Contemporary Journal of African Studies Vol. 12 No. 2 (2025), pp.182–204

Commentary

Inspiration and Reciprocity: Transferring insights and perspectives on restitution matters from Africa to Europe[1]

Andreas Mehler

The workshop "Inspiration and Reciprocity: Transferring insights and perspectives on restitution matters from Africa to Europe", held on 26 and 27 September 2024 at the University of Freiburg (UFR) and organized in collaboration with the Africa Centre for Transregional Research (ACT), was the Merian Institute for Advanced Studies in Africa (MIASA)'s first event taking place outside the African continent. It aimed at discussing and promoting the research findings on restitution issues elaborated particularly at MIASA at the University of Ghana (UG), Legon, Accra, and more broadly on the African continent. The impetus, emphasis and findings of this research has been partly ignored in Germany. A disconnect between discussions can be noted. In Germany, the primary topics of discussion continue to revolve around challenges faced by exclusively German museums of different sizes, the prerequisites and outcomes of provenance research, legal considerations regarding transfer modalities, and political influences both in favor of and against restitution. There is little attention to issues of entanglement and comparison with other sites, especially, but not only, those where artefacts, ancestral remains etc. originate. This means that the historical–political background of "collecting", the expectations and effects of restitution in African societies, as well as the challenges and opportunities facing African museums and university collections

[1] I want to thank Ines Tönnissen for taking extensive notes during the workshop, Anika Becher for carefully going through the argumentation and Agnes Schneider-Musah for language edits.

are largely absent from the German discourse. Additionally, negotiations between local "communities of origin" (see below) and nation-state actors are often overlooked. MIASA fellows, guests, and advisory board members, including those from Germany, have consistently highlighted what was already evident at the first MIASA restitution workshop in 2018: the location of knowledge production significantly impacts research questions, content, and focus. Furthermore, it aimed at initiating conversations with non-Africanist researchers in selected relevant disciplines, particularly archaeology and history.

Place Matters! Main concerns and main insights on restitution matters - from Africa.

The Freiburg workshop's first panel built on the 2018 MIASA workshop on restitution which had resulted in a statement by participants that has set a tone in the debate[2]. The 2018 workshop was followed by an edited volume in the UG-based *Contemporary Journal of African Studies*[3], an Interdisciplinary Fellow Group[4], a related workshop held at the premises of the German Historical Institute in Paris[5], a research tandem[6] and contributions to the mid-term conference of MIASA. Six participants from the first workshop were present in Freiburg again. In the meantime, a number of publications directly or indirectly related to MIASA's activities in the area of restitution have been published (see bibliography); applications

[2] https://ugspace.ug.edu.gh/items/d992a0fa-a8c1-4b84-9a83-c8f1c537bd9b
[3] https://journals.ug.edu.gh/index.php/cjas/issue/view/33
[4] https://miasa.hypotheses.org/1711
[5] https://www.dhi-paris.fr/de/veranstaltungsdetails/seminare/SeminarTime/detail/epistemologies-of-restitution-transcultural-aphasia3786.html
[6] https://miasa.ug.edu.gh/event/public-lecture-gavua-hahn/

for third-party funding have been launched.[7]

Excursus: MIASA

MIASA is an Institute for Advanced Studies committed to promoting high-quality research. Unlike many comparable institutes, however, MIASA explicitly seeks to lower global asymmetries in knowledge production by supporting outstanding African scholars while simultaneously contributing to intellectual life and research at the University of Ghana, Legon. During its initial and ongoing main project phases, MIASA has received funding from the German Federal Ministry of Research, Technology and Space as one of five affiliated institutes worldwide. At the same time, it was established with a long-term institutional vision, reflected in the University of Ghana's formal recognition of MIASA as an institute under its regulations, as well as the provision of premises, technical infrastructure, and staff support. Restitution, particularly concerning looted artefacts and ancestral remains, constitutes one of MIASA's central thematic areas. Further information on MIASA's programmes, fellows, conferences—including the Anton Wilhelm Amo Lecture—and publications is available via MIASA's official website.

