Dauda (Director of Research Planning & Publication of the National Commission of Museums, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[611] Jafaru Y. Dauda (Director of Research Planning & Publication of the National Commission of Museums, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[612] Annette R. Mainz, *Contesting Human Remains in Museum Collections: The Crisis of Cultural Authority*, (London: Routledge, n.d.), 22.

for royals as spiritual and inalienable possessions that need to be restored to communities of origin. He cited the Asante Golden Stool (a royal possession) as one such object from Ghana.[613]

Still on the issue of restitution, McLeod emphasised that the wheel gained motion immediately after the first African and Latin American countries gained independence. They started agitating for the repatriation of their collections from European museums, with some claims directed to the British Museum".[614] According to McLeod, the question of restitution could therefore no longer be ignored. He further argued that newly independent African countries were putting in place laws to control the export and migration of cultural property and antiquities. As a result, the context of collection for the British Museum and perhaps other metropolitan museums changed dramatically. It was now a challenge for the British Museum to acquire collections that had left their country of origin illegally. There was now the need to demand an export certificate or licence before acquiring an object. This restricted the collection level of the British Museum. New sources of material and approaches had to be developed.[615] However, according to McLeod, many collectors and dealers did not take heed of all the regulations and restrictions and some receiving institutions also did not feel bothered by the restrictions. The discriminatory posture of the colonial environment exacerbated the ignoring of regulations.[616] The conclusion by UNESCO and different states to opt for a shared heritage is therefore a way of trying to find a solution to the debates and the tension that had ensued surrounding the issue of return, repatriation and restitution. Notwithstanding the above situation, today the illegal transfer of cultural property is a rapidly evolving security problem for museums, law enforcement agencies and states, which needs thorough and proper documentation.

African scholars have demonstrated many reasons why their cultural property should be returned to source countries. In George Mudenda's view, the exhibitor or curator of the collections in cosmopolitan museums may not know and preserve the hidden meanings behind some of the objects.[617] This is to let the audiences know that for some of the objects from African cultures, visitors are not supposed to know certain spiritual truths about them. Even

---

[613] Kwame Amoah Labi, "New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa," 166.
[614] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*.
[615] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 16-17.
[616] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 15–18.
[617] George S. Mudenda, "Exhibiting Africa: Contemporary Perspectives on Representation of Culture in Museums." See also Ting Chang, "Emile Guimet's Network for Research and Collecting Asian Objects (ca. 1877–1918)," in *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets*, eds. Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald, (De Gruyter, 2018), 209–223.

individuals within a given culture do not always know the obscure meanings entrenched in certain objects and their contextual implications, except provenance communities or certain individuals from the community such as traditional priests. This mostly applies to inalienable artefacts, those that should never have been taken away due to their spiritual significance. In the same vein a curator has to be aware that the first agent, the producer of the object has a significant bond and attachment to the object. This is to say that the craftsman understands the cultural context and use for which the object was made more than anyone else. This clearly means that the intrinsic value of certain objects might not be reflected if they are exhibited by strangers and away from provenance communities. This is a situation that warrants return or restitution of the concerned artefacts back to countries of origin. This also explains the grievance and rankling by of African countries over repatriation as indicated by Lyndel Prott.[618] Amoah Labi emphasised that these inalienable possessions should not be managed far from home by curators who do not know them because they are supposed to be preserved and handled in special ways.[619]

The above therefore supports the argument that restitution could be the best option for the migrated museum. In the context of sharing, exchange and reciprocity, given that most of the objects were transferred some centuries ago, it becomes difficult to expect some form of obligation to any of the parties, the receiver and the owner. Where there is less possibility for return, Annette Weiner renews our hope by indicating that in gift exchange and reciprocity objects are inalienable. They maintain a link with the original owners because there is still a chance of returning to the original owner. The many given examples of returned objects and human remains so far in Botswana, African countries and elsewhere is testimony to this. However, she cautions that if the gift is to a stranger, there is no obligation and no development of a bond, and the object then becomes alienated and assimilated in its new surroundings or home.[620]

The concept of truth and reconciliation as espoused by Canada and South Africa is also a forerunner to repatriation. The atrocities suffered by indigenous communities and the process of reconciliation and repatriation leads to intergenerational trauma. In reality, the colonies offered a ground for violent activities and unlawfulness which could not have taken place in

[618] Lyndel V. Prott, Witnesses to History: A *C*ompendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects.
[619] Kwame Amoah Labi, "New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa," 166.
[620] Annette Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping While Giving*.

the cosmopolitan state.[621] Through the same understanding, Canadian museums have done a lot of repatriation of both objects and human remains. The approach is to work with communities of provenance and to exhibit that which they approve. Indigenous people around the world share a common problem, which is asserting their right to their culture and natural resources. They also have the right to dignity and human rights to protection and survival as pointed out by Prott.[622] The UN has a Law on Human Rights for Indigenous People that countries can benchmark in case of involvement with communities and when formulating domestic laws that deal with heritage and communities.[623]

Under international law, the process for restitution therefore becomes a multi-layered process projecting a shared heritage of all humanity and a process to sustain international stability and collective identity. The aim of international law is to enforce restitution, ensuring that the global community contributes to the preservation of their own heritage and that of others. This refers to culture as in objects, song, dance and the intangible aspects.[624] This is also an indication that the international community and the international law today have abandoned colonial attitudes with entrenchment on racial classes and superiority in favour of cultural diversity. To sum it all up Vrdoljak indicated that:

> It is imperative that the international community and museums specifically, acknowledge the pre-eminence of the rights, laws and customs of Indigenous peoples in their cultural heritage over those of the scientific or artistic communities, or national interests and laws of the relevant state. Indigenous peoples must be involved in and approve the development of any international and national frameworks for the protection and restitution of their cultural heritage.[625]

Restitution is needed in order to restore and preserve the positive cultural values of African communities. This justifies the campaign for return fostered by UNIDROIT, ICOM, UNESCO, activist countries, heritage practitioners, and scholars. While colonial rule was established with crimes and exploitation, according to Mondlane,[626] one of the grave offences in African imperialism, particularly by the Portuguese, was to disregard and underrate the strength and

---

621 Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism,* 4.
622 Lyndel V. Prott, Witnesses to History: A *C*ompendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects
623 Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects," 194–195.
624 Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects," 194–195.
625 Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects," 198.
626 African Information Services, Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral

cultural resilience of African communities. The cultural resistance of the African peoples persisted. It was not destroyed, not even by the betrayal by one another, let alone persecution and humiliation. The call for correcting colonial wrongs through restitution is an indication of cultural maturity by the global community. This is a reflection of the fact that imperialist rule was dominated by pillage and the destruction of cultural values. It was also dominated by the accumulation of capital and cultural property by the imperial powers at the expense of African societies.[627] The discussion has clearly demonstrated and summarised the point on restitution and the culture of colonised people.

In their analysis of a cultural display at an Australian Agricultural show in 1913, Joanne Scott and Ross Laurie highlighted that the artefacts of colonised people were showcased only as exotic collections with no other meaning and life. According to them,

> This revealed a transnational fascination in the display of the Indigenous people and their material culture. At first glance, this display seemed counter-intuitive given that the '*primitive*' items were arrayed on the top shelf while the newest and most *'civilised'* items were placed on the lowest shelf. It seems likely that this presentation reflected the organisers' belief that the items which drew the eye of most visitors were the older, exotic items that hinted at more picturesque and violent times. The contained and controlled nature of the Aboriginal exhibits of the 1910s, including the people displayed, reflected the official protectors' view of Indigenous people as a non-threatening source of domestic and rural labour"[628]

This demonstrates the colonial racial hierarchies. According to the exhibitor, the culture and objects from the colonised had no value and could only be present as exotics and curios. Those who produced the objects were also degraded and placed at the lowest level of the social ladder. Their only befitting career was the provision of labour. Hence, anything about African or any Indigenous people including the 'self' were relegated to the lowest societal position.

The return of a Makonde Mask from the Barbier-Mueller Museum of Geneva to the National Museum of Tanzania in 2002 testifies to the restitution of objects back to countries of origin. Its discussion adds to the success stories of restitution and the cost and implications of restitution endeavours for both the giving and receiving states, communities and families. It demonstrates the use of peaceful negotiations, general bilateral relations, and agreements by states to achieve this. The role played by political and legal structures in countries testifies to their investment. This also contributes to the analysis of national and political interests as

---

[627] Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects," 48–57.
[628] Joanne Scott and Ross Laurie, "The Australian Agricultural Shows," *Week Newspaper* (1913, 22 August).

opposed to museological interests in the migration and restitution of cultural property, which is often a problematic issue. International heritage bodies are instrumental in many cases of restitution by member states.[629] However, the whole process, starting with the migration of objects to Europe to their restitution, testifies to the absence of concepts applied in the exchange of objects by precolonial societies. There is no exchange and reciprocity in that the returned Makonde Mask was stolen. We only see the end process, which brings in the two governments into a mutual agreement. Only the return process testifies to the expected relations and outcome between the involved parties and the implications and outcomes of the exchange in the concepts of exchange and transfer.

Pascale Mollard-Chenebenoi addressed the issue of restitution by emphasising responses by African countries and the resultant relations between the giving and receiving countries in pursuance for return. He used the example of return of cultural objects by the Louvre Museum in France stolen from Egypt in the 1980s by French dealers and auctioneers. The article highlighted the resultant campaigns by African countries for the return of their cultural properties from other cosmopolitan museums. These include Scandinavian countries, American museums and the Smithsonian Institution.[630] The lack of reciprocity in the cultural exchange between the Western world and Africa is still visible. The investigation also looked at whether in the transfer process, the ownership rights of the objects were ever really transferred to the new owners. The study wanted to find out if reciprocity was an obligation or option to the collectors. While contributing to the investigation of the ensuing relations between the giving and receiving world, it is important to note that this was not really the gift exchange relation as described by Mauss and other anthropologists.[631]

In the ICOM Newsletter Aedin Mac Devitt talked about restitution in relation to the legislation that needs to be put in place to allow for restitution. He indicated that restitution is on the rise and that countries such as France and Italy are developing restitution laws.[632] Yet it is important to know what type of laws these are and if they will aid restitutions or protect the hosting countries against restitution challenges. It is also important to note if the legislation is applicable at a national or international level and how relevant it is to the restitution process.

---

[629] Folarin Shyllon, "Return of Makonde Mask from Switzerland to Tanzania: A Righteous Conclusion?," *Art, Antiquity and Law* 16, no. 1 (2011).
[630] P. Chabenoi, "France Returns Stolen Cultural Objects," *Africom Newsletter* (2009): 20.
[631] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift*. (London: Routledge, 1925).
[632] Aedin Mac Devitt, "Upholding the Law: an Overview of the Trends in Art and Museum Law Today," 12.

We must also ask if the views of those whose collections are held and need restituting have been taken on board. Sadly, while restitution cases are increasing (mostly for the colonial holdings), online trading of artworks and cultural property has also gone up since the turn of the 21st century. Ironically, this now becomes an issue of phasing out the colonial trade and ushering in the contemporary trafficking. Restitution of artworks, however, often has some significance far beyond the face value of the object in question, which looks into the fate of the objects after restitution as already highlighted and the new relation they have with the receiving community. While Mauss indicated that gift exchange between groups or societies builds a relationship of solidarity among people, one would want to see if this has been the case between the colonial African countries and the master countries. Perhaps one could still rely on Mauss in the conclusion that this practice among archaic societies was collective; it had concern for others. This was obviously different from Western societies, who in this case were the colonisers and the object receivers.[633] In this vicious cycle of Western countries versus colonised countries in the transfer of cultural property, one should therefore not expect the same relations as discussed by Mauss.

Restitution has also been tackled in relation to universality and a shared heritage. I make reference to the conference organised by the Supreme Council of Antiquities, a branch of the Egyptian Ministry of Culture, from 7–8 April 2010. The discussion was about how ancient treasures could be brought back to their countries of origin. Around 20 countries attended the two-day event in Cairo. The efforts by Egypt and other African countries to recover artefacts have attracted wide media attention.[634] Of note is that Egypt is one of the African countries with the highest number of collections at the British Museum, as reflected in its Egyptology section. The composition of countries attending the workshop in Egypt (including African and European countries) is indicative of the shared global initiative focussed towards the restitution of cultural property. The collaborative effort is also a pointer towards a universal concern over heritage. All the parties advocated for the protection, promotion and access to heritage regardless of where the heritage is and who it belongs to. In this way the heritage becomes a universal and shared property.

---

633 Marcel Mauss, *The Gift*, (London: Routledge, 1925).

634 Aedin Mac Devitt, "High Stakes: Restitution Claims and Online Art Trading are Making the Case for Fresh Legislation," *ICOM Newsletter* 64, no. 1 (2010): 4–5.

The sharing concept here also becomes a two-tier structure, because it could apply to two states allowing equal access after restitution, or sharing in the universal sense, where access is for the global community. However, the concern will be whether the concerted efforts towards restitution are the best approach and practice. Should we have each country minding its own heritage? The promotion of universal culture where restitution fails is integration, contemporisation and universalisation of African cultures. This is within the world context of the promotion of humanity and rights, solidarity, respect and devotion to human beings. According to the UNSECO Forum on Memory and Universality, "the universality notion is also the African people's progress towards the integration into the general framework of today's history, dominated by discussions for equality, collaborations and humanity".[635]

As previously noted, issues of copyright and intellectual property rights are also relevant here to test the concepts of restitution and the sharing of cultural property. If a migrated object retains the identity and cultural right of the owner and if it is to be returned, its copyright and intellectual property right remain with the original owner. The above authenticates the degree of ownership of collections, and the ownership held by Botswana and other African countries over the cultural property that is abroad. However, one wonders whether this is enough basis to argue for return and to claim and prove ownership. To complement the copyright claims, it is notable that currently ICOM, UNESCO and Interpol are putting more emphasis on inventorying and documentation of collections in order to prove authenticity and assured ownership. Claims for goods trafficked during the precolonial period, which are otherwise not documented, can therefore only rely on the available concept of reciprocity in the absence of authenticated copyright claims, documentation, and provenance research.

However, the only consolation for Botswana and other African states whose rare pieces are in foreign country museums is that since the skill and workmanship of the objects was done in Africa, then the copyright remains with the community of provenance. This will also be complemented by provenance research and detailed documentation. as already indicated. The quest to establish a database of Botswana collections in the diaspora is therefore an initiative to claim copyright and intellectual property right on the materials in order to authenticate the claims. The inventorying of diasporic holdings is a move needed for many African countries, because it would make claims and restitution cases much easier. It is also important to make

[635] UNSECO Forum on Memory and Universality, "Museums, Memory and Universality," 52–55.

note of the link between the notion of restitution and legislation. It becomes a compelling point for all nation states pondering cases of return to reflect on their legislation first.

While restitution and return are presented as the best options, it still raises many questions. The first query is how these objects are now used, how they are displayed and with what intention. The other concern is whether these returned objects have had a positive influence, for example, towards nation building. The lack of proper presentation and representation of people's cultures through these migrated collections have also led to divisions and bitterness among communities and governments. This explains why in cross reference to the "primitivism exhibition" of the colonial era, Yoshida looked at how people would want to represent themselves or be presented in museum exhibitions.[636] For restitution, it is necessary to identify significant objects for return back to countries of origin rather than lobby for the return of everything. These are the inalienable possessions discussed by Annette Weiner, Amoah Labi and Jeremy Silvester. Meanwhile, the sharing of heritage will promote skills transfer and proper object interpretation by the owner institutions and communities of provenance. It also requires mutual understanding between nations and institutions and it becomes a two-way sharing between museums, other heritage institutions, communities of provenance, the global community and states.[637] What is at stake is whether this has contributed to a shift in relationships as mentioned earlier and if this has been a positive shift in approaches. How has this affected (either positively or negatively) the previous museums, their audiences and national being? It is critical to take this line of approach because merely returning an object is not necessarily beneficial. The return of objects can create or reinforce divisions or resuscitate undying antagonisms, which is already the case in Namibia with the return of the Nama/Herero Genocide victim skulls from Germany. The Nama want the skulls returned to them, the Herero want the same, and the government is undecided as to whether they go into the National Museum, a mass grave, or be returned to the source communities. It would be difficult to know which ones belong to the Nama and to the Herero. Claudia Buchwald maintained that the discussion by the Berlin Museum of History on the repatriation of the Stone Cross of Cape Cross back to Namibia symbolises many such discussions the world over on the repatriation of objects. The

[636] Kenji Yoshida, "Ethnographic Exhibitions Today," 165.
[637] Regina Isaacs and Barend van der Merwe (Heritage practitioners, SAHRA) in conversation with the author, 2015.

provenance research and return fill up gaps or provide what Buchwald called the "missing link" in the culture and history of both the owner communities and the host countries.[638]

It is sometimes said that it is not good to return people to a past that they are trying to forget. The concern is whether restitution is not tantamount to doing the same, whether engaging over the cultural property migrated during this rough period is not in a way getting into the past, and whether receiving the migrated goods back home is not opening old wounds. Sarr and Savoy maintained the same position in their report. They supported repatriation but also advanced the argument that this could have negative implications.[639] Their observation is, however, open to debate because other voices feel that the return of cultural property brings healing and closure. Dahmali indicated that repatriation is needed to close wounds.[640] This argument extends to the notion of sharing and collaboration as discussed in this thesis, even though Dahmali did not seem to favour a shared heritage.

While still on the subject of object restitution and the law, the media has also contributed by advocating on issues of restitution. According to Aedin Mac Devitt, the New York Times reported that "some museums are in the process of returning cultural property back to original owners due to lack of storage space".[641] In close analysis, this could also mean irrelevance to the local community and the fact that these could no longer be kept by the museum on the basis of curiosity and aesthetics. These regional and local museums often have objects that have not been documented and subjected to provenance research. Jeremy Silvester talked about "colonial collections in European museums that are locked away in storage with no opportunity to be displayed and to be in a public space"[642] This applies to many of the British museums in Kent, Brighton, Scotland, and Liverpool and museums in America. These are testimonies given by the curators on consultation about the presence of Botswana materials in their museums, such as Sarah Warden of the National Museum of Scotland, Rachel Hemingway-Hurst, a curator at the Brighton and Pavilion Museum, and Richard Benjamin of the International Slavery Museum. This has also been supported by the curator at the National Museum in Lagos, who highlighted that it is important to collaborate with those holding cultural property because they can also not interpret the objects as African owners might. Hence, they need the original

[638] Claudia Buchwald, "*Introduction*," Historical Judgment 1 (2019): 2.
[639] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 10–15.
[640] Cherki Dahmali, "African Looted Heritage is Not a Shared Heritage."
[641] Aedin Mac Devitt, "High Stakes: Restitution Claims and Online Art Trading are Making the Case for Fresh Legislation," 12–13.
[642] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network," 111.

owners to partner with them to help give narration to the objects. The local African experts, curators, and heritage managers also need incentives and motivation to do research and publish books, just like the curators in the global North, such as at the British Museum. A good number of books on the British Museum collections have been written and published by the resident curators.[643]

The discussed situation of migrated collections and their irrelevance to the local communities, poor interpretation, lack of proper documentation, in turn reduces the value of the collections. This is compared to those that have space and are relevant to the local communal cultural and historical background. For example, the Brooklyn Museum in New York currently lacks the space to display all its acquired collections. The museum has announced its intention to return 4 500 pre-Colombian archaeological objects to the National Museum of Costa Rica. This collection was acquired during the 19th century by the shipping magnate Minor C. Keith before being acquired by the Brooklyn Museum in 1934. The source gives direct examples of the migration aspect of collections and how political instability can lead to the looting of heritage sites and museums.[644] The above examples also show how unforeseen circumstances can change object transfers and possessions.

Craig Forrest argued that the provenance of some cultural property that has entered the art and antiquities market remains a key focus area, giving Iraq as an example. He proposed a solution for stopping the illicit trade.[645] This allows for a critical analysis of the responses towards the problem of illegal migration of objects by both receiving and the migrating countries. Similarly, Maurice Godelier adopted Weiner's discourse by maintaining that society should give away permanently and not expect the same goods back.[646] Godelier's theory proposes a relation of giving and giving for keeping and not returning. I believe this would not apply to the ceremonial and spiritual objects, particularly where they were taken with no consent from the source communities. His analysis, however, guides the investigation into cultural transfers between Botswana, Africa and the Western countries, as well as the restitution and return concept within the broader framework of Europe/Africa relations during the colonial period. Given the framework of Godelier's argument, one wonders whether African countries are justified to demand the return of their objects and if these were ever meant to be returned and

---

643 Edith Ekunke (Director of the National Museum in Lagos) in conversation with the author, 2015.
644 Aedin Mac Devitt, "High Stakes: Restitution Claims and Online Art Trading are Making the Case for Fresh Legislation," 4–5.
645 Craig Forrest, *International Law and the Practice of Cultural Property*, 319.
646 Maurice Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999), 34.

what the expectation by both parties. In this case and under the prevailing circumstances where some of the foreign museums have 80% of their collections coming from postcolonial countries, how feasible and how easy are the returns? The motivation is from the ongoing debates and conversations about restitution, collaborations, provenance research and communities of origin and decolonisation of the museum. Meanwhile, all is not lost because there are many cases of breakthrough in the fight, prevention and restitution, both in Botswana and other parts of the world as will be seen in the section that follows.

5.2 A SYNOPSIS OF SUCCESSFUL CASE STUDIES OF RESTITUTION OF BOTSWANA COLLECTIONS & TO OTHER PARTS OF AFRICA

As a way of opening, Ciraj Rassool talked about how the ethics of exchanges during the colonial period were based on unequal relations and led to detachment between the collections and communities of origin. The debate around issues of redress, restitution, forgiveness and closure is therefore aimed at repairing this gap.[647] Due to contestations by mainline museums in Europe, and most probably due to their influence, ICOM and UNESCO started opting for a shared heritage and universality. It is against this background that many cases of return have been recorded in Botswana, across Africa and in other parts of the world, all through different circumstances. While these have been recorded, there is a possibility of some not having been recorded. The emphasis is still that the repatriation and restitution of these objects need to be dealt with in a systematic manner, based on established policy guidelines and principles. This is supported by Gareth Harris's report in the Weekly Art Newspaper in reaction to what Macron had said with regards to the repatriation of African artefacts. Harris captured the mixed reaction by different experts towards the declaration.[648] Nicholas Thomas, on the other hand, felt that it was a welcome move to curators: "African countries may now be forced to draw up new guidelines for repatriation". This is because "more than 70 000 objects from sub-Saharan African countries are housed at the Musée du Quai Branly-Jacques Chirac in Paris". This is but a small fraction of the African, Latin American and Asian heritage that is in European and American museums.[649] Besides the Macron case, there is also a lot of dialogue over issues of

[647] Ciraj Rassool, "Building a Critical Museology in Africa."
[648] Gareth Harris, "What Restitution Experts Have to Say about President Macrons Pledge to Return African Artefacts," *The Art Newspaper* (2017, 29 November).
[649] Gareth Harris, "What Restitution Experts Have to Say about President Macrons Pledge to Return African Artefacts."

return in different parts of the world. New cases emerge routinely in what has now become a cycle.

In 1978, the Director of UNESCO Amadour-Mahtar M'Bow appealed for the return of colonial holdings held in foreign museums. In 2007, the UN also took a stride towards the appeal for return and initiated a policy, the Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, that supported restitution, the right to have access to sacred objects, and co-curation where applicable.[650] The following subsections give an outline of some known and recorded successful return cases in Botswana and other countries.

5.2.1 The Botswana Situation

5.2.1.1 El Negro

El Negro's remains were returned Botswana from a museum in Spain in 2000. Since some of the artefacts that were part of the display, such as the spear, remained in the Spanish museum, there is still a ned for fresh dialogue on restitution or collaboration.[651] El Negro was a middle-aged man of Basarwa origin "migrated" by two taxidermists, the French Vereaur brothers in the 19th century as part of an anatomical exploration, which was common then. He was later sold and displayed at a museum in Banyoles in Spain. After years of display under a short label 'le Bechuana', the remains were returned back to Botswana in 2000 due to pressure from the African Union, UNESCO and international scholars of heritage, such as Alphonse Arcelin, a Spanish doctor of Haitian origin. He mounted a protest to have the mummified body removed from display.[652] Since the documentation indicated that he was of Tswana origin, the Botswana government was approached to receive the body. His grave is in Gaborone in Tsholofelo Park and has since been declared a monument. There are many such cases of human remains, which are also discussed as heritage, to be repatriated or to collaborate over. However, there have been indications from the Foreign Affairs office that the South African government has laid claims to the human remains. This is on the grounds that El Negro was from the Batlhaping community of South Africa. The exact origin of El Negro is unknown as he was labelled as

[650] Noémie Etienne, Chonja Lee and Claire Brizon, "Global Provenance."

[651] Botswana Government, "Repatriation Document on El Negro." See also Bruce Bennett, "Dead Bodies on Display: El Negro in Cross-Cultural Perspective," 1; Aedin Mac Devitt, "Upholding the Law: an Overview of the Trends in Art and Museum Law Today," 10.

[652] Botswana Government, "Repatriation Document on El Negro," 2. See also Bruce Bennett, "Dead Bodies on Display: El Negro in Cross-Cultural Perspective," 1.

coming from the Kalahari, a vast desert that covers several countries. There is a possibility of another re-repatriation if the case favours South Africa.[653]

El Negro's was a clear case of unethical collections and no reciprocity. The repatriation process was not facilitated by Botswana and Spain, but by the above tabulated stakeholders, who merely dealt with the Foreign Affairs office in Botswana. The Museum played a minimal role, except to declare the grave a monument.

5.2.1.2 Return of a kaross by the Queen's Palace

The return of a kaross to the Botswana National Museum by the Queen's Palace in England. Chief Khama of the Bangwato gave this to Queen Elizabeth II on the occasion of the three chiefs' visit to England during the colonial period. It was migrated as a gift. The gift inadvertently constituted a historical and key process in the transfer of cultural property to the outside. The kaross was, however, later on returned to the museum with the excuse that there was no space for it at the queen's palace. No one knows what the real reason was and we can only speculate. Today the kaross is one of the prized collections of the National Museum and one with a unique history of having travelled. This is one of the many voluntary cases of repatriation that Botswana has had the fortune to be faced with. The transfer of the kaross was meant to be an act of reciprocity by the chief and the bond created by this gesture still remains to be investigated by scholars. The return process was voluntary and there was no dialogue for repatriation. The transfer was facilitated by the British Council after communication with the Botswana government.

5.2.1.3 Return of the Botswana National museum's entomology collection by Forcharmmer

The return or surrender of the Botswana National Museum's Entomology Collection by Forcharmmer (a resident white) from Serowe to the Botswana National Museum in the 1990s. He was a natural historian who developed his own private collection during the many years he stayed in Serowe. Later on, when Forcharmmer retired back to his home country, Denmark, he decided to donate or surrender the collection of around 10 000 insect species to the National Museum. Forcharmmer first came to Botswana as an employee of Khama Memorial Museum

[653] Neil Parsons, "South African Origins of El Negro Near the Orange/Vaal Rivers, 1830." See also G. Ramsay, "El Negro's Origins as a Motlhaping," (Gaborone: Botswana Government, 2015).

in Serowe, and later decided to stay on in Serowe after the end of his contract.[654] He continued collecting for years and no one knows what exchanges and transactions took place during the time with other colleagues and institutions of learning in the region, back home in Denmark, and internationally. The only consolation is that the rest of the collection was not smuggled out or sold out to some prestigious institution for profit, as is generally the norm

The Forcharmmer collection was not done with any reciprocal aim. He was simply a resident collector, and while museums knew about his business of collecting, no one really knows what the hope and thinking was. However, the final gesture of giving to the museum was a good one, more especially that he was not coerced to do so. This is as seen through most of the migrated collections at the British Museum and the many detailed cases by the thesis. A good example would be the "Van Rensburg Collection" detailed below.

5.2.1.4 The Van Rensburg Collection

The return of the Van Rensburg Collection to Botswana, which was transferred by a resident white colonial officer, Van Rensburg, of South African origin. He worked for the Roads Department in Botswana and collected during his official trips in the country. When he returned to South Africa, he took the artefacts with him, about 166 objects, mostly ethnographic. This was at some point used by the South African Broadcasting Cooperation as part of an exhibition and by UNISA as teaching aids, but was later deposited at the Mafikeng Museum. It is the Mafikeng Museum that alerted and invited the Botswana National Museum to repatriate the collection in 2000. The collection has been documented by the National Museum as the Van Rensburg Collection after the name of its collector which is quite common with museum collections, including the British Museum.[655] The collecting and migration of the Van Rensburg Collection was not really meant to create any friendship or bond between him and Botswana; it was just for his personal satisfaction. There was also no dialogue over the repatriation because the Botswana government or Museum was not aware of the existence of such a collection of objects. It is only the good gesture by the Mafikeng Museum in letting the National Museum know and offering to facilitate return (which it did) that is most appreciated.

[654] Scobie Lekhutlile in conversation with the author, 2016.
[655] Mafikeng Museum. "Documentation Records on Botswana Collections at Mafikeng Museum," (Mafikeng: Mafikeng Museum, 2016).

5.2.1.5 Bakgatla rainmaking pot and initiation drums

The Bakgatla rainmaking pot and initiation drum was returned by the South African Museum or Iziko Museums of Cape Town, which were migrated during the colonial period, probably by Isaac Schapera since he worked mostly among the Bakgatla. However, most of the objects from the Bakgatla (and many other Tswana groups) remain at Iziko Museums. According to Sandy Grant, one of the royal women (*Gabena*) gave the Bakgatla initiation drum and rainmaking pot to Schapera, as a way of protecting them from destruction because the ruling *Kgosi* Molefhe did not want them.[656] This is probably because he had been converted to Christianity and regarded them as part of pagan culture. This was a period when most traditional cultural practices, such as initiation schools, had been stopped due to Christianity. However, since these were inalienable possessions, people in Mochudi, including Grant himself, with the help of the National Museum, later demanded their return. The Bakgatla drum and rainmaking pot are currently kept by the National Museum, while the second drum is kept at the local museum Phuthadikobo and is used when needed. The group has since revived its traditional practices such as *bojale* and *bogwera* (initiation schools), which according to custom makes use of the drum. There have however been instances where the group demanded that the twin drum kept by the National Museum be returned to Mochudi.

The migration of the Bakgatla drum to Cape Town was not connected to feelings of reciprocity nor friendship. This applies to many collections found at the Iziko Museums and UCT today. The negotiations for return were a tedious process, according to Sandy Grant, that involved the National Museum, the Phuthadikobo Community Museum, embassies and the South African Museum, Cape Town. The argument for return on the Botswana side was based on the fact that this was an inalienable possession of the Bakgatla that still needed to be put to spiritual use.

5.2.1.6 Offer to return human remains and ethnographic collections to Botswana by the Museum of South Africa and Iziko Museums in Cape Town

The offer to return human remains and ethnographic collections to Botswana has been made by the Museum of South Africa and Iziko Museums in Cape Town. The latter has thousands of ethnographic and archaeological collections from Botswana, and in 2005 they availed a list to the Botswana National Museum with a view to initiate dialogue on the same. In 2017 they

[656] Sandy Grant in conversation with the author, 2018.

also invited the Botswana National Museum, CAM and Museums of Namibia into a partnership. The aim was to discuss logistics around human remains from Namibia and Botswana that are currently housed by Iziko Museums. This was with a view to collaborate in the development of relevant legislation to guide the repatriation of ancestral remains back to source countries. The discussions are ongoing even though the Botswana National Museum has been lagging behind. In spite of the good gesture by Iziko Museums to negotiate return, the Botswana National Museum is not very keen because this is not a focus area for the museum or the country. The case therefore remains stalled and with no hope for action unless there is change of guard to an individual who sees this as a priority area. The University of Botswana was also invited by the National Museum into the discussions and the hope is that eventually the repatriation of both the human remains and collections from Botswana will be realised.

5.2.1.7 Pre-independence trophies

In 2008 the then Minister of Youth Sport and Culture Ms Gladys Kokorwe received 12 pre-independence trophies from Mr Sam Burnett at the National Museum and Art Gallery. Some European settlers who were relocating from Botswana at independence left the trophies in the custody of Mr Burnett and luckily, he later decided to surrender them to the Museum or government.[657] This is a special kind of return by a non-citizen to the government because many like him opted to leave the country with the valuables. The Burnett return case was a voluntary one with no negotiations for repatriation as it is the case in many national, continental and international cases. However, this only serves to give a glimpse of what is in private hands, which in many instances is not made known and many times is sneaked out of the country or left to perish in one way or the other.

The issue of restitution in the Botswana case brings up questions. What are the relations created by the migrations? Which are those that ensue as a result of fresh negotiations for return, prevention and sharing? According to Craig Forrest, some restitution cases have been known to become serious contentions, with emotions running high. This explains the quest to make a critical analysis of relations that ensue as a result of restitution cases between states, communities and institutions.[658] For both the African and international scenario, many repatriation cases are reported regularly. Meanwhile in Botswana, much as there are thousands

[657] *Botswana Daily News* 139, "Minister Gladys Kokorwe Hands Over Artefacts to the National Museum"', (2008): 3.
[658] Craig Forrest, *International Law and the Practice of Cultural Property*.

of collections from Botswana that are in foreign museums, restitution cases are sporadic since the focus by government and the museums themselves is not on this global topic of concern. All the return cases were by chance so far and voluntary.

5.2.2 The African Situation

5.2.2.1 Vigango statues

In 2014, 27 *vigango* statues or figurines from American museums were returned to Kenya. These are wooden carved sculptures made by Mijikenda, and they are normally placed by the grave side as a way of connecting with the ancestors. Most of them have been found in American museums because tourists, art dealers, anthropologists and students started stealing them or simply picking them up as unprotected possessions and trading in them at exorbitant prices. They however ended up in museums. There have been a number of different cases of such disappearances and tracking of such by both families and government. This was the largest number to be returned back, which was a result of many cases and negotiations by the Kenyan government and museums.[659] The statues are the inalienable possessions that are not supposed to leave owner communities. Many of the families have testified that since their disappearance, misfortunes and calamities have befallen them, such as illnesses, deaths, and bad harvests, because they are an intrinsic part of their culture and spirituality.

5.2.2.2 Mural fragments from the tomb of Tutankhamen

In 2010, some mural fragments from the tomb of Tutankhamen were returned by the Louvre after events that scholars have termed an act of cultural vandalism. The five mural fragments were looted from the tomb of Tutankhamen in Egypt. The Louvre maintains that it acquired them in good faith between 2000 and 2003. However, by 2008 their provenance was traced back to the king's tomb in Egypt. The Egyptian Antiquities Authority has been spearheading all the tracing and negotiations for the return of all Egyptian artworks from all over the world. According to an article by Chuka Nnabuife, the return of Egyptian treasures by France resuscitates the repatriation discussion by African countries and others who have lost the cultural property.[660]

---

[659] Joseph Nevadomsky, "The Vigango Affair: The Enterprise Mijikenda Memorial Figures to Kenya," *African Arts* 51, no. 2 (2018).

[660] Chuka Nnabuife, "France's Return of Egyptian Artefacts Reawakes Repatriation Debate. Nigeria," *Nigerian Compass* (2009, 22 December).

5.2.2.3 The repatriation of artefacts to Egypt from the Metropolitan Museum of Art in France

In 2010, 19 artefacts were repatriated to Egypt from the Metropolitan Museum of Art in France. This happened in the mist of the debate about the return of artefacts to Egypt by the Louvre. While a few pieces could also have been from Tutankhamen's tomb, most of the Egyptian artefacts held by the Metropolitan Museum of Art were acquired through collaboration exercises and sharing of excavation findings by local scholars, archaeologists and those from other countries. The rule that all findings should remain in Egypt was not followed, which is the leverage now used by Egyptian authorities to demand the return of the treasures to Egypt. Through this 'findings sharing' process, many of the Egyptian treasures found their way into foreign museums in Europe and America.[661]

5.2.2.4 Makonde mask

In 2010, a stolen Makonde Mask was returned from the Barbier-Mueller Museum of Geneva to the National Museum of Tanzania. Even though the repatriation agreement between the two governments stated donation, this was in fact a way of returning the mask to the country of origin. The mask was stolen along with other artefacts through a burglary at the National Museum of Tanzania. The mask probably ended up at the Barbier-Muller Museum through a sale. However, upon realising its origin, the museum immediately alerted ICOM and UNESCO. The process for return was then started until the eventual return, which was classified as a donation.[662] The word donation is however problematic because it tends to disentangle the Barbier-Muller Museum and the Swiss government from the of burden buying a stolen object without due diligence. The argument advanced by curators from the cosmopolitan museums is that they do not have deaccessioning policies and when faced with repatriation cases, the easiest way out is donation. This does not however mean that the object is not going back to the country of origin for good.

---

[661] *Elginism*, "Return of Egyptian artefacts from the Louvre to Egypt," (2010). http://www.elginism.com/similar-cases/return-of-egyptian-artefacts-by-louvre-re-awakens-restitution-debate/20100101/2641/

[662] Barbier-Muller Museum, "Museum Returns Stolen Makonde Mask to the National Museum of Tanzania," (Geneva: Archival Platform Newsletters, 2010).

5.2.2.5 Return of objects to Namibia taken by the Germans

Objects taken by the Germans during their occupation of the country were returned to Namibia. These included human remains and other objects such as the Hendrik Witbooi bible and the Stone Cross of Cape Cross. Objects from Namibia still remain in German museums, and some of them are being discussed for possible repatriation or sharing, as in collaborations. A good example is the talks between the two parties in June 2018 concerning the legal ownership and future of the Stone Cross of Cape Cross in Namibia, which was housed at the Berlin Museum of History.[663] Luckily the verdict has been that it will be repatriated back to Namibia. On 31 August 2018, the Namibian state also witnessed the historic return of 26 human skulls of genocide victims killed by the Germans during the colonial occupation. The dialogue and vicious cycle continue. Ceremonial objects from royals such as the *Kwanyama* power stones of the Ovambo people have also been returned back to Namibia from a Finnish museum.

5.2.2.6 King Badu Bonsu II of Ghana's severed head

In 2009 King Badu Bonsu II of Ghana's severed head was repatriated to Ghana from Holland. The head was discovered in 2008 in a jar of formaldehyde as part of the Anatomical Collection of the Leiden University Medical Centre in Holland. The Ghanaian king was hanged and decapitated by a Dutch general in 1838. The skull complements the unethically collected human remains done during the colonial period for anatomical collections from many parts of the world.[664] The area was a Dutch colony known as the Dutch Gold Coast and is a part of present-day Ghana. This explains the upper hand by the Dutch over King Bonsu and his community, leading to his execution. A bitter battle was waged by the Ghanaians in order to get the king's head repatriated for a proper and dignified burial. The argument for return was also along the lines of inalienable possession since he was a royal, breaking the chain with departed ancestors. The remains were finally returned in 2009 and the Ghanaian government demanded that as part of reparations the Dutch government should provide schools and hospitals to appease the spirit of the departed king.[665]

---

[663] Jeremy Silvester, *Museum Association of Namibia Newsletter* (2000): 10–11. See also *Botswana Daily News* 255, (2016).
[664] Daniel Kipkorir, "War Medallions Stolen," 20–21.
[665] *AFRICOM Newsletter*, "Chief's Head Returns Home," (2010).

