

ATLAS OF ABSENCE

CAMEROON'S CULTURAL HERITAGE IN GERMANY

This document is an automatic translation DeepL of the German original available here in open access:

<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

The German original includes a large number of colour maps and infographics as well as illustrations. The pagination of the German original is shown in red square brackets in this document to facilitate cross-referencing with the original. References to maps, illustrations and footnotes have been retained, but the visual material has been removed from this unedited translation. Maps, infographics, etc. should therefore be consulted in the German version of the book. Only the original German version is authoritative. Please quote the German version in academic work.

REIMER

Mikaél Assilkinga
Lindiwe Breuer
Fogha Mc. Cornilius Refem
Albert Gouaffo
Dieu Ly Hoang
Yann LeGall
Yrine Matchinda
Andrea Meyer
Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III
Philippe Rekacewicz
Bénédicte Savoy Sebastian-Manès Sprute
Richard Tsogang Fossi
Eyke Vonderau

[P.1] ATLAS OF ABSENCE

CAMEROON'S CULTURAL HERITAGE IN GERMANY

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.2] This publication is a result of the DFG project "Reverse Collection History. Art and Culture from Cameroon in German Museums" led by **Prof. Dr. Albert Gouaffo** (Université de Dschang) and **Prof. Dr. Bénédicte Savoy** (Technische Universität Berlin)
Supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG)
SA 1829/8-1 and SA 1829/14-1

Bibliographic information of the German National Library

The German National Library lists this publication in the German National Bibliography; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at
<http://dnb.dnb.de>.

This work is
published under the Creative Commons licence
CC BY-ND 4.0.

The online version of this publication is
permanently available free of charge (Open Access) at www.arthistoricum.net.
URN: urn:nbn:en:bsz:16-ahn-artbook-1219-0
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

Published by Heidelberg University / University Library, 2023
arthistoricum.net - Specialised Information Service Art - Photography - Design
Grabengasse 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany
www.uni-heidelberg.de/de/impressum

Text © 2023, the authors

Design, layout, typesetting: Dorothée Billard, Mirjam Kroker and Philippe Rekacewicz
Editing: Stefan Krauss, post scriptum, Hüfingen
Research coordination: Eyke Vonderau, Berlin

Cover illustration: Dorothée Billard (original drawing rotated 77°)
Typeface: LL Brown
Paper: 90 g/m² Munken Print White 15
Printing and processing: druckhaus köthen GmbH & Co. KG

Print organisation, sales and marketing: Dietrich Reimer Verlag GmbH
www.reimer-verlag.de
Publishing support: Ben Bauer and Anna Felmy, Berlin

Printed in Germany | Printed on age-resistant paper

ISBN: 978-3-496-01700-4 (print version)
e-ISBN: 978-3-98501-203-9 (PDF)

[P.3] ATLAS OF ABSENCE

CAMEROON'S CULTURAL HERITAGE IN GERMANY

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.12-19>

Mikaél Assilkinga
Lindiwe Breuer
Fogha Mc. Cornilius Refem
Albert Gouaffo
Dieu Ly Hoang
Yann LeGall
Yrine Matchinda
Andrea Meyer
Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III
Philippe Rekacewicz
Bénédicte Savoy Sebastian-Manès Sprute
Richard Tsogang Fossi
Eyke Vonderau

Coordinated by Andrea Meyer and Bénédicte Savoy

[p.4] The figures and statistics for the maps and analyses in this book are based on the research of the DFG project "Reverse Collection History" (2020-2023). The majority of the sources used are stored in the TU Berlin repository and can be accessed in open access here:
<https://doi.org/10.14279/depositonce-17793>

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[S.5]

[Introduction]

9 - **The Project** (Bénédicte Savoy, Albert Gouaffo)

29 - **"Cameroons" becomes German**. History of a manipulative removal (Richard Tsogang Fossi)

45 - **Dislocation of Cameroon's cultural heritage in figures** (Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

[Stakeholders]

61 - **Chronology and stakeholders in the appropriation of Cameroonian cultural property**

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

95 - **"Carrier Calamities"**. Cultural property confiscation and the destruction of labour (Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

113 - **"Only to be obtained by force"**. Military Violence and Museum Collections (Yann LeGall)

[Objects]

141 - **Museums, Missions and Colonial Cultural Relocation** (Richard Tsogang Fossi)

157 - **Misunderstood, Missing, Coveted**. Objects of Power from Cameroon in Germany (Mikaél Assilkinga)

173 - **Parts of living people as museum objects**. The Appropriation of Hair in a Colonial Context (Richard Tsogang Fossi)

185 - **The "first German elephant"**. A Cameroonian Elephant on Order (Lindiwe Breuer)

[Benefits]

199 - **Unrecognisable**. Cultural Objects from Cameroon in German Image Production, 1905-1989 (Andrea Meyer)

229 - **In the Name of Science**. On the History of Research on the Cameroon Collections in Berlin in the 20th Century (Bénédicte Savoy)

265 - **Chaos in the Museum**. Taking Stock and Ordering Knowledge (Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

[And now?]

299 - **Plea for a Decolonial Language in the Museum** (Albert Gouaffo)

315 - **Conversations on Absence**. An Approach (Yrine Matchinda)

331 - **Embracing death so they may yet be space for life**. Why we want restitution (Fogha Mc. Cornilius Refem)

341 - **Benevolent attempt to clear up misunderstandings**. A letter after 24 years of waiting (Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III)

[Appendix]

354 - **Museums that hold Cameroonian cultural property in Germany**

356 - **Cameroonian Objects in German Inventories by Stakeholders**

358 - **Stakeholders**

370 - **Exemplary biographies**

[Picture booklet] - 441 **Selection of objects from Cameroon in German public museums**

[Appendix] - 505 **Picture credits, map credits, thanks, authors, index of names**

[S.7]

[Introduction]

9 - **The Project** (Bénédicte Savoy, Albert Gouaffo)

29 - **"Cameroons" becomes German.** History of a manipulative removal (Richard Tsogang Fossi)

45 - **Dislocation of Cameroon's cultural heritage in figures** (Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.9] The project

BÉNÉDICTE SAVOY, ALBERT GOUAFFO

Over 40,000 objects from Cameroon are now kept in public museums in the Federal Republic of Germany. That is a lot, even a great deal. By way of comparison, the entire African holdings of one of the most important ethnological museums in the world, the Musée du Quai Branly Jacques Chirac in Paris, has 69,000 inventory numbers for all countries in sub-Saharan Africa. This puts it on a par with the British Museum (69,000) or the Ethnological Museum (75,000) in Berlin - three institutions whose African collections are closely linked to Europe's colonial history.

Unlike in centralised France, where such collections are concentrated mainly in the capital Paris, the African holdings in Germany are spread across a large number of institutions throughout the country. In Stuttgart alone, the Cameroon collection of the Linden Museum comprises over 8,000 objects, in Berlin just over 5,000 and in Leipzig likewise, to name but three examples. [1] Here, too, a comparison is illuminating: Cameroon is far less present in the rich institutions of the British and French capitals of the respective former empires than in Germany: the Musée du Quai Branly in Paris lists almost 7840, the British Museum in London even "only" 1468 objects from Cameroon.[2] Yet Cameroon was under French or British administration (1920-1960) longer than under German rule (1884-1916/19). There is no state in the world that holds more objects from Cameroon in public ownership than the Federal Republic of Germany. This is a fundamental, surprising and downright shocking finding from the research for this book.

The huge Cameroon collection in the Federal Republic of Germany is not only the largest in the world - neither in Europe, nor in Asia, nor in the USA, let alone in Africa itself, are there similarly extensive collections in public ownership; they exceed many times over the state collections in Cameroon's capital Yaoundé, which with approx. 3] The "German" Cameroon collection is also the oldest in the world, since as early as 1884, often very old cultural objects were systematically removed and transported en masse to the German Reich, where they were no longer accessible to the subsequent colonial powers, France and Great Britain.