[7] Currently funded is PhoTogo: – Shedding light on colonial photographs from Togo: conducting reciprocal, transnational, and interdisciplinary research with MIASA PI Kokou Azamede and Freiburg-based Richard Legay https://www.arnold-bergstraesser.de/en/projects/phototogo-shedding-light-colonial-photographs-togo-conducting-reciprocal-transnational-and; and a project on Ancestral Remains in University collections involving inter alia Andreas Mehler and MIASA AAB member Ciray Rassool, https://www.eucor-uni.org/en/funding-opportunities/eucor-seed-money/id-2024/research-innovation-and-transfer/human-remains-in-university-collections-comparison-and-entanglements. More applications are currently submitted.

While many discussants warned of over-generalization in the debate – considering the different shapes colonial conquest and violence took, how the histories and current practices of museums varied, and the diverse attitudes displayed by African governments – some key elements of a more African-centered debate were tangible.

Restitution itself is understood differently in North and South/Germany and many African countries. The apparently innocent and more or less technical connotation of "Rückgabe" ("giving back") in German discourse is far from being uncontested while "restitution" is both a juridical term, a claim to restore justice which necessarily involves at least apologies but also possibly reparations, and a long-term societal engagement with past guilt. Hence, "restitution" is to be understood as a process ("restitutionary work") rather than an individual act, a work of mourning and healing. Restitution work can thus be considered as part of the work of decolonization and should – in the view of many – be African-led. Therefore, insisting on property that simply needs to be transferred back is inappropriate. Some participants criticized the fact that German decision-makers still want to determine the framework of discussions while it is high time to listen, accept African initiatives, and question a historically (or colonially) acquired dominance in international affairs.

One key African plea ignored in Germany/Europe is giving weight to local actors and their emotions; there is a human face to questions of restitution and to the setting where the materials are from, which is often largely ignored by German/European actors. Emotions are not only involved when addressing the absence of ancestors, but also artefacts

and other materials. "Communities of origin" (for lack of a better word)[8] may still pray to the (lost) materials. Through books and oral accounts, African people know about colonial injustice and widespread violence exerted during the colonial context. However, precise knowledge may be limited, because oral information is often the only source African researchers can easily access (with archival resources often situated abroad and difficult to access). Reversing the gaze, what do ordinary German citizens know and think of the colonial past that was nearly fully absent from public debate until only recently? The disconnect of the African from the German debate is evident on at least two counts: a) in the latter, empathy with the victims of colonialism is rarely displayed; b) academic studies on colonialism can be quite aloof from society and remain abstract.

Another disconnect that has to be overcome by recent efforts is more practical: how can looted or otherwise "acquired" materials go/come back? A legal framework is not yet well defined, situations between the federal states of Germany are potentially confusing, although guidelines have been updated recently, marking a true progress in comparison to earlier stages.[9] MIASA-related research would affirm that at least one thing is clear: source communities would, in most cases, prefer to get the materials back to the same place from which they were stolen. But whether they should go to a royal palace or a museum to be built after the materials' return (or to other places), that may still vary.

---

[8] Several controversies on appropriate terminology came up during the workshop. Among them was "community" which at times could be more appropriately replaced by family, clan, village, kingdom, polity etc. – depending on context. Similarly, "objects" or "items" may convey the impression of being inanimate, neutral and at best materially valuable. Still it is difficult to propose alternatives that would also be well-understood.

[9] See https://restitutionmatters.org/publication/germany-new-guidelines-on-the-treatment-of-cultural-property-and-human-remains/

Museums – both in former colonizing and formerly colonized states – have to reinvent themselves in the light of the current discussion (and curators present at the workshop are all engaged in this process). The violent, extractivist nature of colonial "collection" is increasingly acknowledged in Germany, though not everywhere. However, the problem of "objectification" of artefacts, human beings, animals and materials (classification along typologies, giving numbers, entering them in catalogues) resulting in one-dimensionality of meanings, desecration and/or loss of dignity, is still hardly addressed. Among the ideas in that regard mentioned at the workshop were, to give voice to the ancestors, and the inclusion of multi-media archives. Museums would no longer be silent places, both in former colonies and Germany but could become main actors in the long-term work of healing and reconstruction (which they are not yet!).

Restitution can also be considered as a work of mourning which moves the work by activists, and the African diaspora in Germany, to the center-stage; this cannot simply be done by (white) German actors. The overall sentiment in the workshop was that one should not be discouraged by resistance, ignorance, misunderstandings and practical challenges that are part of a necessary discussion on colonial heritages.