5.2.2.7 The Cox Collection

A good example of the repatriation of Malawian heritage is the 'Cox Collection' that is now with the Chichiri Museum. The Cox brothers Theodore and Victor (plantation farmers) collected the objects over many years and migrated them to their home country England. The collection was later migrated to America by one of the family members, where it ended up at the Whatcom Museum in Bellingham. After gaining independence, the government and intellectuals from the country started agitating for its return. The repatriation was realised in 1989 through the facilitation of a Malawian Representative in the US, Dr Donal Brody.[666]

Like all the other collections by individuals, it is referred to as the Cox Collection by Museums of Malawi. Some collections were migrated by David Steward Mogg, a Central African historian, author and researcher who specialised in Malawian history. He collected a lot of objects during his travels in the country. He collected for private use and later donated his collection to museums and universities, but most of the collections were later returned to Malawi. For some of the collections that were repatriated, lack of storage area for the collection in the hosting museums was cited as the main reason.[667]

5.2.2.8 The remains of Klaas and his wife Trooi Pienaar

The remains of Klaas and his wife Trooi Pienaar of South Africa, who were exhumed from their graves by an Austrian anthropologist Rudolf Poch, were returned to South Africa. He claimed he was doing research on dwarfism and they and their kinsmen seemed the right target for his enquiry. Many other human remains were taken for the same reason: Anatomical explorations of the colonial period on certain types of people. Some individuals were taken alive for the same explorations and ended up dying abroad. The remains of Klaas and Trooi were later displayed at the Natural History Museum in Vienna, Austria. The government, together with scholars from South Africa such as Ciraj Rassool lobbied for their return in 2012 and reburial in their home village Kuruman in the Northern Cape.[668] Rudolf Poch is the same character who migrated Botswana collections to the Weltmuseum Wien in Austria. This is therefore an indication of his presence and work in the region over many years

[666] Mthotha C. Tamonda, "The Cox Collection; Museums of Malawi and the Politics of Repatriation 1892–2016."
[667] Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[668] Iziko Museum Documentation records, "The Return of Klaas and Trooi Pienaar," (2017).

5.2.2.9 The Benin government and objects in French museums

The Benin government has requested the French Foreign Ministry to repatriate all art works under its custody back to Benin. However, the then minister Jean-Marc Ayrault refused to repatriate claiming that restitution is difficult because the collections, like those in other French museums, are inalienable possessions. In other words, they are now an integral part of the French history and culture, and therefore, cannot be taken away. This is however surprising because inalienable possessions are those objects that should never really have left owner communities because they are spiritual, ceremonial, royal possessions or a part of human suffering. Accordingly, these would be inalienable to the Benin communities and not the French. This is however an area or case that is open to further investigation and debate by scholars of heritage.[669]

5.2.2.10 Musée du Quai Branly-Jacques Chirac and Benin

Musée du Quai Branly-Jacques Chirac of Paris is also engaged in a restitution battle with Benin. This is over the repatriation of the Guezo, Glele and Behanzin treasures, which are part of the museum's collection. The disputed objects were looted by the French army in 1892. Similarly, to the Kgalagadi Bushmen collections and the Benin bronzes or treasures were some of the most sought after objects during the 1800s, and this explains their large presence in many European museums today and the agitation for return by Nigeria.[670] We are yet to see the same effort from Botswana, South Africa and Namibia since the 'Kgalagadi Bushman' whom we call Basarwa, in Botswana are found in these three countries and their colonial holdings are some of the treasures still found in museums all over the world.

5.2.3 The International Scenario

5.2.3.1 Recovered Italian paintings

Italy recovered two paintings by the French artists Paul Gauguin and Pierre Bonnard. These were stolen from London in the 1970s. Italy's specialised police, the Carabinieri, facilitated the discovery and return. The Carabinieri shared details of the works and their recovery with the public and the media. The recovered works are worth millions of dollars. The police division

[669] Jean-Marc Ayrault refused to repatriate the Benin bronzes on grounds that they are inalienable possessions of the French government.
[670] Gareth Harris, "What Restitution Experts Have to Say about President Macrons Pledge to Return African Artefacts."

for cultural heritage has meanwhile devised an application for cell phones. It allows citizens to actively participate in the search for stolen works of art by sending in photographs of suspected artworks. This is evidence that even though the highest volume of trafficking in artworks are from non-European territories, there are still cases of migration within Europe itself. The local trafficking particularly from less powerful states such as the Greece, Poland and Turkey.

5.2.3.2 Maori head

In 1992. a Maori head was returned by the city of Geneva from its Museum of Ethnography to New Zealand. This was initially in the form of a loan, but in 2011 the loan was converted to full restitution.

5.2.3.3 Statuette of Ekeko, the divinity of abundance

In 2014, the city of Berlin returned from its History Museum a statuette of Ekeko, the divinity of abundance to Bolivia.[671]

5.2.3.4 Return of a Hindu deity's head by the French Guimet Museum

In 2016 a Hindu deity's head was returned by the French Guimet Museum to the National Museum in Phnom Penh. This was looted during the French colonial occupation from a Cambodian temple 130 years ago. It was then shipped to France in 1886. The other part of the statue remained behind, and according to the Minister of Culture, Noraksathaya, reuniting the two pieces will reconnect the national heritage of Cambodia. The return of this Hindu deity, the Harihara statue, was done at the request of the Kingdom of Cambodia. The state has been hunting down all its lost artworks, and as a result, American museums have returned quite a number pf objects following negotiations and legal battles.[672]

5.2.3.5 Cultural remains of Indigenous Canadians

Whole collections of cultural remains of indigenous Canadians have been returned to Alert Bay, their place of origin, by a Canadian Museum. These were repatriated after extensive lobbying by the Alert Bay community and activists. The return falls within the broader context

---

[671] Noémie Etienne, Chonja Lee and Claire Brizon, "Global Provenance."

[672] Noraksathaya, "Speech by Minister of Cambodia on the occasion of the repatriation the Hindu God's head from a Museum in France," (Cambodia, 2016).

of the return of cultural objects and ancestral remains to the Indigenous people as realised under the truth and reconciliation initiatives by the Canadian government.

5.2.3.6 Return of pre-Colombian archaeological objects to the National Museum of Costa Rica

The Brooklyn Museum in New York returned 4 500 pre-Colombian archaeological objects to the National Museum of Costa Rica. This collection had been acquired during the 19th century by the shipping magnate Minor C. Keith before being acquired by the Brooklyn Museum in 1934. The Brooklyn Museum cited lack of storage space for the display of all its acquired collections, hence, it decided to return some of the collections.[673] It is therefore one of the specialised cases of many self-volunteering returns, which in spite of the reasons behind them is a welcome move. It should be noted that the Latin American countries, just like Africa, lost a lot of cultural property through the voyages of discovery and the colonial occupations.

5.2.3.7 Returns by Canadian museums to the First Nations

There have been numerous return cases by Canadian museums to the Indigenous people of Canada, the First Nations. The returns included both objects and dead bodies from the museums to the communities. Those that were not returned, was at the discretion of the communities themselves. The Canadian government regarded that as a process of truth and reconciliation (as borrowed from South Africa) to bring closure to the atrocities suffered by the Indigenous people through white occupation. Given that the Canadian case is about internal restitution, perhaps this could help in addressing the current animosity by some local groups and community museums in Botswana that have also been proposing repatriation of communal holdings by the National Museum.

5.2.3.8 Return of portrait by Australian gallery

In 2014, an Australian gallery was reported to prepare for the return of a portrait that was once thought the work of Vincent Van Gogh to its rightful owners. This presents as part of the country's initiative to restitute art lost under Nazi rule. The National Gallery of Victoria acknowledged that a forced sale by a German Jew Richard Semmel of the 'head of a man' was done in 1933. This therefore had to be returned to his heirs. Like the examples of the

---

[673] France Desmarais, "Heritage in Danger," 14–21. See also *The New York Times*, "The Return of African Objects," (2010).

Nma/Herero versus the German government, the National Gallery of Victoria accepted full responsibility of determining ownership to lootings and confiscated artworks. This also included persecutions and related policies (anti-Semitic) that presented under Nazi rule between 1933–1945. The gallery worked with the Dutch Restitution Committee, which adjudicated claims about Nazi-confiscated art. Some artworks were sold due to pressure from war. The artwork had moved from one owner to another since its auction in 1933, before it was finally bought by the Melbourne Gallery. Besides scrutiny and documentation by international scholars, the Van Gogh Museum in Amsterdam also made an investigation in 2006 before deciding to return the portrait. The decision to return the portrait was a deliberate move by the National Gallery of Victoria towards the correction of the historical mistakes.[674]

5.2.3.9 The J. Paul Getty Museum in California and the Trocadero Museum of Ethnology in France

The J. Paul Getty Museum in California and the Trocadero Museum of Ethnology in Paris were established as a result of the dispossession of African art, Asian treasures and Latin American heritage. Some of the collections also came from weaker European states, as indicated earlier. These museums receive millions of visitors per a year because of these rare pieces. There have, however, been a lot of tension and exchanges over some of these looted collections, particularly with the Greeks and Italians. Some repatriations were recorded such as the return of objects to the Archaeological Museum of Thesaloniki in 2006 and the return of some collections back to Italy. The demands still continue and the dialogue is ongoing.[675]

Many cases of repatriation, dialogue and discussions about objects found in European museums are today a critical point and a reality in the history of heritage. Vivid pointers are cases such as the recent pledge by President Macron of France to repatriate all African cultural property in French museums back to the African countries of origin and the related Sarr-Savoy Report. This is another step towards the repatriation of African treasures. While the announcement was hailed as historic, it received mixed reactions from the heritage fraternity. Some restitution analysts think it is a doubtful undertaking and will be difficult to implement, but Nicholas Thomas observed that this is a move that will most likely be appreciated by museum curators. The route is clearly marked towards restitution and or a shared heritage, and

---

[674] *Botswana Daily News*, "Australian Gallery to Return Portrait Lost Under Nazis," (2014, May).
[675] *The New York Times*, "The Return of African Objects," (2010).

there is no going back. The debates, negotiations and practical cases of return, co-curation and provenance research are testimony to that. The Sarr-Savoy Report that was commissioned by President Macron has been a catalyst for a lot of thinking by European museums about the future of their African collections. The UK has been slow to move on issues of repatriation, restitution or decolonising because it first opted for the winding route of temporary and permanent loans. However, there is a need for support from funders and policy makers to achieve the things proposed by the report. The funding is to support the costs of travel, workshops or events, collection research and documentation or digitisation, and training and object transportation.[676]

The Saudi Mega Museum—King Abdul-Aziz Centre in Dhahran is also finally moving ahead with repatriations of collections to countries of origin.[677] They are returning cultural property back to the original owners due to lack of storage space, as indicated by the *New York Times* in the American example.

However, while all these are commendable moves in the right direction, there are also sentiments such as those echoed by Echi Dahmali, Vice President of AFRICOM, to the effect that "African looted heritage is not a shared heritage".[678] Museums should therefore support the restitution of all properties, either cultural, intellectual, religious or spiritual taken without consent. This was in violation of laws, traditions and customs of the communities of origin. They should provide access while at the same time respecting the privacy of religious and cultural sites. Museums should also allow access to the use and control of ceremonial objects in their custody, particularly by the source community. The same should also apply to repatriated human remains.[679] A review of collections at the Johannesburg Museum or Museum Africa in South Africa by the study has revealed that most of the diasporic collections are from private and individual collections. However, in the view of Diana Hall, the Collections Manager at Museum Africa, collections collected through clandestine channels and those that were used for religious and ceremonial purposes should be returned.[680]

---

[676] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 30.
[677] Aedin Mac Devitt, "High Stakes: Restitution Claims and Online Art Trading are Making the Case for Fresh Legislation," 10–13.
[678] Cherki Dahmali, "African Looted Heritage is Not a Shared Heritage."
[679] Nika Collison, "Museums, Communities and Repatriation," Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.
[680] Diana Hall (Collections Manager at Museum Africa) in conversation of author, 2015.

Prince Shyllon and his foundation are concerned with the promotion of Nigerian art and culture and the collecting Nigerian works of art. However, the foundation has not made much effort to restitute the art that is in the diaspora. Much of the contact with the outside world has been to ascertain what art pieces are outside, to promote Nigerian art back home, and to get financial support for the foundation in order to continue its work. The partnerships formed with international institutions have therefore not been focussed at the returning of any artworks but rather on promoting access to the Nigerian artworks back home.[681]

In summary and in view of the synopsis given, it should be noted that after independence or on the eve of independence for many African countries, free collecting started being restricted. Laws were initiated to restrict the export of all objects of historical and cultural value, such as the Bushman and Relics Acts of Botswana, South Africa, and Zimbabwe. When colonial dominance ended, it immediately became an issue who had the right to keep the objects from ex-colonial societies. Furious debates ensued between the European and American countries holding the collections and the ex-colonial states. In some newly independent countries, museum directors immediately began to demand back objects that had left their countries. Many such demands were levelled at the British Museum by African countries.[682] This is because of the quantity of African collections at the British Museum. According to John Mack, formerly a Senior Keeper at the British Museum, Africa has always been at the centre of the British Museum's ethnographic research. This led to the growth of its Africa collections, leading to the establishment of the Africa section at the British Museum. The collections were a reflection of the changing relations between Africa, the global North and between the museum and the global community. An example of this kind of relation was the master and servant relations between the British and its imperial trappings. Africa is still at the centre or forefront of museum interests as elaborated in Section 3.1.[683]

The issue of cultural property ownership and claims for restitution therefore dates back to the post-independence period. The British Museum has a rich collection, and there were numerous publications on the collection and it also exhibited regularly. This helped publicise the collection and make it well-known. As a result, the collection became an easy target for restitution claims because the owner states got to know where their objects were housed. The

---

[681] Prince Shyllon (Art collector and lawyer, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[682] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*.
[683] John Mack, *Africa and its Cultures*, cover page.

demands for the return of cultural property came from the African continent and other parts of the world. Ying-Chen Peng talked about "shopping China in Europe" as reference to the migration of objects from China into European markets and museums. The Chinese collections were also very popular among European societies and have been referred to as 'China ware' in reference to their artistic value.[684] Hence, the demands for return still come to these cosmopolitan museums from all over. Acquisition policies by the new and demanding states have also had to take the restitution issue into consideration. Their core argument and framework on restitution rested on consideration of inalienable possessions where complete restitution cannot be achieved. Natasha Eaton discussed these inalienable possessions or spiritual objects in relation to Indian rituals and Hindu Gods.[685] These were found at the colonially initiated museum of the Dutch East India Company, also known as the Indian Museum or the 'diasporic museum'. The name was in reference to the diverse collections and cultures represented in the museum.

5.3 NORTHERN CRITIQUES OF FURTHER RESTITUTION

The arrival of the era of demands for restitution was from the onset met with mixed feelings in the global North. Different countries reacted differently, and some chose to play indifferent. According to Rassool, the cosmopolitan museums started posing as universal museums in order to counteract demands for repatriation. The British Museum, for example, embarked on a programme for partnerships with African museums and offered the objects back as loans. He argued that the response by the British Museum and other museums that did the same still enforced a relationship of dependency.[686] This takes us back to the enquiry by the study on whether the collaborations and a shared heritage are done on an equal basis. According to the Sarr-Savoy Report, the German government reacted by opting to build the Humboldt Museum in order to house all the colonial holdings. George Abungu also talked about how some European museums started declaring themselves universal museums of humankind because they were challenged by the move for decolonisation, which entailed repatriation.[687] However, after the declaration by the French president, many museums came out to face restitution and

[684] Ying-chen Peng, "Shopping China in Europe," in *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets*, eds. Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald, (De Gruyter, 2018), 50–52.
[685]. Natasha Eaton, 'Colonial Iconoclash: Mimetic Rivalry, Collecting and Idolatry Between India and Britain", eds. Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald, (De Gruyter, 2018), 31
[686] Ciraj Rassool, "Building a Critical Museology in Africa," xxii.
[687] George Okello Abungu, "Connected by History, Divided by Reality," 33.

all its challenges.[688] It was therefore because of varying reasons that host museums were not willing to let go of their foreign collections. As a result, some of the requests for restitution have resulted in debates and animosity between these cosmopolitan museums and the requesting states. This is what eventually led to the option to share and to collaborate, which is the current state of affairs. However, the situation is more complicated than it appears to be for the colonial master museums. To them, repatriation is not really a favourable option, which explains their resistance to and critique of this option. Moreover, this is work done over centuries, where the aim was to be the best and to excel in collecting and housing the best; the British Museum being a good example. To some diaspora museums, the African collections are an essential part of the museum's main collection. They are a source of pride and reflect the museum's achievements in research, collecting and excellence. In some instances, whole museums are made up largely by collections from colonial countries and repatriating means closing down; an option not favourable to the host museums or their personnel. Philip Jones concluded that due to the migration or trade in cultural property, there are more Aboriginal objects in Europe than in Australia.[689] This would explain the arguments by McLeod and the response by the British Museum Director to the Greek government upon the request to return the Parthenon marbles. This is an answer shared by many of the concerned museums. Some of the dissenting voices argue that it is advisable to leave the objects where they are because those that are hosting the objects value them more than the original communities do. These hosting countries and museums, just like UNESCO, see these artefacts as universal heritage, a heritage for humanity. This still points to the notion of a shared heritage.[690]

According to Julie Hudson, a curator at the British Museum, while the British Museum is more committed to collaborations, there is still room for the possible return of special collections to countries of origin in case the need arises. Hudson also believed that the British Museum is now more honest, transparent and flexible than before about collections looted from Africa, such as the Benin bronzes. This makes dialogue and collaborations with African counterparts much easier.[691] The consideration for special objects takes us back to the concept of alienable and inalienable objects as discussed by Annette Weiner and Natasha Eaton. This is

---

[688] Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 15.

[689] Philip Jones "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," 125.

[690] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*.

[691] Julie Hudson (Curator of the Africa Section, British Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015. See also Annette Weiner on Inalienable Possessions and Natasha Eaton, Colonial Iconoclash, in *Acquiring Cultures,* De Gruyter, 2018

questionable though because of the issues just discussed. Could it be that because of the current debates on decolonising the museum they are now forced by the circumstances, particularly the calls for repatriation by different states? The Carmo Museum of Archaeology in Lisbon has also played indifferent to the call to decolonise and remove human remains from display. They argued that it was an internal and administrative matter. Due to pressure from activists, the media and writings by scholars and heritage practitioners, it finally agreed to reconsider but with no concrete commitment.[692]

Still on the issue of repatriations, different views are being presented by the global North and the global South. According to Nkatha George Ufot of Nigeria,[693] it is the professionals and heritage managers from government who should advise African governments and policy makers on the way forward, whether restitution or a shared heritage. However, his concern was whether African countries can manage to accommodate and host all the cultural property that is abroad if it is all returned. This raises a concern about whether the demanding states have the capacity that is needed to host the collections in terms of manpower, skills and storage space. This thought was complemented by Prince Shyllon's proposal that the mainline museum should assist in building museums in the source countries. The undertaking could be done before the restitution, so that the returned heritage is properly stored and preserved.[694] This proposal by the Nigerians serves as another form or interpretation to a shared heritage. Kiprop Lagat also discussed the different arguments advanced by those opposed to restitution, particularly from the global North. They maintain that Africans do not have the skill or the capacity to look after the heritage. They also maintain that the collections were migrated before current African states were established.[695] Hence, they argue that no one is justified to claim this diasporic heritage. This also resonates with Hatala Matthes's argument that since the heritage was not taken from today's generation, what gives them the right to claim it.[696]

In Shyllon's view, African museums still lack the passion for the preservation of heritage compared to their counterparts in the developed world. The local museum's capacity, such as funding, space and accommodation for the collections, is also still very limited. This is evidenced by the lack of expansion, development and growth in the current museums. Even

---

[692] Filipa Cordeiro and Rui Mourao, *Time of the Huacas*.
[693] Nkatha George Ufot of Nigeria in conversation with the author
[694] Prince Shyllon, (Nigerian Art Collector) in Conversation with the author
[695] Kiprop Lagat, "The Hazina Exhibition. Challenges and Lessons for International Museum Collaboration," 136.
[696] Erich Hatala Matthes, "Repatriation and the Radical Redistribution of Art," 432.

maintenance is difficult, such that some museums are under the maintenance trap, and are not growing, not able to sustain themselves or to even maintain the status quo.[697] If this is the situation in some of the local museums today, particularly in countries where there have been armed struggles for liberation, genocide or natural disasters, one then wonders whether African countries would be able to accept the collections back, to accommodate them, and to give them the care and the passion that they have been afforded by the current owners. If the current situation in African museums prevails, then the collections cannot be returned

Holger Stoecker of the German Museum of Natural History & Humboldt University shared the same sentiments. According to him, the issue of return for African collections is a widely debated area. Some people argue for return, while some think it is unwise because the owners of this cultural property have no capacity or economic means to handle the collections. They also feel that the claims by the Africans, for example, have no foresight and no long-term plan but only the wish to make money through the return exercise.[698] It is insinuations such these that require a sharp lens on the fate of the objects once returned, as discussed earlier on.

Do countries demanding repatriation really want to make political capital out of such situations? What is the impact of return on the receiving public and communities of provenance? It is also important to know where and how the artefacts will be displayed or used after restitution and also whether the original community will still use and revere the objects in the same way as before. If it is a ceremonial object, have other objects replaced it or has the culture and practice for making and using the object since died? Jeremy Silvester and Napandulwe Shiweda interrogated this issue at length in their discussion of the return of the Kwanyama Power stones from a Finnish museum to Namibia.[699]

The main arguments by the critiques of the return exercise and the host museums as reiterated earlier are two-fold. Firstly, there were no museums in Africa, hence the objects were deposited in foreign museums for display and safekeeping. According to McLeod, the founder of the Berlin Museum fur Volkerkunde, Adolf Bastian, believed that they were saving objects which

[697] Prince Shyllon (Art collector and lawyer, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015. Prince A. Shyllon is an art collector and has the largest art collection in Nigeria with art pieces dating from years back before the colonial period. He has some of the finest pieces and by the best Nigerian artists. The collection is managed through the Ommoba Yemisi Adedoyin Shyllon Art Foundation (OYASAF) under the directorship of Prince Yemisi Shyllon himself.

[698] Holger Stoecker (German Museum of Natural History & Humboldt University) in conversation with the author, 2016.

[699] Jeremy Silvester and Napandulwe Shiweda, "The Return of Sacred Stones of the Ovambo Kingdoms: Restitution and the Revision of the Past," 30–39.

would otherwise have been left to destruction.[700] Secondly, the objects were to be subjected to further research and analysis in laboratories, universities or research institutions as scientific discoveries and for anatomical investigations. This is why in my MA thesis, I discussed the evolution of the African museum, from traditional institutions to the modern museum. This is to show that Africans had their own ways of conserving their own culture and therefore did not need someone else to keep safe or conserve the objects for them.[701] This is not a valid reason for the migration of cultural property. Kwame Amoah Labi also attested to the fact that Africans had and still have their own special way of protecting, conserving and presenting their cultural heritage.[702] This would explain the presence of many objects in metropolitan museums and the many contested cases of restitution as documented in Section 5.2.

My argument on the notion of restitution is summarised in the following points. The call for repatriation of objects to source communities has been going on for some time and has intensified with time. It goes back to the time of the first independence for African countries, even though from the colonial view point it was ignored as coming from the 'primitive'.[703] This would also explain some of the responses to demands for restitution, such as that given by Foreign Minister of France, Jean-Marc Ayrault, in 2016. His indication that France will not repatriate because the objects in their custody are inalienable possessions of the museum is misinformed. To the demanding states, it would appear as an insult. This accounts for the polarisation and disparity between the two camps and the ensuing current debates and discussions on the same subjects.

The ICOM Newsletter titled *High Stakes: Restitution Claims and Online Art Trading are Making the Case for Fresh Legislation* talks to the legislation that needs to be put in place to allow for restitution. Due to the rising demand for restitution of collections, many cosmopolitan countries are developing restitution laws.[704] According to the Newsletter, while restitution cases are increasing, online trading of artworks and cultural property has also gone up in the 21st century. Sadly, some of the cited countries in the restitution exercise are some of the key markets in the trade of cultural property. The conventions that are discussed earlier are also very careful about the period allowed for restitution of the migrated collections. One wonders

[700] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 60.
[701] Winani Thebele-Kgwatalala, "The Evolution and Development of the Museum in Botswana towards a Heritage Institution."
[702] Kwame Amoah Labi, "New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa," 165.
[703] Malcolm McLeod, *Collecting for the British Museum*, 15–18.
[704] Aedin Mac Devitt, "High Stakes: Restitution Claims and Online Art Trading are Making the Case for Fresh Legislation."

whether this could have been a deliberate strategy by the host countries to use UNESCO through the conventions to remain protected and not to return the collections. They could easily manipulate UNESCO and the other international bodies to insert clauses in the conventions that favour them. The host countries remain protected to keep the collections. The conventions and protocols instead concentrate on the repatriation of collections from the current cases of illicit trafficking, pillaging and plundering, such as Mali, Syria, and Iraq. However, the fact that some European museums have chosen to ignore the debate about restitution and decolonisation delays the revolution that is proposed for the museum today.[705]

In some cases, curators from these early museums, such as Diana Hall of the Johannesburg Museum, feel that the collections cannot be returned because they are part of the core function of the museum, which is dissemination of information and publicity. Hall shared the same view as the French minister and the British Museum Ex-Director, Neil McGregor. She highlighted that the reason for collecting was mainly research and that the absence of borders then also made collecting much easier and legitimate, hence the legitimacy to own the collection and not adhere to requests for return.[706] Ms Ekunke, the curator at the National Museum in Lagos, Nigeria, also believed that even if the option is restitution, African countries cannot re-acquire all the cultural property abroad. According to her, there would be no space and the capacity is not up to standard. She maintained that it is advisable to leave the objects where they are because those that are hosting them value them more than the communities or countries of provenance. They look after them more than the communities of origin do. The update on the repatriated objects in Nigeria according to Ekunke is that some of the excess stuff, and mostly replicas from the objects, that have been restituted to Nigeria from European museums is sold in the curio shop of the Lagos National Museum. The original objects are in the storerooms and some are displayed on the museum grounds. She also revealed that there are efforts to turn one of the museums, probably in Kaduna, into a centre for all the returned collections.[707] This is an indication that the degree of response varies and that some countries take the conversations on return of cultural property seriously.

Meanwhile, an interview with Jonathan Fine, a curator at the Staatliche Museum of Ethnography in Germany revealed that they have had very few repatriation cases. However, he

[705] Winani Thebele, "The Reinvention of the Museum into a Cultural Hub in the African Context," 37.
[706] Diana Hall (Collections Manager at Museum Africa) in conversation of author, 2015.
[707] Edith Ekunke (Director of the National Museum in Lagos) in conversation with the author, 2015.

was not willing to talk about the few they have had, which were from West Africa. The German government also does not allow for deaccessioning of objects, hence, the repatriated one is on a permanent loan in Germany, which is a very tricky situation, as discussed earlier. It would be useful to know the terms and conditions of this type of repatriation and the permanent loan that has ensued. He could not be drawn out to talk about it but indicated that any requests would be most welcome and that each case will be considered on its merit. The idea is to consider all the circumstances surrounding the object, copyright and intellectual property in the dialogue between the two parties. He, however, still agreed with the larger museum fraternity that Africans should be involved in the development of European museum exhibitions to fill up the information and collection gaps and contribute to the narrative.[708]

It is very clear that there are different viewpoints among heritage managers from both the global South and global North. Interestingly, the African museum curators also believed that restitution should be carefully considered and that sharing and universality are a good option given the current situation, provided it is done equally and there is proper consultation of the communities of provenance. The same analysis also applies to the Western museums holding cultural material from African museums, so that their response to the restitution processes and proposal for a shared heritage is brought to light. This is also to assess the different responses between the camps involved in the migration struggle. Is the struggle, the debates and the conversations working to bring the two camps together towards a common goal? This is the goal of being equal partners, for all parties have an equal say with no one above the other.

Host museums are often not willing to let go of their collections, and restitution could be a difficult and politically sensitive issue between nation states. Countries and museums should therefore explore new ways in which cultural property can be 'restored' to its rightful owners. This should allow for sharing the objects with diasporic communities and not only the legitimate owners. Repatriation will enable the source community to co-manage the heritage. This allows for total repatriation, loaning out or virtual repatriation as in replicas and images. Total repatriation in some instances restores the object to its former state and use in rituals, ceremonies and festivals.

All the individual instigators had different motivations for trafficking these collections. However, with the demand for return and awareness raised by the debates for restitution,

[708] Jonathan Fine (Curator, Staatliche Museum of Ethnography) in conversation with the author, 2016.

African states have been developing restrictive laws. The free collecting by the cosmopolitan museums has been affected and resurfaced in today's smuggling, thefts, illegal excavations, pillaging and looting during war. All the museums now have to follow the ICOM, UNESCO rule of authenticating ownership and provenance before acquiring objects for the collection. However, in spite of all the advanced arguments against restitution, there are still those who blame Africans themselves for cultural migration. It is not clear whether this should justify the refusal to repatriate. Philip Jones talked about indigenous Australians producing deliberately for the dealers and market.[709] Jonathan Fine also talked about the role and agency of the Africans themselves to aid the migrations, and in this case, he refers to the Bamum of Cameroon. These two cases, as well as others, cause a contradiction in that it is the owners of the heritage who deliberately went out of their way to produce and satisfy the demands of the market. Their agency and voluntary contribution to the market make it difficult to argue for return from an African perspective today.[710]

Interestingly, in the midst of restitution issues and the reactions and discomfort, the resultant solution by museums from the global North and global South has been to re-configure the museum into a 'cultural hub' as a way of decolonisation. Of late, the conversations between heritage managers from both camps have been how this re-configuration is achieved, what needs to be done in order to achieve this and whether this can be achieved for both the global North and the global South. Different perspectives have been interrogated, with some focusing on provenance research. The implementation is yet to be realised. The hope is that within this configuring exercise, the repatriation of cultural property becomes a pivotal point.

[709] Philip Jones, "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," 125.
[710] Jonathan Fine, "Obscure Objects of Desire," 154.

CHAPTER 6
EXPERIMENTS IN SHARING

This study's main questions are organised around the proposed collective responsibility of sharing the global culture of humanity. I investigate whether in light of the unequal access to resources and knowledge between museums in the Northern countries and those in the global South it is possible to share heritage in an equal manner, with equal access and equal benefits. It is also important to know what this sharing really is and what the anticipated benefits from the implied access and sharing of this cultural heritage and resources are. What does this sharing mean for countries from the global South, which have most of their cultural heritage kept in museums of the global North? This serves as the rationale for investigating this global option to share our collective heritage. Scholars, countries and communities have referred to the Nagoya Protocol as leverage in exploring all these questions because the protocol advocates for access to resources by indigenous communities. It also ensures that there is fair and equitable sharing of benefits. In the discussion of collaborations, partnerships, exchanges with the communities of origin in reference to colonial holdings, how much do communities of origin benefit? How far do laws and regulations on restitution take into consideration the wellbeing of these communities?[711]

In addition to the empirical study on the issue of illegally migrated objects and the option to share, there are general concepts relating to exchange and reciprocity that complement the concept of sharing. I relate the concepts of alterity and mimesis, approximating the ideas of 'the other' or 'othering' and 'mimicking' or assimilation to my discussion of object migration here, and the relations that have developed as a result. My observation is that, while sharing implies an element of equality, looting or trading in an unequal exchange is hardly the basis of sharing. So, is this proposed sharing a practical possibility? Is the exchange of cultural objects based on a shared understanding of reciprocal relationships?

The concept of sharing has its roots in the 20th century and was initiated by organisations such as the UN, UNESCO and ICOM. It is a modern idea as compared to the patterns of sharing and gift giving found among precolonial communities of the world. In the UNESCO/ICOM and other contemporary understandings of sharing, cultural heritage promotes diversity, tolerance, and appreciation of others in the world community. Cultural property should be shared to

[711] Noémie Etienne, Chonja Lee and Claire Brizon, "Global Provenance."

promote knowledge and understanding of world cultures and communities.[712] This could justify the scientific and curatorial expeditions of earlier times, notwithstanding the fact that individuals, companies, states and of late criminal syndicates contributed to this migration of heritage.[713] The early explorers, travellers, hunters, traders, and scientists also collected as part of their encounter with a new world. They wanted to share their findings and to analyse for knowledge. Nonetheless, these objects became display material and curios for the world community. This has real consequences for a critical engagement with the concept of sharing and with the very concept of a world museum. The study in this way provides a basis for re-conceptualising what it means to share within and across museum institutions worldwide. Today cultural brokers, current state facilitators, and current illegal traders in 'exotic' artefacts, among others, confer certain aspects of a mimesis and hybridity by re-casting such objects and artefacts as shared.

Needless to say, the UNESCO/ICOM definition of sharing has limitations because, while in formal terms museums all over the world exist on an equal legal footing, they do not do so in terms of resources, skills, expertise and access to funds. This means that there are differences in understanding what shared ownership means. The notion of sharing here includes different assumptions such as shared ownership of cultural property, universality, shared responsibility, co-ownership, co-curation, and equal and open access for all. The analysis that follows is an effort to assess the above given the background on inequality.

The two proposals of restitution and sharing have been investigated together in this study. This is because they have a bearing on one another in that if options for restitution fail, then we move to the idea of shared heritage and the exploration of the migrated object as one that is shared between countries, cultures and peoples. The issue of restitution becomes now recast as the sharing of heritage. In this perspective, a shared object is recast to play a representational role to the community of origin, wherever it is. The expectation is that if sharing is the option to go by, then this object should give the community of origin a sense of pride. Ownership remains contested, albeit settled as shared cultural knowledge. Is pride in this shared heritage and knowledge derived from how the object has been returned to its owners or that it now occupies an international space while remaining in the cosmopolitan museum?

---

[712] *Botswana Daily News*, "Italy Police Recover Stolen Painting."
[713] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*, vii, ix, 187.

Lyndel Prott pointed out that there is a renewed interest in the discussion about illegal trade in cultural property and its restitution by the international community, legislators as well as the media.[714] The point made by Prott is why I enquire into the correlation between respect for cultural diversity, tolerance of differences and the valorisation of one's own cultural objects and achievements. For a long time, cosmopolitan museums intensified access to such objects by a wider audience, the global community, while intensifying exclusion for the community of origin. Host communities admired these artefacts and wondered at the genius of the men and women who made them, creating a vicarious "respect and admiration of the ingenuity of the Africans who made the objects regardless".[715] This marks the 'curiosity and wonder' period in the history of colonial collections. While I have opted to address this issue as cultural migration, the idea is not to sweep the question of illicitness and illegality under the carpet. It is also not due to the political inadequacy of the answers by former colonial powers that the giving states have stalled from advocating for restitution. Rather, it is the quest to interrogate the option of sharing as manifest in universality and collaborations and as a chosen global alternative to rectifying the past.

The question of the practicality of sharing this heritage is a key concern for current museologist and those interested in the migration of objects, records and archives. There are calls for ease of access by the country of origin, a shared or ease of access to websites, collections and the option for exchange exhibitions, research, expertise and capacity building for museum personnel. It is important to probe if sharing extends to diverse cultures or only to cultural objects. This would refer to cultural components such as dance, music, and intangible heritage as espoused by the UNESCO Director of the Pacific, Clément Etienne.[716] Hence, it is critical to make a thorough analysis of this option. This is sharing of issues such as history and intangible heritage as well as practical works such as ethnographic objects found in museums. However, it would be of interest to establish whether museums are sharing, exchanging and returning cultural property in order to rectify the unequal past. Are they perhaps sharing because heritage is a human right? Because there is need for open access by communities of origin? How are we to deal with histories in which there was no mutual exchange or reciprocal undertaking among those who collected and the owner communities? There was also no verbal

[714] Lyndel V. Prott, Witnesses to History: A *C*ompendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects, iii.
[715] Stephen Greenblatt, "Resonance and Wonder," 52–53. See also Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 39.
[716] *Botswana Daily News*, "Pacific Cultural Heritage under Threat," 29.

and or written reciprocal acknowledgement underlining the sharing during the time of collecting.[717] Most importantly, the exchanged objects now do not have the same functional or ceremonial efficacy as they had in the source country, as observed by George Mudenda.[718]

Sharing in this sense becomes a broad concept covering many aspects of heritage and history. According to Karine Duhamel, in a paper presented at the CAM Nation Building Symposium in Calgary, 2017, "the violations suffered by the Indigenous people are a shared history and heritage. Many Indigenous people around the world have suffered the same fate".[719] This is a deliberate move towards a transformative museology, a museology in which Indigenous people's rights are realised in indigenous terms. Shabnam Dailoo felt that museums should continue contributing to the evolution of national identities and should focus on inclusion and inclusivity. The museum should be an all-inclusive institution addressing all aspects of heritage and human life.[720] In this way, the museum becomes a focal point for the community, both local and global. In this way museums all over the world would become relevant beyond current audiences and would rightfully be viewed and used as a universal property and resource.[721] Nonetheless, Peter Odey of Museums of Nigeria felt that if the option adopted is a shared heritage, then African countries are at a loss. He referred back to traditional African museums where Africans were managing their own cultural property. He however, acknowledged that sharing also has its advantages as well as disadvantages. Sharing would be beneficial to African museums in terms of capacity building, and sharing of resources and expertise with the advanced museums of the global North. More collaborative encounters are needed to realise the above.[722]

The above conclusion was also supported by Nigerian Senior Archivist Imoesin Yona, who favoured the sharing of heritage because there is no guarantee that the hosting states will return the original and authentic records. According to her, African countries with collections in the diaspora should consult with hosting states, opting to work and collaborate with them in order to get access to what is rightfully theirs. She indicated that the Nigerian National Archives is a

---

[717] Jeremy Silvester and Napandulwe Shiweda, "The Return of Sacred Stones of the Ovambo Kingdoms: Restitution and the Revision of the Past," 30–39.
[718] George S. Mudenda, "Exhibiting Africa: Contemporary Perspectives on Representation of Culture in Museums."
[719] Shabnam Dailoo and Karine Duhamel, "Indigenous People and Their Rights to Heritage," Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.
[720] Shabnam Dailoo and Karine Duhamel, "Indigenous People and Their Rights to Heritage."
[721] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 160–161. See also M. Laggat, "Indigenous People and Their Rights to Heritage," Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.
[722] Peter Odey (Deputy Director of the Nigerian Commission of Museums) in conversation with the author, 2015.

member of the World Association of Archival Institutions and this could encourage collaborations between states and experts on the preservation of world heritage and records. However, she feels that Nigeria has the capacity and the ability to accommodate the records and heritage if returned.[723]

There is therefore, an array of views among African scholars and heritage managers with regards to migrated heritage and the two options of restitution and sharing. Minin Alhaji Nagya, Deputy Director of the Nigerian National Library in Abuja, felt that it would be difficult for Africans to maintain objects, even if they wanted them returned. He agrees with the thinking that ex-colonists took the objects because African did not have the capacity. According to him, the best option would be to work together with hosting museums. Otherwise, he argued, that with the economic and infrastructural obstacles faced by African states, the museum is faced with challenges that will lead to maintenance traps, as reflected in some museums. Hence, museums cannot keep the objects safe if returned. According to him, the challenge would be how to approach the museums with African collections and their willingness to collaborate, to share and to work collectively with African experts and curators as well as communities of provenance.[724] Nigerian heritage officials do, however, want hosting countries to acknowledge the objects as belonging to Nigeria, particularly in cases where they are not returned. In extensive discussions by Nigerians with cosmopolitan museums, particularly over the Benin bronzes, they have created a platform called the "Benin Dialogue Group". The platform has been spearheading discussions with all the countries that still hold the Nigerian bronzes. The composition of the platform includes museum experts, politicians and lawyers from both Nigeria and Europe.