[p.10] Presence and Absence

One of the working hypotheses for the present atlas was that all the Cameroonian objects in German museums form a phantom Cameroon - to quote Michel Leiris' famous colonial-critical study *Fantom Africa* (1934) - or rather: a phantom and its shadow. A phantom in Germany, where the Cameroon holdings, although present in large numbers, are virtually invisible and yet have an effect on the society in which they quietly live - they are reminiscent of the fiction Congo, which was created during the Belgian colonial period not far from Brussels with over 180,000 objects in the Museum of Tervuren and which continues to evoke unease to this day.[4] At the same time, however, this phantom casts its long shadow on Cameroon itself, where a lack of information, aphasia and amnesia go hand in hand when talking about historical cultural assets outside the country.[5] Even the authors of this atlas had no idea at the beginning of their research of the immense dimensions of the material cultural heritage from Cameroon present in German ethnological museums, and at the same time how staggering the ignorance of it is, both in Cameroon and in Germany.[6]

Transparency

Research conducted in parallel to the work on this atlas has shown that this ignorance is not a coincidence of history, but was actually planned in the Federal Republic: In the 1970s, when after the turmoil of the First and Second World Wars museum scholars would have been perfectly capable of systematically processing and publishing the African holdings in the now divided Germany that came into their institutions so en masse around 1900, a doctrine prevailed, at least in West Germany, that warned against compiling inventories of objects: "This would arouse covetousness all the more", it was said in a secret paper of 1978 on the "defence" against restitution claims from the African continent and UNESCO.[7] In the decades that followed, this attitude became tacitly accepted. This explains why

in the Federal Republic of Germany, even museums supported by the federal government still do not have complete, publicly accessible descriptions of their Cameroon holdings, or indeed of their "non-European" collections in general. When we began work on this atlas, it accordingly took several months for all public museums that preserve cultural objects from Cameroon in Germany to make their object lists available.

However, since the return of several hundred so-called Benin bronzes by the Federal Republic of Germany to Nigeria in the summer of 2022 and the associated radical political [p.11], institutional and rhetorical turnaround on restitution issues in Germany, the work on and with the museums' object lists, which is essential for this atlas, has become increasingly easy and self-evident. Instead of "not wanting to arouse covetousness", many German museums are now concerned with promoting - or at least no longer preventing - ongoing efforts around the "Restitution of Knowledge" outside their institution. After all, the knowledge about the objects that were brought to Germany from Cameroon 100 years ago in the context of colonial power relations belongs to everyone. First and foremost, however, to those who recognise in them valuable testimonies to their own history and culture, in Cameroon and beyond.

No objects

We speak of "objects" and must warn at this point: the term is inappropriate. It refers to things of the most diverse nature, which are listed in European museums as musical instruments, textiles, weapons, jewellery, architectural elements, utilitarian objects, ritual statues, masks, etc. and are presented in museum halls in the best case scenario, but were never conceived as passive artefacts for display cases or depot shelves. Most of them originated as man-made companions to social and individual life in Cameroon. Many among them are endowed with singular powers, intergenerational histories, a character, a power, some even a will and a language, or to put it in English: they have agency. Linguistically, objects are defined by the fact that they are "demanded by a predicate". In our case, it is the so-called objects that often demand the predicate; they act like subjects, ordering, moving and shaping the world of people around them. Consequently, this atlas tries to avoid the term "object" as systematically as possible. If it does appear occasionally, then it is for pragmatic reasons, in order to be able to grasp the enormous quantity and heterogeneity of Cameroonian entities in German museums in linguistic terms.

Corpus

The corpus of approximately 40,000 inventory numbers from Cameroon in German public collections that lies behind the object concept is both enormous and tiny at the same time: in addition to them, there are also - often in the same institutions - hundreds of thousands of historical photographs and films from the former colony of Cameroon; in sound and phonographic archives countless recordings of human voices and music played; in natural history museums, zoological and [p.14] botanical gardens similar vast quantities of biological and geological specimens as well as living or hunted animals; in museums of prehistory and early history archaeological finds. In libraries also manuscripts and drawings, especially from the Bamum region, famous for its writing culture.[8] They have all not been systematically considered in this atlas; only one elephant, representative of many others, roams the pages of this book.

We also do not go into detail about the hundreds, perhaps thousands of fragments of Cameroonian people who died a natural or violent death in Cameroon around 1900 or were exhumed and brought to Germany to serve future "scientific" purposes, most of which have not been specified to date. Their skeletons, but often only isolated bones, skulls and teeth, were deposited thousands of times in university, medical or even ethnological museums in the German Reich alongside other parts of people from other regions of the world who had died; today, in many cases, they can hardly be associated with names of people or places. These anonymous persons or ancestors, known in German as "menschliche Überreste" or in English as "human remains", play a central role in the collective consciousness in Cameroon today. They are actually inseparable from the other things, animals, plants, recorded human voices, etc., that were taken out of the country during the German colonial

period to function as exhibits in Germany. The neat separation of people, animals, objects and material and immaterial entities is artificial. It corresponds to systems of classification that gradually established themselves in Europe in the course of the development of academic disciplines and museums from around 1750 onwards and are in no way suitable for grasping the relationality of human existence on earth, neither in Cameroon nor in other regions of the world. By concentrating in this atlas on objects from Cameroon in German ethnological museums nevertheless, we do not contribute to overcoming this oppressive classification. Behind our approach, however, is the pragmatic intention to initially make visible and hopefully also usable just one single, albeit staggeringly large, collection that has remained invisible and virtually unused since its formation in the German Empire over 100 years ago. A consideration of all the evidence of people, nature and culture that was relocated from Cameroon during the German colonial period, as desirable as it would have been, would have been beyond the scope of what was possible.^[9] Nevertheless, this atlas takes up this problem in one chapter by illuminating the removal and museum-related objectification of the hair of living people from Cameroon by German occupiers in the years around 1900.

[p.15] New Borders

But what does "Cameroon" mean here and what "Germany"? In both cases, the borders have changed. The African country of this name, from which German stakeholders extracted tens of thousands of objects between 1884 and 1919 under asymmetrical power relations, does not correspond to the present-day borders of Cameroon. Some of the things attributed to "Cameroon" in museum inventories today come from areas located in present-day Nigeria or Gabon. Conversely, some entries in the databases of German museums suggest that objects removed from the German colony of Cameroon during the colonial period belong to the neighbouring states of Gabon or Nigeria - this applies, for example, to countless objects from the fishing culture on the southern border of the former German colony (according to the databases: from Gabon). The approximately 40,000 Cameroonian objects in German public museums that we identified in painstaking reconstruction work are thus only those that were inventoried by the institutions as "Cameroonian". More in-depth research should undoubtedly unearth hundreds more objects that came to the German Empire around 1900 due to the power situation in the colony of Cameroon and that are not associated with this geographical indication in today's German museums. However, the border shifts do not only affect the African continent. Bavaria, for example, Prussia and the German Empire, in whose favour these objects were so massively withdrawn, no longer exist today in the borders of that time - or, like Prussia, have simply ceased to exist since 1945.

Intertemporality

Literally translated, intertemporality refers to the "time in between": between an event (e.g. the removal of cultural goods from A to B) and the moment in which this event is thematised (e.g. today). In the 100 years since the end of the German colony of Cameroon, the United Kingdom and the Republic of France shared the territory (1920-1960), adjusting its external borders. After independence from France (1960) and Great Britain (1961), which was achieved under brutal circumstances, Cameroon gave itself an independent constitution and form of government. This was followed by further border adjustments and a referendum in 1972, which resulted in a new border demarcation. During the same period, the German Reich lost territories in the west (Alsace-Lorraine) and east (including Posen, West Prussia, the Memelland, Danzig) after 1919 and was replaced by the Weimar Republic until the so-called Third Reich under Adolf Hitler occupied extensive territories in Europe after 1933. After 1945, in turn, not least the abolition of Prussia led to a radical **[p.20]** redefinition of borders within the framework of the division of Germany, until the two German states of the GDR and FRG were reunited in 1989.

For the history of Cameroonian objects taken to the then German Reich during the German colonial period, the history of German border and state changes as well as the Cold War plays a central role.

For example, today in Strasbourg, France, one finds Cameroonian holdings that went to the then Kaiser Wilhelm University during the "German period" and are still in the university collection. In today's Poland, for example in the capital Warsaw, there are also holdings from Cameroon that were integrated into the collections of the (Prussian) University of Wrocław around 1900, only to be centralised in Poland's capital in the 1950s after a stopover at the Muzeum Państwowe (State Museum Wrocław). A similar situation applies to the holdings of the (once Prussian) City Museum in Szczecin (Stettin), which was renamed Muzeum Pomorza Zachodniego (West Pomeranian Museum) after the Second World War and had to relinquish large parts of its historical Africa collection to Warsaw in 1951.^[10] The museum's collection was then centralised in the Polish capital.

Museums, violence, benefits - and now?

This Atlas of Absence begins by noting the immense, if invisible, presence of Cameroon's material cultural heritage in the museums of German cities today. It looks statistically and geographically at this heritage in the current territory of the Federal Republic, asking about the origin of objects in Cameroon and their typological classification both in German museum inventories today and in the regions from which they originate. It is explained in detail why museum inventories - one of the most important sources of information on Cameroonian cultural heritage in Germany alongside the objects themselves - are at the same time highly problematic, uncertain documents that should be treated with great caution. The language of these inventories is also critically questioned. All in all, this atlas goes through the methodology of a "reverse collection history", which starts less from the collections of individual (German) museums than from the identification of missing cultural objects in certain regions of Cameroon.