The German Discussion – main elements and obvious gaps.

The second panel grappled with the German debate and particular institutional frameworks with their distinctive features. African researchers in former German colonies may have more immediate connections to French or British institutions which work differently, complicating matters considerably. For this panel with its focus on Germany,

comparing geopolitical motivations, legislation and restitution practices in different European countries proved insightful.

An element of concern that emerged was the slow progress in implementing a joint policy between federal government and the "Länder" (federal states). Only limited achievements have been made since 2019, when the impulse to move forward was clearly voiced. While the German Lost Arts Foundation has opened a new research focus and was able to spend substantial amounts of money in project funding, no law or national commission has been implemented. The Foreign Office and the Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and the Media are only recently more coherent in their approach (the new Guidelines adopted in 2025 are a step forward). However, very few items have been returned.[10]

For German museums, trust-building with (research) partners from all over the world is a fundamental new task that is, in varying degrees, taken on with energy and acknowledgment of one's own responsibility (although, admittedly, initial requests for changing attitudes have rather come from outside the museum). In practice, for museum staff, restitution activities come in addition to all other tasks; this is a real challenge that is not always spotted by African critiques. One may consider this new field of activity as the new "regular work" which should have consequences for budget allocation within museums. Additional sources of funding are limited and often project-oriented, while restitution work needs continuity, first and foremost.[11] However, some applicants manage to use project

[10] See German Colonial Restitution Monitor. See https://dekolonial-erinnern.de/german-colonial-restitution-monitor/ (Status 3 December 2025). The German guidelines for restitution have been updated recently

[11] A side-track discussion was on the notion of „slow science" which highlights depth and long-term cooperation. However, one strong emphasis in the entire discussion was also on the need to speed up research – given the danger of closing windows of opportunities in light of a fundamental reclusion of the political space in many European countries after recent elections.

money to produce tangible outcomes that are at least shared with African colleagues or, in the best case scenario, are already a result of transcontinental co-production.

The political environment varies strongly between German museums due to different judicial situations. The federal government rarely has direct influence on museums, a position more frequently exercised by state and municipal decision-makers and bureaucracies. Given the largely decentralized nature of politics in Germany, political leanings differ strongly between localities. This has effects on the restitution debate which is differently perceived by the "left" and "right". It is important to understand that museums are bound to follow the policies of city or state level authorities. This may lead to controversial assessments, with state bureaucracies, curators, visitors, local citizens and diaspora activists rarely on the same page or having the same priorities.

However, committed museums are also increasingly becoming places of conversation between stakeholders and take on a political role as spaces for debate and deliberation, fully different from their role when founded (nation-building via education, conferring the image of racial superiority, justification of a civilizing mission, raising interest in the exploitation of material resources etc.).

Museums as part of the academic scene have also taken on new roles. Valuing oral history and local knowledge is starting to become a lived reality in some museums and may bridge dividing lines between historiography and social/cultural anthropology. Museums can explore key questions (for example, how do people remember? Who tells the story to whom?) that are marginal in most universities. Curators can also take an active part by asking innovative questions such as what to do when "objects" have lost their spiritual meaning, and by initiating international collaboration.

However, particularly from an African perspective, German institutions have not only failed to substantially return clearly

requested items, but also failed to produce enough transparency on their holdings. It took a major lateral initiative to produce the Atlas of Absence focusing only on cultural heritage from Cameroon in German collections.[12] Furthermore, German museums are still often reluctant to grant full access to their archives and sources, particularly for researchers from the Global South.

One element of discussion was whether not only "objects" will be restituted, but also knowledge. More is needed from museums in Germany in this regard. At the same time, museums (and research) need to open up more to knowledge and perspectives from "communities of origin" and create spaces for dialogue/polylogue.

What happens once restitution has taken place – in "societies of origin"?

The third panel looked into the local effects of restitution. A fully smooth transfer is unlikely when several issues remain contested: who is entitled to negotiate and to receive restituted items? which items should be prioritized for restitution? in what condition should they return? what are appropriate surrounding conditions? which role and which place should be reserved for these items (whether artefacts, documents or ancestral remains)? While the term "stakeholder" was disliked by some in the discussion, it was still clear in the discussion that various actors involved in the process of restitution have their own – often diverging – interests.