The UN also advocated for a sharing and universality of heritage as a remedy or compensation for past illicit trafficking. It indicated that it is the duty of the international community to contribute to the fight against the illicit trade of cultural goods. It also encouraged member states to come up with relevant national and international legal instruments to combat the illegal trade. It further advocated for capacity building and awareness raising for law enforcement agencies.[725]

---

[723] Imoesin Yona (Senior archivist at the National Archives, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015. See also Felwine Sarr and Benedicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 2.
[724] Minin A. Nagya (Deputy Director, National Library, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[725] United Nations, *Year Book of the United Nations*, (Geneva: UN, 2006), 1287.

6.1 ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONCEPTIONS OF EXCHANGE

In this section I relate the migration of cultural property to broader theoretical, historical and anthropological frameworks on the issue of exchange and reciprocity. The theorists I refer to include Marcel Mauss, James Laidlaw, Annette Weiner, Alain Testart, Lewis Hyde, Susan Wright and Chris Show. Each of these theorists offers a particular set of views that talks to the migration of objects in relation to varying concepts of exchange. I especially draw from Marcel Mauss on the concept of the gift and Annette Weiner on alienable and inalienable possessions. However, the other sources complement the anthropological conceptions. For example, Conrad Gershevitch advocated for the universality of a shared heritage and gave a comprehensive appraisal of global drifts in heritage and the risks involved and also proposed approaches to understanding these tendencies. His discussions contribute to the theme on universal and shared heritage and also to my broader argument on the legal and illegal transfers, restitution, and national as well as international responses to the issues under discussion and as advocated for by the study.[726]

Anthropological works on processes of object transfer (sharing, exchange, and gift giving) help us assess contemporary transfers. Some objects were given away through exchange as gifts and in trade, and some were surrendered when people converted to Christianity. With time these objects have moved into the realm of a shared heritage as proposed by UNESCO. The transfer can start as exchange and later change to sharing or gift giving. The migrations or exchanges of objects are therefore in an evolving process that has fascinating characteristics. In many of the transfer processes discussed earlier, such as punitive expeditions, curatorial expeditions, and scientific expeditions, objects were alienated and lost connection with places of origin. This excludes items that should never have left their original owners because of their cultural and spiritual significance. The Namibian *Kwanyama* power stones as used by Ovambo royals are such inalienable possessions, and that would explain why they were returned from Finland to Namibia. The same applies to the Bakgatla rainmaking pot in Botswana, the *vigango* masks in Kenya, and the Asante Golden Stool in Ghana, which has all been restored.

The gift economy appears as a form of exchange in many societies, where exchange takes the form of reciprocal gift giving. Many peoples have organised their economic lives around

---

[726] Conrad Gershevitch, *Museums in Human Development: The Place of Museums in a Globalised and Transforming World* (Australia: Common Ground Publishing, 2014).

systems of gift and reciprocity, and such transfers were embedded in ongoing relations of exchange. According to Mauss, through these examples it is clear that banking, borrowing, trade and exchange, as we see in global capitalism today, have always existed but were understood and operated under different names and forms. While earlier societies relied on the economies of generosity, gift giving and reciprocity, the current form is economies of exchange and profit. Scholars have argued though that in gift economies there is nothing for free, or a pure gift. According to scholars such as Mauss the above anthropological concept in essence advocates for a process of investment and return.[727] He argues that the economy of gift exchange united a whole range of otherwise disparate archaic cultures and communities. Moreover, the practice of generous giving is also a long standing one among many African communities. In fact, a sizeable number of artefacts were migrated as a result of gift giving by African communities, particularly royals.[728] For example, there are a number of artefacts belonging to the Bangwato royals of Botswana at the Mafikeng Museum in South Africa, and these are said to have been gifted to colonial officials by Bangwato chiefs. Philip Jones further argued that among early communities during the process of object exchange the value did not rest on the object but the principle of reciprocity. Meanwhile, during the period of cultural migration to Europe, collectors were more concerned about exoticism and the value of objects to satisfy market requirements.[729] On the other, hand Larissa Forster questioned the nature of the gift concepts and argued that she wonders whether these were free gifts or coerced. Did chiefs feel obliged or were they trying to appease colonial masters and hoping for returned favours?[730]

According to Mauss, in the process of gift exchange, objects are not alienated from their givers because there is still a chance of their returning back in some form to their original owners. However, in a situation where the gift is to a stranger, there is no obligation and no development of a bond and the object becomes alienated.[731] In the African situation of object migration, objects were given to strangers and therefore made alienable. There was no obligation, no development of friendship on the receiver's side, which is the cosmopolitan museum or the coloniser. The only relationship that developed was that of dependency and inequality between

[727] Marcel Mauss, *Anthropology of The Gift Economy & Its Other*. (London: Routledge, n.d.), 96–69.
[728] Marcel Mauss, *Anthropology of The Gift Economy & Its Other*. (London: Routledge, n.d.), 96–67.
[729] Philip Jones, "Australian Ethnographica in European Collections," 124.
[730] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 157.
[731] Marcel Mauss, *Anthropology of The Gift Economy & Its Other*. (London: Routledge, n.d.).

the two camps as seen today. I refer back to what I mentioned earlier Larissa Forster said about possible pressure to providing gifts. On the same note, would we say all gifts by African chiefs were 'free gifts', therefore leading to no ties between the exchanging parties? This is in cognisance of the fact that Mauss pointed out that there is no gift without interchange or a tangled obligation. He believed that all gift giving demands obligations, sometimes not so straight as to be clearly or immediately detected.[732]

To get answers to these questions about a shared heritage, equal exchange, and restitution, we first have to understand the different transfer processes involved.[733] The first step towards assessing reciprocity is related to modes of exchange, while my concern with forms of mimesis and alterity is mainly about the relationships that emerged between the exchanging parties. Ulrike Linder, for example, talked of how German colonialism was based on race relations founded on 'othering'. Alterity or mimesis are the end results of exchanges.[734] In light of the above, the history of the migration of cultural property becomes a complex moral web.[735] This is demonstrated in the examples below. But given that there was no mutual bond created by past migrations of objects, this study seeks to establish if the concept of sharing will create mutual bonds and collaboration between European and African museums. Will this be the best way to close the gaps created by past object migrations?[736] Would sharing make for better relations between the two camps today? Could this also extend to the non-human environment?[737]

The migration of cultural artefacts today often takes the form of illicit trafficking, compared to the movement of cultural property seen before the colonial period. However, historians argued that even with the transition, the social virtues of 'good faith' and 'generosity' is always immanent in commercial exchanges.[738] Mauss alluded to the link between gift exchange, charity and welfare, while Scott Shershow saw giving as connected to the work of mutual welfare.[739] One-way welfare, according to its critics, fosters dependency instead of independence. In this way, welfare breaks the two cycles of exchange: work > rewards and gift

---

[732] Marcel Mauss, *Anthropology of The Gift Economy & Its Other*. (London: Routledge, n.d.).
[733] Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture—Anthropology, Travel Culture and Government*.
[734] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 16.
[735] Alain Testart, *Critique of the Gift: Studies on the Non-market Movement*, (Paris: Amazon, 2006), 123.
[736] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift*, (London: Routledge, 1925), 2.
[737] Lewis Hyde, *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property*, (New York: Vintage, 1983/2007), 2.
[738] Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture—Anthropology, Travel Culture and Government*, 100–101.
[739] Scott Shershow, "Charity and Welfare: The Gift as Work," *in The Work and The Gift*, (University of Chicago Press, 2005), 116.

> obligations. Work, like tax, becomes an obligation.[740] Public welfare is also seen to create unequal relations between givers and recipients. Charity destroys potential bonds between the giver and the receiver because it encourages neither work nor obligation.[741]

Alain Testart, one of Mauss's critics, argued that in other cases the giver does not know the receiver and no bond or obligation can therefore be expected. According to Testart, some gifts might be free, given out of free will and with no expectation for reciprocity.[742] Testart like other scholars of anthropology, also studied the various movements of goods in diverse societies. Another work exploring similar ground is Lewis Hyde's *The Gift.* He interrogated the issue of property and its movement or transfer.[743] While thinking along the lines of a shared heritage, it is important to know that UNESCO and ICOM, through their literature on heritage, often alluded to the contribution of widely diverse cultures and peoples to the world heritage. To be more precise, this refers to global efforts towards the preservation and promotion of a universal heritage under discussion. Heritage thus becomes inalienably of a world possession and not that of a specific person, community, nation or institution. By implication, we are only custodians of cultural properties and treasures. But if that is the case, how do humanity and its inalienable cultural objects become shared?

Laidlaw offered a parallel stance to that of Mauss. He explored the contradictory issue of the gift and argued that is inaccurate to conclude that there is always a reciprocal connotation behind a gift. According to him, a gift can just be dispensed with no strings attached and is alienable. According to Laidlaw, "like the pure commodity, the 'pure gift' is characterised by the fact that it does not create personal connections and obligations between parties".[744] In Laidlaw's thinking and in relation to the research question, the movement of cultural material from Africa to the West did not entail any obligation to the receiving party that could warrant any relationship. This should, however, not make us forget that there is also coercive gifting, as argued by Larissa Forster.[745] The Batswana, the Bamum of Cameroon and other African communities gave away their objects without any consideration, particularly where they

---

[740] Scott Shershow, "Charity and Welfare**:** The Gift as Work," 115.

[741] Scott Shershow, "Free Market Futurism: On the Post-Industrial," *in The Work and The Gift*, (University of Chicago Press, 2005), 130–131.

[742] Alain Testart, *Critique of the Gift: Studies on the Non-market Movement*, 123.

[743] Lewis Hyde, *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property*, 2–4. See also Lyndel V. Prott, Witnesses to History: A *C*ompendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects, iii.

[744] James Laidlaw, "A Free Gift Makes no Friends," *Journal of the Royal Anthropology Institute* 6, no. 4 (2000).

[745] Larissa Forster, "Problematic Provenances", Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, German Colonialism; Fragments, Past and Present, 2016, 154

shunned their culture as barbaric and disposed of objects as heathen or where they deliberately produced for the European market. This also applies to other areas of the world where communities have lost their cultural possessions, such as the Australian Aboriginal people and the Japanese who also deliberately produced for the market.[746] Trade is not the same as gift giving because it entails some form of payment or something that is received as an immediate replacement for what has been traded. In the same way, objects migrated through trade cannot be equated to those migrated through gift giving.

6.2 MIMESIS AND ALTERITY

In addition to anthropological work on processes of exchange, my approach to understanding the migration of objects has been shaped by Michael Taussig's work on the concepts on mimesis and alterity.[747] Taussig's analysis of mimesis in varying contexts helps to deepen our understanding of colonial relationships of exchange and representation. Colonialism, as Fanon and others argued, created a constitutive relation of the self and other or alterity among colonial subjects. The colonialist 'self' and the colonised 'other' were classical modes of separating and identifying the different classes of the colonial period. The 'other' conferred a degree of detachment, but its depiction was always uncertain, disclosing a lack of cohesiveness.[748] Hamish Forbes talked of such 'otherness' in his discussion of the Indigenous people of Methana in Greece and their traditional landscape.[749] This is in the same way that this study explores occurrences of mimesis and alterity. It is important to investigate how we explicitly represent alterity in different situations. At the same time, there is mimesis: The mimicking or adopting through assimilation, internalisation, socialisation, sometimes by force, and existing to be like the colonial master.

In the same light, George Mudenda argued that exhibitions can be said to be private stadia for presenting descriptions of the 'self' and 'other'. In this way, exhibitors construct a character that is neither that of the creators of objects nor the viewers, but themselves as exhibition makers. They therefore have the power to intercede between the parties who do not always meet.[750] Similarly, curators who put up exhibitions of African objects, particularly those in

---

[746] Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald, *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets,* 124–125.
[747] Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*, 2.
[748] Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks,* x, xii & xviii.
[749] Hamish Forbes, *Meaning and Identity in a Greek Landscape (An Archaeological Ethnography)*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
[750] George S. Mudenda, "Who Has the Right to Represent Whose Culture?," (2012).

foreign museums, find themselves displaying what Mudenda terms as the organising principles of difference and similarity, producing the imagery of the cultural other.[751] The exhibitor in this case presents objects as representations of exotic cultures. The objects are only displayed in museums as a portion of the past of Western domination and colonial arrogation. The story such objects convey is the account of their position as medals of imperial subjugation. Mudenda's argument is that in most cases an exhibitor who exhibits objects from other cultures exhibits from a Western perspective. In this case it is clear that the curator's action in presentation has determinations and circumstances different from those of the principal agent or the producer of the exhibited objects. The maker here would be the African producer, owner or the 'other'.

The process of mimicking, on the other hand, could refer to an enforced system of domination: "In this way, the colonised willingly and intentionally becomes like someone else. This was also the desire to be accepted through plain mimicking or assimilating in a profoundly ironic and sarcastic way".[752] Meanwhile, being the 'other' entailed the continued use of particular cultural traits or being represented as such through objects and dioramas in museums. This shows the complexity and challenge of accepting colonialism's impositions. For example, when an object is taken from Botswana to be displayed in a foreign museum, it creates both alterity and mimesis. The migrated object must be translated into something that approximates something, such as a concept, another object, or a description such as on a label in a museum that makes it understandable and representative for museum audiences. That understanding may be racist, incorrect, misleading, abstracted from its cultural or historical context, or correct in its interpretation. This is the mimetic process. In this case, Africans go to look at objects of visual interest in museums abroad that house their collections, and they seek understanding of the objects from their cultural perspective. In the process problems met in looking at these African objects give rise to a desire for explanation by the curators, an African desire to correct and point out gaps.[753]

Baxandall argued that in exhibiting any object from another cultural context there are three important positions: "makers of the object", "exhibitors of made objects" and "the viewers of the exhibited objects". These three positions are important in understanding existing

---

751 George S. Mudenda, "Who Has the Right to Represent Whose Culture?," (2012).

736 Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks, ix*, xii & xviii. See also Homi K. Bhabha, *Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences on Assimilation*, (New York: Routledge, 2006).

753 Felwine Sarr and Benedicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 88.

perceptions on depiction of cultures in museums and as the footings that are dynamic in exhibitions. In his view, a curator in the contemporary perspective in museums will be caught in the web of exhibiting African objects as subordinated cultures and showcasing them as exotics and curios. The opportunity to exhibit also presents as a global attraction, which depicts local people and their cultural heritage.[754] In the same way, Mary Roberts explored the museum exhibition as an arena for translation. This is where a narrative is created about the object and its history, as a new and possibly distorted identity is given.[755]

Taussig argued that symbolic images of Indians used in healing are a mimesis of mimesis. This includes, for example, the ability to take oneself out of oneself.[756] According to Josephine Baker, the mimetic faculty here is related to the dancing native girl and is inevitably embedded in modern thought with primitive conditions and colonisation. The native girl becomes 'other' because of her primitiveness in the colonial setting.[757] Reciprocally, for Taussig, Cuna figurines are done in imitation of Europeans. The self and the other here refer to the 'objectified self' of Europeans by the Cuna. This is mimetic, as in mimicking the other person and as in resembling, relating and personifying the other. In this way, mimicry implicated reality. However, the reality could also depend on how you perceive or understand something. In this way, the reality could become subjective.[758] The magic of mimesis is that in some way or another mankind and the existence of artefacts portray 'something' or the 'other'. It gives power over that which is portrayed.[759]

Taussig explored a vision of a Spirit Boat full of Gringos. The vision of the boat is a representation of spirit-motivated illusions of desire. It is more than an object of local mimicry. In the same way, ethnography is a way of retelling stories and of being concrete in doing so. Just like the Gringo ship, the ethnographer imitates the magician's art of production. The recreated visionary image becomes the 'other' or it is mimicked through the vision.[760] Copying of images also requires the power of the original, a copy that is not a copy, but a poorly executed ideogram or symbol. The task to which the mimetic faculty is here set out to capture is the

---

[754] Michael Baxandall, "Exhibiting Intention: Some Preconditions of the Visual Display of Culturally Purposeful Objects," in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, eds. Ivan Karp and Stephen D. Lavine, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), 36–41. See also Kwame Amoah Labi, "New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa," 166.

[755] Mary Roberts.

[756] Michael Taussig, *Terror and the Colonial Mirror*, (London: Routledge, 1987).

[757] Josephine Baker and Count H. Kessler, "Disorganising the Mimesis of Mimesis and the Question of Parody," in *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*, eds. Michael Taussig, (London: Psychology Press, 1993), 63–69.

[758] Michael Taussig, *The Problem, in the Gift*, (London: Routledge, 1993), 6–11.

[759] Michael Taussig, *Medicines Should Not be confused with Decoys. The Gift*, (London: Routledge, 1993), 12–13.

[760] Michael Taussig, *Medicines Should Not be confused with Decoys. The Gift*, (London: Routledge, 1993), 15–16.

spirit of power and the ethnographer or collector of objects has to know what they want to capture if it is through film. The image in this sense assumes both alterity and the mimetic faculty.[761] Similar considerations apply in the migration of objects from African contexts. The process of losing artefacts, which are part of a body or a whole, is in this sense a 'disembodiment'. The disembodiment began when the Africans began to shun their cultural objects and in the process these objects were taken as curios abroad. The artefacts had lost meaning in the African sense. The African and Western relations did not improve with colonial conquest or independence. The disembodiment in this sense becomes the release of the spirit.[762] According to Ashis Nandy, the colonial master recognised the slave as a 'thing' or the 'other'. In the same disposition, modern repression is a scuffle concerning the 'dehumanised self', 'objectified enemy' and the technologized administrator. Like Fanon, Nandy argued that colonialism therefore, does not end with political freedom because it is a state of the mind, for both the coloniser and the colonised.[763]

In summary, the whole process of the migration of objects can be seen as exhibiting problematics of mimesis and alterity. The focus is to mime in order to create or imitate the other. The decisive factor here is the displacement of the social character of human creativity into the migrated object.[764] The yearning is therefore to recover the lost self in these lost objects for restoration, closure, and healing.

Another side to Taussig's discussion of mimesis and alterity concerns the history of representation and the aura of works of art and cultural objects. Does this apply to objects either still with the communities of origin or those that have been migrated? Mimesis is here seen as a two-layered tool covering and copying the visceral quality of the object, uniting the viewer with the viewed. The camera for example is seen as the machine opening up the optical unconscious, translating the object from a realm of magic and into one of science. The camera as a mimetic machine re-invents objects and people. This of course directly links with the history of representation of art works and cultural objects. In African cases, most trafficked objects could not be captured on camera as would be the case today, either in curation or in media and advertisement. The other side of looking at the mimesis in presentation is that the

---

[761] Michael Taussig, *Medicines Should Not be confused with Decoys. The Gift*, (London: Routledge, 1993), 16–18.
[762] Michael Taussig, *Medicines Should Not be confused with Decoys. The Gift*, (London: Routledge, 1993), 18.
[763] Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism,* xvi, x & 3. See also Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks.*
[764] Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism,* 19–23.

objects themselves play a (re)presentational role on behalf of the colonised once they have been put upon display in a Western museum. They now embody or mimic the original owners, subject also to how their meaning is narrated.[765]

Thematics of mimesis and alterity could also be presented in a situation where colonised peoples take on elements of colonial cultural power, such as art or religion. This they can create or re-interpret in their own way. A reciprocal example is Picasso's Cubism, which he ironically acquired from Africa and then used in a different way altogether. Modern music in our townships such as kwaito is another good example. It is traced to its origins in the poetry and music of Haarlem in New York way, back to the 1940s and 1950s, but over the years it was changed to adopt a new image not similar to the original and no longer reflecting its original cultural background but something new entirely. Kwaito therefore becomes an alterity, which has been assimilated into postcolonial African situations, changed into a new genre of music, thus embodying the mimetic faculty.

Also, within the context of these thematics of mimesis and alterity, the coloniser used the lesser communities against one another in cases where they wanted to defeat one of them in particular. While both were referred to as savages, the party that was being used was accorded, and sometimes adopted, the image of a 'good savage' while the other was a 'bad savage'. This was a reflection of the politics of divide and rule as used by colonisers throughout the African continent. In a politics both of domination and of representation, the 'better savage' was played off against hostile communities or 'bad savages. This is of course savagery within the context of the historic constitution of the master as the colonising power and the servant as the colonised. The latter in most cases were non-Western peoples in the colonial world, but while in one regard they appear as a unified non-Western set, in other regards they are carefully differentiated and hierarchically ranked in ways that often reflect the very local dynamics of how colonial power was operating concretely on the ground. Throughout this whole process, cultural objects migrated to the colonising state reflected such dynamics of classification and ranking. In this way, the colonial power's identity machine carries a mosaic of alterities or 'othering', which is also reflected in museum collections and the ranked levels accorded to various colonised peoples.[766]

---

[749] Michael Taussig, *Medicines Should Not be confused with Decoys. The Gift*, (London: Routledge, 1993), 24–33.

[766] Alain Testart, *Critique of the Gift: Studies on the Non-market Movement*, 142–143. See also Dag Henrichsen, "Cape Cross? African Places—History and Stories," 19–20.

According to Taussig, "the cultural politics of alterity should not only be seen as composed of one on one as in Americans against the Cunas … but rather a hierarchy of alterities within a colonial mosaic of attractions and repulsion in which some alters exert positive and others negative charges".[767] In the history of colonialism, both the colonised and coloniser see themselves as better than others in the hierarchical ladder that results. One grouping despises the other groupings. In this way, the colonial history affords dividing lines that separates the groupings. This concept fits in too well with European racism as instituted by almost four centuries of the African slave trade and the "massive infusion of anti-black sentiments" across the entire space of global modernity.[768]

As I have already noted, the Museum of Modern Art in New York showcased an exhibition on primitivism in 20th century art, which reawakened controversies around Western museum practices. According to Yoshida Kenji, the exhibition stirred up controversy concerning Eurocentric ideas towards other races. He further observed that the exhibition tried to describe the history of modern art as a process of assimilation of the tribal or primitive by the modern or civilised. The description of this exhibition by Yoshida revealed unspoken and hallowed assumptions about the civilised and the primitive, the self and the other within the colonial context. The exhibition in a real sense promoted more self-conscious use of language in exhibitions as one displays other cultural settings and represents otherness in the national and international contexts of museum exhibitions.[769]

The challenge to ICOM's concept of sharing therefore is, how do we share? By emphasis on alterity or mimesis, or both? For example, today we share the idea of a museum while historically we have conceptualised museums differently and want to express our identities in the exhibits and reflect African cultural aesthetics and sensibilities. If African culture is reflected in museums, then we are sharing in universal preservation and yet we are different from Europeans and their ideas of representativity. This conceptual lens therefore, aids the exploration of the proposed sharing.

Fanon believed that in cases of assimilation of black people, the black person wants to be white, and this reflects a process of alienation.[770] He emphasised the assimilation of those from the

---

[767] Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*.
[768] Testart, A. (2006). *Mimesis and Alterity*. Paris: Syllepse, pp. 144–5. See also Homi K. Bhabha, *Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences on Assimilation*.
[769] Kenji Yoshida, "Ethnographic Exhibitions Today."
[770] Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks,* ii.

Francophone world, just like the assimilation discussed by Mondlane under the rule of the Portuguese, particularly for the elite Even after the abolition of the slave trade, black people still did not have equal standing.[771] They were still treated as inferior, objectified and treated as the 'other'. This created an inborn complex of self-awareness within the black person. According to Fanon, black children inherit the ways of thinking reflected in their environments, hence they grow up with feelings mainly dominated by hatred, intimidation, inferiority and more.[772] Black people have to therefore overcome their feelings of insignificance. They have to be confident instead of finding remedy by seeking refuge in the white world. In this way, the inferiority complex will not trickle down to their children in turn.

In conclusion, it is the complexity surrounding this movement of cultural property that in most cases leaves the source countries with no other option but to opt for a shared heritage. This is also where efforts for return and or restitution have failed. The complexity is that at times it is not easy to demand unconditional return. Most pressingly, bilateral relations and negotiations have to be engaged in to facilitate the return process, and in some instances bilateral agreements do not exist or engaging in bilateral talks fails. However, in the contemporary situation of illicit trafficking of cultural property some mechanisms put in place by international organisations can bypass these. Interpol expedites global police collaboration even in areas where diplomatic relations do not exist between individual countries.[773] Ratification of the relevant UNESCO conventions could also help if both countries are state parties to the conventions.

6.3 CASE STUDIES OF COLLABORATIONS UNDER THIS MODEL

While sharing might not be the best option in all its different components as discussed by the study, efforts at collaboration have emerged from corners of the globe between museums and other heritage institutions. There could be different circumstances driving both camps into such collaborations and sharing. For African countries, as already indicated, failure to restitute migrated property leaves them with no choice but to move closer to the objects where they are currently housed, through partnerships. This also goes with the deliberate need to benefit from institutional collaborations for capacity building and sharing of resources with well-off cosmopolitan museums. This also goes with exchange of research, skills, exhibitions and

[771] Eduardo Mondlane, African Information Services, Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral.
[772] Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks,* 148–149.
[773] Interpol, "Connecting Police, Securing the World."

materials. The Australian government, the Australian Aboriginal people and the Torres Strait Islanders, on the other hand, see repatriation as an attempt to redeem the self and alleviate the historical guilt of colonising powers. According to them, this becomes a symbolic act of reconciliation.[774] However, for the cosmopolitan museum, the need is to authenticate and legitimate displays through correct information and to fill current gaps in information. The demands of ever inquisitive and well-informed visitors do not allow curators from cosmopolitan museums to be less than fully informed about museum displays. In order to acquire all this authority, it is important to refer to those to whom the objects belong, to curators from communities of provenance. Failure to acquire correct and detailed information on the objects leave no choice but to leave them in storerooms, as is the case with some museums in Europe. Objects can no longer be exhibited as simple curios and aesthetic items with simple captions and no contextual storylines. Another objective for such collaborations by cosmopolitan museums is the quest to present an image of acceptance and tolerance of others as against the race relations of the past. This is in order to be seen publicly to be subscribing to sharing as a chosen global option.

In the same way, this move is also a correctional approach to historical wrongs. National and bilateral involvements buttress this move towards a new museology based on inclusiveness. This inclusiveness is a collective effort to correct history through the compromise of a shared heritage. Eric Hatala Matthes did not, however, agree with this correctional approach because he felt that there is still a limitation of knowledge about the conditions under which objects were acquired. He also argued that "there are metaphysical challenges concerning the continuity of the cultural groupings over time and this creates a problem determining whom the objects should be repatriated to".[775] If pursued to its logical end, however, this philosophical approach could render the whole return exercise null. It is an approach taken by those who are resisting and offer critiques of restitution. Meanwhile, the universal and collaborative approach underscores the point by this thesis to involve curators as well as communities of provenance in the management of the migrated collections, if they are to remain in the diaspora. This marks the parting argument when talking about current viewpoints on the depiction of cultures in museums and the exposition of African resources and populates. Mudenda also argued that museum exhibitions, through displaying the creations of indigenous cultures, such as African

[774] Paul Turnbull, "International Repatriation of Indigenous Human Remains and its Complexities: The Australian Experience," 14.
[775] Erich Hatala Matthes, "Repatriation and the Radical Redistribution of Art."

objects, have triggered debates on the representation of 'otherness' in national and international contexts.[776] This has led to renewed ways of redressing the situation and to fresh dialogue between curators from both camps. A good example is the various forums on collaboration among African as well as European museums. Of note though is how a conversation and dialogue has begun in Europe around how collections abroad, including Botswana's collections, can best be shared or even repatriated. A move that is often dubbed 'decolonising the museum'. This is in most cases through seminars, meetings, conferences, and workshops with themes addressing the same**.** This is also in cognisance of the much celebrated and widely accepted Sarr-Savoy Report as commissioned by France after the declaration by the French President Macron to return African heritage. The report directly addressed the return of cultural property and proposes way in which this can be achieved.[777]

The following subsections outline certain successful ongoing cases of collaboration under this model of sharing.

6.3.1 German and Namibian Museums

The German government and museums have a collaborative involvement with the Namibian government and its museums over Namibian collections found in Germany and migrated during its colonial rule over Namibia. In an interview, Holger Stoecker referred to the debate and collaboration between the German and Namibian governments on the genocide of Herero and Nama people and the repatriation of the human remains.[778] There are still some collections and human remains of Namibians in German museums in spite of the lot that has already been repatriated and the dialogue still continues as a discussion over the Stone Cross of Cape Cross from Namibia as found at the German Museum of History, which was erected along the Namibian coast by the Portuguese during their early travels.[779]

6.3.2 Conference: *Association Between African and European Heritage Institutions*

A conference was held in Switzerland in December 2016 with the theme *Association between African and European Heritage Institutions*. The aim was to discuss and share ideas on the

[776] George S. Mudenda, "Exhibiting Africa: Contemporary Perspectives on Representation of Culture in Museums."
[777] Felwine Sarr and Benedicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics."
[778] Holger Stoecker (German Museum of Natural History & Humboldt University) in conversation with the author, 2016.
[779] Reference is made to the symposium held at the Deutsches Historisches Museum in June 2017 to discuss the Stone Cross of Cape Cross and the related publication that contains different arguments on who the rightful owner of the Stone Cross is. See also *Historical Judgment* 1 (2019).

issue of collaboration and the involvement of communities of provenance. It discussed challenges, modalities and proposals for collaborations between museums from the two continents. It also replicated past representations of partnerships between museums of the global North and global South and the challenges leading to their failure. Case studies were shared on current initiatives at collaboration.

6.3.3 Berlin History Museum Panel Discussion, 2017: *German Colonialism: Fragments of the Past and Present*

A Berlin History Museum Panel Discussion was held in 2017 on the theme *German Colonialism: Fragments of the Past and Present*. The discussion was based on an exhibition by the Berlin Museum of History detailing collections from its colonial past and the history of colonialism in the countries it colonised. The aim was to discuss the way forward for these migrated collections and to share the views of experts and communities with regards to the migrated collections. The discussion was also about the culture of remembrance in Africa and Europe concerning the colonial past and its dealings, and its reappraisal in recent years. The focus was the museum and its collections, taking into consideration the discussion in German museums about their own collections from the colonial time and how to exhibit colonialism. It was also the aim of the discussion to hear something about European museums from an African perspective. What should be done in the future? What are the opportunities for more cooperative arrangements between African and European scholars and museums? The German experts wanted to hear what the expectations were in Africa concerning the reappraisal of colonial rule in Europe and museums with collections from colonial times.

6.3.4 Berlin Museum of History Symposium, 2018: *The Stone Cross from Cape Cross—Colonial Objects and Historical Justice*

A Berlin Museum of History Symposium was held in 2018 on the theme *The Stone Cross from Cape Cross—Colonial Objects and Historical Justice*. The discussions were around the shared ownership of the Cape Cross. Since 2006, the Deutsches Historisches Museum's permanent exhibition has included this special object: The Cape Cross Padrão, or Stone Cross. The cross was first erected in 1486 by the Portuguese navigator Diego Cão in a region now known as the Skeleton Coast in present day Namibia. In 1884, Namibia was officially colonised by the German Empire to become German South West Africa. In 1893, the Stone Cross was migrated

to Germany.[780] After changing hands in several institutions, it was finally acquired by the newly established Deutsches Historisches Museum (DHM) and became part of the museum's permanent collection. From a legal perspective, the stone pillar belongs to the Federal Republic of Germany, but who is its legitimate owner? Is it Portugal, its country of origin? Present day Namibia? Berlin? Is it universal heritage, lacking, as it were, any single location? This is what appears on the exhibition text under which the cross is exhibited. At the symposium, cultural philosophers and legal experts addressed the issue of historical justice and discussed German-Namibian colonial history and related questions relevant to collections and exhibitions. Through this forum, politicians and museum representatives from Germany and Africa outlined and debated their views on possible ways to achieve a historically just approach to colonial objects and how such an approach might look.

6.3.5 Memorandum of the Edmonton Museum in Canada with the Six First Nations

The Edmonton Museum in Canada has a memorandum of understanding with the Six First Nations aimed at repairing the suspicion and mistrust caused by colonial relationships.[781] Negotiations and dialogue take place in order to achieve a level of understanding, taking into consideration concepts of trust, transparency, ownership, authenticity and integrity, especially if the community is involved. This approach also creates awareness and appreciation on the work of the museum, its dealings and heritage.[782]

6.3.6 Collaboration Between the University of Zurich's Museum of Ethnography and the Ugandan National Museums

There is collaboration between the University of Zurich's Museum of Ethnography and the Ugandan National Museums through the Igongo Community Museum. This is based on shared traditions of cattle husbandry between the two cultures. It is probable that the collaboration is based on Ugandan milking objects present in the Zurich Ethnographic Museum. Milking culture has been covered through an international exhibition in the two countries, shared research, workshops, and exchange visits by the curators.

---

[780] *Historical Judgment* 1 (2019). (Different experts (politicians, curators, lawyers, journalists, diplomats, members of the German and Namibian communities) were invited to speak at this forum to decide the fate of the Stone Cross and this is the resultant publication reflecting their arguments.)

[781] Darren Dalglesh, "Relations and Reconciliation at Edmonton," in *The Best in Heritage: 17th edition, Dubrovnk, Croatia, 26–28 September 2018*, ed. Luka Cipek, (Zagreb: ICOM, 2018), 123.

[782] St John Simpson, "Back to Kabul: Case Studies of Successful Collaboration," 181–186.

6.3.7 Collaboration Between Varnesborg Museum and the National Museum of Namibia

There is collaboration between the Varnesborg Museum and the National Museum of Namibia over the bird assemblage found at the Varnesborg Museum of Natural History. The diverse collection of birds came from Namibia and was put together by the traveller Charles John Anderson. The collaboration was realised through the SAMP and like other collaborations over migrated collections, it entailed exchange of staff, exhibitions, research notes and capacity building for staff. During his travels in Africa, Anderson also collected coins and archaeological artefacts from the Middle East and North Africa, and all these were given to the Varnesborg Museum when he died. This points to possible collaboration with the countries of provenance for these coins and archaeological items.

6.3.8 The Berlin Postcolonial Collections Project

There is the Berlin Postcolonial Collections Project, a non-governmental organisation that wants to build Berlin's identity around the looted and colonial collections found today in German museums. The non-governmental organisation also wants to create awareness about these collections and connect them to the states of provenance.

6.3.9 The Humboldt Forum in Berlin

The Humboldt Forum in Berlin has initiated a national process for provenance research and the repatriation of colonial holdings. This has resulted in national partnerships with communities of origin in different parts of the globe.[783] However, Philipp Schorch felt that the Forum is restricted to Berlin and is not internationalising the "German debate" about its colonial history and colonial holdings, provenance research, restitution and partnerships with communities of origin.[784] The forum was initially established in Berlin to house all the colonial collections from the diaspora. The ex-colonial collections were to be moved from peripheral museums to this centre. However, since the declaration by President Macron to restitute African objects from France, it has somewhat changed focus towards provenance research and restitution.[785]

---

[783] Gesa Grimme, "Systematic Provenance Research on Objects from Colonial Contexts," 52.
[784] Philipp Schorch, "Sensitive Heritage: Ethnographic Museum, Provenance Research and the Potentialities of Restitution."
[785] Felwine Sarr and Benedicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 15.

6.3.10 Willoughby Collections Project: *Colonial Agendas*

The Willoughby Collections Project themed *Colonial Agendas* is a collaboration between the University of Sussex, Brighton, and the Pavilion Museum, the Kent museums, and the Khama Museum on collections from Botswana migrated by Rev. Willoughby to England. The project is to be realised through exchange exhibitions, research, exchange in staff, capacity building, engaging with communities of provenance, and an academic workshop hosted by the University of Botswana.

6.3.11 Nigerian Collaborations Over Benin Bronzes

Nigeria have engaged in collaborations with institutions in a number of countries holding the Benin bronzes, such as the British Museum and museums in Switzerland and Germany. They even have a reference group The Benin Dialogue Group, comprising experts from both Africa and Europe that is spearheading dialogue with all countries and museums that have Nigerian collections, particularly the Benin bronzes. The group is also helping with provenance research on these objects.

6.3.12 Malawian Collaboration with the National Museum of Scotland

Malawians are collaborating with the National Museum of Scotland on collections migrated by Rev. Dr Livingstone during the colonial period. This has resulted in exchange exhibitions, exchange of staff, capacity building for staff, and exchange of research and expertise. This has brought them closer to one of the rare colonial holdings from Malawi, the ‘weaving loom’ that is held by the Scotland Museum. It is a rare piece missing in Malawi.

6.3.13 The Swedish African Museum Programme

The SAMP ran for a number of years supporting twinships between African and Swedish Museums and was later expanded to Latin America. The collaboration went with exchanges in staff, exhibitions, capacity building for staff, and also involved communities for exchanges and empowerment. It proved to be a good networking programme for museum professionals in Africa and brought a lot of dialogue and networking between museum professionals from the two continents and continentally. Many different projects were initiated under the Programme.

6.3.14 ICCROM Training Programme

The ICCROM Training Programme has run for years and is targeted at building capacity for museum experts in the protection and preservation of collections and heritage sites by museums. This is facilitated from Italy and many museum professionals the world over have benefited from the programme. including those from Africa and Botswana.

6.3.15 ICOM Newsletter: Salvaging Haiti's Heritage

A number of sources have also made critical analyses of the proposed sharing and highlighted the different collaborative projects by museums. The ICOM Newsletter of 2010 discussed in its article *Salvaging Haiti's Heritage* how Haitians are salvaging their heritage from rubble since the earthquake on 12 January 2010.[786] This was followed by a response by UNESCO and ICOM to mobilise and send a team of experts to help salvage Haiti's heritage. This article indicated how these organisations of heritage and museums of the world have created an enabling climate for open dialogue on restitution, care, and protection of heritage. International collaborations towards the salvation and protection of the heritage as discussed by the source is also another sign towards a shared concern.

6.3.16 UNESCO and the Heritage of Mali, Syria, Iraq and Egypt

Other efforts at teamwork towards collaboration and a shared responsibility over world heritage by UNESCO and partners have been extended to Mali, Syria, Iraq, and Egypt because of the civil strife in these countries and the fact that heritage is always at risk in that kind of situation. This followed the 2013 political unrests in Mali, which greatly affected heritage and exposed it to illicit trafficking. ICOM and UNESCO's global efforts at cultural property protection managed to send rescue parties to Mali. The ICOM Disaster Risk Management Committee helps museums in emergency situations (natural disasters, wars) and illicit trafficking. While aid was sent to Mali in 2013, in 2014 it was sent to Egypt, in 2015 to Nepal, to Haiti following its earthquake, and to many other areas. Sometimes the collaborations were not to salvage heritage but to share ideas and to empower people, political leaders, museum management, experts and communities on the management of heritage. These are good examples of

[786] Stanislas Tarnowski, "Salvaging Haiti's Heritage," *ICOM Newsletter* 63, no. 1 (2010): 14.

teamwork, concerted efforts and case studies under collaborations and sharing at both local and international level.