Based on historical sources, unpublished correspondence, reports and diaries, the concrete conditions of the seizures of Cameroonian objects around 1900, described by the German museums as "acquisitions", are also illuminated here - i.e.: looting, extortion, trickery, bribery, but in some cases also purchases. The focus is on the different stakeholders of the translocation: military personnel of the so-called Imperial Protection Force or Christian missionaries (including some women) on the one hand, and on the other the inhabitants of historically grown Central African kingdoms with their differently shaped structures of rule and power confronted with the wars of aggression of the Germans and their brutal policy of appropriation. This atlas pays special attention to all those stakeholders in Cameroon who were used in a decidedly perfidious way around 1900 to carry their country's cultural heritage on their own heads and shoulders all the way to the coasts so that it could be shipped from there to Germany. The history of the "Cameroon holdings" in German museums, this is the second insight that emerges from the systematic analysis of the colonial-era material that is abundantly available in various archives, is namely inseparable from massive symbolic and real violence against people. Research^[11] that has already been initiated will be able to specify in the coming years how much military and missionary violence is actually associated with certain objects.

Among the hundreds of stakeholders whose names appear in the various chapters, we have made a selection of about 30 on both sides who are the subject of a separate, detailed biographical note. Indeed, it is an emphatic concern of this book to break away from one-sided (German) representation of colonial stakeholders, some of whom are now well researched; moreover, it is important to show the direct and concrete connection between them, their colonial or resistant lives and the collections kept in German public museums, in order to once again establish the close interconnection between colonial rule and museum history through concrete examples. The selection of the persons was not based on the quantity of objects consigned, but serves to highlight the different positions and historical roles. These biographical notes are supplemented by a detailed list of hundreds of stakeholders who could be identified by name by means of the inventories of German museums; the list is published here for the first time with additional information unearthed in the course of the project.^[12] In addition to the individuals who played a central role in the translocation of Cameroonian heritage to Germany during the German colonial period, special groups of objects are highlighted in this atlas: e.g. "objects of power" (e.g., the "Museum of the History of Cameroon"). For example, "objects of power" (regalia, thrones, royal attributes, weapons, etc.), whose strong presence in Germany is directly explained by the removal of power from traditional rulers in colonised Cameroon; or "sacred objects" (such as those

used and sometimes still used in the context of burials or religious acts), which could only come into the possession of public collections due to the complicity between museums and missions. One question comes to mind when describing the massive presence of Cameroonian objects in Germany [p.22], which has now lasted for over 100 years: What use are these objects here? When and by whom were they noticed? With what aims and insights? The answer, it should be anticipated at this point, is sobering. A few objects have been received by artists in the course of the 20th century. Scholarly discussions of them have hardly taken place to date - unlike in the case of the Benin bronzes (Nigeria), also acquired by German museums around 1900, to which numerous publications have been devoted. Although "Art from Cameroon", "The Arts of Cameroon" or "Les Arts du Cameroun" established itself as a fixed category in the Cameroonian and Western art or museum world and on the international art market from the mid-1950s onwards, very few exhibitions or studies came from Germany.

This makes the question about the future of these objects, whose absence is increasingly felt in Cameroon, all the more justified. Several chapters of this book deal with the long experience of loss in Cameroon itself from a Cameroonian perspective. But more and more voices are also rising in Germany, including and especially among a younger generation of intellectuals of African and non-African origin, active in social media and travelling between continents, who want to know more about Cameroonian cultural heritage in Germany and make something of it. Missing, missing, forgetting, wanting to have it back - with or without anger: these are natural consequences of the presence of thousands of invisible objects from Cameroon in the repositories of German museums, which the public is hardly aware of.

Atlas

As an atlas, this book uses maps and graphics to directly visualise the geographical and statistical distribution of Cameroon's material cultural heritage on the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany and beyond; to recall historical shifts in borders; to visualise the varying degrees of presence of Cameroonian regions in today's German museums - but, conversely, also to visualise the large, irrecoverable gaps left in the landscape of Cameroon's cultural heritage by the aggressive collecting policies of German stakeholders around 1900. Our maps and graphics trace the circulation of people and things, they show the conjuncture of collecting in the different phases of the colonial and post-colonial period, they deal with transport routes, military actions and the reclamation of cultural objects.

In the sense of a "radical cartography" [13], the maps in this atlas correct in style and content the dominant, colonial-era model of traditional cartography as an instrument of power, this in the critical awareness that maps are first and foremost an intellectual construction and not, for example, the faithful depiction of a reality. In this [p.23] sense, they give us the opportunity to reveal scientific interpretations of sources that are otherwise difficult to grasp, and help to make the invisible visible: for example, the absence of cultural objects and their associated practices in entire regions of Cameroon. We are aware that we are publishing these critical maps in a publishing house that played a major role in the colonial mapping of Cameroon around 1900 and beyond.

(Without) words, (without) pictures

Closely connected to the project of a critical cartography is that of a critical approach to all the terms that have characterised the process of expropriation, appropriation and museification of Cameroonian cultural heritage for over 100 years on the one (German) side - whether in correspondences, reports or museum inventories - and are accompanied by the experience of loss, resistance, reclamations, amnesia or even aphasia on the other (Cameroonian) side. Language is not neutral. In the authors' collective of this volume, very few are native speakers of German - but most are so-called foreign Germanists. It was a conscious decision to write this book in German. Firstly, because the historical and institutional sources to work with are written in German. Secondly, because it was a pressing concern to make the facts presented here accessible to a broad German public. The German language was thus a unifying but also a challenging element during the work on this book. It was not a

matter of course, and it required constant attention, despite the proximity to colonial-era archival material, not to reproduce and perpetuate colonial terminology in this atlas, but to literally free ourselves from it - the colonial language and view infiltrates everything - and to internally repel the views attached to the terminology in the writing process. But the journey was not easy, nor was the goal always achieved.

After all, the task was not only to question common terms and find more suitable alternatives from a bilateral Cameroonian-German perspective. Rather, the negotiation process also involved overcoming disciplinary boundaries: Words that reflect the latest state of research in ethnology turn into an attempt at renewed tribalisation from the perspective of German studies, while efforts to distance oneself from terms that are trivialising but have been anchored in historiographical discourse for many years can lead to linguistically awkward solutions, as well as to misunderstandings, if not to incomprehension. The fact that in various regions of Cameroon, for example, self-designations are common that sound to German ears like borrowings from [p.24] English or French, such as "chief" or "chefferie", is added to this. Not to mention the translation problems when such terms in German suddenly threatened to turn the "peuple de la forêt" into a "people from the forest", a "chefferie principale" into a "chiefdom" or a "spiritual guide" into a "Führer". Even the syntax began to falter when we realised that the choice of predicate and object in our sentences was guided by the sources we used. All too often, the "Germans" were the predicate and the "Cameroonians" the object in the sentence - until we were shocked to realise this and started trying to read them grammatically against the grain, even if only German accounts of certain events were available in writing. Quotations from representatives of the German colonial power or from relevant colonial literature were also often a challenge, they are sometimes so disturbing that one would rather not have taken note of them and would also rather not have reproduced them. At the same time, they provide unsparing insights into a historical reality that still shapes many things today.

The same applies to the reproduction of portraits or so-called objects, which in this volume we either print only with critical image comments or, especially in the plate section at the end of the volume, free them from their mostly dark black, museum-typical backgrounds - although without being able to call them back to life as a result. The photographs of cultural objects from the various regions of Cameroon in the plate section come from the public institutions that keep them in Germany today, but show them only in very few cases. For pragmatic reasons, we adopt the object information from the museums, but provide them additionally with transparent information on their provenance. Both, object information and information on provenance, are graphically placed across the objects so that the "scientific" ballast does not constrict them too much. How these objects are called in their regions of origin, what memories are attached to them, what functions they fulfilled or still fulfil - the panel section does not address these questions. They are to be systematically discussed in a future project based on the much-discussed "Digital Benin" pilot project.[14]

Collective work

The Atlas of Absence is a collaborative work. It is the first result of a transcontinental project of two universities in partnership with seven German museums and the cartographer Philippe Rekacewicz, funded by the German Research Foundation. The project leader at the Université de Dschang in Cameroon was Albert Gouaffo. In Germany, a [p.25] working group was formed at the Technical University of Berlin. Here, Eyke Vonderau as research coordinator ensured optimal research conditions at the interface between very different administrative structures and cultures. Regular meetings and workshops of the team both on the campus of the university in Dschang and in Berlin, the individual mobility of the researchers between both universities as well as numerous visits to museums and archives gave the project its special character. Beyond the academic contributions collected in this volume, the members of the team took on different tasks: In Berlin, Andrea Meyer coordinated the work on the texts and the intensive discussions on dealing with terminology, point of view (positionality), historical images and sources. Eyke Vonderau supervised the extremely complex cartographic work. Sebastian-Manès Sprute was responsible for obtaining, organising and structuring the extensive and initially confusing museum data on more than 40,000 objects and for setting up and maintaining a digital library within the project. Richard Tsogang Fossi was responsible for comparing the colonial-era knowledge of Cameroon with the geographical, linguistic and social reality on site.