Returns have been organized recently, not least also from Germany. One of the obvious recent cases is the return

[12] About 40,000 "objects", see: Autorenkollektiv (coordinated by Savoy, Bénédicte; Meyer, Angela) (2023). *Atlas der Abwesenheit. Kameruns Kulturerbe in Deutschland*, Dietrich Reimer Verlag:

of Benin Bronzes to Nigeria/Benin City.[13] A number of the complexities of restitution are exemplified in this return:

- the incongruence of the former and current polities on the African side. Obviously, there was no "Nigerian" state when the treasures were stolen and the role of Nigerian government institutions may be questioned,
- some spiritual/ceremonial artefacts may not regain their former role as local people have accepted new religions (Christianity or Islam).
- despite this, it is clear that the returned artefacts are highly valued locally, and the need to revive the spiritual potential of the objects is a local issue of concern.

This points to a more general concern whether artefacts can be cleaned a) from poisonous substances used for their preservation in German museums, and/or damage (by bombs during the world wars) or b) also spiritually from their century-long storage and abuse?

Asymmetries in power relation, contestation of representation, legitimacy or inclusion/participation in negotiations and the ceremonial side of restitution can be exemplified by focusing on recent returns to Namibia. While the Namibian government claimed an important role in state to state negotiations, it was hardly the driver behind restitution claims. The chosen procedures in the end looked unacceptable to many, not least when consensus over the rightful owner of symbolic "objects" (in particular Hendrik Witboii's so-called "whip" and Bible) could not be achieved. Such openly displayed quarrels equally put German actors in an awkward situation.

[13] The former kingdom of Benin was an important polity with a prominent role in the slave trade, but was "punished" by the British by a full destruction and plunder of the capital and palace in 1897. As a result, probably 3-5,000 pieces were looted and are spread all over the world.

A further important local issue is in the field of potential reparations. Once again, the role of African governments is delicate. Not all African governments look prepared to stand in for communities that have suffered hardest from colonialism. All the more, it has become essential that communities of origin have direct access to German institutions, get due attention and receive at least the essential, spiritually important items plus whatever documentation is available. Still, also in the area of reparations, it cannot be assumed that national governments are better positioned than successor generations of direct victims of colonization to formulate their claims.

Confronting established disciplines with new ethical and practical concerns from Africa

The second day of the workshop started with two parallel panels focusing specifically on two relevant academic disciplines: Archaeology and (public) History.

The moderated discussion on History focused on the specific historical grounding of the discipline in Germany and in African countries, including formative experiences during the colonial era. In Germany, the colonial discipline structure still largely persists. The German discipline is formed out of a narrow understanding of history. While African school education in history often overemphasized the role of colonial powers in world affairs, the predilection for national history/histories resulted in similar distortions in Germany – while manifold economic, cultural and political asymmetries and entanglements originating in colonialism are still formative today.

Many participants argued that restitution gets too little attention in German historiography, leaving this topic largely to social and cultural anthropology. Among the reasons invoked was the preference by contemporary history for written sources, not objects. Historical provenance research is rarely conducted, although methodologically relevant, or mis–

communicated. Self-sustaining cross-continental research networks are created through continued practice, or will not endure. With the exception of Public History (claiming social and political relevance) and strands of Global History, the discipline at times looks imprisoned in a self-imposed exile where post-colonial thinking is anathema. However, relevant historiography on colonialism exists outside the academic sphere; however, these local initiatives (such as "Berlin Postkolonial" or "Freiburg Postkolonial" or "Geschichtswerkstätten") can hardly replace paid positions in universities.

A number of critical themes for the discipline were raised:

- Lack of self-inquiry: There is a dearth of opportunities and spaces where scholars, students, activists and practitioners could come together to question the disciplinary setup.
- Little exposure to transdisciplinary work: This might be due to limited openness of (German) historiography to trans/multi/interdisciplinary work which enables the reproduction of the same institutions and habits unable to transcend colonially imposed geographical and disciplinary boundaries.
- Misunderstanding restitution issues as topics of the present time where history is misplaced or degraded to a "help-desk" in provenance research.
- Unethical practices: The persistence of colonial era (ab)use of African interlocutors as a source of information instead of acknowledging them as co-creators of history.
- Teaching failures: One-sided trainings for students of history to understand primarily "the archive". Appropriate training should include attention to local (incl. oral) history and getting access to a much broader set of information (e.g. online-libraries, digitized archives, museums etc.).