6.3.17 ICOM Newsletter: Heritage in Danger

Another article titled *Heritage in Danger* in the ICOM Newsletter discussed security issues as a global concern for universal or shared heritage. It used the example of the damage of the Icelandic heritage in the Skogar Museum by volcanic ash to show responses by international bodies through volunteers on risk management to salvage heritage.[787]

6.3.18 The British Museum and Collaborations with African Countries

Julie Hudson of the British Museum under the Africa Section indicated that because of the large number of collections from Africa, they try as much as possible to work with African countries and communities of provenance, as well as African curators and museums to fill gaps and for the informed interpretation of collections. According to her, the collaborations are to encourage proper interpretation of collections by those who know them better and have more understanding of the collections. She highlighted the partnerships they have had with museums in Africa. Through these partnerships, the British Museum is able to share collections with African counterparts and make them more accessible. According to her, the commitment by the British Museum for the Africa collection is to collaborate with museums in Africa and communities of provenance. The first such collaboration was with Kenyan Museums. The collaborations are therefore based on collections from specific countries and regions. The partners commit through a memorandum of understanding and develop publications, catalogues, exhibitions and many other programmes. According to Hudson, The British Museum is still open and interested in engaging in dialogue with countries and regions for collaborations based on the collections in their custody.[788] Hudson also discussed the Triangle Trust which is specifically designed to run workshops in Africa and for collaborations. The contact people for the link are Julie Hudson and Chris Spring, both curators at the British Museum. There is a project under the Triangle Trust for African Rock Art (known as TARA). Alec Campbell, the founder and first director of the Botswana National Museum (an African rock art specialist) was part of this project and has shared Botswana rock art collections with

[787] Aedin Mac Devitt, "Heritage in Danger," 4.
[788] Julie Hudson (Curator of the Africa Section, British Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015.

the British Museum through the same programme.[789] This accounts for photographs and collections on rock art from many African countries as well as from Botswana at the British Museum. The project is funded by Founding Trustees of the British Museum and the African Rock Art Foundation

Because of its large collection from Africa, the British Museum developed an Africa Programme. This involves exchanges by museum professionals for capacity building, sharing of research findings and skills. One such collaboration has been with the National Museum of Nairobi, Kenya, which involved an exchange exhibition and sharing of artefacts. Through the African Programme the British Museum has also run a number of cultural programmes in Ghana, and it is ready to open collaboration and dialogue with any country whose collections it has. It is already in the process of implementing another with South Africa. Some of the countries that the British Museum has so far managed to have exhibitions with as part of the discussed collaborations, sharing and appraisal include Ghana, Sierra Leone, Madagascar and Nigeria. However, there is scepticism from the African side on how equal their partnerships are.[790] Rassool felt that these will still render the African partner in a dependent position and perpetuate the unbalanced development of the two continents.[791]

6.3.19 Collaboration Between the Iziko Museums, the Museum Association of Namibia, the Botswana National Museum and the CAM

There is an ongoing collaboration between Iziko Museums of Cape Town, the Museum Association of Namibia, the Botswana National Museum and the CAM on the management and repatriation of human remains. The project is funded by ICOM and CAM. This is based on the substantial presence of human remains from Namibia and Botswana at the Iziko Museums and other places. The latter are keen to repatriate the remains and the collaborations are meant to provide for more in-house research to authenticate information on specific cases and agree on the terms of repatriation, engage governments, and most importantly, to development legal structures to guide repatriation. The aim is also to eventually roll out the project to other countries in SADC.

---

[789] Julie Hudson (Curator of the Africa Section, British Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015.

[790] British Museum, Documentation records on Botswana & African Collections at the British Museum. (London: British Museum, 2015). See also the British Museum website: https://www.britishmuseum.org/

[791] Ciraj Rassool, "Building a Critical Museology in Africa," xxii.

6.3.20 The Botswana National Museum and the Ditsong Museums of South Africa

The Botswana National Museum is collaborating with the Ditsong Museums of South Africa (a flagship of nine different museums) on the management of collections and exhibition design. This is meant to find out if there are Botswana collections in the different museums that have collections on natural history, ethnography, art, geology, history and archaeology. It is also for exchanges in exhibitions, expertise, research, and capacity building for museum staff.

6.3.21 **Africa Accessioned Network**

According to Jeremy Silvester, the Africa Accessioned Network was initiated in 2014 to seek partnerships with European museums that hold African collections. The focus was on partnerships based on common remunerations for both the partner museums and communities of origin and the exchange of knowledge and collections. This could also be achieved through information sharing, doing detailed inventories of the collections, and establishing an inclusive network.[792] The collaboration is by four Southern African countries, Namibia, Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, with four countries from the global North that hold their collections, Finland, Germany, Sweden and the UK. In an article titled *Namibian Theme Selected for International Museums Day 2014*, Silvester highlighted the support given by ICOM to the project through funding and adopting a related International Museums Day slogan "Museums Collections Make Connections" proposed by Namibia, the initiator of the project. The slogan provided an impetus to initiate the project, because it talked to the partnership and connection to co-curate the collections found in the four global North countries.[793] The Namibians have gone a step further to develop collaborations with Finnish and German museums that have Namibian collections of interest under this network. The collaborations are hoped to function as representations for upcoming collaborations.

6.3.22 The Prevention in Museums in Sub-Saharan Africa Project and the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa

The Prevention in Museums in Sub-Saharan Africa Project and the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa are also initiatives for cooperation among African museums and with European museums. According to Kwame Amoah Labi, these initiatives were aimed at the

[792] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network," 111–112.
[793] Jeremy Silvester "Namibian Theme Selected for International Museums Day," *Museum Matters – Newsletter* (2014).

integrations of African museums into "the postcolonial cultural and socio-economic life of serving African countries".[794] This is notwithstanding the fact that these were later beset by problems, including finance, and lost their continental character to be replaced by local initiatives by different countries. Labi highlighted that these were some of "the most recent African European museum cooperation projects" and their achievement and challenges could be used to form new sustainable initiatives.[795]

6.3.23 The Australian Government and the Repatriation of Ancestral Remains for the Australian Aboriginal People and Torres Strait Islanders

Further afield, the Australian government has been facing challenges because of the repatriation of ancestral remains for the Australian Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders. As a result, it has engaged the services of universities to carry out provenance research and authenticate return cases. It has also established the Aboriginal Torres Islander Commission in 1990 to follow up the repatriations and deal with other issues affecting the Indigenous people.[796]

The above examples of collaboration strengthen the discourse on prevention and international responses in case of damage to world collections and other cultural property. This also contributes to the concept of a shared heritage and the quest to establish if this is shared heritage as a national, continental or international approach. The sharing could also refer to national, continental and global approaches towards the promotion and protection of cultural property. This would refer particularly to the African setting where the illegal transfers are a common problem. Meanwhile, in the international scenario there are already approaches and responses towards the same. This is reflected in the international move towards a concerted effort at salvaging and protecting universal heritage.[797]

6.4 ASSESSMENT OF SUCCESSES AND FAILURES

Quite a number of collaborations have taken place and are taking place among the global South and the global North regarding migrated collections, as endeavours at sharing, and the display of a universal responsibility towards heritage. Those outlined above are a few examples. Some

[794] Kwame Amoah Labi, "New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa," 165.
[795] Kwame Amoah Labi, "New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa," 166.
[796] Paul Turnbull, "International Repatriation of Indigenous Human Remains and its Complexities: The Australian Experience," 7–9.
[797] Jeremy Silvester "Namibian Theme Selected for International Museums Day."

of these have been very successful and beneficial to both partners, while some have had and still have teething problems. Some have started and died along the way, some have been success stories, and some are still being discussed, particularly now with the focus on decolonising the museum. There is hope that more efforts at collaboration and a shared responsibility towards heritage will keep coming up. There is therefore a network of collaborations by many different institutions of heritage in different parts of the world and under different circumstances and terms and conditions. The argument by different African scholars is that a lot of these collaborations have come up under the guise of universality because global North museums want to gain global recognition.[798] Rassool argued that the European museums started acting as agents of "a shared heritage and universality" in order to evade repatriation.[799] The British Museum, for example, embarked on a programme, as elaborated by its curator Julie Hudson in the previous section, of partnerships with many African museums. This included training, exchange exhibitions, long-term and the temporary loaning of objects. However, the partnerships were not beneficial to African partners because they were not equal partnerships to begin with.[800] George Abungu supported the idea that the adoption of a universal approach to shared heritage by European museums was fuelled by the fear of the call for repatriation.[801]

Even though the initiative to share world heritage as a global responsibility has been embraced by the world heritage fraternity, it still has its own challenges. Moreover, in current efforts at collaboration, there are still some cases where metropolitan institutions are struggling to gain close contact with counterparts in Africa and the latter are stalling to do so as well. This came out during a discussion with Dr Inna Heumann and colleagues at Museum fur Naturkunde in Berlin in connection with a dinosaur project in Tanzania. The findings were taken to Germany in the 1920s after the research work was done in the then Tanganyika because it was a German colony. However, today most of the players that feature are the German scholars, and according to them, there is no forthcoming and positive response from the locals in Tanzania from either the Museum or the University. Holger Stoecker of the Museum of Natural History shared the same arguments about failed efforts to involve local experts. The dinosaur project is a colonial initiative that the current German experts have decided to revisit. During the interview, the

[798] Felwine Sarr and Benedicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics," 2.
[799] Ciraj Rassool, "Building a Critical Museology in Africa," xxii.
[800] Ciraj Rassool, "Building a Critical Museology in Africa," xxii.
[801] George Okello Abungu, "Connected by History, Divided by Reality," 33.

museum curator admitted that it was a gap not to be working with the Tanzanians, particularly in this era where there are equally good experts in Tanzania and where the world is talking about provenance, inclusivity, and shared responsibility. The scholars also agree that even if restitution is not the option, sharing and universality should still be embraced.[802]

There is thus a slow move towards collaboration with some of the ex-colonies, and this also applies to the Staatliche Museum's ethnographic collections project, which deals with the assembling and documentation of all colonial objects for the Humboldt Forum. One reason is that not all ex-colonies and any other relevant countries know that they have collections in Germany or in other European countries and museums. According to Jonathan Fine of the Staatliche Museums, the intention is to create awareness and to collaborate with African experts as well as communities of provenance. This will allow for exchanges in staff, exhibitions, research findings and expertise and for filling gaps, proper interpretation of displays and the authentication of information. He indicated that they are trying to put their collections online for transparency purposes and accessibility, which they think will allow the African countries whose collections they have more access and insight. According to him, the project is slow, but they have already succeeded with the Benin bronzes and Nigeria.[803] Stoecker and other German scholars felt that all the partnerships and dialogues with ex-colonial countries help them to re-construct German colonial history and to fill the gaps. Most of the collections held by German museums come from its ex-colonies because the Germans felt and still feel that they had the right to take from their sphere of influence, an argument they have even used in their Nama/Herero genocide case.[804] Fine, however, voiced the fear that the Humboldt Forum that is to house all the colonial collections in Germany might be a political agent. This is fear that the intention of the project could be politically motivated, and therefore, aid the interests of the government instead of the museum and its mandate. This is a common trend with most governments and museums, particularly national ones.

Silvester reiterated the fact that the challenge for Namibian museums is to make contact with other museums that cover similar themes or have collections containing Namibian objects so that they can develop opportunities for international cooperation. This is also a proposal towards a shared responsibility for universal heritage. The line of thinking directly answers to

---

[802] Inna Heumann (Curator, Natural History Museum, Germany) in conversation with the author, 2016.

[803] Jonathan Fine (Curator, Staatliche Museum of Ethnography) in conversation with the author, 2016.

[804] Holger Stoecker, Inna Heumann and Manuela Bauche (German Museum of Natural History & Humboldt University) in conversation with the author, 2016. See also Jonathan Fine (Curator, Staatliche Museum of Ethnography) in conversation with the author, 2016.

the research question in its quest to find out what the best option is for the migrated museum**:** restitution or a shared global inheritance.[805] While he did not do an in-depth analysis of the concept of restitution and a shared heritage, his proposals provided a basis for critical analysis in this study. He argued that museums can play an important role in creating international dialogue. He also believes that in some cases this could reveal the presence of objects that are of sacred importance to communities and that need to be returned to their homes. This is an indication that some of the cultural property has a spiritual and cultural bond with communities that cannot be broken, and this calls for the return of the objects. In this way, his thinking supports Weiner and Marcel Mauss's thinking on the circulation of alienable and inalienable possessions. According to him, in other cases, museums, displays and exhibitions can be used to develop cultural dialogue between different countries. Museums can in this way act as bridges between different cultural and political contexts and as such promote a universal approach to heritage.[806]

In the case of the British Museum's successes and failures at collaboration, it is imperative that the Museum should deal with one country project at a time. This is because there is not enough exhibition space to accommodate all viable projects or exhibitions at once. However, in some cases, which I believe have not been very successful, the British Museum did the research and exhibitions alone and not in collaboration with local heritage managers. The Museum then concluded that these were collaborative projects nonetheless. Nevertheless, there is a notable publication that came about as a result of these projects with Africa, *Africa: Arts and Culture* edited by John Mack, curator for African Collections at the British Museum.[807] The other milestone is that all the objects from Botswana and other countries that are at the British Museum have been photographed and put on the internet for ease of access. During an interview, Julie Hudson indicated that her museum wanted to encourage the Botswana National Museum to view the collections online and for possible collaboration with the Art section in the future.[808] However, efforts to connect the British Museum and the Thapong Visual Art Centre in Botswana have failed since 2015. Things are sometimes easier said than done.

On a positive note, as a continent that has been greatly affected by the migration of cultural property, the sharing of a universal heritage places a global spotlight on African creativity in

---

[805] Jeremy Silvester "Namibian Theme Selected for International Museums Day."
[806] Jeremy Silvester "Namibian Theme Selected for International Museums Day."
[807] John Mack, *Africa and its Cultures*.
[808] Julie Hudson (Curator of the Africa Section, British Museum) in conversation with the author, 2015.

the general framework of human accomplishments. This is because displayed objects of African origin, wherever they are, have the command to influence varied spectators. They bring to light the contextual cultural background of their provenances.[809] The Lekota people of North America also believe that their objects still mediate power even when inside a museum. In their dealings with the museum, they believe that rituals have to be performed on the objects in order to release their spiritual power and free them to be museum objects. The notion of a shared heritage cannot therefore be divorced from such communities and their heritage.[810]

In conclusion, it has been the intention of this research to critique the proposed sharing concept and to interrogate the equity, fairness and reciprocity of the exchanges. The benefits were not the same nor equal for the source countries and the traffickers in the above discussed methods of transfer. European collectors dictated the terms and the benefits were more for the colonising counterparts, while the giving communities lost their cultural property and prized artefacts. Even in the gift giving process, the giving communities acted as if indoctrinated, particularly the elite. They started shunning their culture as barbaric and opting for Christianity and modernity, and in the process, alienated their cultural heritage. The colonised were seen and treated as children to be reformed through westernisation, modernisation and Christianization. As a result, the elite began to aid or ignore the migration of cultural property. Redemption in this way meant caricature of the British or the coloniser, (the 'other') in alliance and in hostility. This is an issue of assimilation as discussed earlier. The Sarr-Savoy Report also asked if this was free gifting or coerced gifting.[811] Rassool argued that the earlier initiatives at cooperation and a shared heritage in Africa, such as AFRICOM, SAMP, and the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa, and Prevention in Museums in Sub-Saharan Africa, failed because the money that had been directed towards funding them was diverted towards the partnership initiatives meant to combat decolonisation and repatriation by cosmopolitan museums.[812]

That is why even today some heritage managers are very sceptical about the proposed sharing and universality of cultural property. They are afraid that there will be no equality and propose that there should be co-ownership and compensation to the giving communities in the form of resources so that they can develop museums back home.[813] As a rejoinder to the proposed

---

[809] Stephen Greenblatt, "Resonance and Wonder," 42.

[810] Carsten Viggo Nielsen, "When Objects of Religious Significance Mediate Power," 88.

[811] Felwine Sarr and Benedicte Savoy, "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards A New Relation Ethics". See also African Information Services, *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*.

[812] Ciraj Rassool, "Building a Critical Museology in Africa," xxii.

[813] Prince Shyllon (Art collector and lawyer, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.

sharing and collaborations, Prince Shyllon advised that all European and American countries holding collections from African countries should contribute towards the building of a world museum (UN Museum). The proposal for a UN Museum is in line with the notion of universality, humanity and sharing, and it does not matter where the museum is located, in the global South or global North. Reference to the UN allows for a politics of international unity and collaboration. This museum would house all collections from the diaspora and will be owned by all, particularly those whose collections will be housed in the museum. In Shyllon's view, this would be a true reflection of universality and a shared heritage as perceived by UNESCO, ICOM and AFRICOM. According to him, the currently proposed universality is not based on equality and relegates African partners to a secondary position, while current owners of the collections dictate terms and conditions.[814] Desmond Phiri of Malawi shared these sentiments on the subject of the migrated collections and their future.[815]

If the option proposed by Shyllon is one to go by, the sharing proposed by the British Museum fails by comparison by not giving African partners the due respect, dignity, and the much-deserved superior title as rightful owners of cultural property. African owners or partners have to be in control. The advice therefore is to ask for equal partnership with the British Museum rather than the secondary position that African museums are relegated to in the collaborations so far.[816] The observed trend today is that many museums from Europe, America and Africa are taking the initiative to engage in dialogue and collaboration as a step towards sharing and universality. While there have been success stories, there are also challenges resulting in delayed progress towards collaborative projects. Sometimes this leads to failure and discontinuation. The move to start dialogue is not an easy one and there is also the challenge to acquire funding to initiate and facilitate the collaborations. In summary, it is clear that while the notion of sharing is a reality following the above discussion, it is a complicated one, just like that of restitution.

Cherki Dahmali of AFRICOM argued that "African looted heritage is not a shared heritage". This directly translates that you cannot steal African objects and then call them into a sharing relationship instead of returning the objects back. According to Dahmali, the notion of a shared global heritage was adopted by countries that hold foreign collections in order to justify their

---

[814] Prince Shyllon (Art collector and lawyer, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015. See also Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere, *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe*.
[815] Desmon Phiri (Writer & Historian, Malawi) in conversation with the author, 2015.
[816] Prince Shyllon (Art collector and lawyer, Nigeria) in conversation with the author, 2015.

continued holding of African looted cultural properties. The same countries argue that some demands for return are based on the need for financial benefit from the collections. In that case, Dahmali feels that they should instead make and keep copies of the collections and give back the originals to Africans because the heritage belongs to Africans and is not for sharing, "because African people have the right to recover this ancestral cultural heritage which is a very important part of their lives".[817] Much as the general consensus by the majority of museums, curators and governments is the repatriation of the heritage under discussion, and alternatively a shared responsibility in the form of collaborations, radical voices such as Dahmali's are often heard at different forums. Sometimes these even come from the global North.

[817] Cherki Dahmali, "African Looted Heritage is Not a Shared Heritage."

CHAPTER 7
POLICY PROPOSALS

7.1 OUTLINE OF PRINCIPLES

There is a sizeable number of international protocols on heritage, as well as a number of national laws in various countries. Nonetheless, there are still gaps. Many countries, such as Botswana, still lack rounded domestic legislation to address issues affecting heritage and emerging global trends such as the illicit trafficking of cultural property, restitution, management of human remains, relations with communities and Indigenous people, globalisation and sharing of heritage, and the decolonisation of the contemporary museum. The protocols, regulations and laws have to take into account the principles of heritage as outlined by international organisations dealing with heritage and by museums. Most of the principles are deliberately coined to address issues and problems affecting heritage in one way or another for the best management and protection of heritage. For instance, ICOM has a set of principles in its *Code of Ethics for Museums*[818] *The Code of Ethics* covers a number of expected principles in the general management of heritage. They centre on collections (tangible and intangible, human remains), research, collaboration and partnerships with communities and the private sector. The code also covers displays and exhibitions, professional conduct, and the necessary legal framework for the management of heritage. These act as a guide in the general management of heritage globally. ICOM reviews and renews its code on a regular basis in order to be on par with global trends and developments in heritage. Below are some of the expected principles in the management of heritage.

Museums keeping collections have to document them properly in line with international standards to authenticate information and prove ownership in case of proposals to repatriate. This allows for ease of identification and tracking of objects. Heritage institutions should also put their collections online for accessibility by the international community and for best practice. Meanwhile, due to the sensitivity of belongings of unethically collected ancestral remains museums are cautioned to ensure the careful handling and deaccessioning of human remains. This calls for proper consultation in cases of repatriation and burials of human remains

[818] ICOM, "Code of Ethics for Museums." The code is published after every three years and it carries all the guidelines to the different functions of the museum, about Museum personnel and professional ethics, standardisation for museums and its relations with the public. The Code of Ethics is published in a small blue book and distributed to the whole museum fraternity free of charge. The latest copy was published in 2017).

to allow for closure for affected families or communities. The remains represent the dark history of colonialism, hence the pain and anger associated with them. The Iziko/CAM project in Southern Africa exemplifies the uncertainly surrounding the identification of the remains, particularly if coming from a vast area such as the Kalahari that covers three countries. This therefore calls for systematic provenance research on the same.[819]

Scholars have referred to human remains displayed in museums as a 'problematic heritage' because of the unethical ways they were collected, with some stolen from graves or smuggled out of countries. As a result, the quest to repatriate them is a way of correcting wrongs and is a part of the decolonisation process for museums.[820] This is to rehumanise the dehumanised, and the heritage fraternity has to take heed of this fundamental principle.

The WIPO is a UN frame that sets broad-based principles for patenting and for national use and adoption by state parties.[821] The reflection here is that with appropriate laws and regulations, claims for restitution and the right to copyright can work for African countries that have lost cultural property and still continue doing so today. Copyright and intellectual property rights aid in the authentication of cases and ownership of objects. They are also most applicable in the contemporary museum situation of technology and the internet for online collections.[822] The repatriation of human remains also needs preparation, resources, policies and protocols. Many museums in Southern Africa house human remains. These are local remains, and some are from within the region. The Iziko Museums have the largest holding of human remains. The dominant remains are those of the Basarwa or Khoisan, because in the 20th century they were the most sought after remains for anatomical explorations and comparative analyses.[823]

The options of restitution or sharing of cultural heritage ultimately points in one direction. This is with emphasis on cultural diversity, tolerance of differences, and the valorisation of one's own cultural objects and achievements by institutions of heritage, states, and the world community. This explains why the world community today is so interested in knowing about other people, their cultures, languages, and histories. It also explains why the international

[819] Wendy Black et al., "Who Were They? Repatriation and the Rehumanisation of Human Remains in Museums in Southern Africa," 320.
[820] Wendy Black et al., "Who Were They? Repatriation and the Rehumanisation of Human Remains in Museums in Southern Africa," 317.
[821] John McAvity, "The Importance of Copyright," 8–29.
[822] Julien Anfruns, "Foreword," 2.
[823] Wendy Black et al., "Who Were They? Repatriation and the Rehumanisation of Human Remains in Museums in Southern Africa," 312.

community is talking about inclusivity, equality and cultural diversity as some of the principles guarding universal heritage.

The anticipation for return and sharing is an expectation to contribute to the management, to the future use, display and exhibition of the cultural property in the diaspora. This still attests to collaborations between organisations over this migrated heritage and to an age of inclusivity and universalism. The museum, as a matter of principle, is about collaborations, the community and inclusiveness.

The security of cultural property in museums is another opinion area that cannot be ignored. The human factor, which is facilitating the migration of cultural property and aiding traffickers (as has been the case in other areas), is a constituent that threatens the safekeeping of museums and their collections. The ICOM *Code of Ethics* covers this as well under the code of conduct for museum professionals. Another security threat are natural disasters, such as in Haiti after the earthquake and the Skogar and Icelandic Museum after volcanic ashes affected its collections. This could include floods, fires and wars. The general principles affecting heritage also cover the funding of museums, their educational programmes, awareness programmes and the museum's public image at both a national and an international level. All these need governing policies and regulations for the smooth running of the museum and the operation of its different functions and disciplines.

7.2 PROPOSALS FOR FORMAL LEGISLATION

In 2014, UNESCO advised Pacific nations to protect their "at risk cultural heritage" in order to stop the trafficking of artefacts. The UNESCO Director for the Pacific, Clément Etienne, reported to the Australian Broadcasting Commission that countries had started losing traditions such as dance, music and language alongside cultural objects. Practices such as dance, music and language were under threat as the Pacific region became modernised. He advised them to sign the 2005 Convention on Cultural Diversity. This presented as a political commitment from governments and a sign of responsibility to other states. He appealed for the development of legislation, rules and regulations for implementation and enforcement. Countries need to domesticate through national laws and to implement protocols through national legislation.[824]

[824] *Botswana Daily News*, "Pacific Cultural Heritage under Threat," 29

This explains the long and winding process of ratification because nations have to establish national laws before finalising the ratification process. This is discussed in Chapter 2.

The purpose of international law in this logic is to implement restoration and to ensure that every society benefits and enjoys its culture and that of others as a human right. This refers to culture in its totality and not only to objects. However, all these have to be reflected in national and regional laws and regulations. There is also a need for museums to put in place proper collection and acquisition policies to allow for the proper handling of issues related to the collections, such as the new museum function of restitution. It is imperative to check if the object was acquired in a legitimate and procedural way and through the application of legal ethical criteria of purchase. There is also caution here according to the 1970 and UNIDROIT conventions to give consideration to the innocent buyer and to exercise due diligence when acquiring objects on the market to make sure that they have been authentically acquired.

It is notable that ICOM, UNESCO and Interpol are emphasising the inventorying and documentation of collections in order to prove authenticity and assured ownership. Claims for goods trafficked during the colonial period, which are otherwise not documented, can only rely on the available concept of reciprocity. This is however an area that should be covered by national law in order to allow for implementation. This is despite the fact that it is a controversial area, because the demanding states want their cultural property regardless of the fact that it might have been acquired recently or hundreds of years ago. Museums need to have in place collections policies, including the deaccessioning component. European museums are sometimes forced to repatriate African collections as loans because they lack deaccessioning policies.

Nigerian officials have proposed a world museum or UN Museum to house collections from the diaspora and to be owned by all, including those connected to the collections. However, Glyn Balkwil cautioned that while this would be a true reflection of universality and shared heritage, it would obviously need to be covered by law to regulate the degree of involvement and contribution, especially since it would be outside national boundaries.[825] There is also a proposal that museums should benchmark with the UN Law on the Rights of Indigenous People when formulating domestic laws on the management of human remains and collections. This also goes with the involvement of local communities in formulating such laws because they

[825] Glyn Balkwil (Curator, Ditsong Museum of Cultural History) in conversation with the author, 2016.

are about their own heritage. Within the same understanding, the local communities have to be involved in the management of this heritage. This reminds us that Susan Ashley talked about cultural policy in relation to local, national and international scenarios and how it could be applied to contemporary trends such as globalisation and others.[826] This is another policy area that needs to be taken into consideration by scholars, academic institutions, museums and heritage managers as a key principle on Indigenous people.

Museums should consider both the options of sharing and of restitution. Collaboration as in a shared heritage and restitution should therefore be addressed as key. The two options have bearing on each other. They determine the future of world heritage in the diaspora. Communities of provenance should be involved through awareness exercises and consideration of their views in the formulation of laws and regulations that affect heritage, because they are also the owners of such. The two options of restitution and sharing should be included in the formulated law. Domesticating the two options through the promulgation of regulations, guidelines and legislation would help guide sharing and make it standard, internationally and regionally.

In the case of collaborations between African and European museums over shared cultural heritage, European countries are expected to stay vigilant for trafficked goods from African partners in their markets and auction houses. The collaborations should also consider the status of inalienable objects so that their possible repatriation is facilitated. Also, in the partnerships, African curators should co-curate the collections, particularly in exhibition design. This calls for standards and compelling guidelines for cooperation among museums from Europe and Africa. Laws and regulations covering the partnerships and their requirements are critical to ensure that these collaborations are standardised, sustainable and successful.

While advocating for provenance research and restitution, Philipp Schorch maintained that the countries dealing with colonial holdings and restitution should come up with proper legal structures, political procedures, and principled museum practices appropriate for the development. This is because the issue of sacred objects is sensitive and needs calculated legal approaches.[827] In reaction to the move towards restitution, in 2003 a number of states in the global North signed the Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums.

---

[826] Susan Ashley, "*Theoretical Approaches to Cultural Policy,*" 1.

[827] Philipp Schorch, "Sensitive Heritage: Ethnographic Museum, Provenance Research and the Potentialities of Restitution," 2.

However, it led to contestation resulting in a focus on provenance research, co-curation and communities of origin.[828]

In conclusion, it is always in order to note Nicholas Thomas's declaration that "historicized ethnographic explorations of the colonial experience are the most fruitful approaches to understanding colonialism's continued effects". According to Thomas, cultural materials create a window through which to understand colonialism, particularly for modern Europeans. Cirigliano also maintained that collections help us interpret our heritage better by deepening our understanding and appreciation of the global community's culture and history.[829] It is this realisation that has given rise to initiatives and conversations on heritage between European and African museum professionals today. Of note in the midst of all the discussions over migrated objects is that it is incontestable that migrated African art and crafts occupy a unique place in the universal space today.

7.3 PROPOSALS FOR BEST MUSEUM PRACTICE

The contemporary world, marked as it is by division and mistrust following the slave trade, colonisation, the migration of cultural property and human remains, and continuing racial discrimination, demands a transformative museum space with innovative approaches. Such a museum will foster intercultural dialogue and understanding. According to Viv Golding and Jenny Walklate, such a museum should be modelled around the concepts of community, diversity, dialogue and collaboration as part of its best practice.[830] The focus and functions of the museum have had to change according to the values and expectation of society today.[831] Global museums and communities today are engaged in conversations through which they seek to decolonise the museum, to redefine it and to reappraise its colonial past and its histories of collecting. Museums are moving towards the acknowledgement of historical wrongs, addressing the history and culture of collecting problematic heritage such as human remains and inalienable possessions.[832] Liviu Razvan Pripon and Valentino Andrian argued that "the museum needs a dynamic and metabolic character in order to be viable in contemporary

---

[828] Kostas Arvanities and Louis Tythacott, *Museums and Restitution: New Practices, New Approaches*, 1–2.
[829] Michael Cirigliano, "Where Global History Meets the Metropolitan Museum," in *The Best in Heritage: 17th edition, Dubrovnk, Croatia, 26–28 September 2018*, ed. Luka Cipek, (Zagreb: ICOM, 2018), 17.
[830] Viv Golding and Jen Walklate (eds.), *Museums and Communities*.
[831] Chi Thien Pham, "How Museums Identify and Face Challenges with Diverse Communities," 110.
[832] Viv Golding and Jen Walklate (eds.), *Museums and Communities*, 13.

society".[833] Scholars have of late taken keen interest in examining the kind of museum that is suited to the contemporary environment and what best practices it needs to adopt. The publication *Museums and Restitution*: *New Practices, New Approaches* discussed contemporary practices and the degree to which the concept of restitution is adopted by global North and global South museums. It also puts a microscopic lens on challenges for best practice by museums in relation to restitution.[834]

As part of best practice, there is a need for transparency and the sharing of notes and records from colonial times by institutions of heritage and by scholars. This includes accepting that there are historical and cultural gaps that need to be filled. Museums, archives and universities need to use resources such as the internet, digitisation, and other technological innovations. It is also important to use media to publicise and promote returns, exchanges and collaborations as part of transparency.[835] As a point of departure, the museum has had to give space and resources to the proper inventorying of its collections. There are standards on the proper inventorying of collections in order to allow for authentication in cases of thefts and claims for return. This is in cognisance of the fact that objects should be inventoried in line with ICOM and Interpol standards to allow museums to prove beyond doubt that the objects belong to the claiming nation. ICOM, UNESCO and Interpol are emphasising property inventorying and the documentation of collections to prove authenticity and assured ownership in cases of tracing illicitly trafficked goods. Contemporary claims rely on authenticating beyond doubt through proper inventorying and documentation. However, in most cases, objects left colonised territories without such. Zimbabwe, for instance, has so far failed to reclaim its cultural property stolen and sold in South Africa because it did not meet this criterion.[836] This calls for what Larissa Forster terms the "inevitable postcolonial provenance research" done systematically and in collaboration with communities of provenance.[837]

It is also very important for museums to investigate the circumstances in which an object lined up for restitution was acquired. However, following legal ethical standards of acquisition becomes problematic if countries and museums do not have all-inclusive national inventories

---

[833] Virgil Stefan Nitulescu (ed), *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019): 9.

[834] Kostas Arvanities and Louis Tythacott, *Museums and Restitution: New Practices, New Approaches*, 1.

[835] Dag Henrichsen, "Cape Cross? African Places—History and Stories," 20.

[836] Godfrey Mahachi (General Director, National Museums of Zimbabwe) in conversation with the author, 2015.

[837] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 159. See also Jeremy Silvester, "Museum Objects, Memory and Identity in Namibia," 23. See also Ellen Ndeshi Namhila, "The Hendrik Witbooi Diaries: From War Booty to Memory of the World Treasure."

of museum holdings and databases of stolen objects. This explains why Christa Roodt and Bernadine Benson argued that before recording stolen objects, they should be validated as having exceptional significance.[838] This helps give weight to demands for return and authentication of objects of significance to the history and culture of the claiming nations. This addresses the diverse current cases of return, such as the Hendrik Witbooi bible, the Benin bronzes, and objects from the Maji rebellion in Tanzania, all discussed above. Gesa Grimme advised that the key areas to look into in provenance research are, "circumstances surrounding the acquisition, who acquired, when it was done, where the object came from and who sold to the museum (because sometimes the objects changed hands before landing in the museum)".[839] Some of the objects were even modified in order to suit the demands of the market. The observation though is that in some European countries, such as Switzerland and Germany, provenance research has long started, and in Germany this has even led to the development of museum collection profiles. Philipp Schorch complements Larissa Forster and Gesa Grimme in arguing that provenance research should lead to restitution, particularly to ex-German colonies such as Namibia, New Zealand, or Tanzania. According to Schorch, provenance research and restitution should contribute to the knowledge base about the communities of provenance. He advised that the first port of call should be ethnographic museums because that is where the bulk of colonial cultural holdings are housed.[840]

There is a need for systematic and focussed collecting by museums in order to fill gaps in collections. This is a move that is still lacking in many museums today, including in Botswana. Some do not have collecting policies and are collecting haphazardly, while for others collecting has stalled.[841] Museums have to keep on collecting because culture is dynamic and new developments and innovations have to be conserved for posterity.

In addition to the obvious move by the global museum to share by working together, there is a deliberate call for a new museology of accessibility, which focuses on communities of provenance, co-curation and co-interpretation. Hans-Martin Hinz emphasised the need to listen to current voices from former colonial territories as part of best museum practice.[842] This involves a museology of diasporic cooperation that crosses continents, such as the workshop

[838] Christa Roodt and Bernadine Benson, "Databases for Stolen Art: Progress, Prospects and Limitations."
[839] Gesa Grimme, "Systematic Provenance Research on Objects from Colonial Contexts," 53–60.
[840] Gesa Grimme, "Systematic Provenance Research on Objects from Colonial Contexts."
[841] Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere, *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe*.
[842] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 13.

and resultant publication by the University of Zurich's Museum of Ethnography in December 2016 on *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe.*[843]

This needs to be covered by law and countries must develop laws addressing collaborations and restitutions. Countries and museums are called to ratify international protocols and treaties that deal with the protection and promotion of culture. This is particularly so for treaties that enforce the protection of heritage during war, such as the 1970, 1954 and 1995 UN conventions. This should be accompanied by domestic laws to allow for implementation and action against perpetrators. The conventions advocate for a shared responsibility towards the prevention of illegal transfers of cultural property and promotion and protection of heritage as a global responsibility and property, and most importantly, as a human right. The 1995 UNIDROIT Convention complements the 1970 and 1954 conventions and deals with international law in cases of restitution. However, most of the conventions do not cover objects acquired during the colonial period, which is as dictated by UNESCO and the European museums. The best practice for museums, however, is to ratify the conventions, have in place domestic regulations, and then deal with each case as and when it comes. This is still taking into cognisance inalienable objects. As a result, and in spite of all the odds and obstacles, countries have managed to repatriate objects, even those collected before the colonial period that are not covered by the conventions.

There is a need for global, continental and regional protocols to encourage collaborations between museums, for example, for SADC in the handling and repatriation of human remains and collections. These regional states share communities and landscapes and also house collections from neighbours, migrated during the colonial period. Botswana is a good example, having collections in neighbouring states such as Zimbabwe, Zambia, South Africa and probably Namibia. This calls for institutional collaborations with ease of access by the country of origin, shared access to websites and collections, and the option for exchange exhibitions, expertise and capacity building. This move should be clearly reflected by law. In this way, the museums will move towards inclusivity by expanding their activities beyond national borders to regional, continental and global efforts in the management of heritage.

Local communities use museums and heritage sites to reaffirm and rebuild their identities, even those lost through colonialism and migration of cultural property. Museums should therefore

---

[843] Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere, ed, *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe*.

address themselves to all issues affecting society so that they are relevant in this regard. Policies should also take this into consideration. Mojca Racic and Ralf Čeplak Mencin talked of "social inclusion", which subscribes to the participatory approach in museums, leading to the representation of different groupings, particularly the disadvantaged.[844] The active participation of communities in the different functions of the museum gives them an opportunity to remake their history through the collections found there.[845] This would be a shift from the detachment of earlier times when objects were curios for wonder and where European viewers introspected through unanswered questions, as analysed by Greenblatt.[846] How did these items arrive here and come to be exhibited in a foreign museums? What is the prize in classifying them as being of museum value? How were they initially used by those who made them? What and how is the culture of those who made them and what is the context in which they were made? What was the spirit and mood leading to their production? Were they for ceremonial, spiritual use and what and how is the ethnic group that produced, held, cherished, them originally?

There are also calls for innovative strategies and exchange in best practice by heritage managers under this new museology. In the same token, Gershevitch gave an overview of the ideal future museum as a site of collective, democratic decision-making where universal difficulties are tackled at a local level and where those who have lost their humanity are given back their dignity.[847] This will mostly apply to museums that have collections of human remains, and in particular, unethically collected ones from the colonial period.

It is also important that museums recognise the rights of indigenous peoples in deciding how their heritage is handled. Botswana is a good example in that the government does not recognise the Basarwa as Indigenous people. Their argument is that all are Batswana and are equal. As a result, the Basarwa have been made to move from their ancestral land, the Central Kalahari, to new settlements so that the government can provide for them. This leaves the museum in Botswana torn between the recognition of Indigenous people and their rights and the interests of the state and its laws. Local communities must benefit sustainably and approve guidelines that satisfy their cultural beliefs in relation to their heritage that is in museums. This is to satisfy the expectation of good museum practice today and laws on Indigenous people and

---

[844] Anna Maria Pecci, "Refugees are in Front of Our Doors! Endeavours by the Slovene Ethnographic Museum towards the Deconstruction of Stereotypes and Prejudice," in *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, eds. Viv Golding and Jen Walklate, (London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019), 218.