Doctoral students Mikaél Assilkinga and Yrine Matchinda conducted interviews with Cameroonian stakeholders whose communities were and are differently affected by the colonial-era practice of removing cultural objects. Lindiwe Breuer and Dieu Ly Hoang supported the project as student assistants. Without the generous help of many partners in Cameroon, Germany and beyond, this Atlas of Absence would not have come to fruition → [Thanks, 510](#). Our sincere thanks go to them, to the editor Stefan Krauss, to the book designers Dorothée Billard and Mirjam Kroker, and to the team at Reimer Verlag.

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

"Cameroons" becomes German. History of a manipulative removal

RICHARD TSOANG FOSSI

On 26 February 1885, 19 European powers signed the General Act of the Berlin Conference in the capital of the German Empire. Article 6, entitled "Provisions Concerning the Protection of Natives, Missionaries and Travellers, and Religious Freedom", reads:

"All Powers exercising sovereign rights or influence in the said territories undertake to supervise the preservation of the native population and the improvement of their moral and material condition of life, and [...] [to] favour undertakings created and organised for that purpose, or aimed at educating the natives and making them understand and appreciate the advantages of civilisation."^[1]

This is immediately followed by a sentence of great significance for the prosperity of all European museums, but rarely quoted: "Christian missionaries, scholars, researchers, as well as their entourage, their belongings and their collections also form the object of special protection.

State protection for collectors and collections: From the beginning, in Europe, the colonial project, the rhetoric of civilisation and the accumulation of material samples of culture and nature on the African continent went hand in hand. In Central Africa, this was particularly felt in the area that makes up the territory of present-day Cameroon. The following outlines the political conditions for the cultural exploitation of the country by the German colonial power.

Before 1880, autonomous kingdoms were located in the coastal regions of West Africa, whose rulers maintained complex relations with kings in the interior. The social fabric had endured despite the transatlantic slave trade and the contact that had already been maintained for some time with European traders and missionaries.^[2] However, a radical change was triggered by the so-called Scramble for Africa, the race to divide up the continent, which was controlled from Europe.^[3] It also affected the Douala territory - hitherto known as the Cameroons - over which four families and their kings, Ndumb'a Lobe (King Bell, d. 1897), Ngando Mpondo (King Akwa), Jim Ekwalla (King Dido) and Kum'a Mbape alias Lock Priso Bell → [Bio, 397](#) (1846-1916) ruled on both sides of the Wuri River.^[4] The scramble for Africa, which was driven by Europe, was a radical change.

[S.30] The German merchants who had been active in the region until then were operating without official backing from the empire.^[5] As a result of the increasing importance of trade and the difficult relations with other European powers such as France and Great Britain, which already had some base colonies ^[6] on the West African coast, the German side - represented, among others, by Adolf Priso Bell - was also pushing for the establishment of a new trading post. represented by merchants such as Adolf Woermann (1847-1911), the largest German shipowner on the west coast of Africa - increasingly pushed for the acquisition of colonies, not least to give traders a sense of protection. Confident in their own power, on the other hand, none of the micro-nations of West Africa considered it possible to be colonised.^[7] However, the interest of European states and companies in territorial control grew ever stronger - from ocean to river, from river to land and from land to hinterland.

Much has already been written,^[8] sometimes in a nostalgic tone, about the actual process of taking possession of "Kamerun" as well as about the initial reluctance of the imperial government to establish formal colonies.^[9] Starting with the growing colonial interest within the borders of the German Empire, this chapter firstly sheds light on the colonial treaties. As will be shown, they can be traced back to the machinations of German stakeholders in expansion policy such as Woermann, the medical doctor and interim consul for Cameroon Max Buchner → [Bio, 375](#) (1846-1921), the first governor Julius von Soden (1846-1921), or even the jurist and natural scientist Eugen Zintgraff (1858-1897), who led the first so-called hinterland expeditions from 1886 onwards on behalf of the Foreign Office. Their statements must therefore be subjected to a critical re-reading. On the other hand, it is important to take a closer look at how the Duala tried to counteract the manipulation by the German lobbyists and thus give their agency more visibility. The - ideal and actual - seizure of the region following the treaties will be presented in conclusion.

Colonial enthusiasm of the 1880s

Around 1880, colonial thinking in Germany experienced an enormous upswing, as it was now adopted not only by missionaries and merchants but also by politicians. The colonial question was not only seen as a matter of prestige for a state that had advanced to become a world power, but also as a tried and tested means of remedying social deficits, [10] which had arisen after the founding of the empire due to a persistent depression, falling wages, rising rents, redundancies or also the agricultural crisis from 1879. This led to the founding of many societies that propagated a broad colonial political commitment as a solution to the economic crisis. [11] Missionaries such as the head of the largest Protestant missionary society in Germany, Ernst Friedrich Fabri (1824-1891), [p.31] merchants such as Woermann, Wilhelm Jantzen (1839-1917), Johann Thormählen (1842-1909), Ernst von Weber (1830-1902) or writers such as Wilhelm Hübe-Schleiden (1846-1916) were among the well-known personalities who were active in this field. [12] Fabri's booklet *Demand for Germany of the Colonies?* of 1879 triggered a veritable colonial enthusiasm among businessmen, big bankers, politicians, military officers and shipowners. Colonial associations such as the "West German Association for Colonisation and Export" established in Düsseldorf in 1881 spread the propaganda further. [13] The call to the meeting for the constituent session directly addressed the goals of such an association, which were to shape colonial policy in the following years:

"The need for overseas colonies is felt more and more vividly in Germany, which grant our rural and other emigrants a new German home, provide capital with a secure and high pension, industry with increased sales, and trade and shipping with new opportunities for profitable activity." [14]

Branch associations or similar colonial societies also dedicated themselves to this ideological orientation. The "Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft", which emerged in 1887 from the merger of such associations, developed into the most influential German colonial association, still playing a significant role even in the interwar period. [15] The colonial enterprise was supposed to enable Germany to also fulfil a "civilising mission" in the world, i.e. to "cultivate" the supposedly backward "natives". [16] These basic assumptions were even stylised in Reichstag debates on colonisation work as a "duty to help" the "lowly" peoples and justified in racist terms under the guise of an alleged cultural "uplift": [17]

"Not only the legal obligation incumbent on us as the patrons, no gentlemen, our position as a cultural state compels us to help these peoples with the self-evident arguments of the civilised world view and to try to provide them with better living conditions than they themselves have been able to obtain in their limitation. Colonising means missionising." [18]

The economic and political motives of the colonial project are veiled here by an allegedly altruistic side of colonialism. Obviously, the empire no longer wanted to be content with the informal, trade-driven exchanges of the previous years. [19]

Trade situation and political situation

As indicated above, by 1880 many French, English and German companies were already active on the West African coasts. Their relations were characterised by rivalry. [20] The French and British trading establishments operated as if in a second fatherland due to the rule of their respective governments over [p.32] the territories addressed. The German companies therefore complained about high customs taxes from other powers and saw themselves disadvantaged by unequal navigation and acquisition rights. [21] The company C. Woermann, which alone owned 24 of the 48 factories [22] on the coast, took the lead in advocating the idea of a German takeover of some territories and also lobbied for the stationing of warships in order to improve the starting position for German trade. [23] In

a memorandum from the Hamburg Chamber of Commerce to the Reich Chancellor in 1883, Adolf Woermann summarised the most important points as a basis for the Reich's future colonial policy. Thus point 2 read:

"2. conclusion of treaties with England, possibly also France, by which the Germans in the colonies [!] of these states are guaranteed equal rights with the nationals of the latter in every respect, namely with regard to the acquisition of landed property [!]."[24]

The competition between the European powers was accompanied by a tense situation for the local population in "Cameroons". The rival Duala families Bell and Akwa were at odds with their vassals who were gaining economic influence. [25] Since the population had already concluded numerous treaties with Great Britain, which was represented locally by consuls, [26] since the 1840s, [27] and the British government had even established an important legal body - the "Court of Equity" founded in 1856 - in "Cameroons", [28] the kings Bell and Akwa believed that the internal tensions could be resolved by a British annexation. Thus, individually or collectively, they wrote letters to the British government urging annexation rather than protection. They saw annexation as an opportunity for responsible and charitable modernisation. They tended to associate protection with the loss of their autonomy and sovereignty or land rights. Although Gustav Nachtigal (1834-1885) knew this well, he did not hesitate to manipulate reality in favour of the establishing colonial power. [29] Britain's hesitant or negative response once again strengthened the colonial interests of the German traders.