In the parallel session on Archaeology, a tour de table produced a good starting point of discussions. One broad challenge to European archaeologists might originate in different understandings of the discipline's dominant self-conception as "excavating the past" when "producing new history" could be an alternative vision. Archaeology has been to a large extent a "colonial discipline" (just mentioning obelisks in London or Paris may suffice…) which now needs to face the challenge of its own decolonialization. However, some current approaches hold promises like "experimental archaeology," which aims at understanding historical craftsmanship by copying them and could be read as an invitation to broader participation and cooperation with communities. The inherent potential of Archaeology has not been used sufficiently: a) findings by archaeologists have the potential to challenge dominant narratives or even change power relations, b) it may be used to elucidate crimes (including colonial crimes against humanity), and it can c) serve as an equivalent to missing voices from past periods.

Here again a number of critical themes were mentioned:

- Unethical practices: for a long time taking excavated material to one's home departments for research – and rarely returning them – was common.
- Eurocentric terminology (plus typologies, classification etc.) is rarely questioned.
- Teaching and curricula avoid the debate about the colonial history of the discipline.
- Publications: Often only lead archaeologists are mentioned in academic publications, while many more support staff (local assistants, including also women and children) are actively ignored (this is remnant of a colonial attitude); open access publishing is rare, translations into local languages are absent, meaning that research findings are not restituted.

- Frequently, communities whose history and ancestors are studied are absent from narration.
- While discussions on public museums and university collections have started, private holdings – potentially of high importance – are left out.
- The discipline itself is rather discrete and does not engage in public debate while one can claim that archaeology is highly political, not least in terms of bilateral relations (it is not by chance that the German Archaeological Institute is under the tutelage of the Foreign Office).

"Reciprocity", "reversing the gaze" and collaborative practices on publications, archival work, museum, arts

The next panel was meant to exemplify different formats of co-creation within the thematic field across borders. It ranged from experiences of co-editorship in the production of a special issue in an open access Africa-based scholarly journal, tandem research in an innovative long-term project and in a shorter tandem fellowship at MIASA plus collaborative approaches in archival work. Panelists exemplified the sort of collaborative practices sometimes not only involving different research traditions bound to nationality, but also disciplines. All formats face concrete, mostly practical challenges in the short-term, but were presented as eye-opening and rewarding. The longer-term challenge is to turn project-related funding into more solid sustainable partnership.

Expectations on Africa-based research on restitution matters

The last panel discussed ways forward for research on restitution matters in Africa. Participants clearly voiced a plea

for stock-taking ("Where are we?" and "What is going on?").[14] After all, we can witness only limited progress in restituting artefacts despite the acceptance of justified claims. This raises the question: who blocks the process (in Germany, in African countries)? One of the crucial items identified by the participants is the attitude of African governments towards restitution, concretely towards claims by communities and families, traditional authorities, but also national and local museums. It is evident that awareness about both opportunities and challenges of colonial memory politics is only expanding now. The role governments take on vary across the continent (from supportive to passive, if not reluctant), but also within one country from institution to institution. While this in itself could be an interesting topic of research, some participants rather highlighted the political role of researchers themselves who frequently discretely push – in conjunction with less discrete civil society representatives – for restitution.

It was pointed out that today's states in Africa have come about as a result of colonization/decolonization and that governments have inherited features from the dominant colonial power disposition that now affect their approaches. Furthermore, the level of awareness about restitution issues among some key decision-makers in government, bureaucracy and legislatures – and obviously also traditional chiefs, scholars and students – may be limited. Therefore, exposure to research results through media, school teaching and civil society campaigns would be an important, indirect precondition for more progress in the actual process of restitution. However, a high level of mutual distrust between researchers and decision-makers has to be overcome, at least in some cases.

[14] A first test survey of expert assessments on such questions is presented and commented in Andreas Mehler: Restitution Governance – Current Status and the Way Forward, MIASA Working Paper, 2024 (2).

Awakening the self-interest of governments in the topic may open new opportunities: "Bringing back the objects" could build solid top-down relationships or could help to heal rifts within society. Promoting tourism and generating income may be further motives for supporting research and restitution itself.