[845] Mojca Račič and Ralf Čeplak Mencin, "Refugees are in Front of Our Doors!" 110.

[846] Stephen Greenblatt, "Resonance and Wonder," 45.

[847] Conrad Gershevitch, *Museums in Human Development: The Place of Museums in a Globalised and Transforming World,* 287.

their heritage.[848] This is to recognise that heritage is a human right and that every people and nation has the right to the recognition, appreciation, celebration and support of their heritage.

Copyright derives from most activities presented by museums. This includes displays, the digitisation of museum collections, research, education, websites, conservation of objects and even gift shops. Museums are not immune to law and are obliged to attain copyright and consent from titleholders of collections (not essentially the originators). This could lead to the quest to find patent owners or their heirs, and this is difficult in most cases. European countries have tried it when repatriating art solen by Nazis during World War II. Copyright decrees, however, bring their own issues in that private owners have been bestowed with privileges that require respect. The privileges extend to the creators' heirs for 50 or more years, depending on national laws. As a part of good practice, museums should embrace these in order to avoid uncomfortable situations.[849]

In a special report on museum security, Aedin Mac Devitt advocated for the security of objects in museums. According to Mac Devitt, recent high-profile art thefts have raised doubt as to the safety of museum collections. The danger is posed by both the human factor and natural disasters. Examples include Mali, Egypt, Haiti, Syria and Iraq, where there has been wide spread and deliberate looting and vandalism of heritage during political unrest and destruction by natural disasters. The proposal is for the exploration of the use of new technology and other security measures to tighten museum security, such as CCTV, backup generators and fire assembly points.[850] The security measures are meant for prevention against human and natural disaster challenges alongside illicit trafficking. How and to what extent are museums or states responding to these security challenges, particularly African states such Botswana? The publication *Countering Illicit Trafficking* by ICOM is a compendium of essays that tried to answer these concerns. It discussed the establishment of an observatory by ICOM to monitor the trafficking of cultural property, the legislation put in place by countries to fight the trafficking and also details on different cases of trafficking and how each country has dealt with the related challenges.[851]

---

[848] Ana Vrdoljak, "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects," 198. See also Winani Thebele, "The Reinvention of the Museum into a Cultural Hub in the African Context," 36–37.
[849] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*.
[850] Mac Devitt, A. (2014). Safe Havens. *ICOM Newsletter*, Paris: ICOM, p. 10
[851] France Desmarais, *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage*.

Floris Guntenaar, on the other hand, proposed solutions grounded on the most topical IT improvements in the Collections Management Systems. These include future records models, the harmonisation of records bundles, quick and easy 'positive' cataloguing, and the documentation of collections.[852] Museums are therefore expected to adopt these proposals as best practice in order to stay relevant with contemporary trends. Stephen Allen talked of transforming the National Museum of Scotland and how this was done through the development of better exhibitions and displays, the use of digital labels, audio-visual programmes and interactive technologies. The museum is also developing a related journal of learning and discovery. This is part of best practice and an endeavour to give the visitor the best experience: "They read, play, listen, chat and watch, participate, perform, converse, create and touch during a tour of the museum. A tour of this type of museum today becomes a physical, emotional, traditional, intellectual and social experience".[853] Most museums today also offer online digital programmes that became more visible during the 2020 lockdown experience due to Covid-19. This is believed to make the museum more friendly and relevant to both the old and the young. Illicit trafficking uses technologies such as the internet, making it imperative for museums to keep pace.[854]

One of the observations at the *Human Remains Symposium* at Iziko Museums was that the issue of repatriating human remains is a new experience for museums. This therefore calls for museum curators to be proactive and to follow the South African approach of transparency with the presence of this problematic heritage in their custody, and to work on developing legislation to guide handling and repatriation. There is also a need for a proper verification and authentication process for such claims because it involves a deep colonial history, calling for provenance research. As in the concept of sharing, this also calls for collaborative curatorship and museology to promote heritage as a human right.[855] In the Africa Accessioned Network Project between SADC museums and museums from the North, there are plans to establish a website with researchable databases. This also talks to virtual museums under partnerships for ease of access by all partners and transparency.[856]

---

[852] Floris Guntenaar, "Combat against Illicit Traffic," 2–5.

[853] Stephen Allen, "Transforming the National Museum of Scotland," inn *The Best in Heritage: 17th edition, Dubrovnk, Croatia, 26–28 September 2018*, ed. Luka Cipek, (Zagreb: ICOM, 2018), 119–121.

[854] Neil Brodie, "The Internet Market in Antiquities," 11.

[855] Wendy Black, "Human Remains and the Development of Policy in Southern Africa," Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*. See also Lyndel V. Prott, *Witnesses to History: A Compendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects*.

[856] Jeremy Silvester, "The Africa Accessioned Network," 113.

In the current efforts at collaborations for a shared heritage and responsibility, the main focus is the communities of provenance, and this relates to what Larissa Forster termed "traditional core-conservation" in the museums that hold colonial collections. This includes the loaning of objects to communities for practical use. The Bakgatla drum in Botswana is one such object, kept by the Phuthadikobo Community Museum and loaned to the community for use in annual initiation exercises. The First Nations in Canada have the same privileges in their shared responsibility with local museums.[857]

A transformed museum will become a place where ideas, beliefs, and senses of identity are forged and nurtured, dealing with contested histories and collections. Issues that affect communities, such as histories of dispossession, violence and suffering will be dealt with in such a museum.[858] It will be a people-centred museum, concerned with community empowerment and equality for all. Communities could thus become authors of their own culture through co-interpretation of collections and displays in the museum. This will give such communities of origin a sense of pride, ownership, and healing.[859] All these are pointers and qualities for good practice in the museum today.

In summary, the museum has evolved from a museum of wonder, curios, and aesthetic appreciation to a museum of intercultural dialogue, co-interpretation, reconstruction and representation. It has the potential to be a democratic space. Its mandate has also been expanded based on the needs of contemporary society and is no longer only about protection but also about the revitalisation of culture. According to Wendy Black et al., museums can be a part of "indigenous futures".[860] It has now been appreciated globally that museums play a leading role in making us understand culture. They also strive in collaborations and partnerships, which could be with other museums, communities, government, the private sector or the media. These are generally realised through signed agreements, memorandum of agreements and memorandums of understanding. The Edmonton Museum in Canada and its partnership with the Six First Nations is a good example. Museums today have also taken a pioneering role in combat against the unlawful marketing of objects in promotion of their return to countries of origin. Reconciliation with Indigenous people has been a main focus for museums in recent years, and for some governments to a certain extent. This explains why ideals such as truth and

---

[857] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 161.
[858] Viv Golding and Jen Walklate (eds.), Museums and Communities, 13.
[859] Anna M. Pecci, "Refugees are in Front of Our Doors!" 107.
[860] Wendy Black et al., "Who Were They? Repatriation and the Rehumanisation of Human Remains in Museums in Southern Africa," 306.

reconciliation were put into practise and migrated from one country to another.[861] Museums have the potential to become spaces for healing, forgiveness, and acceptance of one another regardless of colour and culture.[862]

This also explains why ICOM and the museum fraternity are grappling with the task of coming up with a new and more suitable definition of the museum. This is a definition that will take into account the museum's diversified responsibilities and show that it has evolved. In fact, some museums are already community centres and cultural platforms, providing alternative and protective schools for civil society.[863] This is notwithstanding the fact that in the global North there is more emphasis on ethnographic museums, and that is why Philipp Schorch concluded that "facilitating, substantiality and shaping the materialised temporal juncture of histories, presenting realities and future imaginations is what ethnographic museums should be about in the 21st century".[864]

[861] Darren Dalglesh, "Relations and Reconciliation at Edmonton," 123.
[862] Winani Thebele, "The Reinvention of the Museum into a Cultural Hub in the African Context," 35
[863] Virgil Stefan Nitulescu (ed), *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019): 8.
[864] Philipp Schorch, "Sensitive Heritage: Ethnographic Museum, Provenance Research and the Potentialities of Restitution," 3.

CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is evident that the notion of a shared heritage is one that is gaining currency as it is promoted by international organisations and is a non-confrontational approach to resolving historical inequities in the global arena of cultural property. It is, however, a problematic issue that needs careful interrogation. The fundamental issue of concern for this thesis has been how to share cultural material in a way that satisfies the conditions of its association with the making of national and local identities while also being part of the global culture of humanity. In bringing these seemingly separate issues into focus, I have explored how alterity is made to represent certain categories of people and conferred through the trajectories of objects. What do the entanglements of such objects with various actors, be these explorers, conquistadors or administrators and museum professionals, mean for the giving communities and countries as well as those who have received them? Cultural brokers, current state facilitators, and even current illegal traders have recast artefacts as 'shared'. We thus need to ask by what set of social relations does this cultural heritage become shared, for whom is this shared, and ultimately to what purpose.

The African continent has suffered from the loss of its cultural heritage during the period of colonial encounters. Reconstructing the concept of sharing in a global context and in unequal entanglements is, however, fraught with difficulty. While scholars of museology, heritage and cultural studies ponder over the issue of a shared heritage and the option of restitution to countries of origin and to communities of provenance, Africans continue to demand respect for their cultural property. African heritage is universal in that it is found all over the globe and all of it will not be repatriated. This is in cognisance of cases of private and remote area ownership that are not known and may never be known, hence the option of a shared heritage. Museum professionals and local communities whose culture is exhibited in cosmopolitan museums are reminded that repatriation, self-representation and curating their own objects still leaves the question of "who has the right to represent a culture which is not their own" unanswered.[865] Museum professionals' activities in exhibiting 'other' cultures cannot be freed from the bonds of their own ways of thinking. It is crucial for ethnographic exhibitions today to be fully aware

[865] Anne Mayor, Vincent Négri and Eric Huysecom (eds.), *African Memory in Danger*, 50.

of the stereotypes that govern curators' images of others at the same time as they develop dialogical relationships with those whose collections are exhibited.

Culture reflects society and its ethics. It is therefore important to be conscious of the value of African cultures in the structure of universal civilisation to determine what contribution the African culture in its diversity has made and can make, and what it can receive from elsewhere. While liberation means economic, political, social and cultural freedom, culture is an inexhaustible source of courage. The promotion of universal culture where restitution fails is therefore meant for "a perfect integration into the contemporary world, for constant generalised promotion of feelings of humanism, solidarity, respect, equality and devotion to human beings. The universality notion is therefore, the African people's progress`s in the general framework and evolution of history".[866]

It is therefore the responsibility of curators to continuously stretch the boundaries of meaning-making in order to ensure that the dynamism of African culture, its histories and legacies is not lost in static or archaic modes of representation. This is as might be today where collections remain, especially where they are still viewed as curiosities. Curators must unremittingly pursue the utmost liberating practices for expanding the exhibition edge. This is to sanction different opinions and many other ways of showing the significance and value of the objects. This allows the object to dynamically imbue and take us through its on-going use and purpose in life and for those that it represents. In effect, "museum professionals must be willing to be changed by the languages and cultures from which they translate the contexts and purposes of the objects they seek to display, so that epistemological frameworks may be enriched and transformed to accommodate new paradigms for understanding the world".[867] The above applies to curators from both the cosmopolitan world and the global South since they are now in dialogue about migrated heritage. It is only through this approach that the proposal for cooperation and universality could make sense.

Moreover, the argument about restitution and sharing of cultural property has converted into a basic matter for dialogue. This is brought about by the movement of cultural heritage from Africa to the rest of the world. The option to involve local communities in provenance research and co-interpretation is therefore meant to put an end to the tradition of a European monopoly

[866] Anne Mayor, Vincent Négri and Eric Huysecom (eds.), *African Memory in Danger*, 52–55.
[867] George S. Mudenda, "Exhibiting Africa: Contemporary Perspectives on Representation of Culture in Museums."

on knowledge. Circumstances are now forcing museums from both the global South and global North to become continually free and open spaces.[868] Louis Tythacott and Kostas Arvanities argued that even though emotive and contentious, "the global focus on restitution today is a reflection of global power relations and bold, unwavering vocal reappraisal of colonialism and the Western museums and the colonial holdings in their custody".[869]

The option of a shared heritage is therefore a way to find a solution to the debates and tensions that have ensued. Sharing offers a tangible solution even though it is fraught with difficulty. As a result of the described situation, the illegal transfer of cultural property is a rapidly evolving security problem in the history of museums, law enforcement agencies and states, which needs thorough and proper documentation as well as calculated action. It has in the interim absorbed the attention of heritage managers, scholars, lawyers, politicians, media and the diplomatic community.[870] As a result, Lyndel Prott emphasised the seriousness of the grievance over migrating other people's cultural property and the bitterness it has caused, forcing the global community to unite in fighting illegal transfers. According to Prott, all civilised nations should subscribe to this common justice.[871]

Statements such as Prott's and the call for collective responsibility make a notable move away from the politics of restitution and towards the universal shareability of the heritage under discussion. However, in the whole debate about restitution, sharing and universality for cultural property, African museum professionals are not advocating that treasured objects should principally exist to be owned. Their display should, however, be collectively enriched and transformed to accommodate new paradigms for understanding the world away from old stereotypes and the concepts of a civilisational hierarchy.[872]

Given the historical epoch of colonial migrations of objects and human remains, it is justified to conclude that anti-colonialism is a cultural as much as a political struggle. Culture was also used as an instrument to forge identities in Africa. Even the repatriated cultural material is to be used to forge identities within the local and international community today. Culture is turned into an object of consumption and is objectified as in the migrated museum and illicit trafficking. Objects from distant lands were collected and displayed as signs and

---

[868] Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*, 9.
[869] Kostas Arvanities and Louis Tythacott, *Museums and Restitution: New Practices, New Approaches*, 1.
[870] Winani Thebele-Kgwatalala, "The Prevention and Fight against Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Goods, Case of Botswana," 2.
[871] Lyndel V. Prott, Witnesses to History: A *C*ompendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects, iii.
[872] George S. Mudenda, "Exhibiting Africa: Contemporary Perspectives on Representation of Culture in Museums."

representations of particular cultures. They were also a sign of European mastery over the world. While colonialism was important for scientific advances, which dominated in the development of European museums, scientific discoveries must, however, be distinguished from looting, the spoils of war, and the criminal smuggling of objects. Meanwhile, stolen objects are more likely to be easily returned than those that were obtained through a colonial situation that allowed for the transfer of cultural and other objects from colonies to the colonial metropolitan centre.

The call, therefore, is for a new museum, a cultural hub that is a local as well as a universal resource. This is a museum of accessibility that focuses on communities of provenance and co-interpretation and where all community groupings, including women, youth, and the disabled, are represented equally. This calls for a museology of diasporic cooperation that crosses continents. There is also a call for innovative strategies and exchange in good practice by heritage managers under this new museology.[873] The concluding proposal by this study is therefore, to consider both options of sharing and restitution. Collaboration, sharing and restitution should be addressed as key important historical options because the two have a bearing on one another. They determine the future of African heritage in the diaspora. The representational role played by museum objects after co-curation becomes a source of pride for communities of origin. It is also the role of the museum to advice governments about the rights of indigenous people and about the need to take them on board when formulating laws that govern the management of their heritage. Hence co-curation is not only about curators from the global North and South, but also about communities of provenance.[874] It is important to note that objects have evolved from being dead relics or exotic curiosities to being live entities that "provoke debates, contestation, conflict, reconciliation, collaborations and reciprocal knowledge production".[875]

The main contribution of this study is to have addressed the case of Botswana in issues of the migration of cultural property, restitution, and conversations on collaboration. The thesis also contributed to museum studies by proposing best practices in museums and made proposals for the sort of new museum that is needed to address the contemporary situation of reappraisals, decolonisation, co-curation, collaboration, inclusivity and equal representation. This accounts

[873] Winani Thebele, "The Reinvention of the Museum into a Cultural Hub in the African Context," 40.
[874] Dan Hicks, The Brutish Museums, 2021
[875] Philipp Schorch, "Sensitive Heritage: Ethnographic Museum, Provenance Research and the Potentialities of Restitution," 3.

to a new museology. The study also brought to light the new museology that now deals with issues of human remains in a different way by considering local belief systems, provenance research, emphasising indigenous communities and their important role in museums.

This thesis conveyed a diversity of African and Northern viewpoints and provided empirical evidence for a new field of museological study. It is a contribution to rethinking museums today and a contribution to the discourse of decolonisation that is at the centre of discussions between European and African museum experts and scholars. It is therefore a contribution to the building of a critical museology in Africa and beyond.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abungu, George Okello. “Connected by History, Divided by Reality. Eliminating Suspicion and Promoting Cooperation between African and European Museums.” In *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe: A New Field for Museum Studies*, edited by Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere. transcript-Verlag, 2018.

African Information Services. *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*. Monthly Review Press, 1973.

AFRICOM Newsletter 8 (2009).

Alam, Shawkat, Jahid Hosaan Bhuiyan, Tarec M. R. Chowdnury and Erika J. Techera. *Handbook of International Environmental Law*. Routledge, London, 2012.

Allen, Stephen. “Transforming the National Museum of Scotland.” In *The Best in Heritage: 17th edition, Dubrovnk, Croatia, 26–28 September 2018*, edited by Luka Cipek. Zagreb: ICOM, 2018.

Alexander, Edward. *Museums in Motion: An Introduction to the History and Functions of Museums*. Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1997.

American Alliance of Museums. *Annual Meeting and Museum-Expo Gateways for Understanding: Diversity, Equity, Accessibility and Inclusion in Museums, St Louis, Missouri, 2017 May.*

Anderson, Jane and Molly Torsen. “Intellectual Property and the Safeguarding of Traditional Cultures: Legal Issues and Practical Options for Museums. Libraries and Archives.” Geneva: WIPO, 2012.

Anderson, Charles J. *Notes on Birds of Damaraland and the Adjacent Countries of South West Africa*. Edited by John H. Gurney. London: Taylor and Francis, 1873).

Anfruns, Julien. “Foreword,” *ICOM Newsletter* 63, no. 1 (2010).

Arvanities, Kostas and Louis Tythacott. *Museums and Restitution: New Practices, New Approaches*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2014.

Ashley, Susan. “Theoretical Approaches to Cultural Policy.” Unpublished, 2008.

Ayrault, Jean-Marc. “Human remains as inalienable possession found in French museums.” 2016.

Baker, Josephine and Count H. Kessler, “Disorganising the Mimesis of Mimesis and the Question of Parody.” In *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*. Edited by Michael Taussig. London: Psychology Press, 1993.

Banton, Michael (ed.). *A.S.A Monographs 1: The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*. Tavistock Publishers, 1968.

Barbier-Muller Museum. “Museum Returns Stolen Makonde Mask to the National Museum of Tanzania.” Geneva: Archival Platform Newsletters, 2010.

Bassani, Ezio, “Foreword” In *Collecting for the British Museum.* Malcolm McLeod. London: British Museum Press, 1993.

Baxandall, Michael. “Exhibiting Intention: Some Preconditions of the Visual Display of Culturally Purposeful Objects.” In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Edited by Ivan Karp and Stephen D. Lavine. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.

Benjamin, Richard. “The European Debate about the Decolonization of the Museum.” Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.

Bennett, Bruce. “Dead Bodies on Display: El Negro in Cross-Cultural Perspective.” *PULA: Botswana Journal of African Studies* 16, no. 1, (2002): 1

Bethencourt, Francisco. “Colonial Objects: Imposed, Appropriated and Exhibited.” *Historical Judgment* 1 (2019): 6–9.

Bhabha, Homi K. *Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences on Assimilation*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

“Birmingham Personal Papers by Willoughby.” Birmingham University, 2019.

Black, Wendy. “Human Remains and the Development of Policy in Southern Africa.” Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.

Black, Wendy. “The European Debate about the Decolonization of the Museum.” Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.

Black, Wendy, Catherine C. Cole, Winani Thebele, Morongwa N. Mosothwane, Rooksana Omar and Jeremy Silvester. “Who Were They? Repatriation and the Rehumanisation of Human Remains in Museums in Southern Africa.” In *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, edited by Viv Golding and Jen Walklate. London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019.

Botswana Daily News, 80 (2017): 3.

Botswana Daily News, 139 (2008, July 25): 3.

Botswana Daily News, 255 (2016).

Botswana Daily News. “Australian Gallery to Return Portrait Lost Under Nazis.” (2014, May).

Botswana Daily News. “El Negro Buried—5th October, 2000,” (2000): 2

Botswana Daily News. “Italy Police Recover Stolen painting.” 63 (2014): 2.

Botswana Daily News. “Judge differs a ruling on Berlin-Namibia Case.” 143 (2017, August 2): 26.

Botswana Daily News. “Libya Loses Historic Statue.” no. 210 (2014, 11 November): 17.

Botswana Daily News. “Pacific Cultural Heritage under Threat.” (2014, July 8): 29.

Botswana Daily News. “Syria’s Cultural Heritage in Peril from War and Looting.” (2014).

Botswana Government. “Botswana Economic Advisory Committee Document.” Gaborone: Botswana Government Printer, 2005.

Botswana Government. “Repatriation Document on El Negro.” Unpublished Paper. Gaborone, 2005.

Botswana Government Regulations Conveyance of Dead Bodies Act, Vol. XIV of 1933.

Botswana Monument and Relics Act of 1997.

Botswana National Museum. “African Landscapes and Heritage.” The Zebra’s Voice (1985).

Botswana National Museum. “The Migration of Cultural Property in Botswana.” The Zebra’s Voice (1985).

Botswana National Museum. *The Zebra’s Voice* 12, no. 2 (1985).

Botswana National Museum. “Workshop Report on Implementation of UNESCO’S 1970, 1954, 1995 UNIDROIT Conventions on Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Objects.” Lobatse: Botswana National Museum, 2019.

Botswana UNESCO Information Magazine (2000).

Botswana and UNESCO Information Magazine 9 (2010).

“Botswana Vision 2016 Council.” Gaborone: Web logic, 2016.

Braunholtz, Hermann J. *Sir Hans Sloane and Ethnography*. London: British Museum Press, 1970.

British Museum. Documentation records on Botswana & African Collections at the British Museum. London: British Museum, 2015.

Brodie, Neil. “The Internet Market in Antiquities.” In *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting the World’s Heritage*, edited by France Desmarais. Paris: ICOM, 2015.

Brumfield, Elizabeth M. “It’s a Material World: History, Artefacts and Anthropology.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 32, no. 1 (2003): 205–223.

Buchwald, Claudia. “Introduction.” Historical Judgment 1 (2019): 1.

Campbell, Alec. “The National Museum and Art Gallery: Remembering How it Started, the Early Years and the Initial Period After It Became a Government Department.” *Botswana Notes and Records* 44 (2012): 204–215. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43855574

Carabinieri, “Historical Calendar of the Carabinieri Corps”, *Yearly Calendar* 324/88 (1988).

Čeplak Mencin, Ralf. “The Role of the Museum Towards Immigrants and Refugees.” Unpublished paper presented at the *ICME Seminar during the ICOM General Conference at the Memorial Museum in Genova, Italy, July 2016*.

Chabenoi, P. “France Returns Stolen Cultural Objects.” *Africom Newsletter* (2009).

Chang, Ting. “Emile Guimet’s Network for Research and Collecting Asian Objects (ca. 1877–1918).” In Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets, edited by Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald. De Gruyter, 2018.

Charpy, Manuel. “Trading Places.” In *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets*, edited by Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald. De Gruyter, 2018.

Chichiri Museum. Documentation records for “David Livingstone Exhibition.” Blantyre: Chichiri Museum, 2015 October.

Chiwaura, Henry. “The Development of Formal Legislation and the Recognition of Traditional Customary Law in Zimbabwe’s Heritage Management.” In *Legal Frameworks for the Protection of Immovable Heritage in Africa*, edited by Webber Ndoro and Gilbert Pwiti. ICCROM conservation studies 5, 2005.

Cipek, Luka (ed.). *The Best in Heritage: 17th edition, Dubrovnk, Croatia, 26–28 September 2018*. Zagreb: ICOM, 2018.

Cirigliano, Michael. “Where Global History Meets the Metropolitan Museum.” in *The Best in Heritage: 17th edition, Dubrovnk, Croatia, 26–28 September 2018*, edited by Luka Cipek. Zagreb: ICOM, 2018.

Cole-King, P.A. “Kukumba Mbiri Mu Malawi.” *Publication Malawî Goverment Department of Antiquities* 15 (1973).

Cole-King, P.A. *The Livingstone Search Expedition, 1867*. Malawi: Government Press, 1968.

Collison, Nika. “Museums, Communities and Repatriation.” Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.

Comaroff, John L. and Jean Comaroff. *Of Revelation and Revolution: The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Cordeiro, Filipa and Rui Mourao. *Time of the Huacas*. Lisbon: Rough’Nough, 2018.

Costa, Alda. “Museums and Communities.” *ICOM Newsletter: What Museums for Africa* (2010).

Cummins, Alissandra. “Decolonised Museums and Indigenous People,” Unpublished paper presented at the Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial General Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June 2017*.

Curtin, Philip, Steven Feierman, Leonard Thompson, and Jan Vansina. *African History: From Earliest Times to Independence*. London: Longman, 1989.

Dahmali, Cherki. “African Looted Heritage is Not a Shared Heritage.” AFRICOM Newsletter (2018).

Dailoo, Shabnam and Karine Duhamel. “Indigenous People and Their Rights to Heritage.” Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.

Dalglesh, Darren. “Relations and Reconciliation at Edmonton.” in *The Best in Heritage: 17th edition, Dubrovnk, Croatia, 26–28 September 2018*, edited by Luka Cipek. Zagreb: ICOM, 2018.

Desmarais, France. *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting Heritage.* Paris: ICOM, 2015.

Desmarais, France. “Heritage in Danger.” *ICOM Newsletter* 61, no. 1, (2010): 14–21.

Eaton, Natasha. “Colonial Iconoclash.” In Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets, edited by Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald. De Gruyter, 2018.

Elginism, “Return of Egyptian artefacts from the Louvre to Egypt.” 2010. http://www.elginism.com/similar-cases/return-of-egyptian-artefacts-by-louvre-re-awakens-restitution-debate/20100101/2641/

Enga, Duncan. “Relations between the National Museum and Regional Museums in Botswana.” 2016.

Étienne, Noémie. “Transaction and Translation.” In *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets,* edited by Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald. De Gruyter, 2018.

Etienne, Noémie, Chonja Lee and Claire Brizon, “Global Provenance: Revisiting Appropriated Heritage in the Light of Inclusive Partnerships in Global Provenance.” Unpublished talk as part of *“The Exotic” exhibition at the Swiss National Science Federation on 28–29 January, 2021*.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks.* Translated by Charles L. Markham. London: Pluto Press, 1968.

Fine, Jonathan. “Obscure Objects of Desire.” In Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets, edited by Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald. De Gruyter, 2018.

Fisman, Raymond and Shang Jin Wei. “The Smuggling of Art, and the Art of Smuggling: Uncovering the Illicit Trade in Cultural Property and Antiquities.” *American Economic Journal* 1, (2009): 82–96.

Forbes, Hamish. *Meaning and Identity in a Greek Landscape (An Archaeological Ethnography)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Forrest, Craig. *International Law and the Practice of Cultural Property*. London: Routledge, 2012.

Francioni, Francesco and James Gordley (eds). *Enforcing International Cultural Heritage Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Fraser, Donald. *Africa Idylls*. London: Service & Co., 1925.

Fraser, Donald. *The Story of Our Mission—Livingstonia*. London: The United Free Church of Scotland, 1915.

Fraser, Donald. *The New Africa*. London: Edinburgh House Press, 1927.

Fraser, Donald. *Winning a Primitive People: Sixteen Years of Work Among the War-Like Tribes of the Ngoni, Senga and Tumbuka Peoples of Central Africa*. London: Seeley Service & Co, 2012.

Gabriel, Mille and Jens Dahl (eds.). *Utimut: Past Heritage— Future Partnerships, Discussions on Repatriation in the 21st Century*. IWGIA, 2008.

The Geological Survey Department. *Natural History Magazine* III, no. 19 (1931).

Gershevitch, Conrad. *Museums in Human Development: The Place of Museums in a Globalised and Transforming World*. Australia: Common Ground Publishing, 2014.

Geulen, Christian. “World Order and Racial Struggles. German Colonialism.” Berlin: Deutsches Historisches Museum, 2016.

Global Security.org. “Nigeria—Early History.” https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/nigeria/history-01.htm

Goeiman, S.-L. “Nama/Herero Lawsuit against Germany.” *Nama Cultural Festival* (n.d.).

Godelier, Maurice. *The Enigma of the Gift*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999.

Golding, Viv and Jen Walklate (eds.). *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*. London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019.

The Governor's Records. "Expeditions by British Museum Officials." Natural History Section, 1930.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Resonance and Wonder." In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, edited by Ivan Karp and Stephen D. Lavine. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.

Grimme, Gesa. "Systematic Provenance Research on Objects from Colonial Contexts." *Museum and Society* 18, no. 1 (2020): 52–65

Guntenaar, Floris. "Combat against Illicit Traffic." *MW2014; Museums and the Web 2014* (2014). https://mw2014.museumsandtheweb.com/paper/combat-against-illicit-traffic/

Handler, Richard (ed.) *History of Anthropology* (Volume II). Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.

Harris, Gareth. "What Restitution Experts Have to Say about President Macrons Pledge to Return African Artefacts." *The Art Newspaper* (2017, 29 November).

Hauser-Schaublin, Brigitta and Lyndel Prott (eds.). *Cultural Property and Contested Ownership: The Trafficking of Artifacts and Quest for The Restitution*. Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2016.

Hekman, Willem. "Introduction." In *A Handbook on Emergency Procedures* by ICOM'S International Committee for Museum Security (Paris: ICOM, 2010).

Hekman, Willem and Irina Kuznetsova. "The Art of Prevention." ICOM Newsletter (2010): 12–13.

Henrichsen, Dag. "Cape Cross? African Places—History and Stories." Historical *Judgment* 1 (2019): 20–21

Historical Judgment 1 (2019).

Hyde, Lewis. *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property*. New York: Vintage, 1983/2007.

ICOM. "Code of Ethics for Museums." Paris: ICOM, 2017.

ICOM. “Red List of West African Cultural Objects at Risk – Mali.” Paris: ICOM, 2012.

ICOM Newsletter 1 (2011).

AFRICOM Newsletter. “Chiefs Head Returns Home.” (2010).

ICOM Newsletter. “Culture as an Instrument for Communication,” (2017).

ICOM Newsletter. “Museum International.” (2017).

Interpol. “Connecting Police, Securing the World.” *Interpol Newsletter* (2018).

Iziko Museum. “Klaas and Trooi Pienaar.” (2017).

Iziko Museum of Social History. “Documentation Records of Botswana Collections at Iziko Museums.” Cape Town: Iziko Museums, 2015.

Iziko Slave Lodge Museums. “Information from Documentation Records on Botswana Collections.” Unpublished documents at Iziko Slave Lodge Museums, 2015.

Jacobs, Figmee. “The Involvement of the Community in Repatriation.” Unpublished paper presented at the *Human Remains Management and Repatriation Workshop, Cape Town, 13–14 February 2017*.

Jenkins, Tiffany. *Contesting Human Remains in Museum Collections: The Crisis of Cultural Authority*. (New York: Routledge, 2013).

Johannesburg Museum. “Documentation Records on Botswana Collections at Johannesburg Museum.” Johannesburg: Johannesburg Museum, 2015.

Jones, Philip. “Australian Ethnographica in European Collections.” In Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets, edited by Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald, 123–152. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.

Jones, Sheryl. “Museum as Agents of Change and Human Rights.” Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial General Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June 2017*.

Keitumetse, Susan. *African Cultural Heritage Conservation and Management: Theory and Practice from Southern Africa*. Switzerland: Springer, 2016.

Keitumetse, Susan. “Botswana National Museum, Addressing Policy through Research Collaboration.” Unpublished paper presented at a *Botswana National Museum Seminar (DNMM), Gaborone, 2009*.

Kipkorir, Daniel. “War Medallions Stolen.” *AFRICOM Newsletter* 8 (2009/10): 20–21.

Knell, Simon (ed.). “Altered Values: Searching for a New Collecting.” In *Museums and the Future of Collecting*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.

Labi, Kwame Amoah. “New Considerations in Afro-European Museum Cooperation in Africa. The Examples of PREMA and Other Initiatives in Ghana.” In *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe: A New Field for Museum Studies*, edited by Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere. transcript-Verlag, 2018.

Laely, Thomas, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere. *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe: A New Field for Museum Studies.* Bielefeld: transcript-Verlag, 2018.

Lagat, Kiprop. “The Hazina Exhibition. Challenges and Lessons for International Museum Collaboration.” In *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe: A New Field for Museum Studies*, edited by Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere. transcript-Verlag, 2018.

Laggat, M. “Indigenous People and Their Rights to Heritage.” Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.

Lagos National Museum. Museum Documentation on Colonial Collections. (Lagos: Lagos National Museum, 2015).

Laidlaw, James. “A Free Gift Makes no Friends,” *Journal of the Royal Anthropology Institute* 6, no. 4 (2000).

Law Revision Commissioner. *The Laws of Botswana, Vol. VIII 8.* Gaborone: Government Printer, 1968.

Legassick, Martin and Ciraj Rassool. *Skeletons in the Cupboards: South African Museums and The Trade in Human Remains 1907–1917*. Cape Town: South African Museum, 2000.

Lenz, Siegfried. *Heimat museum*. Berlin: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2006.

Lilje, Erna. “The museum researcher giving indigenous objects a voice of their own”, This Cambridge Life, 2018, https://medium.com/this-cambridge-life/the-museum-researcher-giving-indigenous-objects-a-voice-of-their-own-e54feb8bbe45

Mac Devitt, Aedin. “Heritage in Danger.” *ICOM Newsletter* 63 (2010).

Mac Devitt, Aedin. “High Stakes: Restitution Claims and Online Art Trading are Making the Case for Fresh Legislation.” *ICOM Newsletter* 64, no. 1 (2010).

Mac Devitt, Aedin. "*Safe Havens," ICOM Newsletter*.

Mac Devitt, Aedin. "Upholding the Law: An Overview of the Trends in Art and Museum Law Today." *ICOM News* 63, no. 1 (2010).

Mack, John. *Africa and its Cultures.* London: British Museum Press, 2000.

Mack, John. *Emil Torday and the Art of the Congo*. Washington: University of Washington Press, 1990).

Mackenzi, Ronnie, Paul Botha and Dirk Coetze. Documents records on Botswana meteorites in Germany. 2005.

Mafikeng Museum. "Documentation Records on Botswana Collections at Mafikeng Museum." Mafikeng: Mafikeng Museum, 2016.

Mainz, Annette R. *Contesting Human Remains in Museum Collections: The Crisis of Cultural Authority.* London: Routledge, n.d.

Manacorda, Stefano and Duncan Chappell. Crime in the Art and Antiquities World: Illegal Trafficking in Cultural Property. New York: Springer, 2011.

Marshall, Frank. "Heavy Metal Display in Botswana." Archival Giclee Print, National Museum of African Art, 2010.

Matthee, Marielle, Brigit Toebes and Marcel Brus (eds.). *Armed Conflict and International Law: In Search of the Human Face.* The Hague: Asser Press, 2013.

Matthes, Erich Hatala. "Repatriation and the Radical Redistribution of Art." *Ergo* 4, no. 32 (2017).

Mauss, Marcel. *Anthropology of The Gift Economy & Its Other*. London: Routledge, n.d.

Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift*. London: Routledge, 1925.

Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: Forms & Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies.* London: Routledge, 1954.

Mayor, Anne, Vincent Négri and Eric Huysecom (eds.). *African Memory in Danger*. Journal of African Archaeology Monograph Series 11, 2015.

McAvity, John. "The Importance of Copyright." *ICOM Newsletter* 67, No. 1–2 (2014).

McLeod, Malcolm. *Collecting for the British Museum.* London: British Museum Press, 1993.

McQuade, Joseph. "Colonialism was a Disaster and the Facts Prove It." *The Conversation*, 27 September, 2017. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/chicago_manual_17th_edition/cmos_formatting_and_style_guide/periodicals.html

Meskell, Lynn. *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies Material Worlds—A Series.* London: Duke University Press, 2009.

Merriam–Webster. "Colonialism." Com: Merriam–Webster, 2018.

Ministry of Youth Sport and Culture: National Museum. "Revised National Policy on Museum Development." Gaborone: Government Printer, 2008.

Mmutle, Mathlodi. "Protection of Cultural Heritage in Botswana." In Legal Frameworks for the Protection of Immovable Heritage in Africa, edited by Webber Ndoro and Gilbert Pwiti. ICCROM conservation studies 5, 2005.

Monteil, Karalyn and Vanessa Kredler. "UNESCO Empowers African Museums." *AFRICOM News* 8 (2010).

Moreetsi, Bogosi. "Countries May Demand the Return of Collections." *The Zebra's Voice* 26, no. 1 (1999).

Morton, Barry. *Pre-Colonial Botswana: An Annotated Bibliography and Guide to the Sources*. (Gaborone: Botswana Society, 1994).

Mosothwane, Morongwa "An Account of South African Human Skeleton Remains at Three North American Museum Collections." *South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series* 11 (2013): 27–34.

MUDEC Museum. "Documentation Information on African Collections at the MUDEC Museum of Culture." Milano: MUDEC, 2016 July.

Mudenda, George S. "Exhibiting Africa: Contemporary Perspectives on Representation of Culture in Museums." An unpublished paper presented at a *Colloquium, Osaka, Japan, 2012*.

Mudenda, George S. "Who Has the Right to Represent Whose Culture?" 2012.

Mudge, Emily. “Portuguese Explorers: A Brief History of Portugal Part 4.” Portugal.com. 2020. https://portugal.com/portugal-blogs/portuguese-explorers-a-brief-history-of-portugal-part-4.

Munjeri, Dawson. “Possibilities for Self-Financing of Museums.” *ICOM Newsletter: What Museums for Africa* (1992).

Museum and Society 18, no. 1 (2020).

Namhila, Ellen Ndeshi. “The Hendrik Witbooi Diaries: From War Booty to Memory of the World Treasure.” *Historical Judgment* 1 (2019): 17–19

Nanda, Serena. “South African Museums and the Creation of a New National Identity.” *American Anthropologist* 106, no. 2 (2004): 379-85.

Nandy, Ashis. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

National Reference Committee for the Ratification of UNESCO Conventions in Botswana. “An Unpublished Report on Community Awareness on UNESCO Conventions and the Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Property.” Gaborone: Botswana National Museum, 2014.

Ndobochani, Nonofho. “Incorporating Community Cultural Values in Archaeological Impact Assessment Process: A Case of Dikgatlhong Dam and Dukwi/Mowana Projects.” MPhil Thesis, University of Botswana, 2009.

Ndoro, Webber and Gilbert Pwiti (eds.). *Legal Frameworks for the Protection of Immovable Heritage in Africa*. ICCROM conservation studies 5, 2005.