German-"Cameroonian" contracts, manipulation and agency

For the transfer of sovereignty in favour of the German Reich, there was not only one German-Cameroonian treaty, but more than 95 treaties. [30] These treaties were concluded with the Duala and other populations. [31] Decisive for the treaty of 12 July 1884, but also for the conditions set by the Duala, were the question of sovereignty and the inviolability in principle of the cultivated Duala land. These two points became the bone of contention between the now established German colonial power and the local Duala population. [32] While the first treaties were apparently [p.34] still negotiated peacefully, coercion and violence increased over time. Indeed, Douala was not then a capital of all local societies, neither of the coast nor of the hinterland. The Duala did play a predominant role in trade with the Europeans, but the different population groups formed micronations with relative autonomy. [33] A kind of de facto or fictitious vassalage, meanwhile, was sometimes claimed vis-à-vis the German officials, such as by King Bell, who claimed Lock Priso → Bio, 397 for his retainer. [34] Three identical treaties were signed with the Duala themselves, one with King Dido as early as 11 July, one with King Bell and one with King Akwa on 12 July 1884. [35] Further 'travels' around Douala to Bimbia and along the upper course of the Wuri were necessary to obtain more treaties with other local rulers. From the beginning, however, these contracts were only possible or extorted thanks to a lot of "dash" (gifts, bribes) and demonstrations of power. [36] From 1884 onwards, the first actually violence-related contracts could already be observed. [37] From July 1884, Lock Priso protested verbally and on 28 August 1884 in writing against the hoisting of the colonial flag on its territory in Hickory Town (today Bonabéri). From December 1884, the protests took an armed form, which was ended in early 1885 by a treaty of submission in favour of the German conquerors. In a letter to the Consul General Gustav Nachtigal, Lock Priso wrote: "We beg you to pull that flag down. No man buy we." [38]

How were the colonial treaties conceived? One gains an insight from Buchner, who reflected on the process in his writings, sometimes ironically, sometimes euphemistically: "The most meagre thing about these treaties is that they had to be sought and applied for by us and also bought [...]. And even the gifts with which one buys are not entirely reprehensible after all." [39]

Obviously, the treaties from the German side were exclusively subordinated to their own goals and took no account of the signing local rulers. As soon as they had signed, they could no longer defend themselves against discrimination. This is illustrated by the case of Jim Ekwalla, who complained to the agent of the firm Jantzen & Thormählen and received the following reply: "You shall no longer receive even the smallest leaf of tobacco". [40] Buchner → Bio, 375 even threatened him if he wanted to reverse his "becoming German":

"Jim Ikwala, don't do anything stupid. Signatures cannot be taken back like a barrel of palm oil or an ivory tooth. [...] How much Dash you deserve, you should have thought about that beforehand. Be careful, Jim Ikwalla, not to be seduced by bad counsellors into doing something you would later regret, and stay away from our enemies. For our warships cannot stay away much longer." [41]

[p.35] Such reactions give an idea of the epistemic and physical violence [42] that structured the colonial situation. It was deliberately used to control the colony in its various aspects. Even King Bell, who enjoyed a good reputation among German colonial officials, experienced this violence, which ultimately spared no colonised person. He defended himself against his bad treatment by Governor Julius von Soden in a protest letter to Berlin dated 23 September 1888: "I am the man who gave my country to the government of Germany. But I am now much surprised how I am daily brutally treated by your Governor who is here. Instead of treating me as a king or respectable man, he is treating me as a dog." [43]

The conditions set by the Kings for their signature - known as "Our Wishes" - were equally questioned. They comprised eight points, which included the continuation of local traditions, the inviolability of intermediary trade, the existing sovereign right on their land and the non-invasion of the hinterland. [44] This important document, which testifies to the agency of the local rulers of the time, only triggered circumvention strategies on the German side, as Buchner's notes once again make clear:

"This has long been a beautiful thought to me, if only because of the writing "Our Wishes" from the days of flag-raising. That would have to be taken away from these noble Duala again. The English are not entirely wrong when they laugh derisively at the fact that Consul Schulze was so willing to tie the hands of the German companies [...] by signing the demand that they stay away from the interior, and they find it strange that [...] the German companies are nevertheless trying to [...] push themselves forward. Only a violent coup could help to resolve this contradiction." [45]

The willingness to use force is further evidenced by Buchner's proposal to "starve out" the opposing side by blocking trade, [46] until it began to "wail horribly": "Some will perhaps as a result convenient themselves to work, for cheap daily wages, which must not be higher than a mark in goods, and these one immediately presses the necessary tools into their hands". [47] Zintgraff, who took exception to the guarantee of the intermediary trade monopoly in "Our Wishes", simply ignored it and, with the permission of Governor Julius von Soden, penetrated as far as Budiman and Jabassi, where he extorted contracts. [48]

It should be noted that the German stakeholders underpinned their colonial theories with the then widespread view of the laziness of the natives and with Charles Darwin's concept of the "struggle for existence" [49], but also that Buchner, for example, took up Woermann, who had been talking about educating black people to work since 1879. [50] The colonisation of the foreign thus led to the so-called civilising mission. [51] "Education for work" became a central motto of colonial propaganda, because only in this way could the "lazy" colonised [p.36]. This formula conceals not least the cruel conditions under which the workers - often badly treated forced labourers, prisoners of war, women and children - were employed. [53] The "education for work" became a central slogan of colonial propaganda.

Drawing the new borders, land grabbing

The arbitrary and violent robbery of territory was a continuous project that was hardly completed by 1914. A striking example of this is the unilateral expropriation of the Duala from their land on the Joss Plateau from 1910 onwards in order to build a port city there. However, this was based on the principle of racial segregation [54] of the white colonial masters and the black populations, who were no longer allowed to live close to each other. The government doctor Hans Ziemann → Bio, 439 (1865-1939) argued that blacks were responsible for the spread of malaria. Instead of the Chininisation of the entire society, he proposed a spatial separation of at least one kilometre. [55] From 1913 onwards, about 20,000 Duala people were therefore expropriated in favour of about 400 Europeans or Germans. Rudolf Duala Manga Bell (c. 1873-1914) and Adolf Ngoso Din (c. 1882-1914) resisted this colonial injustice legally, but were accused of high treason and sentenced to death on 7 August 1914 in a trial that was already branded scandalous at the time, and were actually hanged on 8 August. [56] The

Duala people were not allowed to leave the country.

The expansion of the colonial territory was also due to the so-called punitive expeditions.[57] They were carried out against all population groups that resisted the advance of the Germans. Besides village burnings and devastation of farms, this culminated in further land confiscations as a condition of peace treaties.[58] Thus a colonial newspaper reported after some "punitive expeditions" in the north:

"The permanent occupation of Yoko with a detachment of the Schutztruppe of 120 men sufficiently documents the intention of the German government to permanently seize possession of the country [!] [...] On the basis of the present victories, the way to Garua is open, and thus nothing more stands in the way of seizing possession of the area of the colony that can be used economically [!] from the coast at all at present." [59] The German government's intention to seize possession of Yoko is sufficiently documented.

These punitive expeditions were at the same time explicitly used to draw up the first sketches of maps - an unmistakable sign of the appropriation of territory.[60] From 1884 to 1914, the different communities, arbitrarily and forcibly subordinated to a single territorial entity, experienced more than 200 warlike, often particularly cruel attacks by the colonial troops. More than 4000 sketch maps were produced, on the basis of which Max Moisel (1869-1920) and Paul Sprigade (1863-1928) gradually realised a map of the [p.38] entire occupied territory and published it in the Reimer Verlag. In this area, colonial despotism is particularly evident, as data was collected in wartime situations, localities were named, assigned to each other or divided up without obtaining the consent of the population groups concerned. These initiatives were supported by the Afrikafonds, which since 1878 financed so-called research trips or punitive expeditions as well as the production of maps, atlases and colonial newspapers with a total capital of 150,000 Reichsmarks.[61] The pretext of occupation at work here was obviously no longer the "German-Duala Treaty" but the clauses of the Berlin Congo Conference that legitimised violence,[62] thus destroying the livelihoods of the population.[63] In order to establish the borders in agreement with the neighbouring colonial empires of France and Britain, border commissions were needed in the east, south and west.[64] Many German officers took part, such as Hans Ramsay (1862-1938), Hans Glauning → Bio, 386 (1868-1908), Philipp Engelhardt (1866-1951), Oscar Foerster (1871-1910) and Bernhard von Besser (1862-1914). [65] The determination of the borders between the German Empire and France, however, was due to circumstances other than simple border commissions. The decisive factor was the diplomatic crises between the two powers, which had been vying for influence in Morocco since 1905. After escalation in 1911, the conflict was settled with an agreement that granted France supremacy in Morocco; as compensation, Germany was granted an area of about 275,360 km² in the south and east of its colony with a population of about one million.[66] Thus, the German colonial territory on the Gulf of Guinea now encompassed more than 787,840 km² with a population of between 3 and 4 million people.[67] The area created by the Franco-German agreement was called "New Cameroon". However, this border expansion barely lasted five years, as Germany forfeited its colony in the First World War in 1916. Cameroon itself was divided between Britain and France, and the areas ceded in 1911 reverted to Gabon, Congo, the Central African Republic and Chad, which formed the French colonial empire. [68] Within a few years, some colonised people thus changed the nationalities imposed on them.