Slow progress of the discussion within the African context also contains dangers as European parties have begun to set their guidelines and adapt legislation without due attention to African priorities. Several participants insisted that African researchers and governments should make sure that restitution is an African project and not a European one.

As a consequence, the appeal to the German research community is to invest in research partnerships *and* active restitution. This has several facets of which all stakeholders should be aware:

- Most of the relevant events are taking place in Germany, while awareness is needed in Africa ("how can you appropriate what you don't understand?") – so still more exchange is needed on the African continent, potentially by institutionalizing research and activism beyond the nation-state framework;
- The division between research, on the one hand, and civil society activists and government representatives on the other, may be felt in Germany/other European countries, but it may still be deeper on the African continent. The Ghana Focal Team on Restitution might be a model that others can adapt;
- While German academia and museums have recently faced budget cuts, and complain about limited capacities in personnel, it must be acknowledged that financial resources for restitutionary work are often fully absent for their African counterparts.

Participants also discussed the broad claim of 'shifting the power' which was mostly understood as being attentive to

who is speaking (and acting or failing to act), the legitimacy with which they are speaking, and who they are representing. Officials and co-opted researchers may be less outspoken than civil society activists who can push harder for restitution and also reparation. One expectation on Africa-based research was to build effective alliances.

Finally, some doubts were raised whether restitution will ever become a priority when civil wars, climate change, poverty, infectious diseases and other crises dominate both domestic public debate and global policy agendas. However, valuing heritage in a process of restitution may have important positive side-effects (on self-esteem, valuing local knowledge, contributing to healing) which should not be underestimated.

Conclusion

This workshop had convened participants from different national, disciplinary and occupational backgrounds discussing key issues of restitution in an open atmosphere. Participants expressed appreciation; MIASA feels invited to continue working in this thematic field while thinking of further opportunities to build bridges between stakeholders in universities, museums and civil society.

https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/contjas.v12i2.7

Prof. Andreas Mehler (andreas.mehler@abi.uni-freiburg.de) is Director of the Arnold Bergstraesser Institute and Professor of Political Science at Freiburg University, Germany. He is a former co-editor of Africa Spectrum (2009–2018) and the Africa Yearbook (since 2005) and is currently chair of the executive council of the Merian Institute for Advanced Studies in Africa (MIASA).

References

Apoh, W. & Mehler, A. (2021). Vom Rande aus betrachtet. Das Humboldt-Forum und die Restitutionsdebatte. *Welt Trends*, 2021(179), 54-58.

----------. (2020). Mainstreaming the Discourse on Restitution and Repatriation within African History, Heritage Studies and Political Science. *Contemporary Journal of African Studies (CJAS)*, 7(1), 1-16.

----------. (2020). Introduction: Issues of Restitution and Repatriation of Looted and Illegally Acquired African Objects in European Museums. *Contemporary Journal of African Studies (CJAS)*, 7(1), IX-XII

Azamede, K. & Mehler, A. (2023). Restitution als Chance zum Dialog zwischen "Zentrum" und "Peripherie", SWP Blog Joint Futures 13, 23.10.2023 https://www.swp-berlin.org/publikation/mta-joint-futures-13-restitution-als-change-zum-dialog

Eyifa-Dzidzienyo, A., Mansah, G., Michels, S., Azamede, K., Doll, M., & Zollmann, J. (2023). Restitution, Return, Repatriation and Reparation (the 4Rs) in Africa: Reality or Transcultural Aphasia? MIASA Working Paper 2023(2) https://ugspace.ug.edu.gh/server/api/core/bitstreams/9d7f589a-7ae4-4e38-aad8-7d8af7b10773/content

Gavua, K. & Hahn, H., P. (2025). What is Restitution? Some Conceptual Considerations; MIASA Working Paper 2025(1), https://ugspace.ug.edu.gh/server/api/core/bitstreams/1cecca7a-7e40-470d-b408-a31acfd6ab6f/content

Gavua, K. (2025). The Fate of African Collections in European Museums. *Material Religion* 21.3 (2025): 342-344.