Ndoro, Webber and Gilbert Pwiti (eds.). “Preface.” In Legal Frameworks for the Protection of Immovable Heritage in Africa. ICCROM conservation studies 5, 2005.

Nevadomsky, Joseph. “The Vigango Affair: The Enterprise Mijikenda Memorial Figures to Kenya.” *African Arts* 51, no. 2 (2018).

The New York Times. “The Return of African Objects.” (2010).

Nielsen, Carsten Viggo. “When Objects of Religious Significance Mediate Power.” In *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, edited by Viv Golding and Jen Walklate. London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019.

Nitulescu, Virgil Stefan (ed). *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019).

Nnabuife, Chuka. “France’s Return of Egyptian Artefacts Reawakes Repatriation Debate. Nigeria.” *Nigerian Compass* (2009, 22 December).

Noraksathaya. “Speech by Minister of Cambodia on the occasion of the repatriation the Hindu God’s head from a Museum in France.” Cambodia, 2016.

Nteta, Doreen. “The Museum Service in Botswana.” Research Essay, University of Zimbabwe, 1992.

Omar, Rooksana. “Proposal for Legal Protocols and Regional Cooperation.” Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June, 2017*.

Open Society Exhibition. Exhibition: “Facing the Past and Apology.” Turkey, 2014.

Oram, J.L. and Doreen Nteta. “National Museum Monuments and Art Gallery, Botswana Extension Project Consultancy Report.” Gaborone: Government Printer, 1984.

Osman, Suhali. Unpublished paper presented at *CAM Triennial General Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June 2017*.

Parsons, Neil. “A Hundred Years of Botswana Film and Filming. Botswana Notes and Records.” Gaborone: Botswana Notes and Records, 2006.

Parsons, Neil. “El Negro.” *The African Journal* (2002)

Parsons, Neil. “One body playing many parts—le Betjouana, El Negro, and il Bosquimano.” *PULA: Botswana Journal of African Studies* 16, no. 1 (2002): 19–29.

Parsons, Neil. “South African Origins of El Negro Near the Orange/Vaal Rivers, 1830.” Gaborone: University of Botswana, 2000.

Pecci, Anna Maria. “Refugees are in Front of Our Doors! Endeavours by the Slovene Ethnographic Museum towards the Deconstruction of Stereotypes and Prejudice.” In *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, edited by Viv Golding and Jen Walklate. London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019.

Peng, Ying-chen. “Shopping China in Europe.” In Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets, edited by Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald. De Gruyter, 2018.

Peters, Susanne (eds.). *Directory of Museums in Africa*. London: Kegan Paul International, 1990.

Petterson, Meagan. “Museums and Communities Today.” Unpublished paper presented at the *CAM Triennial General Meeting, Calgary, Canada, June 2017*.

Petterson, Orlando. *Slavery and Social Death*. Harvard University Press, 1982.

Pham, Chi Thien. “How Museums Identify and Face Challenges with Diverse Communities.” In *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, edited by Viv Golding and Jen Walklate. London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019.

Pickard, Rob and Council of Europe. *European Cultural Heritage: A Review of Policies and Practices*. London: Council of Europe, 2002.

Plakensteiner, Barbara. *Benin: Kings and Rituals: Court Arts from Nigeria*. Chicago: Chicago Press, 2008.

Prott, Lyndel V. *Witnesses to History: A Compendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects*. Paris: UNESCO, 2009.

Račič, Mojca and Ralf Čeplak Mencin. “Refugees are in Front of Our Doors! Endeavours by the Slovene Ethnographic Museum towards the Deconstruction of Stereotypes and Prejudice.” In *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations*, edited by Viv Golding and Jen Walklate. London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019.

Ramsay, G. “El Negro’s Origins as a Motlhaping.” Gaborone: Botswana Government, 2015.

Rassool, Ciraj. “Building a Critical Museology in Africa.” In *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe.* Edited by Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere. Bielefeld: transcript-Verlag, 2018.

Read, Margaret. *Children of Their Fathers: Growing Up Among the Ngoni of Nyasaland*. London: Meuthuen & Co., 1959.

Republic of South Africa. “Draft National Policy on the Repatriation and Restitution of Human Remains and Heritage Objects.” South Africa: Department of Arts and Culture, 2016.

Roldan-Alzate, Oscar. “Memory,” *Unofficial Guide to Carmo Museums: Chancay Collection*. https://sites.google.com/view/otempodashuacasenglish/about/guia/essays

Roodt, Christa and Bernadine Benson. “Databases for Stolen Art: Progress, Prospects and Limitations.” *South African Crime Quarterly* (2015): 52.

Rutherford, John. *Little Giant of Bechuanaland: A Biography of William Charles Willoughby*. Gaborone: Mmegi Publishing House, 2009.

SAMP, "Illicit Traffic and Security of Collections: Survey of SAMP Network." Stockholm: SAMP, 2008.

Sarr, Felwine and Bénédicte Savoy. "The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage: Towards a New Relational Ethics." Paris, 2018.

Savoy, Bénédicte and Charlotte Guichard. "Acquiring Cultures and Trading Value in a Global World." In *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets*, edited by Bénédicte Savoy, Charlotte Guichard and Christine Howald. De Gruyter, 2018.

Savoy, Bénédicte, Christine Howald, and Charlotte Guichard (eds). *Acquiring Cultures*: *Histories of World Art on Western Markets.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.

Schorch, Philipp. "Sensitive Heritage: Ethnographic Museum, Provenance Research and the Potentialities of Restitution." Museum and Society 18, no. 1 (2020): 1–5.

Scott, Joanne and Ross Laurie. "The Australian Agricultural Shows." *Week Newspaper* (1913, 22 August).

Seetelo, Mimi. "The Management of Human Remains and Development of Legislation in SA." Unpublished paper presented at the *Human Remains Management and Repatriation Workshop, Cape Town, 13–14 February 2017*.

Segobye, Alinah. "Missing bodies …." *Botswana Daily News,* 2005: 10–11.

Segobye, Alinah. "Missing Persons, Stolen Bodies an Issue of Patrimony: The El Negro Story." *PULA: Botswana Journal of African Studies* 16, no. 1 (2002), 13.

Scriba, Arnulf. "The European Curator's Perspective on Colonial Collections." in Reckoning with History, Steve Hochstadt, (2017).

Shepherd, Nick and Steven Robins (eds.). *New South African Key Words*. Ohio University Press, 2008.

Sheppard, Beverly. "Do Museums Make a Difference? Evaluating Programs for Social Change." *Curator: The Museum Journal* 43 (2000): 63-74. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2000.tb01159.x

Shershow, Scott. *The Work and The Gift*. University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Setlhabi, Keletso. “Developing a Collections Policy of the National Museum Monuments and Art Gallery of Botswana (NMMAG).” MA Thesis, Deakin University, 1999.

Shyllon, Folarin. “Return of Makonde Mask from Switzerland to Tanzania: A Righteous Conclusion?” *Art, Antiquity and Law* 16, no. 1 (2011).

Silvester, Jeremy. “Museum Objects, Memory and Identity in Namibia.” *Historical Judgment* 1 (2019): 22–24

Silvester, Jeremy. *Museum Association of Namibia Newsletter* (2000): 10–11.

Silvester, Jeremy. “Namibia Celebrates Heritage Week.” *Museums Matters* 23, no. 2 (2013).

Silvester, Jeremy. “Namibian Theme Selected for International Museums Day.” *Museum Matters – Newsletter* (2014).

Silvester, Jeremy. “The Africa Accessioned Network. ‘Museum Collections make Connections’ between Europe and Africa: A Case Study of Finland and Namibia.” In *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe: A New Field for Museum Studies*, edited by Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere. transcript-Verlag, 2018.

Silvester, Jeremy and Napandulwe Shiweda. “The Return of Sacred Stones of the Ovambo Kingdoms: Restitution and the Revision of the Past.” *Museum and Society* 18, no. 1 (2020): 30–39.

Simpson, St John. “Back to Kabul: Case Studies of Successful Collaboration.” In *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting the World’s Heritage*, edited by France Desmarais. Paris: ICOM, 2015.

Slapping, Joy and Claudia Augustat. “A Colonial Thing Booklet.” Vienna: Weltmuseum Wien, 2019.

Smith, Laurajane. “Class Heritage and the Negotiation of Place.” A paper presented at the *Missing Out on Heritage: Socio-Economic Status and Heritage Participation Conference, English Heritage, 2009.*

Smithers, R.H.N. “Report of Trustees for 1949.” Bulawayo: High Court, 1949.

Spring, Christopher. *Africa: Arms and Armour*. London: British Museum Press, 1993.

Stander, Reinnette. “In line with the National Heritage Council’s Position Paper on Repatriation of Heritage Resources.” Pretoria: DAC, 2011.

Stander, Reinette. “Legal Frameworks for the Management of Museums.” Unpublished paper presented at *the Human Remains Management and Repatriation Workshop, Cape Town, 13–14 February 2017*.

Stander, Reinnette. “National Policy on the Repatriation, Restitution of Human Remains and Objects.” Unpublished paper presented at *the Human Remains Management and Repatriation Workshop, Cape Town, 13–14 February 2017*.

Stevenson, Bryan. “Truth and Reconciliation: Using Cultural Spaces to Change the Narrative.” In *General Conference for The American Alliance of Museums: Annual Meeting & Museum-Expo, St Louis, May 2017*.

Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum. *German Colonialism: Fragments, Past and Present*. (Berlin, 2016).

Tamonda, Mthotha C. “The Cox Collection; Museums of Malawi and the Politics of Repatriation 1892–2016.” MA Thesis, University of Cape Town, 2016.

Tarnowski, Stanislas. “Salvaging Haiti’s Heritage.” *ICOM Newsletter* 63, no. 1 (2010).

Taussig, Michael. *Medicines Should Not be confused with Decoys. The Gift*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Taussig, Michael. *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*. London: Psychology Press, 1993.

Taussig, Michael. *Terror and the Colonial Mirror*. London: Routledge, 1987.

Taussig, Michael. *The Problem, in the Gift*, London: Routledge, 1993.

Taylor, Michael. “Life, Land and Power: Contesting Development in Northern Botswana.” PhD Thesis, University of Edinburg, 2001.

Testart, Alain. *Critique of the Gift: Studies on the Non-market Movement*. Paris: Amazon, 2006.

Thebele, Winani. “Current Status of Human Remains Collection in Botswana,” Unpublished paper presented at the *Human Remains Management and Repatriation Symposium, Iziko Museums, Cape Town, 13–14 February, 2017*.

Thebele, Winani. “The Reinvention of the Museum into a Cultural Hub in the African Context.” *Revista Muzeelor* 1, (2019).

Thebele-Kgwatalala, Winani. “The Evolution and Development of the Museum in Botswana towards a Heritage Institution.” MA Thesis, University of Botswana.

Thebele-Kgwatalala, Winani. “The Prevention and Fight against Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Goods, Case of Botswana.” Unpublished Paper Presented at a *UNESCO Work, Windhoek, 14–15th September, 2011*.

Thomas, Nicholas. *Colonialism’s Culture—Anthropology, Travel Culture and Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Togola, Tereba. “The Plight of Mali’s Past.” In *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?* edited by Kenji Yoshida and John Mack. Suffolk: James Currey, 2008.

Tsheboeng, Alfred. “Archaeology and Planning in Botswana.” MA thesis, Manchester University, 1991.

Turnbull, Paul. “International Repatriation of Indigenous Human Remains and its Complexities: The Australian Experience.” *Museums and Society* 18, no. 1 (2020): 6–18.

UNESCO. “Database of National Cultural Heritage Laws.” 2003. https://en.unesco.org/cultnatlaws/list

UNSECO. *Legal Practical Measures against Illicit Trafficking in Cultural Property, UNESCO Handbook.* Paris: UNESCO, 2006.

UNESCO and African Union. “Roads to Independence: The African Liberation Heritage Programme.” Unpublished paper. Tanzania: UNESCO and AU, 2010.

UNSECO Forum on Memory and Universality. “Museums, Memory and Universality.” In *Witnesses to History: A Compendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects*, edited by Lyndel V. Prott. Paris: UNESCO, 2009.

United Nations. “Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice: Report on the Fifteenth Session.” Geneva: UN, 2010.

United Nations. “Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilisation to the Convention on Bio-diversity.” Canada: UN, 2011.

United Nations. “United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People/United Nations for Indigenous People.” 2015.

https//www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeople/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP

United Nations. *Year Book of the United Nations.* Geneva: UN, 2006.

United States III of Public Law 97/446, Statute 2329 of 1982. (USA).

University of Botswana Seminar Presentation. "Views from the Discussions." Gaborone: University of Botswana, 2016.

Van Beurden, Jos. *Treasures in Trusted Hands: Negotiating the Future of Colonial Cultural Objects*. Leidon: Sidestone Press, 2017.

Vrdoljak, Ana. "International Law, Museum and the Return of Cultural Objects." In *Witnesses to History: A Compendium of Documents and Writings on The Return of Cultural Objects*, edited by Lyndel V. Prott. Paris: UNESCO, 2009.

Wanless, Ann. "The Fourie Collection of Khoisan Ethnographica: Forming an Archive." *Journal of African Studies* 36, no. 1 (2010).

Watson, Sheila. *Museums and their Communities*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Weiner, Annette. *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping While Giving*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Wessel, Gunther. "Dealers and Collectors, Provenances and Rights: Searching for Traces," in Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting the World's Heritage, edited by France Desmarais, 1–10. Paris: ICOM, 2015.

Whitehead, Christopher and Francesca Lanz. "Museums and a Progressive Sense of Place." In *Museums and Communities: Diversity, Dialogue and Collaboration in an Age of Migrations* edited by Viv Golding and Jen Walklate. London: Cambridge Scholars, 2019.

World Archaeological Congress, "World Archaeology Congress First Code of Ethics", (WAC: Venezuela, 1990).

Yoshida, Kenji. "Ethnographic Exhibitions Today." in *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?* edited by Kenji Yoshida and John Mack. Suffolk: James Currey, 2008.

Yoshida, Kenji and John Mack (ed.). *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?* Suffolk: James Currey, 2008.

Young, Cullen and Kamuzu B. Hasting (eds.). *Our African Way of Life*. Blantyre: Central African Limited, 1946.

Young, Cullen and Kamuzu B. Hasting (eds.). *Our African Way of Life*. Blantyre: Central African Limited, 2008. First published in 1946 by Central African Limited.

Young, Janet. "Partnership with Government and Community." Unpublished paper presented at the *Human Remains Management and Repatriation Workshop, Cape Town, 13–14 February 2017*.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1
A CASE PROCESSING SUMMARY FOR RESPONDENTS; GENDER, OCCUPATION, COUNTRY, YEAR

RESPONDENT	GENDER	OCCUPATION	LOCATION /COUNTRY	YEAR
1. Julie Hudson	F	Curator, British Museum	London/ UK	2015
2. Princess Modikwa	F	Ex-curator, Kgari Sechele Museum	Molepolole/ Botswana	2016
3. Oliver Ramatopi	M	Ex-curator, Supa Ngwao Museum	Francistown, Botswana	2016
4. Gase Kediseng	F	Curator, Khama Museum	Serowe, Botswana	2016
5. Holger Stoecker	M	Curator, Natural History Museum	Berlin/ Germany	2016
6. Alissandra Cummins	F	Director, Barbados National Museum	Barbados/Carribean	2017
7. Jonathan Fine	M	Curator, Staatliche Museum of Ethnography	Berlin, Germany	2015
8. Edith Ekunke	F	Director, National Commission of Museums	Lagos/ Nigeria	2015
9. Carol Kaufmann	F	Curator of Art, National Art Gallery, Iziko Museums	Cape Town	2015
10. Reinnette Stander	F	Deputy Director, Ministry of Culture	Pretoria	2017
11. Diana Hall	F	Curator, Museum Africa	Johannesburg /South Africa	2015
12. Imoesin Yona	M	Senior Archivist, National Archivist	Abuja/ Nigeria	2015
13. Thomas Laely	M	Director, Museum of Ethnography	Zurich, Switzerland	2016
14. Minin Alhaji Nagya	M	Deputy Director National Archives	Abuja/ Nigeria	2015
15. Jafaru Yunusa Dauda	M	Director of Research Planning & Publication, National Commission of Museums	Abuja/ Nigeria	2015
16. Richard Benjamin	M	Director, Museums of Liverpool	Liverpool/ UK	2017
17. Prof Kings Phiri	M	University professor	Mzuzu /Malawi	2015
18. Nonofo Mosesane	M	Chief curator, Botswana National Museum	Gaborone, Botswana	2017
19. Botho Modukanele	M	Senior curator, Botswana National Museum	Gaborone/ Botswana	2016

RESPONDENT	GENDER	OCCUPATION	LOCATION /COUNTRY	YEAR
20. Alinah Grant	F	Ex-Director, Phuthadikobo Museum	Oodi/Botswana	2016
21. Gaogakwe Phorano	M	Director, Botswana National Museum	Gaborone/Botswana	2015
22. Duncan Enga	M	Ex-curator, Nhabe Museum, District Council Member	Maun/ Botswana	2015
23. Peter Odey	M	Deputy Director, Nigerian Commission of Museums	Abuja/ Nigeria	2015
24. Phillip Segadika	M	Chief curator of Archaeology, Botswana National Museum	Gaborone/ Botswana	2017
25. Wendy Molnar	F	Director/Heritage Consultancy	Calgary/ Canada	2017
26. Mr Minin Alhaji Nagya	M	Deputy Director, National Library	Abuja / Nigeria	2015
27. Folarin Shyllon	M	Law professor, University of Ibadan	Ibadan / Nigeria	2015
28. Isa Jalo	M	Director, Federal Capital Territory Administration	Abuja / Nigeria	2015
29. R.S. Fish	M	Accountant & Board Member – Supa Ngwao Museum	Francistown / Botswana	2015
30. Keletso Setlhabi	F	Lecturer/University of Botswana	Gaborone / Botswana	2017
31. Desmond Phiri	M	Writer & Historian	Blantyre / Malawi	2015
32. M.G. Kumwenda	M	Ex-Director, National Museums of Malawi	Blantyre / Malawi	2015
33. Glyn Balkwil	M	Curator, Ditsong Museum of Cultural History	Pretoria/ SA	2015
34. Peter Hamil	M	Curator, British Museum	London / UK	2015
35. Lovemore Mazibuko	M	Ag. Director, National Museums of Malawi	Blantyre / Malawi	2015
36. Sandy Grant	M	Historian & Heritage Manager	Oodi/ Gaborone	2018
37. Arnulf Scriba	M	Curator, Special Exhibitions & Projects, Berlin Museum of History	Berlin / Germany	2016
38. Prince Adedoyin Shyllon	M	Art collector & lawyer	Lagos / Nigeria	2015
39. Manuela Bauche	F	Curator, Natural History Museum	Berlin / Germany	2016

RESPONDENT	GENDER	OCCUPATION	LOCATION /COUNTRY	YEAR
40. Inna Heumann	F	Curator, Natural History Museum	Berlin / Germany	2015
41. Roksana Omar	F	CEO, Iziko Museums	Cape Town /South Africa	2017
42. Flexon Mizinga	M	Executive Secretary, National Museums Board/Zambia	Lusaka/ Zambia	2017
43. Jeremy Silvester	M	Director for Projects Museum Association of Namibia	Windhoek/ Namibia	2016
44. Prof. Klaus Schneider	M	Director, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum in Cologne	Cologne/Germany	2016
45. Stephen Mogotsi	M	Deputy Director, Botswana National Museum	Gaborone/ Botswana	2016
46. Ms Regina Isaacs	F	Heritage Practitioner, South African Heritage and Research Agency	Cape Town/South Africa	2015
47. Barend Vd Merwe,	M	Heritage Practitioner, South African Heritage and Research Agency	Cape Town/SA	2015
48. Njabulo Chipangura	M	Post-Doctoral Research Fellow, Wits University	Johannesburg/South Africa	2017
49. Christine Mullen Kreamer	F	Interim Director & Senior curator, Smithsonian National Museum of Art	Washington DC/ USA	2017
50. Pam McClusky	F	Curator of African Pacific Art, Seattle Museum	Seattle/USA	2017
51. Rene OConnell	M	Image Archivist Denver Museum	Denver, USA	2018
52. Christine Howald	F	Berlin University of Technology	Berlin, Germany	2018
53. Godfrey Mahachi	M	General Director, National Museums of Zimbabwe	Harare/Zimbabwe	2015

APPENDIX 2
LISTS OF BOTSWANA COLLECTIONS AS PROVIDED BY MUSEUMS

Below are different lists provided by some museums and it is only meant to give proof of the existence of Botswana's collections outside its boundaries. It is not in any way representative of what certain countries hold from Botswana in their different museums. In certain cases, such as South Africa, Germany only one museum has volunteered while a dozen other museums still hold collections from Botswana. There is therefore, still need for a more detail enquiry as to what collections exist from Botswana in the many museums of any given country.

List of Objects from Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum, Cologne/Germany

Invnr	Total No. of Objects	Konvolut Nr	Objekt Bezeichnung	Ethnie	Aktueller Staats Name	Best Pruef Vorh	Vorb Name	Vorb Vorname
44566	1.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44568	2.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44569	3.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44574	4.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44576	5.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44577	6.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
45995	7.	195610	Tier	Tswana	Botswana	J	Wellcome Historical Medical Museum	
62717	8.	200635	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J		
62718	9.	200635	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J		
62719	10.	200635	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J		
62775	11.	200635	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J		
44567	12.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
9224	13.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9232	14.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9187	15.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9211	16.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
44558	17.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44575	18.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
9206	19.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9261	20.	189901	Hüftschnur	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9030	21.	189901	Kopfbank	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele

Invnr	Total No. of Objects	Konvolut Nr	Objekt Bezeichnung	Ethnie	Aktueller Staats Name	Best Pruef Vorh	Vorb Name	Vorb Vorname
9032	22.	189901	Kopfbank	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9033	23.	189901	Kopfbank	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9045	24.	189901	Schöpfkelle	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9047	25.	189901	Doppelgefäß	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9239	26.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9241	27.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9242	28.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9243	29.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9244	30.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9246	31.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9238	32.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9254	33.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9255	34.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9259	35.	189901	Hüftschnur	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9260	36.	189901	Hüftschnur	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9219	37.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9220	38.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9221	39.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9222	40.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9223	41.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9225	42.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9227	43.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9228	44.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9229	45.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9230	46.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9233	47.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9234	48.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9235	49.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9237	50.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9166	51.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9168	52.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9170	53.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9172	54.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele

Invnr	Total No. of Objects	Konvolut Nr	Objekt Bezeichnung	Ethnie	Aktueller Staats Name	Best Pruef Vorh	Vorb Name	Vorb Vorname
9175	55.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9182	56.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9184	57.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9185	58.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9186	59.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9189	60.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9190	61.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9194	62.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9198	63.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9199	64.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9200	65.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9201	66.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9202	67.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9203	68.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9204	69.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9205	70.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9214	71.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9215	72.	189901	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9216	73.	189901	Fußring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
9218	74.	189901	Fußring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Rautenstrauch	Eugen und Adele
22276	75.	190801	Puppe	Tswana-Ngwato	Botswana	J	Oldman	William Ockelford
26371	76.	191105	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Küppers	Josefine
26372	77.	191105	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Küppers	Josefine
44559	78.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44560	79.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44561	80.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44562	81.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44563	82.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44564	83.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe
44565	84.	194202	Armring	Tswana	Botswana	J	Schellig	Phöbe

List of Object from the National Museum of Scotland (UK)

Weaponry: battle-axe, throwing club, dagger, spear, and knobkerrie

Adornment: hair ornaments of fur, copper, brass, wire and elephant hair bracelets, ostrich shell, glass trade beads

Dress: hide and bead girdle

Carved wood: spoon, double linked headrest

List of Objects at the Banyoles Museum in Spain Which Were Part of the El Negro Display

The remaining known objects are a *spear, bow* and *arrow.* There could also be more; subject to further investigation.

List of Objects from the International Slavery Museum/Museums of Liverpool

Baskets, wooden spoons, San quivers, various parts of Nharo hunting kits donated by Jane Taylor. Some of the stuff is on display at the International Museum of Slavery *(refer to LIV.2005.29. 1–13 series)*

List of Objects at the Seattle Museum/USA.

A big Karros, 20 Tswana baskets, two aprons (skirts of hides and beads), 1 Herero doll and a sansa instrument that is tentatively attributed

List of Botswana Objects from the British Museum

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1886,1111.1/PRN: EAF31353	Rock painting.	Purchased from: C D Webb Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Zimbabwe	Acquired in 1886
Af1892,0714.23/PRN: EAF32186	Nose scraper made of iron, hide.	Tswana Donated by: James Theodore Bent	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1892
Af1892,0714.23/PRN: EAF32186	Nose scraper made of iron, hide.	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: James Theodore Bent	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana.	Acquired in 1892
Af1892,0714.153/PRN: EAF32356	Wood headrest with three rounded supports	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: James Theodore Bent	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana. Made in Zimbabwe	Acquired in 1892
Af1897, -.5.a-j/PRN: EAF33397 additional ID: Af1897C3.5a (old CDMS no.)	Quiver (with strap) made of bark, skin, sinew, leather (a) with nine arrows made out of various combinations of reed, sinew, bone and wood (b-j).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897, -.5.a-j/PRN: EAF33397 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5a (old CDMS no.)	Quiver (with strap) made of bark, skin, sinew, leather (a) with nine arrows made out of various combinations of reed, sinew, bone and wood (b-j).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897, -.5.a-j/PRN: EAF3339 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5a (old CDMS no.)	Quiver (with strap) made of bark, skin, sinew, leather (a) with nine arrows made out of various combinations of reed, sinew, bone and wood (b-j).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897, -.5.a-j/PRN: EAF33397 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5a (old CDMS no.)	Quiver (with strap) made of bark, skin, sinew, leather (a) with nine arrows made out of various combinations of reed, sinew, bone and wood (b-j).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1897, -.5.a-j/PRN: EAF33397 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5a (old CDMS no.)	Quiver (with strap) made of bark, skin, sinew, leather (a) with nine arrows made out of various combinations of reed, sinew, bone and wood (b-j).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897,-.5.a-j/PRN: EAF33397 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5a (old CDMS no.)	Quiver (with strap) made of bark, skin, sinew, leather (a) with nine arrows made out of various combinations of reed, sinew, bone and wood (b-j).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897, -.5.b/PRN: EAF33399 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5b: b (old CDMS no.)	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of reed, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897, -.5.b/PRN: EAF33398 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5b: a (old CDMS no.)	Arrowhead (with fore-shaft) made of bone, reed, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897, -.5.c/PRN**:** EAF33401 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5c: b (old CDMS no.)	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of reed, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by**:** Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897-5.c/PRN**:** EAF33401 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5c: b (old CDMS no.)	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of reed, sinew.		Found/Acquired**:** South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897-5.c/PRN**:** EAF33400 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5c: a (old CDMS no.)	Arrowhead (with fore-shaft) made of bone, reed, sinew.	Ethnic group**:** San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name**:** Christy Collection	Found/Acquired**:** South Africa, Namibia Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897-5.d-f/PRN**:** EAF33402 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5d-f (old CDMS no.)	Arrow made of bone, reed, sinew	Ethnic group: San Donated by**:** Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks	Found/Acquired**:** South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
		Collection name**:** Christy Collection		
Af1897-5.g/ PRN**:** EAF33404 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5g: b (old CDMS no.)	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of reed, sinew.	Ethnic group**:** San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired**:** South Africa Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897-5g/ PRN**:** EAF33403 Additional ID**:** Af1897C3.5g: a (old CDMS no.)	Arrow fore-shaft, made of bone.	Ethnic group**:** San Donated by**:** Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired**:** South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897-5.h/PRN**:** EAF33406 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5h: b (old CDMS no.)	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of reed, sinew	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897-5.h/PRN**:** EAF33405 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5h: a (old CDMS no.)	Arrowhead made of bone.	Ethnic group**:** San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name**:** Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897-5.i/PRN: EAF33408' Additional ID**:** Af1897C3.5i: b (old CDMS no.)	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of reed, sinew.	Ethnic group**:** San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1897-5.i/PRN**:** EAF33407 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5i: a (old CDMS no.)	Arrowhead made of bone.	Ethnic group**:** San Donated by**:** Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1897-5.j/PRN: EAF33409 Additional ID: Af1897C3.5j (old CDMS no.)	Arrow made of wood, reed, sinew	Ethnic group**:** San Donated by: Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1897
Af1903,0316.3/PRN: EAF34708	Male figure (sitting)	Made of plaster. Purchased from**:** Mrs. Rosa Holus	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1903
Af1904,1216.1. a/PRN: EAF35016 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2796 Additional ID: Af1973Q1.413	Quiver (with cap); made of wood; hollowed-out cylinder of wood with fur cap on one end; sinew wrapped around outside.	Ethnic group**:** Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.b/PRN: EAF35017 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1421 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2971	Arrow shaft (with fore-shaft), arrow shaft (with fore-shaft) made of reed, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group**:** Tswana Donated by**:** Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.c/PRN: EAF35018 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1421 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2971	Arrow shaft (with fore-shaft), arrow shaft (with fore-shaft) made of reed, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group**:** Tswana Donated by**:** Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.d/PRN: EAF35020 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1421 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2971	Arrow shaft (with removable fore-shaft), arrow shaft made of reed, sinew; fore-shaft made of bone.	Ethnic group**:** Tswana Donated by**:** Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.e/PRN: EAF35021 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1425 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2970	Poisoned incomplete arrow made of reed, sinew, bone.	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.f/PRN: EAF35022 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1425 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2970	Poisoned fore-shaft arrowhead made of reed, sinew, bone.	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.g/PRN: EAF35023 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1425 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2970	Incomplete arrowhead made of thorn (?), sinew, bone.	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.h/PRN: EAF35024 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1424 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2973	Arrow with bone triangular head, long tang, bone fore-shaft tanged, pale jointed reed shaft bound with	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
	sinew, nocked. Spotted regularly with viscous yellow material.			
Af1904,1216.1.i/PRN: EAF35025 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1424 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2973	Poisoned? with fore-shaft arrowhead made of sinew, bone	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.j/PRN: EAF35026 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1424 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2973	Arrow with bone triangular head, long tang, bone fore-shaft tanged, pale jointed reed shaft bound with sinew, nocked. Spotted regularly with viscous yellow material.	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.k/PRN: EAF35027 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1424 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2973	Poisoned? with fore-shaft arrowhead made of bone	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.l/PRN: EAF35028 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1424 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2973	Poisoned arrowhead (with fore-shaft) made of wood, thorn (?), stone (?), sinew.	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1904,1216.1.m/PRN: EAF35029 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1424 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2973	Poisoned? with fore-shaft arrowhead made of iron, bone, sinew.	release to Collection Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1910,-.125/PRN: EAF39180 Additional ID: Af1910C3.125 (old CDMS no.)	Hat made of web (spider's), twig, twine (vegetable fibre), feathers (ostrich?).	Ethnic group: Sarwa/San Donated by: R B Woosnam Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.126/PRN: EAF39181 Additional ID: Af1910C3.126 (old CDMS no.)	Hat (with loop) made of spider's web (?), seed (grass), fibre (vegetable), textile (cotton), and feather (ostrich?).	Ethnic group: Sarwa/San Donated by: R B Woosnam Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.127/PRN: EAF39182 Additional ID: Af1910C3.127 (old CDMS no.)	Sample of soap made of dung (?), fibre (vegetable).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: R B Woosnam	Found/Acquired: Ngami, Lake in Botswana	Acquired in 1910

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
		Collection name: Christy Collection		
Af1910, -.128.a/PRN: EAF39183 Additional ID: Af1910C3.128a (old CDMS no.)	Dagger made of iron, wood	Donated by: R B Woosnam Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Lake Ngami/ Botswana	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.128.b/PRN: EAF39184 Additional ID: Af1910C3.128b (old CDMS no.)	Sheath made of wood.	Donated by: R B Woosnam Collection name: Christy Collection Acquired in 1910	Found/Acquired: Lake Ngami/Botswana	
Af1910, -.129.a/PRN: EAF39185 Additional ID: Af1910C3.129a (old CDMS no.)	Dagger made of iron, wood.	Donated by: R B Woosnam Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Lake Ngami, Botswana, (north of)	Acquired in 1910
Af1910, -.129.b/PRN: EAF39186 Additional ID: Af1910C3.129b (old CDMS no.)	Sheath made of wood.	Donated by: R B Woosnam Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Lake Ngami/Botswana, (north of)	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.130/PRN: EAF39187 Additional ID: Af1910C3.130 (old CDMS no.)	Female figure (with skirt) made of wood, string, beads, cloth	Donated by: R B Woosnam Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Lake Ngami/Botswana	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.130/PRN: EAF39187 Additional ID: Af1910C3.130 (old CDMS no.)	Female figure (with skirt) made of wood, string, beads, cloth.	Donated by: R B Woosnam Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired Botswana/Lake Ngami (north of)	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.227/PRN: EAF39190 Additional ID: Af1910C3.227 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood, leaf.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.228/PRN: EAF39191 Additional ID: Af1910C3.228 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood, cane.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.229/PRN: EAF122657	Comb made of wood, cane.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Additional ID: Af1910C3.229 (old CDMS no.)				
Af1910,-.230/PRN: EAF122658 Additional ID: Af1910C3.230 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood, cane.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.231/PRN: EAF39192 Additional ID: Af1910C3.231 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.232/PRN: EAF122659 Additional ID: Af1910C3.232 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.233/PRN: EAF122660 Additional ID: Af1910C3.233 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.234/PRN: EAF122661 Additional ID: Af1910C3.234 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.235/PRN: EAF122662 Additional ID: Af1910C3.235 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.236PRN: / Additional ID: Af1910C3.236 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood, wire (brass).	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.237/PRN: EAF39194 Additional ID: Af1910C3.237 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.238/PRN: EAF122663 Additional ID: Af1910C3.238 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1910,-.239/PRN: EAF122664 Additional ID: Af1910C3.239 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.240/PRN: EAF122665 Additional ID: Af1910C3.240 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.241/PRN: EAF122666 Additional ID: Af1910C3.241 (old CDMS no.)	Comb made of wood.	Donated by: H W Garbutt Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.359/PRN: EAF39207 Additional ID: Af1910C3.359 (old CDMS no.)	Digging stick (with weight), carved of wood; stick of wood carved to point at one end; stick inserted through hole carved in stone; stone tied to stick with vegetable fibre string.	Ethnic group: San Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa, Namibia	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.362/PRN: EAF39212 Additional ID: Af1910C3.362 (old CDMS no.)	Tripod vessel made of wood.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.363/PRN: EAF39213 Additional ID: Af1910C3.363 (old CDMS no.)	Container, water-vessel (?), with engraved zig-zag line decoration, made of ostrich egg shell, mounted on metal tripod.	Ethnic group: San Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana, Namibia	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.364/PRN: EAF39216 Additional ID: Af1910C3.364c (old CDMS no.)	Waist ornament (for woman) made of beads (ostrich eggshell), beads (leather), leather, cord fibre	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910, -.364.a/PRN: EAF39214 Additional ID: Af1910C3.364a (old CDMS no.)	Waist ornament made of beads (ostrich egg shell), cord (fibre).	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1910,-.364.b/PRN: EAF39215 Additional ID: Af1910C3.364b (old CDMS no.)	Ornament, [waist-band], made of beads (ostrich eggshell), cord (fibre), beads (iron), leather.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1910
Af1910, -.378.a/PRN: EAF39228 Additional ID: Af1910C3.378a (old CDMS no.)	Snuffbox made of wood.	Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910, -.378.b/PRN: EAF39229 Additional ID: Af1910C3.378b (old CDMS no.)	Snuff spoon, snuff spoon made of bone	Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910, -.380.a/PRN: EAF39232 Additional ID: Af1910C3.380a (old CDMS no.)	Knife made of iron, bone.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910, -.380.b/PRN: EAF39233 Additional ID: Af1910C3.380b (old CDMS no.)	Sheath made of wood, skin.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1910
Af1910, -.382.a/PRN: EAF39236 Additional ID: Af1910C3.382a (old CDMS no.)	Pin (?), needle (?) made of iron.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910, -.382.b/PRN: EAF39237 Additional ID: Af1910C3.382b (old CDMS no.)	Case made of string.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910, -.383.a/PRN: EAF39238 Additional ID: Af1910C3.383a (old CDMS no.)	Pin (?), needle (?) made of iron.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
		Collection name: Christy Collection		
Af1910, -.383.b/PRN: EAF39239 Additional ID: Af1910C3.383b (old CDMS no.)	Case made of string.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910-384.a/PRN: EAF39240 Additional ID: Af1910C3.384a (old CDMS no.) Additional ID: Af1910C3.384 Additional ID: 78	Snuffbox (with human head and loop) made of ivory, wood, leather.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collected by: Moffat Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.386/PRN: EAF39242 Additional ID: Af1910C3.386 (old CDMS no.)	Box (for grease) made of bone, leather.	Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.398/PRN: EAF39254 Additional ID: Af1910C3.398 (old CDMS no.)	Cap, dance headdress made of bristles (porcupine), leather.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.407/PRN: EAF39263 Additional ID: Af1910C3.407 (old CDMS no.)	Sandal (left foot) made of leather.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.408/PRN: EAF39264 Additional ID: Af1910C3.408 (old CDMS no.)	Charm made of cane, string, gourd, beads (glass), and buttons, hide.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.413/PRN: EAF39269 Additional ID: Af1910C3.413 (old CDMS no.)	Axe made of iron, wood.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1910,-.414/PRN: EAF39270 Additional ID: Af1910C3.414 (old CDMS no.)	Axe made of iron, wood.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.415/PRN: EAF39271 Additional ID: Af1910C3.415 (old CDMS no.)	Axe made of iron, wood.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.416/PRN: EAF39272 Additional ID: Af1910C3.416 (old CDMS no.)	Adze blade (?), axe blade (?) made of iron.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910, -.417.a-b/PRN: EAF39273 Additional ID: Af1910C3.417a-b (old CDMS no.)	Fire stick made of wood.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.422/PRN: EAF39280 Additional ID: Af1910C3.422 (old CDMS no.)	Spoon made of grass, hair (elephant).	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,-.423/PRN: EAF39281 Additional ID: Af1910C3.423 (old CDMS no.)	Milk vessel made of earthenware, pottery.	Purchased from: London Missionary Society Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,1005.81/PRN: EAF39020 Additional ID: 18 (Collector's Collection number)	Bowl made of wood.	Ethnic group: Tswana. Donated by: Sir Bartle Frere	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	Acquired in 1910
Af1910,1005.91/PRN: EAF39029 Additional ID: 36 (Collector's)	Pigment made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Sir Bartle Frere	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1910