Colonial administration, missions and schools

The colonial occupation of numerous micronations had led to their being brought under a single power through the centralisation of the government apparatus. Formerly relatively autonomous entities were arbitrarily divided into districts or wards.[69] These new administrative apparatuses were under the leadership of district officers [p.39] who were subordinate to the governor as the highest authority in the country.[70] In addition to these administrative units under civilian leadership, there were mostly wards administered by the military. These were mainly established where a conquest had taken place or where the population could not be easily subdued.[71] As a third category, the Residenturen existed mainly in the northern part of the colony as a kind of provisional form of administration. They were mostly subordinate to the military due to the still strong position of the local feudal system, which was only overcome from 1902 onwards.[72] The administrative apparatus was subordinate to the military from 1891 onwards.

The administrative apparatus was assisted by a police force from 1891 and a so-called protection

force[73] from 1894 as a means of power. From 1884 to 1901, the seat of both the civil and the military administration was in Douala. By decree of Governor Jesko von Puttkamer → Bio, 422 (1855-1917), both went to Buea near Victoria (now Limbe) from 1901, so that the designation 'Cameroon' no longer applied to Douala alone, but to the entire colony.[74] By 1916, 18 districts, six military stations and four residencies are attested.[75] Colonial rule, however, consolidated not only in the reorganisation of the country, but also in the legal relations. A range of punishments were introduced as a disciplinary strategy, often based on a racial division of the colonial population. Common forms of punishment for the natives included corporal punishment, imprisonment of varying duration, fines or the death penalty.[76] However, corporal punishment was so widespread even without a legal framework that Cameroon became known as "the twenty-five-country" in allusion to the 25 lashes regularly imposed.[77] It was only thanks to such terrorist measures and actions that the barely 1560 Europeans or Germans could hope to rule over two to three million people.[78] Schools were used as partners and means to consolidate rule. The government schools were sponsored by the German state. The first was opened in Douala in 1888 with Theodor Christaller (1863-1896) as the first government teacher. The aim of the government school was mainly to provide local administrators with assistants by giving them a rudimentary education.[79] The Christian missions - the English Baptists since the 1850s, the Basel Mission since 1886, the Catholic Pallottine Mission since 1890[80] as well as the Presbyterian Mission[81] - also played an important role in shaping a new identity for the colonised at that time. They were first and foremost committed to combating local customs, which they condemned as devilish.[82] Thus, government and mission schools became the very places where the so-called civilising mission took place on both secular and spiritual levels, profoundly shaking indigenous forms of identity.[83]

All in all, the German colonial period in Cameroon lasted little longer than 30 years, marked by incessant outbreaks of violence and [p.40] acts of resistance by a defiant local population against the German occupying power. These decades not only left deep physical and psychological scars in Cameroon, but also a gaping cultural hole: Between 1884 and 1919, in fact, the country lost tens of thousands of cultural objects, including some 40,000 that are now kept in German public museums. For the colonial logic of appropriation and expropriation also prevailed in the area of the massive extraction of material heritage. Above all, the military punitive expeditions did not serve solely to subjugate territories and people. Under the pretext of punishing the resistance of local societies, they encouraged the forcible removal and targeted destruction of cultural assets. Missionary work under the guise of conversion to Christianity had similar effects. In this way, thousands of cultural, sacral and power objects were stolen, "bought", confiscated, abducted, seized, extorted and destroyed. By passing resolutions in 1889 on how to deal with cultural objects brought from the colonies, the Federal Council legitimised the looting and destruction of entire cultural systems. Last but not least, the new border demarcation of 1911 to 1916 is likely to raise the question of the origin of those goods that were extracted from the affected areas and taken to European museums.

Dislocation of Cameroon's cultural heritage in figures

SEBASTIAN MANÈS SPRUTE

In German public museums from Berlin to Stuttgart via Hamburg, Leipzig and Munich, large quantities of weapons, spears, thrones, sacred objects, palace furnishings, regalia, musical instruments, human-sized statues, everyday objects, manuscripts, jewellery, gravestones, etc. have been stored for 100 years. The largest share, approx. 39,000 inventory numbers, entered German collections between 1884 and 1919, so it was clearly acquired and exported in the course of the German colonial period in Cameroon. In the English- French colonial era between 1919 and 1960, on the other hand, the Cameroon collections grew by only 6,000 inventory numbers, with an equally large number, i.e. again around 6,000, being added from 1960 to the present. For about 5000 inventory numbers with Cameroon provenance, no information is available as to when they arrived in Germany. In the following, we will provide an overview of these inventories, their location and the diversity of the testimonies of Cameroonian culture preserved in them.

In the course of our inventory of Cameroonian cultural heritage in German public museums, we identified 40,950 cultural objects in a total of 45 institutions that are currently still in their exhibition and storage rooms.[1] In addition to this already enormous quantity, there is a much larger number of objects that have been registered in the collection documentation over time, i.e. that were once in the possession of the museums at some point in history, but are no longer there today for various reasons - exchange, sale, loss due to war. Even though among the institutions surveyed only seven larger and two smaller ones were able to provide information on this, taking these values into account in these cases alone leads to an increase in the total inventory to 56,040 inventory numbers.[2]

With a historical total of 16,670 inventory numbers and a current inventory of 8871 inventory numbers, the Linden-Museum Stuttgart houses by far the largest German Cameroon collections[3]. It is followed in second and third place by the Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig with a ratio of 7432 to 5190 inventory numbers[4] and the Ethnological Museum Berlin with one of 7194 to 5135 inventory numbers.[5] Further extensive collections are [p.48] accounted for by a number of others among the largest ethnological museums in Germany. For example, the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum in Cologne still has 3164 inventory numbers out of 3344,[6] the Museum Fünf Kontinente in Munich 3018,[7] the Museum für Völkerkunde in Dresden still has 2444 out of 2674,[8] the Übersee-Museum in Bremen 2250 out of 2737,[9] the Weltkulturen Museum in Frankfurt 2154,[10] the Reiss-Engelhorn-Museen in Mannheim 1789[11] and the Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum in Hannover 1562.[12]

Our inventory focused on "ethnological collection objects", also dubbed "ethnographica". In contrast, human remains, zoological, botanical, geological or similar specimens and preparations, which are also often represented in ethnological collections, were not the focus of our research project and were therefore not included.

Among the ethnological collection holdings, which are difficult to narrow down, the proportion of cultural objects classified as "weapons", "jewellery", everyday and "sacred" objects[13] is particularly extensive. They already occupied a prominent position in the "desiderata list[s]" of colonial-era collecting instructions drafted by the heads of the Africa Department of the Royal Museum of Ethnology in Berlin Adolf Bastian (1826-1905),[14] Felix von Luschan (1854-1924)[15] and Bernhard Ankermann (1859-1943)[16]. For example, the categories "weapons", "jewellery" and everyday objects or "utensils" together make up three quarters of the collection holdings at the Reiss-Engelhorn-Museen Mannheim.[17]

The cuts of the object categories chosen by the museums lead to a distortion that should not be underestimated, since weapons and jewellery are comparatively distinct categories, whereas the category of everyday objects is much broader. Here, it is not the function of a piece of clothing, a basket, a bag, a drinking vessel or a toy that is decisive, but its (regular) use. Ultimately, almost all objects can be classified as everyday objects. The category therefore always consists of a large amount of different objects that could also be assigned differently. In this respect, it says little about which cultural testimonies from Cameroon are hidden behind it: simple everyday objects or sacred attributes that were only used in certain constellations or by certain people. Object typologies such as that of the Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde in Leipzig, where weapons are the most common category and, with a total of 1174 inventory numbers, account for around 15% of the holdings, are a more

appropriate representation of their subdivision.[18] Correspondingly, comparable subdivisions can also be found in the holdings of the Reiss-Engelhorn-Museen Mannheim with approx. 15% of "Weapons + Accessories"[19] and the holdings of the Museum für Völkerkunde Dresden with approx. 20% of "Weapons and Equipment",[20] even if the cuts of the categories are not so distinct here and not [p.49] only weapons per se, but also military equipment and accessories. Moreover, the category of weapons is the only one that can be found in almost all collections, including countless spears, arrows, swords and knives, but also rifles, helmets, shields, axes, bows, crossbows, etc.