Mehler, A. (2024). Restitution Governance – Current Status and the Way Forward. MIASA Working Paper 2024 (2),

https://ugspace.ug.edu.gh/server/api/core/bitstreams/fa26e08c-ad71-403b-ace8-bc3365be5051/content

Tsogang, F., R. & Mehler, A. (2025). ≪ Restes humains ≫ dans les collections universitaires. Un héritage de la violence coloniale à traiter d'urgence. Policy Paper No 3, BMBF Network Postcolonial Hierarchies in Peace and Conflict & Africa Centre for Transregional Research (ACT) Policy Paper https://rewritingpeaceandconflict.net/2025/05/30/policy-paper-restes-humains/

Appendix

Inspiration and Reciprocity: Transferring insights and perspectives on restitution matters from Africa to Europe (26/27 September 2024)

Workshop Programme

Workshop aims The planned event serves to discuss and publicise the research results on restitution issues, but not least discussing African perspectives within the German academic landscape.

In Germany, the main topics of discussion are still the challenges faced by local museums, the prerequisites and results of provenance research, legal considerations regarding transfer modalities and political influences in favour of and against restitution. Largely absent from the German discussion, however, are the (controversial) historical–political and identity–creating effects of restitutions in African countries, the problems and opportunities of African museums – as well as university collections – but also the negotiations between local communities of origin and nation–state actors. MIASA fellows, guests and advisory board members – including those from Germany – have repeatedly emphasised what was already very clear at the first MIASA restitution workshop namely that the place of knowledge production has a major influence on research questions, content and emphasis. This is also true for disciplinary discussions – and we want to start discussions with non–africanist researchers in selected concerned disciplines, beginning with archaeology.

26 September

9:30 Registration

9:45 Welcome (Grace Diabah and Mamadou Diawara)

10:00 Introduction to the workshop (Andreas Mehler and Wazi Apoh)

10:15–12:00 Place Matters! Main concerns and main insights on restitution matters – from Africa

- Aba Eyifa-Dzidzienyo (Co-Convenor IFG), Commented by advisory board member – Ciraj Rassool, Kokou Azamede, Dag Henrichsen as observer of the first activity/workshop in 2018
- Open discussion

12:00–13:15 Lunch

13:15–15:00 The German Discussion – main elements and obvious gaps.

Chair: Anna-Maria Brandstetter

Insights by insiders – short inputs:

- Thomas Fues (political sphere)
- Fiona Siegenthaler, Friedrich von Bose (museum and ethnography)
- Larissa Förster (funding organisation)
- Albert Gouaffo (frequent interlocutor and member of advisory boards)
- Richard Legay (public history) with a comparative perspective (France)
- Discussion

15:00 Coffee break

15:30–17:15 What happens once restitution has taken place – in „societies of origin"?

Chair: Kokou Azamede

Inputs

- by close observers, e.g. from the restitution to Benin City (Zainab Moussa Shallangwa)

- Local concerns with issues of power, representation, legitimacy, inclusion/participation – focus on Namibia (Reinhart Koessler)
- From restitution to claims for reparations? (Valence Silayo)
- Discussion

19:00 Dinner

27 September

10:00–12:00 Confronting established disciplines with new ethical and practical concerns from Arica: Two parallel sessions, moderated discussions

a) Archaeology: participants would include Gavua, Wazi, Stroth, Eyifa-Dzidzienyo, Silayo, Rushohora etc.
b) (Public) History: participants would include Kalibani, Rassool, Holger Stoecker, (Sylvia Paletschek tbc) etc.

12–13:15 Lunch

13:15–15:00 "Reciprocity", "reversing the gaze" and collaborative practices in publications, archival work, museums, arts

Chair: Elise Pape

Inputs

- Special issue publication: Wazi Apoh/Andreas Mehler (CJAS)
- Archive: Judith Opoku-Boateng
- Research project – dialogue/polylogue: Nadja Germann/Albert Gouaffo
- Tandem research: Kodzo Gavua/Hanspeter Hahn

15:00–15:15 Coffee Break

15:15–17:00 Expectations on Africa-based research on restitution matters

Chair: Mamadou Diawara

- What do communities of origin want? How to conduct research locally (by insiders and outsiders) – Input Nancy Rushohora
- Reluctant governments? Are claims for restitution sufficiently supported by African governments – Input Kodzo Gavua
- Civil Society: co-creation in research, initiatives to push for restitution – Input Sylvie Njobati
- Role of MIASA (final phase and beyond)

17:00 Final discussion: the way ahead

17:30 End of workshop