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1911,-.22/PRN: EAF39449 Additional ID: Af1911C3.22 (old CDMS no.)	Club made of wood, wire (brass).	Donated by: Maj G H Grant. Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1911
Af1914, Loan 01.39/PRN: EAF40088 Additional ID: Af1914L1.39 (old CDMS no.)	Axe.	Ethnic group: Tswana. On loan from: Royal Armories Collection name: Tower Loan	Found/Acquired: South Africa Botswana	Acquired in 1914
Af1915, -.6.a/PRN: EAF40176 Additional ID: Af1915C3.6a (old CDMS no.) Additional ID: Aft????D14.196b (?)	Arrowhead (with fore-shaft, poisoned) made of iron (?), bone (?), cane (?), sinew (?), quill (?).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Capt. Alfred Walter Francis Fuller Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1915
Af1915, -.6.b/PRN: EAF40177 Additional ID: Af1915C3.6b (old CDMS no.).	Arrow shaft (with fore-shaft), made of reed, bone & sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Capt. Alfred Walter Francis Fuller Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1915
Af1915, -.7.a/PRN: EAF40178 Additional ID: Af1915C3.7a (old CDMS no.)	Arrowhead (with fore-shaft) made of cane, bone, sinew (?), stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Capt. Alfred Walter Francis Fuller Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1915
Af1915, -.7.b/PRN: EAF40179 Additional ID: Af1915C3.7b (old CDMS no.)	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of reed, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Capt. Alfred Walter Francis Fuller Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1915
Af1919,1118.9/PRN: EAF40392	Beer strainer made of cane.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: Rev Neville Jones	Found/Acquired: South Africa Botswana Zimbabwe	Acquired in 1919
Af1919,1118.9/PRN: EAF40392	Beer strainer made of cane.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: Rev Neville Jones	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana Zimbabwe	Acquired in 1919
Af1919,1118.14/PRN: EAF40396	Model animal (dog?), toy made of clay.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: Rev Neville Jones	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1919

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1919,1118.15-17/PRN: EAF40397	Toy quadruped made of clay.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: Rev Neville Jones	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1919
Af1919,1118.18/PRN: EAF40398	Toy sheep made of clay.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: Rev Neville Jones	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1919
Af1919,1118.19-21/PRN: EAF40399	Toy ox made of clay.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: Rev Neville Jones	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1919
Af1919,1118.22/PRN: EAF40400	Model ram (used as toy) made of clay.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: Rev Neville Jones	Found/Acquired: South Africa Botswana	Acquired in 1919
Af1921,1014.175/PRN: EAF40628	Whistle made of bone, string (vegetable fibre).	Purchased from: Yorkshire Philosophical Society Museum	Found/Acquired: South Africa Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1921
Af1926,0210.1/PRN: EAF41656	Cloak made of hide (ox).	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: T Starke	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/ Bechuanaland, South Africa	Acquired in 1926
Af1926,0210.2/PRN: EAF41657	Girl's girdle made of skin.	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: T Starke	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert South Africa Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1926
Af1927,-.55/PRN: EAF42101 Additional ID: Af1927C3.55 (old CDMS no.)	Model, cooking pot made of pottery.	Donated by: C Foster Carr. name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1927
Af1927,-.56/PRN: EAF42102 Additional ID: Af1927C3.56 (old CDMS no.)	Model, cooking pot made of pottery.	Donated by: C Foster Carr, name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1927
Af1927, -.57.a/PRN: EAF42103 Additional ID: Af1927C3.57a (old CDMS no.)	Warrior figure made of wood, feathers.	Donated by: C Foster Carr. name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1927
Af1927,-.57.b/PRN: EAF42104 Additional ID: Af1927C3.57b (old CDMS no.)	Model shield (for warrior figure) made of wood.	Donated by: C Foster Carr. name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1927

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1927-57.c/PRN: EAF42105 Additional ID: Af1927C3.57c (old CDMS no.)	Model spear (for warrior figure) made of wood.	Donated by: C Foster Carr. name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1927
Af1927-57.d/PRN: EAF42106 Additional ID: Af1927C3.57d (old CDMS no.)	Model spear (for warrior figure) made of wood.	Donated by: C Foster Carr. name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1927
Af1927-58.a-b/PRN: EAF42107 Additional ID: Af1927C3.58a-b (old CDMS no.)	Guinea-fowl figures (pair of), part of model made of wood.	Donated by: C Foster Carr. name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1927
Af1927-58.c-d/PRN: EAF42108 Additional ID: Af1927C3.58c-d (old CDMS no.)	Pegs (pair of), part of model made of wood.	Donated by: C Foster Carr. name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1927
Af1904,1216.1.l/PRN: EAF35028 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1424 Additional ID: Af1979A1.2973	Poisoned arrowhead (with fore-shaft) made of wood, thorn (?), stone (?), sinew.	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Miss I Wratislaw	Found/Acquired: South Africa Botswana	Acquired in 1904
Af1927, -.58.e/PRN: EAF42109 Additional ID: Af1927C3.58e (old CDMS no.)	Base, part of model made of wood.	Donated by: C Foster Carr. Collection name: Christy Collection	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland	Acquired in 1927
Af1928,1106.1/PRN: EAF42451	Digging stick weight, digging stick weight made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss L Frere, Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928
Af1928,1106.2/PRN: EAF42452	Digging stick weight, digging stick weight made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss L Frere, Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928
Af1928,1106.3/PRN: EAF42453	Digging stick weight, digging stick weight made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss L Frere Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1928,1106.4/PRN: EAF42454	Digging stick weight, digging stick weight made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss L Frere Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928
Af1928,1106.5/PRN: EAF42455	Digging stick weight made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss L Frere, Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928
Af1928,1106.7/PRN: EAF42457	Pestle made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss L Frere, Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928
Af1928,1106.8/PRN: EAF4245	Pestle made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss L Frere, Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928
Af1928,1106.10/PRN: EAF42461	Flake made of glass.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss L Frere, Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928
Af1928,1106.11/PRN: EAF42462	Flake made of stone (shale).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss L Frere, Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928
Af1928,1106.12/PRN: EAF42463	Flake made of stone (shale).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss L Frere, Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928
Af1928,1106.13/PRN: EAF42464	Scraper made of stone (shale).	Ethnic group: San. Donated by: Miss Frere, Collected by: Lady Catherine Frere	Found/Acquired: Namibia South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1928
Af1929,0508.2/PRN: EAF42527	Arrow made of cane, bone, iron, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Hermann Justus Braunholtz	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert Botswana, Namibia, South Africa	Acquired in 1929

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1929,0508.2/PRN: EAF42527	Arrow made of cane, bone, iron, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Hermann Justus Braunholtz	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/ Botswana, Namibia South Africa	Acquired in 1929
Af1929,0508.3/PRN: EAF42528	Arrow made of cane, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Hermann Justus Braunholtz	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/Botswana, Namibia, South Africa	Acquired in 1929
Af1929,0508.5/PRN: EAF42530	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of cane, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Hermann Justus Braunholtz	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/ Botswana, Namibia, South Africa	Acquired in 1929
Af1929,0508.4/PRN: EAF	Poisoned? Arrow made of cane, bone, sinew, gum (?).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Hermann Justus Braunholtz	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/ Botswana, Namibia South Africa	Acquired in 1929
Af1930,0120.18.a/PRN: EAF42946	Poisoned arrowhead made of reed, sinew, bone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss Maria Wilman	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/ Botswana, Namibia, South Africa	Acquired in 1930
Af1930,0120.18.b/PRN: EAF42947	Arrow shaft, made of reed sinew, wood	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss Maria Wilman	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/ Botswana, Namibia, South Africa	Acquired in 1930
Af1930,0120.19.a-c/PRN: EAF42948	Poisoned arrowhead made of reed, sinew, bone [a], arrow fore-shaft made of bone [b], arrow shaft made of reed, sinew [c].	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss Maria Wilman	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/Botswana, Namibia, South Africa	Acquired in 1930
Af1930,0120.20.a-c/PRN: EAF42951	Poisoned arrowhead made of reed, sinew, bone [a], arrow shaft made of reed, sinew, wood [b], arrow shaft made of reed.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss Maria Wilman	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/ Botswana, Namibia, South Africa	Acquired in 1930
Af1930,0120.21.a-b/PRN: EAF42954 Additional ID: Af1930,0120.21.b (former part number)	Poisoned arrowhead made of reed, sinew, bone (a), with arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of reed, sinew, wood (b).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss Maria Wilman	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/ Botswana, Namibia, South Africa	Acquired in 1930
Af1930,0120.21.b/PRN: EAF42955	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of reed, sinew, wood.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Miss Maria Wilman	Found/Acquired: Kalahari Desert/ Botswana, Namibia, South Africa	Acquired in 1930

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1930,0128.65/PRN: EAF43072	Necklace made of seeds, beads.	Donated by: Hermann Justus Braunholtz Donated by: Hermann Justus Braunholtz	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/South East District, Botswana	Acquired in 1930
Af1931,1110.1.a/PRN: EAF43633	Arrowhead (with fore-shaft) made of bone, cane, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Harry Geoffrey Beasley Collection name: Beasley Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1931
Af1931,1110.1.b/PRN: EAF43634	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of cane, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Harry Geoffrey Beasley Collection name: Beasley Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1931
Af1931,1110.2.a-b/PRN: EAF43635	Arrowhead with fore-shaft made of cane, sinew, bone [a], arrow shaft made of cane, sinew [b].	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Harry Geoffrey Beasley Collection name: Beasley Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1931
Af1931,1110.3/PRN: EAF43637	Arrow made of iron, bone, cane, sinew, with fore-shaft and arrowhead.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Harry Geoffrey Beasley Collection name: Beasley Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1931
Af1931,1110.4.a/PRN: EAF43638	Arrowhead made of bone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Harry Geoffrey Beasley Collection name: Beasley Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1931
Af1931,1110.4.b/PRN: EAF43639	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of bone, cane, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Harry Geoffrey Beasley Collection name: Beasley Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1931
Af1931,1110.7/PRN: EAF43644	Poisoned? Arrow made of iron, bone, cane, sinew.	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa	Acquired in 1931

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
		Donated by: Harry Geoffrey Beasley Collection name: Beasley Collection	Namibia, Botswana	
Af1933,1030.1/PRN: EAF44113	King's official rod-of-office, staff made of wood, wire (iron), wire (brass), and copper.	Ethnic group: Ngwato Donated by: Mrs H Tolson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/ Botswana,	Acquired in 1933
Af1934,0707.134/PRN: EAF44897	Beads (with fragments group) made of beads (ostrich eggshell), beads (glass). Etho.Doc.: 78	Excavated/Find spot: South Africa/Orange River. Donated by: James A Swan	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Bechuanaland/ (Botswana), Prieska (?)	Acquired in 1934
Af1934,0726.79/PRN: EAF45028	Crescent, tool made of stone (flint?).	Excavated/Find spot**:** Tati, River. Donated by: Hugh S Gordon	Botswana, Tati River	Acquired in 1934
Af1935,0202.1/PRN: EAF45318	Girl's headdress (dancing) made of leather, bristles (porcupine). Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/ (Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.2.a-b/PRN: EAF45319	Girl's anklet (dancing, one of a pair) made of seeds. Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/ (Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.4/PRN: EAF45321	Waist-fringe, girdle made of hide. Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/ (Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.5/PRN: EAF45322	Girdle made of beads, hide. Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.6/PRN: EAF45323	Snuffbox made of carapace (tortoise), beads (iron), beads (glass), and beads (brass). Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.3/PRN: EAF45320	Girdle made of beads (ostrich egg), beads (hide). Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.7/PRN: EAF45324	Snuffbox made of carapace (tortoise), beads (glass), cloth. Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.9.a/PRN: EAF45326	Needle-case made of hide. Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1935

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1935,0202.9.b/PRN: EAF45327	Needle-case packing made of hide, straw, fibre. Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.10.a-b/PRN: EAF45328	Needle made of iron. Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland(Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.11/PRN: EAF45329	Box (with lid and seeds) made of horn, rawhide, beads (glass), and seeds. Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.12/PRN: EAF45330	Box (with seeds) made of rawhide, beads (brass) and seeds. Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1935,0202.13/PRN: EAF45331	Snuffbox (with stopper) made of horn, hide, cloth (corduroy). Eth.Doc.: 82	Donated by: Col J J Leverson	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1935
Af1937,0210.1/PRN: EAF46470	Quiver (with strap) made of bark, sinew, leather.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.2/PRN: EAF46471	Arrow made of iron, reed, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/Botswana)	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.2/PRN: EAF46471	Arrow made of iron, reed, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1937
Af1937, 0210.3-6/PRN: EAF46472	Poisoned arrow made of reed, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.7.a/PRN: EAF46473	Poisoned arrowhead made of bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.7.b/PRN: EAF46474	Arrow shaft, arrow shaft made of wood (?), reed, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.8/PRN: EAF46475	Drinking straw made of reed, thread (fibre).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1937

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1937,0210.9/PRN: EAF46476	Drinking straw made of reed, skin (?).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.10/PRN: EAF46477	Reeds (bundle of 15), quiver packing made of reeds.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.11/PRN: EAF46478	Fire stick made of wood, fibre (vegetable).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/(Botswana)	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.12/PRN: EAF46479	Fire stick made of wood.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/Botswana	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.13/PRN: EAF46480	Sample of locusts (dried, ground).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/ Botswana	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.14/PRN: EAF46481	Spoon (?), ladle made of carapace (tortoise).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/Botswana	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0210.1/PRN: EAF46482	Fire stick made of wood.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/ Botswana	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0705.9/PRN: EAF47062	Smoking pipe-bowl made of soapstone.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: Gerald P L Miles Purchased from: Stevens' Auction Rooms Ltd	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,0705.10-1/PRN: EAF47063	Smoking pipe-bowl made of soapstone.	Ethnic group: Tswana Purchased from: Gerald P L Miles from: Stevens' Auction Rooms Ltd	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,1130.1/PRN: EAF47126	Bag (with fringe) made of hide, beads (glass), button (glass?), sinew (?), button (pearl-shell).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bakwena Reserve/Botswana	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,1130.2/PRN: EAF47127	Bag made of hide, sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bakwena Reserve/ Botswana,	Acquired in 1937

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1937,1130.3/PRN: EAF47128	Necklace made of beads (ostrich eggshell), skin (?), string (fibre).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bakwena Reserve/ Botswana	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,1130.4/PRN: EAF47129	Digging stick, digging stick, dibble made of wood.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bakwena Reserve/ Botswana	Acquired in 1937
Af1937,1130.5/PRN: EAF47130	Bow made of wood, string (sinew).	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Venerable Archdeacon J W Mogg	Found/Acquired: Bakwena Reserve/Botswana	Acquired in 1937
Af1939,05.1/PRN: EAF47626	Quartzite artefact.	Donated by: Hugh S Gordon	Found/Acquired: Tati/North East District (Botswana)	Acquired in 1939
Af1939,05./PRN: EAF47627	Stone point, possibly made of chert.	Donated by: Hugh S Gordon	Found/Acquired: Tati/North East District (Botswana),	Acquired in 1939
Af1939,05.3/PRN: EAF47628	Stone point, possibly made of chert.	Donated by: Hugh S Gordon	Excavated/Find spot: Tati River/ North East District (Botswana),	Acquired in 1939
Af1939,19.4/PRN: EAF47734	Necklace, of hide? And flattish brass beads. Register 1939: Brass bead necklace of flattish beads. Necklace made of beads (brass), hide (?).	Donated by: W A Green	Found/Acquired: Jamasep/ Botswana,	Acquired in 1939
Af1939,19.8-10/PRN: EAF47737	Spoons made of wood.	Donated by: W A Green. Ethnic group: San. Purchased from: Mrs D K Oldman with contribution from: The Art Fund (as NACF)	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/ Botswana, Africa, South, Namibia	Acquired in 1939
Af1949,46.606-607/PRN: EAF49788	Digging stick weight, digging stick weight made of stone.	Collected by: William Ockelford Oldman	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia	Acquired in 1949
Af1949,46.608.a-b/PRN: EAF49789	Snuffbox made of horn (rhinoceros?) [a]; with stopper made of wood.	Ethnic group: Zulu Purchased from: Mrs D K Oldman with contribution from: The Art Fund (as NACF) Collected by: William Ockelford Oldman	Found/Acquired: Botswana	Acquired in 1949

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1949,46.608.b/PRN: EAF49790	Stopper made of wood.	Ethnic group: San Purchased from: Mrs D K Oldman with contribution from: The Art Fund (as NACF) Collected by: William Ockelford Oldman	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1949
Af1949,46.609/PRN: EAF49791	Wrist? Ornament made of shells, string (fibre)	Ethnic group: San, Khoikhoi, Zulu, Xhosa Purchased from: Mrs D K Oldman with contribution from: The Art Fund (as NACF). Collected by: William Ockelford Oldman	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1949
Af1949,46.610/PRN: EAF49792	Wrist? Ornament made of shells, hide.	Ethnic group: San, Khoikhoi, Zulu, Xhosa Purchased from: Mrs D K Oldman with contribution from: The Art Fund (as NACF) Collected by: William Ockelford Oldman	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1949
Af1949,46.611.a-c/PRN: EAF49793	Necklace (?), belt (? waist?) made of shells, string (fibre), in three pieces.	Ethnic group: San, Khoikhoi, Zulu, Xhosa Purchased from: Mrs D K Oldman with contribution from: The Art Fund (as NACF). Collected by: William Ockelford Oldman	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1949
Af1954,+23.158/PRN: EAF51355	Apron made of beads. Additional ID: 19142 (Welcome Collection number)	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/Botswana	Acquired in 1954

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
		Collection name: Welcome Collection – Additional		
Af1954,+23.163/PRN: EAF51360	Necklet, neck ornament made of beads. Additional ID: 106779 (Welcome Collection number)	Ethnic group: Sotho Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: *Welcome Collection* – Additional	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Lesotho, Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.614/PRN: EAF51571	Milk vessel. Additional ID: NN (*Welcome Collection* number)	Ethnic group: Tswana Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: Welcome Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.814/PRN: EAF51659	Ladle.	Ethnic group: Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: Welcome Collection	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.1069/PRN: EAF51779	Quiver made of wood and vegetal fibre.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: Welcome Collection –	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.1070.a-c/PRN: EAF51780	Quiver made of wood and skin (a), with arrow (b) and arrowhead	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: Welcome	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.1071/PRN: EAF51783	Arrow made out of reed (?), metal, skin and bone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1954

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
		Collection name: Welcome Collection –		
Af1954,+23.1072/PRN: EAF130342	Arrow made out of reed (?), metal and bone. Additional ID: N/N (Welcome Collection number)	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: Welcome Collection – Additional	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.1073/PRN: EAF130343	Arrow made out of reed (?), metal, skin and bone.	Ethnic group: San Found/Acquired: South Africa, Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: Welcome Collection – Additional	Found/Acquired: Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.1074/PRN: EAF130344	Arrow made out of reed (?) and vegetal fibre.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: *Welcome Collection* – Additional	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.1075/PRN: EAF130345	Arrow made out of reed (?), vegetal fibre and skin.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: *Welcome Collection* – Additional	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.1969/PRN: EAF52224	Pipe-bowl. Additional ID: 221319 (*Welcome Collection* number)	Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine	Found/Acquired: Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe	Acquired in 1954

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
		Collection name: *Welcome Collection* – Additional		
Af1954,+23.3257/PRN: EAF52895	Headdress made of quill (porcupine).	Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: *Welcome Collection* – Additional	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/ Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.3258/PRN: EAF130191	Headdress made of quill (porcupine).	Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: *Welcome Collection* – Additional	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1954,+23.3259/PRN: EAF130192	Headdress made of quill (porcupine).	Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: Welcome Collection – Additional	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1955,11.3/PRN: EAF53001	Composite charm, of a wooden stick covered with fine black linear ornament, with ostrich egg shell bead ornaments and leather loop.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Mrs. Maud Brown	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1955
Af1954,+23.3261/PRN: EAF130190	Headdress made of quill (porcupine).	Donated by: Welcome Institute for the History of Medicine Collection name: Welcome Collection – Additional	Found/Acquired: Botswana, Botswana	Acquired in 1954
Af1955,11.4/PRN: EAF53002	Register 1955: Composite girl's apron, of leather with ostrich eggshell bead border and central fringe with fibre thread and stone? Beads.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Mrs. Maud Brown	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia Botswana (?)	Acquired in 1955

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1955,11.5.a-b/PRN: EAF53003	Leather and gut quiver [a] containing 55 arrows of horn points, sepia colour, bound with gut, in small grass sheaths, the ends also bound with gut [b].	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Mrs. Maud Brown	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1955
Af1955,11.9/PRN: EAF53115	Horn bow, miniature, gut binding & string.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Mrs. Maud Brown	Found/Acquired: Namibia, South Africa, Botswana	Acquired in 1955
Af1955,11.10/PRN: EAF53116	Horn bow, miniature, with gut binding and iron bead round bow; used for courtship?	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Mrs. Maud Brown	Found/Acquired: Namibia, Botswana South Africa	Acquired in 1955
Af1958,14.38/PRN: EAF53381	Wooden club with partly-coloured head.	Donated by: Henry Bassett	Found/Acquired: Mozambique Bechuanaland/Botswana	Acquired in 1958
Af1958,14.65/PRN: EAF53403	Wooden club.	Donated by: Henry Bassett	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/ Botswana,	Acquired in 1958
Af1958,14.66/PRN: EAF53404	Wooden staff carved to resemble spear	Donated by: Henry Bassett	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/Botswana,	Acquired in 1958
Af1958,14.67/PRN: EAF53405	Cane staff with brown-stained carvings over most of surface	Donated by: Henry Bassett	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/Botswana,	Acquired in 1958
Af1960,20.66/PRN: EAF53687	Reed stems wrap-woven to form a basket.	Donated by: Royal Kew Botanic Gardens, Collected by: Thomas Baines	Found/Acquired: Bechuanaland/Botswana	Acquired in 1960
Af1960,20.67/PRN: EAF53688	Sansevieria fibre fishing net, a rope is attached along one edge at the other a bunch of reed stems is attached at intervals.	Ethnic group: Kuba Donated by: Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew Collected by: J A Nicolls and the Colonial Office	Found/Acquired: Ngami, Lake/ Botswana	Acquired in 1960
Af1960,20.117/PRN: EAF53749	Composite bow, wooden stave bound at the grips and each end with sinew, string of sinew.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Kew Royal Botanic Gardens, Collected by: Hon Rawson W Rawson	Found/Acquired: Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1960

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
		Collected by: South African Museum		
Af1960,20.118/PRN: EAF53750 Register 1960 Additional ID: Af1973Q1.449	Composite quiver formed by a hollow plant stem bound with leather at two points, where the leather sling (broken) is attached, with a leather bottom.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew Collected by: Hon Rawson W Rawson Collected by: South African Museum	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1960
Af1960,20.119.a-d/PRN: EAF53752	Four composite arrows, [formerly] joined with wire. [a] Reed shaft, broken at the butt. Bone fore-shaft connecting with a wooden shank, bound with sinew, into which an iron blade is tanged. [b] Reed shaft and bone fore-shaft only single feather bound to the butt with sinew. [c] Arrow with reed shaft and bone fore-shaft only single feather bound to the butt with sinew. [d] Shaft of feather only, bone fore-shaft missing.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew Collected by: Hon W Rawson and the South African Museum	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1960
Af1960,20.120/PRN: EAF53756	Arrow-straightener, grooved pebble made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew Collected by: E J Dunn	Found/ Acquired: Namibia, Botswana South Africa	Acquired in 1960
Af1963,21.22.a-c/PRN: EAF53861	Group of three divining tablets made of ivory.	Ethnic group: San Made in: Kalahari Desert/ Botswana Bechuanaland, South Africa Exchanged with: Ralph Nash	Found/Acquired: Kuruman/ South Africa, Kuruman/ Northern Cape, Bechuanaland/ Botswana,	Acquired in 1963
Af1968,07.1/PRN: EAF53940	Poisoned? Arrowhead made of bone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: G H J Krausbauer	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	Acquired in 1968

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1968,07.2/PRN: EAF53941	Arrowhead (with fore-shaft, poisoned?) made of bone, bamboo (?), cane, wood, twine (grass?), twine (sinew?), and gum.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: G H J Krausbauer	Found/Acquired: Namibia, Botswana South Africa	Acquired in 1968
Af1973,Q.318/PRN: EAF55118	Axe made of wood (?), iron (?). Axe made of wood (?), iron (?).	Ethnic group: Tswana	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	No year
Af1979,01.1314/PRN: EAF55586	Arrowhead (with fore-shaft) made of iron, bone, sinew, resin (?).	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	No year
Af1979,01.1327 PRN: EAF55595	Arrowhead made of cane, sinew, ivory (?), bone.	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	No year
Af1979,01.1336.a-PRN: EAF55598	Rock painting (1 of 5 joining parts); made of pigment on stone; rock broken into four large pieces and one bag of smaller pieces, showing an antelope, possibly a hartebeest.	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	No year
Af1979,01.1470/PRN: EAF55672	Poisoned? Arrowhead made of iron, wood, sinew, mud (?).	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	No year
Af1979,01.2830/PRN: EAF57026 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.935	Digging stick weight, digging stick weight made of stone.	Ethnic group: San, Tswana	Excavated/Find spot: South Africa, Botswana	No year
Af1979,01.2831/PRN: EAF57027 Additional ID: Af1872?1115 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.936	Digging stick weight, digging stick weight made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Dr T Shaw	Excavated/Find spot: South Africa, Botswana	No year
Af1979,01.2832/PRN: EAF57028 Additional ID: Af1874?0320 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1417	Digging stick weight, digging stick weight made of stone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: R Fair bridge	Excavated/Find spot: South Africa, Botswana	No year
Af1979,01.2950/PRN: EAF57209 Additional ID: Af1973Q1.417	Neck ornament (waist) made of beads (ostrich eggshell), leather (?), and hide.	No ethnic group	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Bechuanaland/ Botswana	No year
Af1979,01.2957.a/PRN:EAF57226 Additional ID: Af1934A0726 (?) Additional ID: Af1975Q1.810	Point made of stone (flint).	Nothing	Excavated/Find spot**:** Tati Rive/Botswana	nothing

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1979,01.2957.a/PRN: EAF57226 Additional ID: Af1934A0726 (?) Additional ID: Af1975Q1.810	Point made of stone (flint).	Nothing	Excavated/Find spot: Botswana/Tati River(G)	nothing
Af1979,01.2957.b/PRN: EAF57227 Additional ID: Af1934A0726 (?) Additional ID: Af1975Q1.811	Flake made of stone (flint).	Nothing	Excavated/Find spot: Botswana/ Tati, River(G)	nothing
Af1979,01.2957.c/PRN: EAF57228 Additional ID: Af1934A0726 (?) Additional ID: Af1975Q1.814	Scraper made of stone (flint).	Nothing	Excavated/Find spot: Botswana/ Tati River	nothing
Af1979,01.2957.d/PRN: EAF57229 Additional ID: Af1934A0726 (?) Additional ID: Af1975Q1.815	Scraper made of stone (flint).	Nothing	Excavated/Find spot: Botswana/Tati River	Nil
Af1979,01.2963/PRN: EAF57236 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1420	Poisoned? Arrowhead made of reed, bone, sinew with arrow shaft (with fore-shaft), arrow shaft (with fore-shaft) Made of reed, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	nil
Af1979,01.2963.b/PRN: EAF57237 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1420	Arrow shaft (with fore-shaft), arrow shaft (with fore-shaft) made of reed, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	nil
Af1979,01.2964/PRN: EAF57238 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1420	Poisoned? Arrow made of reed, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	no
Af1979,01.2965/PRN: EAF57239 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1420	Poisoned? Arrow made of reed, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	no
Af1979,01.2966/PRN: EAF57240 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1420	Poisoned? Arrow made of reed, bone, sinew.	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	no
Af1979,01.2967/PRN: EAF57241 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1420	Arrow fore-shaft, arrow fore-shaft made of bone with arrow shaft made of reed, sinew, skin (lizard?).	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	no

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1979,01.2967.b/PRN: EAF57242 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1420	Arrow shaft made of reed, sinew, skin (lizard?).	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa Namibia, Botswana	no
Af1979,01.3072/PRN: EAF57339 Additional ID: Af1974Q1.735	Arrowhead (with fore-shaft) made of bone, thread (sinew).	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	no
Af1979,01.3073/PRN: EAF57340 Additional ID:.1427	Arrow (?), dart (?) made of wood (?), reed (?), sinew.	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	no
Af1979,01.3074.a-c/PRN: EAF57341 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1423	Poisoned arrow made of wood (?), cane (?), sinew, fibre (?), bone, quill (?), resin (?) (a); two arrows made of wood (?), cane (?), sinew, fibre (?), quill (?) (b-c)	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	no
Af1979,01.3074.b-c/PRN: EAF57342 Additional ID: Af1975Q1.1423	Arrow made of wood (?), cane (?), sinew, fibre (?), quill (?).	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana	no
Af1979,01.3114/PRN: EAF57379 Additional ID: Af1975,Q.132	Iron arrowhead (with barb either side at rear) fixed to wood fore-shaft; bound with sinew.	Ethnic group: San	Found/Acquired: South Africa, Botswana	no
Af1979,01.4510/PRN: EAF57534 Additional ID: Af1892A0714 Additional ID: Af1973Q1.183	Necklace made of flat, circular beads (ostrich eggshell), string (fibre).	Ethnic group: Shona, San Made in: Zimbabwe From: James Theodore Bent	Found/Acquired: Namibia, Zimbabwe South Africa, Botswana	no
Af1979,01.4773/PRN: EAF101808	An axe with curved wooden shaft bound with bands of iron and brass. A long, tapering forged iron blade is set into a spherical wooden head, bound with hide and embellished with 330 numerous copper and iron studs.	Ethnic group: Tswana	Found/Acquired: Okavango, River/ Botswana	Acquired in 1979
Af1979,01.5169/PRN: EAF122342	A wooden spoon carved in the form of a giraffe.	Ethnic group: Tswana	Found/Acquired: Botswana, South Africa	no
Af1981,12.5/PRN: EAF58213	Apron made of leather, beads (glass).	Purchased from Frida	Found/Acquired: Botswana..	Acquired in 1981

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
Af1985,01.1.a/PRN: EAF59371 Af1985,01.1.b-g/PRN: EAF59372	Quiver made of plastic arrow made of wood, bone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Mrs. Trekkie Parsons		Acquired in 1985 Acquired in 1985
Af1985,01.2.a/PRN: EAF59373	Quiver made of plastic.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Mrs. Trekkie Parsons	Found/Acquired: Binga, Botswana,	Acquired in 1985
Af1985,01.2.b/PRN: EAF59374	Love bow made of bone.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Mrs. Trekkie Parsons	Found/Acquired: Binga, Botswana	Acquired in 1985
Af1985,01.2.c-e/PRN: EAF59375	Arrow made of bone, wood.	Ethnic group: San Donated by: Mrs. Trekkie Parsons	Found/Acquired: Binga/ Botswana,	Acquired in 1985
Af1985,01.3.a/PRN: EAF100266	Quiver made from the point of a large bird's (ostrich?) feather	Ethnic group: San Made in: Botswana Donated by: Mrs. Trekkie Parsons	Found/Acquired: Botswana/Kalahari, Binga?	Acquired in 1985
Af1985,01.3.b/PRN: EAF100267	Love bow made of bone with fibre string. Made in: Botswana©	Ethnic group: San Made in: Kalahari Desert. Donated by: Mrs. Trekkie Parsons	Found/Acquired: Binga, Botswana,	Acquired in 1985
Af1985,01.3.c-e/PRN: EAF100269	Three arrows made of bone, wood.	Ethnic group: San, Made in: Kalahari Desert Donated by: Mrs Trekkie Parsons	Found/Acquired: Binga, Botswana/Kalahari Desert Africa, Botswana, Binga	Acquired in 1985
Af1985,01.4.a/PRN: EAF100271	Quiver made from the point of a large bird's (ostrich?) feather, with incised linear decoration	Ethnic group: San. Donated by: Mrs. Trekkie Parsons	Found/Acquired: Botswana, Binga?	Acquired in 1985
Af1985,01.4.b-g /PRN: EAF100273	Six arrows made of bone, wood. Release to Collection	Ethnic group: San. Made in the Kalahari_–desert. Donated by: Mrs. Trekkie Parsons	Found/Acquired: Binga, Kalahari Desert/Botswana,	Acquired in 1985
Af1985,11.180/PRN: EAF59569	Necklace made of shells.	Ethnic group: San Purchased from: Mrs. R Cross	Found/Acquired: South Africa Zimbabwe, Namibia Botswana	Acquired in 1985
Af1987,08.1/PRN: EAF59892	An axe, with wooden handle and iron head. The head is bound to the	Donated by: Mrs. Blunt	Found/Acquired: Botswana Zimbabwe, Namibia	Acquired in 1987

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
	handle with wire and is decorated with incised geometrical motifs.			
Af1989,13.1/PRN: EAF60492	Basket (with sliding lid and suspension loop) made of vegetable fibre.	Donated by: Eva, Lady Wilson	Found/Acquired: Maun/Botswana, North West District	Acquired in 1989
Af1989,13.3/PRN: EAF60494	Toy crocodile made of palm leaf fibre.	Donated by: Eva, Lady Wilson	Found/Acquired: Maun/Botswana, North West District	Acquired in 1989
Af1989,13.4/PRN: EAF60495	Neck-band made of beads (ostrich eggshell), beads (wood), hide, thread (cotton).	Donated by: Eva, Lady Wilson	Found/Acquired: Ukwi Pan, Gantsi/Kgalagadi (district), Botswana	Acquired in 1989
Af1989,13.5/PRN: EAF60496	Fringed bag made of beads (ostrich eggshell), beads (glass), hide.	Donated by: Eva, Lady Wilson	Found/Acquired: Ukwi Pan, Ghantsi Kgalagadi (district)/ Botswana	Acquired in 1989
2010,2032.1/PRN: EAF117866	A shallow, reddish brown basketry bowl decorated with black and white patterns depicting animals and geometric shapes	Made by Mahurero Diyeve Donated by: Anglo American PLC	Found/Acquired: Botswana	Acquired in 1987
2010,2032.2.a-b/PRN: EAF117867	A tall, bulbous, basketry vessel (a), with narrow base and neck, decorated with black and white geometric patterns. Separate lid	Made by Napemba Mashopa. Donated by: Anglo American PLC	Found/Acquired: Botswana	Acquired in 2010
2014,2005.1/PRN: EAF137387	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly purple and black and with a lion motif. This element has the name 'NDAU'	Ethnic group: Makonde Donated by: Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.2/PRN: EAF139734	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly green	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made in: Gaborone by Ann Gollifer Donated by: Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/South East District (Botswana), Gaborone	Acquired in 2014

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
	and purple and with a tiger motif. This element has the name 'LOLO',			
2014,2005.3/PRN: EAF139735	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly black and white. This element has the name 'SENA'	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer.	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.5/PRN: EAF139737	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly yellow and blue and with the image of a blue hand holding coins. This element has the name 'MARENJE'	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made in: and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ East District (Botswana),	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.6/PRN: EAF139825	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly pale green and black. This element has the name 'MAKHUWA',	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made in Botswana by Ann Gollifer. Donated by: Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.7/PRN: EAF139826	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly blue	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer.	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
	and black. This element has the name 'TAKAWE'.			
2014,2005.8/PRN: EAF139827	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly yellow and black and with the printed inscription on the cloth: '1 DE MAIO'. This element has the name 'MAINDO'	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.9/PRN: EAF139828	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly blue and yellow. This element has the name 'MANYIKA',	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer.	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/Botswana, South East /	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.10/PRN: EAF139829	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly yellow and black. This element has the name 'KOKOLA'	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District (Botswana)	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.11/PRN: EAF139830	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth,	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer.	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
	'capulana', of predominantly green and black. This element has the name 'NSENGA'.			
2014,2005.12/PRN: EAF139831	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly brown with a light bulb motif. This element has the name 'DEMA',	Ethnic group**:** Makonde. Made by Ann Gollifer Donated by: Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.13/PRN: EAF139832	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly green and black. This element has the name 'PHIMBI'.	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.14/PRN: EAF139833	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask one of 41 Indigenous languages of Mozambique, embroidered in the bottom, right hand corner. Covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly purple and blue. This element has the name 'LOMWE',	Ethnic group: Makonde Donated by: Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.15/PRN: EAF139834	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
	covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of purple and black and with a part of Barack Obama's face. This element has the name 'TONGA'.			
2014,2005.16/PRN: EAF139835	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly black and with a cowry shell motif. This element has the name 'MAKHUWA-MARREVONE',.	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.17/PRN: EAF139836	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly red, yellow and black and with a 'king of spades' playing card motif. This element has the name 'RONGA'.	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.18/PRN: EAF139837	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly blue and black. This element has the name 'MAKWE'.	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
2014,2005.19/PRN: EAF139838	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly green and brown. This element has the name 'TEWE'.	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.20/PRN: EAF139839	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly brown and grey. This element has the name 'MAKHUWA-SAKA'.	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.21/PRN: EAF139840	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly brown and black. This element has the name 'TSONGA'	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.22/PRN: EAF139841	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly pale green and black. This element has the name 'MAKHUWA-MEETO'	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
2014,2005.23/PRN: EAF139842	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly blue and black, and with circle and dot and floral motifs. This element has the name 'NYANJA'	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.24/PRN: EAF139843	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly brown and yellow, and with telephone motif. This element has the name 'MWANI'	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014
2014,2005.25/PRN: EAF139844	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly black and white with feet and shoes motifs. This element has the name 'TSWA'.	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014

ITEM	OBJECTS	DOCUMENTATION	PLACE OF ORIGIN	YEAR
2014,2005.26/PRN: EAF139845	One element of a contemporary art installation entitled 'Mother Tongue' consisting of a rectangular section of wood bearing the image of a Makonde 'mapiko' mask covered with printed cloth, 'capulana', of predominantly green and white with a hot air balloon motif. This element has the name 'CHOPI'.	Ethnic group: Makonde. Made and donated by Ann Gollifer	Found/Acquired: Gaborone/ Botswana, South East District	Acquired in 2014

List of Botswana Objects from the Livingstone Museum in Zambia

S/N	DESCRIPTION	TRIBE	LOCALITY
1	Neck string	Bushman	Nungu Bechuanaland
2	3 wristlets beads & giraffe hair	“	“
3	3 wristlets beads	“	“
4	Doll (Kaffir orange type)	“	“
5	Knife and sheath	“	“
6	Ostrich Egg shell	“	“
7	Medicine necklace	“	“
8	Medicinal root	“	“
9	Medicinal root Abaka	“	“
10	Medicinal root	“	“
11	Spear	“	“
12	Child’s toy wooden spear	“	“
13	Girl’s fibre fringe apron	“	“
14	Musical bow-Makangara	“	“
15	Woman’s skin skirt	“	“
16	Ostrich Egg shell water	“	“
17	Bone matting needle	“	“
18	Ostrich Egg shell	Bushman	Bechuanaland
19	Knife	“	“
20	Knife	“	“
21	Matting needle	“	“
22	Spoon Wooden	“	“
23	Porridge stirrer	“	“
24	Musical instrument	“	“
25	Bow	“	“
26	Cosmetic powder	“	“
27	Peddle for grinding	“	“
28	Cosmetic powder	“	“
29	Calabash diving kit	“	Nungu Bechuanaland
30	Skin bag for cosmetics	“	“
31	Karros	“	“
32	Sleeping mat	“	“
33	1 pair hide sandals	“	“
34	Mungongo Anvil stove	“	“
36	Dog’s feeding trough	“	“

S/N	DESCRIPTION	TRIBE	LOCALITY
37	Medicinal root	“	“
38	Fibre Fringe bin	“	“
39	4 toy wooden spears	“	“
40	Lower Jaw of warthog	“	“
41	Upper arm bracelet	“	“
42	Powder pouch	“	“
43	Anklets	“	“
44	Woman’s belt	“	“
45	Beads 3 strands	“	“
46	Child’s leather belt	“	“
47	Woman’s leather belt	“	“
48	Bow	“	“
49	Woman’s apron hide	“	“
50	3 baskets	“	“

List of Objects from the Museums of Kent and Brighton/UK (the Willoughby Collection)

ACC/ID NUMBER	COLLECTION	OBJECT NAME	PLACE CREATED	DATE COLLECTED	COLLECTOR	MATERIALS
BC101600	Natural Sciences	Hippopotamus	Botswana	Pre-1899	W C Willoughby	Osteological Strip of skin
BC425476	Natural Sciences	Ostrich	Botswana	Pre-1899		Egg shell
BC425477	Natural Sciences	Ostrich	Botswana	Pre-1899		Egg shell
BC425478	Natural Sciences	Ostrich	Botswana	Pre-1899		Egg shell
R4007/15.	World Art	Corn Bag; Sack	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Animal skin; Duiker; Leather Corn bag / sack made of duiker's skin, a small antelope, with sewn leather circular decoration/ mends
R4007/100	World Art	Bow	Botswana	Pre-1936	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Bow with twisted hide String
R4007/109	World Art	Fly whisk				Two fly whisks made of wildebeest's tail
R4007/11	World Art	Bullet Pouch	Botswana	Before 1936	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Animal skin; Iron Skin bullet pouch in the form of a girdle, having two long and one short purse-like pockets, with iron buckle.