The deficits of the object typology mean that outstanding individual pieces and masterpieces of Cameroonian cultural heritage, which were attributed supernatural powers in the local context or were associated with specific actions, often do not fit into any of the categories formulated from a Eurocentric perspective, making them invisible in the collections. This applies to prestigious showpieces and symbols of power[21] such as the "Mandu Yenu", the pearl-embroidered throne of Sultan Njoya of Bamum[22 → Image booklet XLVIII or the "Tange" or ship's beak of the "Duala" → Pictorial Booklet LIV, [22] sacred figures such as "Ngonnso", the statue of the mother deity of the "Nso"[23] → Pictorial Booklet III or the "Queen Mother (nafoyn) Naya" of the "Kom".[→ Booklet XIII Monumental drums with special significance, such as the "slit drum[s]" from "Banssa"[25] currently on display in the Cameroon exhibition of the Ethnological Museum Berlin in the Humboldt Forum, are equally ill-suited to the category of musical instruments reserved for them. Rather, they were mostly seen as subjects and/or represented insignia of rulership, used only by a select group of people in specific ceremonies.[26]

Even for monumental woodcarvings, such as the famous "Blaue Reiter Pfosten", listed in the inventory book of the Museum Fünf Kontinente München under the designation "Kulthauspfosten?" of the "Lundu",[27] ultimately no suitable category can be found in the collection documentation. This also applies to the 27 "gates", "door jambs", "lintels" and "door sills" concealed behind 13 inventory numbers,[28] which are currently also on display in the Humboldt Forum. Architectural elements such as these were often taken from historical buildings of great political and religious significance that had existed for generations, most of which were completely destroyed in the process. This was also the case with the "gate" consisting of three elements from "Baham" in Berlin,[29] which together with other pieces of a "hall 20 m long, 18 m wide, supported by wooden columns over 6 m high in the middle, apparently the chief's assembly and drinking room" was looted in the course of a military operation against the local population.[30] The Schutztruppen officer Hans Glauning (1868-1908) who handed in the loot announced it to the then head of the Africa Department of the Museum für Völkerkunde Berlin, Felix von Luschan in a letter dated 7 August 1905: "There are 20 loads in total, which require about 25 porters. The collection contains numerous doorworks, doorposts, chairs, dance masks, idols, vessels, etc., the items [...] are mostly captured, like everything that comes from Bamenom and Baham, partly purchased." [31] Today [p.50], these particularly symbolic core components of local architecture are on display in Berlin. Their presence in the German capital at the beginning of the 21st century is less indicative of an architectural style or the like than of the almost complete destruction of centuries-old local societies and an almost complete sell-out of local cultural assets.

Apart from the aforementioned problems of classification, the Cameroon collection preserved in Germany is composed of material evidence from all areas of human life. In addition to monumental individual pieces, it includes numerous collections of tiny tokens, hairpins, earrings etc. Very old sculptures, such as the stone Akwanshi tomb figures of the "Ekoi" in the border region with Nigeria,[32] which can be dated back in parts to the 15th to 16th centuries, can be found among them, as well as recent new acquisitions, such as the "motorbike" from Yaoundé, which the Linden-Museum Stuttgart acquired in 2018.[33] Everyday objects such as "spoons", [34] "bowls", [35] "baskets", [36] "brooms" [37] or "chairs", [38] most of which are available in large quantities, are just as much a part of the holdings as sensitive relics from sacred Byeri reliquaries.[39] These are a type of burial place or ensemble consisting of the remains of ancestors, a special container for storing them, and wooden ancestor guardian figures. Byeri are respectfully kept by descendants in their own households and are only accessible to non-family members at all on special occasions. They are therefore completely out of place in public collection institutions. In addition, object categories such as "clothing", [40] "toys", [41] "means of payment", "means of transport", "masks", "furniture", "hunting accessories", "tools", "toiletries" [42] can be found - the list could be continued at will and proves the massive dislocation of Cameroonian cultural heritage in terms of quality and quantity.

It is also of particular interest that we were able to assign a total of 31,707 inventory numbers to 231 historical Cameroonian population groups within the framework of the project. By far the largest

number of collection items came from the north-western part of Cameroon (Grasslands), followed by the northern regions (High North) and the coastal regions (Littoral). Even though the definitions of the population groups are of colonial origin and do not correspond to the then and now self-designations of the local population, the cultural objects can thus be reassigned to the local groupings from which they were taken. However, due to the general lack of understanding by German colonial rule of the composition of the local population, overlaps are also possible here. Moreover, the miserable documentation of colonial object procurers on the ground often obscures the actual place of origin of a particular object."^[43]

[p.51] Taken together, the Cameroon stock held in German institutions is characterised above all by its size, great age and the typological diversity of the objects in the collection. All this, however, remains unseen and unsuspected, since hardly anything of the 40,950 inventory numbers in 45 institutions has ever been shown. The Ethnological Museum Berlin, for example, currently exhibits just a few hundred of a total of 5,135 items of Cameroonian cultural heritage, a tiny fraction of the current total. The rest continues to lie dormant in the depots of museums and collections, thus doubly unused and invisible to people both in Cameroon and in Germany.

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

61 - **Chronology and Stakeholders in the appropriation of Cameroonian cultural property**
(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

95 - **"Carrier Calamities"**. Deprivation of Cultural Goods and the Destruction of Labour (Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

113 - **"Only to be obtained by force"**. Military Violence and Museum Collections (Yann LeGall)

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

Chronology and stakeholders in the appropriation of Cameroonian cultural assets

RICHARD TOSGANG FOSSI

Currently, only 45 public institutions in Germany house around 40,000 religious, dynastic, but also simple artisanal testimonies of the material cultural heritage from Cameroon. These were abducted from Cameroon and brought to Germany at different times, by different hands and with different justifications. On the one hand, this chapter examines the chronology of the incorporation of cultural objects from Cameroon into German public museums. On the other hand, it outlines a typology of the stakeholders involved in this systematic translocation. [1] At this point, only this much can be said about the various justifications for the massive extraction of cultural heritage: around 1900, they did not differ fundamentally from the justifications used in other colonies. Through a supposedly humanistic discourse of rescue, it was propagated that the found overseas populations would perish in contact with the Europeans. Ironically, instead of slowing down this disappearance, the process was rather accelerated by calling for the withdrawal of cultural objects in order to save them for posterity. [2] Museum directors, who acted as clients in this regard, even drew up guidelines for the systematic removal of so-called ethnographica, since the people travelling to or officiating in the colonies were not only "laymen", but the colony was also considered a zone capable of or in need of extraction. [3] The material for the reconstruction of the ramified cultures of the so-called primitive peoples, as claimed by ethnology, was then to be "gathered outside, be it likewise by experts, be it by laymen". [4] The instructions for ethnological observation and collecting, which were also received in France, [5] particularly encouraged rapid and massive collecting and also endeavoured to systematise the extraction processes:

"Therefore, it is necessary to bring what can be brought [...] But where it is not just a matter of acquiring individual objects, collect systematically, i.e. in such a way that the collection gives as exhaustive a picture as possible of the culture of the tribe concerned."

[6]

Last but not least, traders, explorers and missionaries were involved in the taking away of cultural goods, which they justified with their missionary mandate [p.62]. However, there is a large gap between the rhetoric of legitimisation and the actual practice of the taking.

The business cycle of accumulation

In 1849, the missionary Hermann Gustav Carl Halleur (1818-1866) gave the first material evidence from the region now known as Cameroon, which according to inventories ended up in a German museum, to the then Royal Kunstkammer in the Berlin Palace; the Royal Museum of Ethnology emerged from its holdings in 1873. [7] These are spears of the balimba, a braided bag, swords with a disc or also cigar bags. [8] Of the total of 17 inventory numbers, however, some are now lamented as war losses. [9] The second group of museum objects of alleged Cameroonian origin are listed under the name of a certain Cohen in the Landesmuseum Hannover for 1853. It is an attachment mask of the Boki from the Cross River area and a dance suit, presumably of the Bakoko. [10] This incorporation of isolated Cameroonian weapons, masks, sacred attributes and utensils into German museum collections coincides with the period of exploration of the African coasts, [11] but also with the time of the first settlement of Jamaican-English Baptist missionaries on the Douala and Bimbia coasts of present-day Cameroon. [12] It was not until 1875, 23 years later, that a few more inventory numbers with reference to Cameroon are found in Berlin. [13] The situation changed abruptly from 1884: The isolated arrivals were now followed by a regular influx of cultural objects during Germany's formal colonial rule in Cameroon. Since the Berlin Congo Conference of November 1884 to February 1885, at which the terms for a division of the African continent among the major European powers were decided, German colonisers had been advancing from the coasts into the hinterland. In 1886/87, Eugen Zintgraff (1858-1897) had succeeded in reaching Jabassi from Douala via the Wuri River and

then Barombi from Douala via the Mungo River, with Grassland as their destination; in 1889, Captain Richard Kund (1852-1904) and Lieutenant Hans Tappenbeck (1861-1889) reached Yaoundé in the centre via Kribi south of the country. [14] The overexploitation of people and nature went hand in hand with the appropriation of hundreds of thousands of cultural assets. In 1925, after the German Reich had formally lost its colonies to France and England since 1919 with the Treaty of Versailles, the Völkerkundemuseum in Berlin, for example, counted 60,182 catalogue numbers from the African continent, compared to 3361 in 1880. This means an increase of 56,821 inventory numbers in 45 years, 32 of which were colonial years. With regard to this period, even the ethnologist Kurt Krieger, who directed the Ethnological Museum (EM) Berlin from 1970 to 1985, spoke of an "ever-increasing influx of [p.63] collections".[15] This translocation of foreign cultural heritage took place under different circumstances and for different motivations, and a number of stakeholders were involved, either alone or in networks.