R4007/110	World Art	Fly whisk				Fly whisk made from wire woven handle (Zulu like style) brass and steel. And entire tail of ox
R4007/11110.	World Art	Cloak; Cape	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Animal skin; Calf; Leather Boy's shield-shaped cloak, made of dark Coloured calf skin. With tail and two hide strings at the top. Exterior is decorated with animal hair, interior with decorative and small leather circular applique patches with white hair.
R4007/11312.	World Art	Walking stick	Botswana			
R4007/11413.	World Art	Walking Stick	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood; Horn; Copper; Possible rhinoceros Horn Walking stick cross handle of horn inlaid with copper wire.
R4007/11514.	World Art	Staff				Wooden staff of dark stained wood. Decoratively carved in twisted shape with slight club at end.
R4007/11615.	World Art	Walking stick	Botswana			Decorated with broad burn spiral band
R4007/11716.	World Art	Walking stick	Botswana			Decorated with lines of burn oval dots

R4007/12 17.	World Art	Hat	Botswana	Pre-1936	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Grass Conical woven grass sun hat. With four vertical bands of black in Two sections. With upper knob at top. Unlined interior
R4007/129 18.	World Art	Porridge stick	Botswana			Porridge Stick
R4007/14 19.	World Art	Bowl				Winnowing bowl used as an Agricultural tool. Made from grass /wicker/ wood and coated in a brown substance. Diameter: 44cm.
R4007/15 20.	World Art	Ornament; Belt	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Glass; Plant fibre Botswana female waist ornament; strings of light blue, dark blue, and pink beads, strung in alternate bands. Length, doubled, 20 Inches.
R4007/17 21.	World Art	Ornament				Beaded ornament of ostrich egg shells and seeds 11 strings of beads joined together, with leather tie

R4007/1822.	World Art	Ornament; Belt	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Leather; Glass Botswana women's Loin Ornament or apron made of a doubled skin apron with three skin tabs at the top. Bottom decorated with a line of white shirt-buttons and deep fringe of coral coloured and white beads; button and bead fringe extend onto the two hide strings at the sides. Worn over a skin skirt. Skin apron: Width 14 Ins. Depth, not including tabs, 6 1/2 Ins. Greatest depth of bead fringe about 14 Inches.
R4007/2223.	World Art	Beadwork; Doll Dress	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Glass Beadwork doll's dress made of a fringed band of beads Sewn to a hide band having button and hole. Bead band of blue beads with zig-zag pattern in white beads and fringe of blue beads.

R4007/24 24.	World Art	Necklace				Necklace, leather thong with beaded triangular pendants hanging from thong, white, black, blue, red, turquoise beads
R4007/26 25.	World Art	Necklace	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Glass; Animal skin; Hide Botswana girl's necklace. Hide string to which is sewn a double row of coloured beads, lengths of black and light coral-coloured beads alternating.
R4007/29 26.	World Art	Necklace	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Animal; Iron Botswana origin necklace consisting of twisted tendons and eight iron wire pendants resembling Small watch keys.
R4007/30 27.	World Art	Ornament–anklet	Botswana			Ornament anklet
R4007/31 28.	World Art	Ornament–arm	Botswana			Ornament–arm
R4007/32 29.	World Art	Ornament–arm	Botswana			Ornament arm.

R4007/33 30.	World Art	Ornament–arm	Botswana			Ornament arm
R4007/38 31.	World Art	Hair Pins				4 ivory hair pins, Willoughby
R4007/4 32.	World Art	Apron; Skin	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Animal skin; Hide; Antelope Women's Antelope skin apron; Waist to knee length. Central square panel with four edges Of curved skins. Two hide skin ties. Some fur present on inside.
R4007/42 33.	World Art	Shawl Pins	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Iron; Metal Four Botswana Shawl Pins made from twisted iron with boss like heads. Lengths; 165.1mm, 127mm, 142.24mm and 93.98mm
R4007/43 34.	World Art	Knife	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Metal Botswana Spatula shape knife implements made of a silver tone metal. The handle and blade are decorated with a double line of zig-zag dots, blade also has three dotted circles.
R4007/44 35.	World Art	Knife	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Metal Botswana spatula Shaped knife implement. With handle decoration; Line of zig-zag dots. Length 4 3/4 Ins.
R4007/5 36.	World Art	Apron; Skin; Dress	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Animal skin; Goat Woman's apron-like goatskin dress, with two skin strips fixed to the top and two skin tabs fixed to the top.

R4007/55 37.	World Art	Tumbler	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Horn; Glass Horn Tumbler made in Botswana: Exterior is decorated with incised stripes and zig-zags and a beaded rim.
R4007/56 38.	World Art	Horn Vessel				Horn vessel
R4007/57 39.	World Art	Tool	Botswana			Wooden tool.
R4007/58 40.	World Art	Club				One long wooden pole / club? With notch on end and loop of leather
R4007/59 41.	World Art	Matt Case				One set of grass/sticks bound around with yellow suede, central metal pin inside
R4007/6 42.	World Art	Apron	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Animal skin Woman's goatskin apron with broad strings. Near the bottom of the apron are two ornaments of coral-orange, white and black beads sewed to leather discs.
R4007/60 43.	World Art	Irons				One wooden bowl section with grass rope bound metal (steel) pins. all tied together in a bundle with brown leather.
R4007/61 44.	World Art	Hat	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Plant fibre Mans woven grass hat. Made from golden yellow grass

						bound with a broader, dark grass.
R4007/62 45.	World Art	Leatherwork				Rectangular leatherwork – decorative panel with brown leather border to central red dyed leather scene depicting 'La Ceremonie d'Exhumation' depicts four people carrying a coffin, two waving onlookers, a four piece band and a flag bearer at front moving t
R4007/65 46.	World Art	Basket	Zambia, Southern Africa, Africa	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Grass; fibre A globe-shaped basket made of plaited grass. Zig-zag pattern in middle of basket . Spherical with slightly flattened base and lid. Lid with central floral or star pattern.
R4007/66 47.	World Art	Ornament–necklace	Botswana			Necklace made of heads of Horned beetle
R4007/67 48.	World Art	Vase	Botswana			Water vase of red clay
R4007/68 49.	World Art	Mug				Large wooden mug with dark stain. With triangular handle. Decorated with central band of two lines which separates a mirrored triangle pattern. Inside of the triangles are carved diagonal lines. Slightly curved base to mug.
R4007/69 50.	World Art	Bowl				Oval wooden porridge bowl. With pierced decorative outer rim-holes of triangle shape in a single row pattern and at either smaller

						end a double row. Stained with dark patina.
R4007/7 51.	World Art	Cloak; Cape	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Animal skin; Hartebeest; Leather Heart or shield-shaped cloak made from animal skin; Hartebeest, with tail at the top. Decorated with star shaped leather applique patches. Three small tabs projecting from the near-centre.
R4007/73 52.	World Art	Sandals	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Leather; Hide Pair of Botswana (Previously known as Bechuana) leather sandals. ten inches in length.
R4007/74 53.	World Art	Anklets; bracelets	Botswana	Pre-1938	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Hide; Animal skin; Animal fur; Porcupine Quills Pair of men's ankle cuffs / bracelets made from animal hair and porcupine quills. Quills splay out in spiral like pattern (curved) from the centre. Worn when dancing.
R4007/75 54.	World Art; Musical Instruments	Girdle; Belt; Musical Instrument	Botswana	Pre-1938	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Plant fibre; Seeds Girdle of seed pods – seed variety unknown. Strung on natural grass like spun fibre.165 pods in total. Pods are open on inside of girdle.
R4007/78 55.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood Large Botswana Porridge spoon used in the cooking process with oblong perforation detail at the end of the handle and blackened design on the rim and base.

R4007/79 56.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood Large Botswana porridge spoon used during the cooking process. The end of the handle, rim and one side of the base are blackened.
R4007/8 57.	World Art	String Apron	Botswana	Before 1936	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Fibre; Animal skin String apron made with plaited strings attached to hide belt.
R4007/86 58.	World Art	Strainer–beer	Botswana			Grass spoon for skimming native beer
R4007/87 59.	World Art	Hoe				Wooden hoe with metal blade
R4007/89 60.	World Art	Adze	Botswana			Adze, in wooden handle
R4007/9 61.	World Art	String Apron	Botswana	Before 1936	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Fibre; Animal skin; Manganese String apron made with plaited strings attached to hide belt.
R4007/90 62.	World Art	Adze	Botswana			Adze in wooden handle
R4007/92 63.	World Art	Hoe				Wooden hoe with metal blade
R4007/93 64.	World Art	Hoe				Wooden hoe with metal blade

R4007/94 65.	World Art	Powder Horn	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Horn; Wood; Metal Powder horn. Bechuanaland. Cow's horn, decorated with raised ring round mouth and two rings below; zig-zag dotted line between two lower rings; double line of dots ascending spirally from base to bottom ring; wooden base; Two iron wire staples let in horn for string attachment which functions as a carrying strap
R4007/95 66.	World Art	Powder Horn	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Horn; Wood Cow's horn with raised ring just below mouth; base and bottom portion bound with hide; thong round neck.
R4007/96 67.	World Art	Powder Horn	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Horn; Wood Cow's horn grooved for string below mouth, wood bottom, iron wire staple bear bottom edge; string for carrying.
R4007/98 68.	World Art	Dagger				Dagger and sheath. White metal dagger with carved wooden handle. Sheath made from two separate pieces of wood bound together with leather. Phallic carving. Animal like carving on upper. Carved loop on back.
WA507584 69.	World Art	Snuff Container	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Bone snuffbox Donor: Rev Willoughby, March 1936
WA507587	World Art	Snuff Container	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Bone snuffbox Donor: Rev Willoughby, March 1936

70.						
WA507594 71.	World Art	Snuff Container	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood Dark bottle-shaped with container carved ridges. Made of horn.
WA507595 72.	World Art	Snuff Container	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	horn; metal copper; A small horn bottle. The body is tapered in towards the top and decorated with eight vertical inlays of copper wire and two light coloured bosses. These two bosses are decorated with linsand dots. The colours of the snuff container are green and black.
WA507596 73.	World Art	Snuff Container	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Small dark bottle-shaped, decorated container with bands, studs and translucent band near base. Wood or horn or mixed.
WA507597 74.	World Art	Snuff Container	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Horn container with stopper Donor: Rev Willoughby, March 1936
WA507599 75.	World Art	Snuff Container	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Horn snuff container Donor: Rev Willoughby, March 1936
WA507605 76.	World Art	Snuff Container	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	horn; metal copper A small horn bottle. The body is decorated with vertical inlays of copper wire to form a striped design. The colours of this snuff containers are green and black.
WA507862 77.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	2 spoons carved from one piece of wood, joined, Bechuanaland Donor: Rev Willoughby, March 1936

WA507869 78.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	spoons ‘for eating porridge’, Bechuanaland Donor: Rev Willoughby, March 1936
WA507870 79.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	spoons ‘for eating porridge’, Bechuanaland Donor: Rev Willoughby, March 1936
WA507872 80.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	spoon ‘for eating porridge’, Bechuanaland Donor: Rev Willoughby, March 1936
WA507873 81.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	spoons ‘for eating porridge’, Bechuanaland Donor: Rev Willoughby, March 1936
WA508014 82.	World Art	Bracelets	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Hide; Elephant Two elephants hide bracelets from Botswana. Circular.
WA508015 83.	World Art	Bracelet	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Ivory; Animal ivory Ivory bangle from Botswana with two grooves and a keel shape on outer surface. A crack has been joined with brass wire through four drilled holes.
WA508025 84.	World Art	Snuff Container	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Small calabash snuffbox, Bechuanaland Donor: Rev Willoughby, March 1936
WA508135 85.	World Art	Bracelet	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	fibre; glass A girl’s bracelet made from a thick twine, with pink beads wound around it in a spiral design. The twine is not visible, concealed by the beadwork.

WA508136.86.	World Art	Bracelet	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	fibre; glass A girl's bracelet made from a thick twine, with blue beads wound around it in a spiral design. The twine is not visible, concealed by the beadwork.
WA508137.87.	World Art	Bracelet	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	fibre; glass A girl's bracelet made from a thick twine, with pink beads wound around it in a spiral design. The twine is not visible, concealed by the beadwork.
WA508139.88.	World Art	Necklace; Charm	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	leather; glass This woman's necklace was also worn as a charm by elephant hunters. It is made from a length of leather strap threaded with large hexagonal dark blue beads and four large elephant eye ornaments. These ornaments are made from discs of hide decorated on the top surface with seven circles of red beads and six of white beads.
WA508140.89.	World Art	Apron	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	leather; glass A small pocket apron of coloured beads made for a baby girl in Botswana. The small oblong pocket is decorated with pink beadwork with a zig-zag row of white beads and groups of white beads at the base. Two wide, leather strings are attached to the top of the pocket so the apron can be tied around the baby's waist.
WA508141.90.	World Art	Apron; Bag	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	leather; glass A small pocket apron of coloured beads made for a girl in Botswana. The small oblong pocket is decorated with a beadwork design of pink and blue zig-zags with a fringe at the bottom in the same colours. Two wide, leather strings are attached to the top of the pocket so the apron can be tied around the girl's waist.
WA508142.91.	World Art	Necklace; Necklet	Botswana	Pre-1910	Mr Proctor	Glass; Plant fibre Necklet, made from three strings of white glass beads, with a few coloured ones at ends and in middle, suspending rectangular panel of pink, white, red, and black

						beadwork, with upper and lower margins of blue. Panel is divided vertically into one pink and one white section.
WA508143 92.	World Art	Necklace	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	glass; textile cotton; animal tooth This woman's necklace is made of oval beads either light or dark blue in colour. In the centre of these beads is a pierced leopard's tooth pendant. This leopard's tooth is both a decoration and a charm. All the beads are threaded onto cotton which is tied at both ends.
WA509030 93.	World Art	Apron	Botswana Makalaka; Tswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	animal skin (goat); glass A goat's skin apron from Botswana. This woman's apron has broad skin strings and three round, beaded leather discs applied to the lower part of the apron. The discs are decorated with black, white and coral-coloured beads.
WA509031 94.	World Art	Apron	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	animal skin sheep; animal hair A sheep skin apron from Botswana. This Tswana woman's sheep skin apron has two skin strings at the top and is bordered with dark animal hair strips.
WA509032 95.	World Art	Necklace	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Glass A woman's necklace consisting of four rows of strung small coral-coloured imported glass beads.

WA50 9033 96.	World Art	Necklace	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	glass; Metal A Tswana girl's beaded necklace. This necklace is made with seven triangular pendants attached to a beaded band. The beaded band consists of a double row of blue beads with a zig-zag of red and white beads as the centre of the band. The pendants are made of variously coloured beads and arranged as chevrons. The necklace is secured in place using a shirt button as a fastener.
WA50 9034 97.	World Art	Walking Stick	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	animal skin (hippopotamus) A walking stick with the stem made of twisted and dried hippopotamus hide. It has a crook handle.)
WA50 9035 98.	World Art	Apron; Belt	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	leather; glass A beaded apron or loin ornament made for a Tswana boy. This apron is triangular in shape and decorated with double lines of pink and blue beads arranged in a "v" shape.
WA50 9036 99.	World Art	Waist Ornament	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	glass; fibre A Tswana woman's waist ornament or "girdle". This waist ornament is made from a length of local Tswana rope with blue and coral-coloured beads strung around it to form lozenge patterns.

WA50 9037 100.	World Art	Basket	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	glass; fibre An urn shaped basket made of coiled grass. This basket has a flat narrow base, a round lid and a leather thong attached as a handle
WA50 9038 101.	World Art	Basket	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Grass; fibre A globe-shaped basket made of plaited grass. Weave is spirally bound with 8 vertical band decorations from the base to the middle and 8 vertical smaller bands from rim to middle. Spherical with slightly flattened base and lid.
WA50 9039 102.	World Art	Bowl	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood A wooden porridge bowl carved from light coloured wood. Below the outer rim a line of triangles has been burnt as decoration. The handle and the shield-shaped ornament in front have also been coloured by burning. The bowl has a rounded bottom.
WA50 9040 103.	World Art	Bowl	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood A carved wooden milk bowl shaped like a large mug. This milk bowl has been made from a light coloured wood which has been darkened on the outside. It has a foot rim and a raised band incised with wavy lines, triangular and lozenge shaped pittings. A small, perforated lug

						projects from the band.
WA509041104.	World Art	Calabash	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	plant gourd; string A calabash made from a gourd. This container was made to hold milk or water. The calabash itself is contained in a network of thick string and has a string handle.
WA509228105.	World Art	Spear	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood; Iron; Brass A spear with a blunt, narrow leaf blade made of iron. This blade is attached to the wooden shaft with a band of interlaced brass wire. There is a hide band near the bottom of the shaft.
WA509229106.	World Art	Spear	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Iron; Wood A spear with a narrow leaf blade made of iron. The edges of the squared iron shank are notched to form short bands of lines. The blade is bound to the shaft with an iron spiral.
WA509230107.	World Art	Spear	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Iron; Wood A spear with a narrow leaf blade. The shank is squared and the sides decorated with incised chevrons. The wooden shaft is attached to the blade with an iron spiral. The lower part of the shaft has three vertical bands of incised chevrons.

WA50 9231 108.	World Art	Bracelets	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Grass; Animal skin Two bracelets of woven yellow grass with hide joins. The bracelets are designed with flat straps and a feather pattern weave.
WA50 9232 109.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood A small wooden porridge spoon used for eating. It has a carved animal head on the end the handle with zig-zag pattern on neck. There is a rough zig-zag on the base of the spoon
WA50 9233 110.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood A small wooden porridge spoon used for eating. It has a ring loop at the end of the handle and a black pattern on the rim and base.
WA50 9234 111.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood A small wooden porridge spoon used for eating. It has an oblong loop at the end of the handle and a black pattern on the rim and base.
WA50 9235 112.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood A small wooden porridge spoon used for eating. The top of the handle is perforated and there is a black pattern on the rim and base.
WA50 9236 113.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood A small wooden porridge spoon used for eating. There is a spoon at each end of

						the handle. The spoon is decorated with a black pattern on the rim and base.
WA509237 114.	World Art	Spoon	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood A pair of spoons with interlocking handles, carved out of one piece of wood, decorated in black with patterns and dotted lines.
WA509471 115.	World Art	Dagger	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Metal; Wood Dark wooden handle and openwork wooden sheath, decorated with raised ornament and incised lines. Blade with double zig-zag line down the centre on both sides. Sheath has perforated lug for string. Originally collected from Bechuanaland, which is now Botswana and South Africa, from the ‘San Bushmen’, which was an offensive term even in the 19th century.
WA509472 116.	World Art	Quiver	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood; Cane Quiver of red hardwood With hide strap and hide cap for base. 12 bands of cane binding, 8 drilled holes for use with fire sticks. In base of quiver was found the front page of comic magazine ‘Sketchy Bits’ No. 146, Vol III. This magazine lasted from 1895–1897. 26/1/67 – presumably the date this page was found. Contains arrows and fire sticks WA509473-WA509479.
WA509473 117.	World Art	Arrow	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Cane; Bone Five arrows with triangular barbed bone heads and cane

						shafts. UB5 list has 4 arrows. Lengths between 490–660mm. In quiver WA509472
WA509474 118.	World Art	Arrowhead	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Bone Barbed bone arrowhead. In quiver WA509472
WA509475 119.	World Art	Arrow	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Bone; Cane; Wood; Lizard skin Three arrows with blunt bone heads, one with a wooden shaft and two with cane. Lizard skin butt collars (?!!). In quiver WA509472
WA509476 120.	World Art	Arrow	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Iron; Bone; Cane Arrow with semi-lunar iron head, attached to bone shank with cane shaft. In quiver WA509472.
WA509477 121.	World Art	Arrow	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood; Bamboo Arrow with wooden head and bamboo shaft. Blunt round hardwood point. In quiver WA509472.
WA509478 122.	World Art	Fire stick	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood; Stick, pointed at both ends, decorated with zig-zag lines and dots. In quiver WA509472.
WA509479 123.	World Art	Fire stick	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood;
WA509603 124.	World Art	Spear	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Metal; Wood; Iron Lozenge blade, long shank, attached to wooden shaft with iron spiral band. Blade width 27mm.
WA509604 125.	World Art	Spear	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Metal; Wood; Iron Leaf blade, two barbs, attached to shaft with iron

						spiral band. Blade width 25mm.
WA509605126.	World Art	Spear	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Metal; Wood; Iron Narrow leaf blade, lower portion of iron shank squared and sides decorated with incised zig-zag lines, attached to wooden shaft with iron spiral band. Blade width 26mm.
WA509606127.	World Art	Spear	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Metal; Wood; Animal skin Long narrow leaf blade, spear attached to part of a staff with interlaced thong of hide.
WA509607128.	World Art	Spear	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Metal; Wood; Animal skin Narrow leaf blade attached to shaft with hide band.
WA509608129.	World Art	Spear	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Metal; Wood; Animal skin Narrow leaf blade attached to shaft with interlaced hide.
WA509609130.	World Art	Spear	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Metal; Wood; Iron Narrow leaf blade attached to shaft with iron spiral band.
WA509610131.	World Art	Axe	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Wood; Iron Axe made from wrought iron, a pointed cylinder beaten out into a cutting end, with a knobbed wooden handle. Axe length 203mm, handle length 552mm.
WA520039132.	World Art	Snuff Container	Botswana	Pre-1899	Reverend William Charles Willoughby	Animal hair; Animal ivory; Ivory; Leather; Hide

List of Objects from the Smithsonian Museum of African Art

Item No.	Documentation No.	Name of object	Origin
80-2-1	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 26.7 x 24.1 x 24.1 cm (10 1/2 x 9 1/2 x 9 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-2	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 12.6 x 16.7 x 16.3 cm (4 15/16 x 6 9/16 x 6 7/16 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket with lid	Botswana
80-2-3	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 17.1 x 26.2 x 26.0 cm (6 3/4 x 10 5/16 x 10 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket with lid	Botswana
80-2-4	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.2 x 35.6 x 35.6 cm (6 x 14 x 14 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-5	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 23.2 x 21.7 x 21.3 cm (9 1/8 x 8 9/16 x 8 3/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-6	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 20.5 x 31.6 x 31.5 cm (8 1/16 x 12 7/16 x 12 3/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket with lid	Botswana
80-2-7	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 22.5 x 26 x 26 cm (8 7/8 x 10 1/4 x 10 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-8	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 27 x 28.9 x 28.9 cm (10 5/8 x 11 3/8 x 11 3/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-9	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 33.6 x 40.3 x 39.8 cm (13 1/4 x 15 7/8 x 15 11/16 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket with lid	Botswana
80-2-10	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 32.7 x 41.2 x 39.0 cm (12 7/8 x 16 1/4 x 15 3/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket with lid	Botswana
80-2-11	Late 20th century Plant fibre 50.0 x 38.0 x 35.6 cm (19 11/16 x 14 15/16 x 14 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket with lid	Botswana
80-2-12	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 41.2 x 53.0 x 50.8 cm (16 1/4 x 20 7/8 x 20 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket with lid	Botswana
80-2-13	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 11.4 x 24.1 x 24.1 cm (4 1/2 x 9 1/2 x 9 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-14	Late 20th century	Basket	Botswana

Item No.	Documentation No.	Name of object	Origin
	Plant fibre H x W x D: 11.4 x 27.6 x 27.6 cm (4 1/2 x 10 7/8 x 10 7/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis		
80-2-15	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 6.7 x 24.4 x 24.4 cm (2 5/8 x 9 5/8 x 9 5/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-16	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 10.2 x 27 x 27 cm (4 x 10 5/8 x 10 5/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-17	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 11.4 x 26 x 26 cm (4 1/2 x 10 1/4 x 10 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-18	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 14.6 x 30.5 x 30.5 cm (5 3/4 x 12 x 12 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-19	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 21.3 x 33.7 x 33.7 cm (8 3/8 x 13 1/4 x 13 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-20	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 9.8 x 31.1 x 31.1 cm (3 7/8 x 12 1/4 x 12 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-21	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 9.2 x 31.1 x 31.1 cm (3 5/8 x 12 1/4 x 12 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-22	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 7.9 x 32.1 x 32.1 cm (3 1/8 x 12 5/8 x 12 5/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-23	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 6.7 x 31.8 x 31.8 cm (2 5/8 x 12 1/2 x 12 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-24	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 11.4 x 35.2 x 35.2 cm (4 1/2 x 13 7/8 x 13 7/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-25	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 11.4 x 36.2 x 36.2 cm (4 1/2 x 14 1/4 x 14 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-26	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 12.1 x 36.2 x 36.2 cm (4 3/4 x 14 1/4 x 14 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-27	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 12.4 x 36.8 x 36.8 cm (4 7/8 x 14 1/2 x 14 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-28	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 13.7 x 37.5 x 37.5 cm (5 3/8 x 14 3/4 x 14 3/4 in.)	Basket	Botswana

Item No.	Documentation No.	Name of object	Origin
	Gift of Rick Davis		
80-2-29	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 12.7 x 38.1 x 38.1 cm (5 x 15 x 15 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-30	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 3.8 x 31.1 x 31.1 cm (1 1/2 x 12 1/4 x 12 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-31	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 3.2 x 34.9 x 34.9 cm (1 1/4 x 13 3/4 x 13 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-32	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 10.5 x 30.5 x 30.5 cm (4 1/8 x 12 x 12 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-33	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 10.8 x 34.9 x 34.9 cm (4 1/4 x 13 3/4 x 13 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-34	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 10.2 x 37.5 x 37.5 cm (4 x 14 3/4 x 14 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-35	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 7.9 x 33 x 33 cm (3 1/8 x 13 x 13 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-36	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 8.6 x 33.3 x 33.3 cm (3 3/8 x 13 1/8 x 13 1/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-37	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 6.4 x 33.7 x 33.7 cm (2 1/2 x 13 1/4 x 13 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-38	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 17.1 x 37.5 x 37.5 cm (6 3/4 x 14 3/4 x 14 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-39	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 18.1 x 38.4 x 38.4 cm (7 1/8 x 15 1/8 x 15 1/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-40	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 14 x 36.2 x 36.2 cm (5 1/2 x 14 1/4 x 14 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-41	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.2 x 37.8 x 37.8 cm (6 x 14 7/8 x 14 7/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-42	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 16.5 x 48.3 x 48.3 cm (6 1/2 x 19 x 19 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana

Item No.	Documentation No.	Name of object	Origin
80-2-43	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 14 x 42.5 x 42.5 cm (5 1/2 x 16 3/4 x 16 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-44	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 16.5 x 45.4 x 45.4 cm (6 1/2 x 17 7/8 x 17 7/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-46	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 17.1 x 45.1 x 45.1 cm (6 3/4 x 17 3/4 x 17 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-47	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 22.9 x 45.7 x 45.7 cm (9 x 18 x 18 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-48	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 7 x 27.3 x 27.3 cm (2 3/4 x 10 3/4 x 10 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-49	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 10.2 x 30.5 x 30.5 cm (4 x 12 x 12 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-50	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 10.2 x 30.8 x 30.8 cm (4 x 12 1/8 x 12 1/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-51	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 13.3 x 33.3 x 33.3 cm (5 1/4 x 13 1/8 x 13 1/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-52	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 9.5 x 34.3 x 34.3 cm (3 3/4 x 13 1/2 x 13 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-53	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 13 x 36.8 x 36.8 cm (5 1/8 x 14 1/2 x 14 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-54	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 11.4 x 35.6 x 35.6 cm (4 1/2 x 14 x 14 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-55	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 12.7 x 38.7 x 38.7 cm (5 x 15 1/4 x 15 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-56	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 13.3 x 41.3 x 41.3 cm (5 1/4 x 16 1/4 x 16 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-57	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 17.8 x 43.2 x 43.2 cm (7 x 17 x 17 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
	Late 20th century	Basket	Botswana

Item No.	Documentation No.	Name of object	Origin
80-2-58	Plant fibre H x W x D: 18.4 x 42.5 x 42.5 cm (7 1/4 x 16 3/4 x 16 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis		
80-2-59	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 16.5 x 40.6 x 40.6 cm (6 1/2 x 16 x 16 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-60	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 17.1 x 43.8 x 43.8 cm (6 3/4 x 17 1/4 x 17 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-61	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.2 x 46.4 x 46.4 cm (6 x 18 1/4 x 18 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-62	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.9 x 46.4 x 46.4 cm (6 1/4 x 18 1/4 x 18 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-63	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 16.5 x 47 x 47 cm (6 1/2 x 18 1/2 x 18 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-64	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 21.6 x 50.8 x 50.8 cm (8 1/2 x 20 x 20 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-65	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 23.2 x 50.8 x 50.8 cm (9 1/8 x 20 x 20 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-66	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 11.4 x 36.2 x 36.2 cm (4 1/2 x 14 1/4 x 14 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-67	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.2 x 36.8 x 36.8 cm (6 x 14 1/2 x 14 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-68	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 14 x 38.7 x 38.7 cm (5 1/2 x 15 1/4 x 15 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-69	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 17.5 x 39.4 x 39.4 cm (6 7/8 x 15 1/2 x 15 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-70	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 18.4 x 38.7 x 38.7 cm (7 1/4 x 15 1/4 x 15 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-71	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.9 x 35.6 x 35.6 cm (6 1/4 x 14 x 14 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-72	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 17.8 x 38.1 x 38.1 cm (7 x 15 x 15 in.)	Basket	Botswana

Item No.	Documentation No.	Name of object	Origin
	Gift of Rick Davis		
80-2-73	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 22.9 x 43.2 x 43.2 cm (9 x 17 x 17 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-74	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 21.6 x 43.2 x 43.2 cm (8 1/2 x 17 x 17 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-75	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 21 x 44.5 x 44.5 cm (8 1/4 x 17 1/2 x 17 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-76	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 17.1 x 46.4 x 46.4 cm (6 3/4 x 18 1/4 x 18 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-77	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 7.9 x 32.4 x 32.4 cm (3 1/8 x 12 3/4 x 12 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-78	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 9.5 x 29.2 x 29.2 cm (3 3/4 x 11 1/2 x 11 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-79	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 10.5 x 31.8 x 31.8 cm (4 1/8 x 12 1/2 x 12 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-80	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 10.5 x 29.2 x 29.2 cm (4 1/8 x 11 1/2 x 11 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-81	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 9.5 x 29.8 x 29.8 cm (3 3/4 x 11 3/4 x 11 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-82	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 11.4 x 33 x 33 cm (4 1/2 x 13 x 13 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-83	Late 20th century Plant fibre Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-84	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 10.5 x 33 x 33 cm (4 1/8 x 13 x 13 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-85	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 14 x 34.9 x 34.9 cm (5 1/2 x 13 3/4 x 13 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-86	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 5.7 x 30.2 x 30.2 cm (2 1/4 x 11 7/8 x 11 7/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-87	Late 20th century Plant fibre	Basket	Botswana

Item No.	Documentation No.	Name of object	Origin
	H x W x D: 4.4 x 29.8 x 29.8 cm (1 3/4 x 11 3/4 x 11 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis		
80-2-88	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 5.7 x 27.9 x 27.9 cm (2 1/4 x 11 x 11 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-89	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 12.4 x 35.6 x 35.6 cm (4 7/8 x 14 x 14 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-90	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 6.4 x 38.7 x 38.7 cm (2 1/2 x 15 1/4 x 15 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-91	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 3.2 x 36.2 x 36.2 cm (1 1/4 x 14 1/4 x 14 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-92	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 16.8 x 38.7 x 38.7 cm (6 5/8 x 15 1/4 x 15 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-93	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 19.4 x 41 x 41 cm (7 5/8 x 16 1/8 x 16 1/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-94	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.6 x 44.5 x 44.5 cm (6 1/8 x 17 1/2 x 17 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-95	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.2 x 44.5 x 44.5 cm (6 x 17 1/2 x 17 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-96	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 13.7 x 42.5 x 42.5 cm (5 3/8 x 16 3/4 x 16 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-97	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 21.3 x 43.8 x 43.8 cm (8 3/8 x 17 1/4 x 17 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-98	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 19.1 x 47.6 x 47.6 cm (7 1/2 x 18 3/4 x 18 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-99	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 18.7 x 46.4 x 46.4 cm (7 3/8 x 18 1/4 x 18 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-100	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 21.3 x 49.8 x 49.8 cm (8 3/8 x 19 5/8 x 19 5/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-101	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 24.4 x 48.6 x 48.6 cm (9 5/8 x 19 1/8 x 19 1/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana

Item No.	Documentation No.	Name of object	Origin
80-2-102	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 14 x 40 x 40 cm (5 1/2 x 15 3/4 x 15 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-103	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.6 x 41.3 x 41.3 cm (6 1/8 x 16 1/4 x 16 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-104	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 19.4 x 39.4 x 39.4 cm (7 5/8 x 15 1/2 x 15 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-105	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 21 x 36.8 x 36.8 cm (8 1/4 x 14 1/2 x 14 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-106	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W: 22.2 x 40 cm (8 3/4 x 15 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-107	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.9 x 35.6 x 35.6 cm (6 1/4 x 14 x 14 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-108	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.6 x 33 x 33 cm (6 1/8 x 13 x 13 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-109	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 19.4 x 40 x 40 cm (7 5/8 x 15 3/4 x 15 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-110	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 20.3 x 40.3 x 40.3 cm (8 x 15 7/8 x 15 7/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-111	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 5.1 x 43.8 x 43.8 cm (2 x 17 1/4 x 17 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-112	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 22.9 x 48.6 x 48.6 cm (9 x 19 1/8 x 19 1/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-113	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 21 x 48.3 x 48.3 cm (8 1/4 x 19 x 19 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-114	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.9 x 50.2 x 50.2 cm (6 1/4 x 19 3/4 x 19 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-115	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 19.7 x 45.7 x 45.7 cm (7 3/4 x 18 x 18 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana

Item No.	Documentation No.	Name of object	Origin
80-2-116	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 13.3 x 41 x 41 cm (5 1/4 x 16 1/8 x 16 1/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-117	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 14 x 40.3 x 40.3 cm (5 1/2 x 15 7/8 x 15 7/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-118	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 17.1 x 42.5 x 42.5 cm (6 3/4 x 16 3/4 x 16 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-119	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 19.7 x 44.5 x 44.5 cm (7 3/4 x 17 1/2 x 17 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-120	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 18.4 x 47 x 47 cm (7 1/4 x 18 1/2 x 18 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-121	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 15.6 x 42.5 x 42.5 cm (6 1/8 x 16 3/4 x 16 3/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-122	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 12.1 x 39.7 x 39.7 cm (4 3/4 x 15 5/8 x 15 5/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-123	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 8.9 x 40.6 x 40.6 cm (3 1/2 x 16 x 16 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-124	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 10.2 x 34.3 x 34.3 cm (4 x 13 1/2 x 13 1/2 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-125	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 8.9 x 36.2 x 36.2 cm (3 1/2 x 14 1/4 x 14 1/4 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-126	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 6.4 x 30.2 x 30.2 cm (2 1/2 x 11 7/8 x 11 7/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-127	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 12.1 x 35.6 x 35.6 cm (4 3/4 x 14 x 14 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-128	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 7.3 x 33.3 x 33.3 cm (2 7/8 x 13 1/8 x 13 1/8 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
80-2-129	Late 20th century Plant fibre H x W x D: 7 x 33 x 33 cm (2 3/4 x 13 x 13 in.) Gift of Rick Davis	Basket	Botswana
89-9-130	Late 20th century Plant fibre, dye	Basket	Possibly Tswana artist

Item No.	Documentation No.	Name of object	Origin
	H x W x D: 38.8 x 37.6 x 37.5 cm (15 1/4 x 14 13/16 x 14 3/4 in.) Museum purchase		Botswana
2012-16-131	San artist Early to mid-20th century Leather, ostrich eggshell beads, sinew H x W x D: 48.3 x 38.1 x 1.3 cm (19 x 15 x 1/2 in.) Gift of Ambassador Kenneth and Bonnie Brown	Apron	South Africa Botswana
80-2-132	Late 20th century plant fibre. Gift of Rick Davis.	basket	Botswana
80-2-133	Late 20th century plant fibre. Gift from Rick Davis	Basket with lid	Botswana
80-2-134	Late 20th century plant fibre. Gift from Rick Davis	Basket with lid	Botswana
80-2-135	Late 20th century plant fibre. Gift from Rick Davies	basket	Botswana
80-2-136	Late 20th century plant fibre. Gift from Rick Davis	basket	Botswana
80-2-137	Late 20th century plant fibre. Gift from Rick Davis	Basket with lid	Botswana
80-2-138	Late 20th century plant fibre. Gift from Rick Davis	basket	Botswana
80-2-139	Late 20th century plant fibre. Gift from Rick Davis	basket	Botswana
80-2-140	Late 20th century plant fibre. Gift from Rick Davis.	Basket with lid	Botswana

APPENDIX 3
A DIGITAL MAP SHOWCASING THE DIASPORA DISPERSION OF BOTSWANA'S COLLECTIONS



APPENDIX 4
LANGUAGE EDITING CERTIFICATE

WORDPLAY EDITING
Copy Editor and Proofreader
Email: karien.hurter@gmail.com
Tel: 071 104 9484
Website: http://wordplayediting.net/

25 April 2020

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to confirm that *The Migrated Museum: Restitution or a Shared Heritage?* by Winani W. Thebele was edited by a professional language practitioner.

Regards,



Karien Hurter