In particular, the colonisation of central regions of the African continent with rich cultural and artistic traditions (Nigeria, Cameroon, Gabon, Congo, Angola, etc.) has led to a spectacular accumulation of "African collections" in European museums. A microchronology of the 32-year German colonial period shows that the vast majority of documented removals took place between 1890 and 1910. Of the total of 16,670 Cameroonian inventory numbers in the Linden-Museum Stuttgart, for example, 8765 were incorporated by the museum between 1891 and 1907, whereas only two numbers were taken between 1885 and 1890. In 1905 alone, even more than 2,500 catalogue numbers entered the museum. From 1908 to 1915, 4975 numbers were catalogued, while from 1916 to 1919 there were only about 490, including 477 in 1917 alone. [16] The massive extraction of material cultural heritage, but also of many thousands of "human remains", was the result of the consolidating asymmetrical constellation of power and increasing violent actions, which have always favoured the exploitation and confiscation of cultural objects from the vanquished. Although this phenomenon is well known in museum research, it has so far been studied mainly in isolation, i.e. specific to museums. [17] A general overview of the influx of Cameroonian cultural objects in Germany is not yet available. The following is the first attempt to sketch an overall chronology of the removal of Cameroonian cultural heritage in Germany on the basis of the museum inventories in Berlin, Stuttgart, Bremen, Mainz, Dresden, Leipzig, Hamburg, etc. The following is an attempt to sketch an overall chronology of the removal of Cameroonian cultural heritage in Germany. To be clear from the outset: This statistical evaluation of all inventories shows that of the over 56,000 catalogue numbers listed in German public collections under "Cameroon"[18], 39,000 were incorporated in the period between 1884 and 1919. Only 6000 were acquired for German museums after Cameroon's independence in 1960. In the case of approximately 5000 inventory numbers, it is not possible to determine precisely from the inventories alone when they left Cameroon and when they entered the museum collections. [19] Of the 56,000 inventory entries, 40,950 are physically in the collection holdings today. Parts of the remaining objects were given to other institutions, sold to the private sector, lost or destroyed over time due to poor conservation.

Different phases

In the history of German colonialism, three phases are often distinguished: an experimental phase, a high phase and a so-called [p.66] scientific phase. [20] During these different phases, not only were resources massively exploited without interruption, but many cultural objects were also abducted from Cameroon. In German museums, their number grew from year to year. This increasing appropriation policy went hand in hand with the development of colonial structures. In the so-called experimental phase from 1884 to around 1890/91, the first colonial or violent seizure of cultural heritage took place. In this phase, it was not only a matter of finding the appropriate methods of colonisation for the "belated nation" of Germany, but also of annulling the treaty signed with the Duala through cunning and the threat of violence in order to be able to penetrate into the interior. [21] Only this penetration made the extraction of natural resources and cultural goods possible. Their removal was accordingly organised according to plan and supported legally, for example by the circular decree of 1889. According to the decree, all "collections" from state-financed expeditions were to be handed over exclusively to the Berlin ethnographic and natural history institutions. [22] The institutions of the federal states were only then to request duplicates in Berlin on the basis of the inventories made available to them. This decision was extended to the colonial officials two years later by a "circular decree", which forbade them to deliver their collections to other institutions. On 13 October 1896, the decree was then extended to the officers and commanders of the "Schutztruppe" in the "protectorates". In the

years to come, this caused a crisis between the museum institutions of the federal states and the political leaders in Berlin, because the latter felt disadvantaged. [23] This shows the competition between institutions for the largest or most complete collection, which was intensified by the decree. The fact that this decree also legitimised the use of force did not interest the German museum representatives. For them, only the collections were of concern, not the conditions under which they were obtained.

The peak period between about 1891 and 1907 saw an increase in the violent removal of cultural objects due to the expansion of violent apparatuses through the establishment of the police force and the so-called Schutztruppe. [24] This was accompanied by military excesses of violence that led to the looting and destruction of many cultural assets. In this phase alone, one counts more than 100 military expeditions [25] and more than 3190 inventory numbers for the Berlin Ethnological Museum, in contrast to just under 400 in the experimental phase between 1884 and 1889/90. The year 1909 shows the highest increase in inventory numbers in Berlin. Consignors whose names appear in this year are officers who were involved in wars of aggression: Ludwig Freiherr von Stein zu Lausnitz (1868-1934, 10 inventory numbers), Karl Georg Lessel (1883-1931, 46 numbers), Wilhelm Langheld (1867-1917, 8 numbers), Martin Karl Arnim Heßler (b. 1874, 16 numbers), Caesar Wegelin (1875-1914) and Peter Scheunemann. [26] However, the decisive factor for the enormous [p.67] expansion of the Cameroon holdings in this year was not an officer, but Ankermann's → Bio, 370 journey in the Cameroon grasslands, from which he brought back about 1500 numbers. [27] Like Diehl → Bio, 378 and many other civilians, however, Ankermann also accepted items captured from military personnel during the war. [28]

The so-called scientific phase from about 1908 to 1914 corresponds with the time of the banker Bernhard Dernburg (1865-1937) as the first state secretary of the newly founded Reichskolonialamt. Due to criticism of the violent excesses in Namibia (1904-1907) and the German colonies in general, Dernburg announced his intention to colonise with "means of preservation" instead of "means of destruction." [29] The colonies nevertheless remained the scene of "punitive expeditions" until 1914, which continued to favour the removal of cultural objects.

In addition to the increase in holdings, the archival records of the museums also reflect losses that can be traced back to exchange, theft or destruction due to the war, but which often can no longer be clarified. Two examples of this: Hans Caspar Gans zu Putlitz (1879-1940) sent twelve boxes with a total weight of 592 kg to Berlin in 1905. These arrived in September of that year and contained more than 213 cultural objects from Bekom, Bamum, Banyang, Wum, etc. [30] The entry book, on the other hand, shows only 189 objects from Putlitz for the year 1906. Under what circumstances 35 pieces of the consignment were lost remains uncertain. The officer Ernst Gustav Menzel sent 297 objects from Wum to Berlin in 1908, of which only 57 can be traced today. [31]

Time-shifted inputs

Another important cyclical feature that is often lost sight of [32] is that the arrival of cultural objects in museums does not correspond to a linear timeline. Quite a few of them, taken away from Cameroon between 1884 and 1916 or 1919, arrived in the museums later. Some evidence of cultural heritage taken from the colony between 1885 and 1904 even entered a museum such as the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg (today Museum am Rothenbaum - Kulturen und Künste der Welt, MARKK) only in 1948 and were inventoried only in 2009. [33] The fact that some Cameroonian cultural objects remained in the families of stakeholders who had lived in Cameroon around 1900 and were later given to museums can be explained by the fact that they were considered "high memorials" of deceased relatives. [34] A hope for later speculation on the art market cannot be ruled out either. Moreover, as a result of the war losses caused by the Second World War, many museums were dependent on the solidarity of citizens to rebuild their collections. [35] The periods [p.68] between 1920 and 1960 as well as after independence in 1960/61 therefore also include numerous cultural objects from the German colonial period.

The colonial or military origin of cultural property that came into German museums even after Cameroon's independence can be illustrated by the case of Bernhard Struck (1888-1971), professor of ethnology in Jena until the 1960s. During his studies, in 1908, at the age of barely 20, Struck had compiled a questionnaire for the first recording of the Adamaua languages on behalf of the Royal Museum in Berlin. Even then, he had recommended using "breaks in marches, admissions of prisoners, legations of remote tribes" as "favourable opportunities" to collect linguistic data. [36] His

later collecting activities are accordingly characterised by few scruples. In 1970, 150 objects with the origin "Cameroon" entered the Grassi Museum in Leipzig under his name. These were very old cultural objects, some of which had been captured during German "punitive expeditions", on the one hand by Governorate Chancellor Heinrich Leist (1859-1910) in 1892/93, [37] and on the other by Walter Stoessel (ca. 1881-?), colonial officer in the years 1906/07 in the village of Bangambe (Ngambe?). Other parts of the collection come from Zintgraff, from Captain Franz von Stephani (1876-1939) as well as from Arno Franke, colonial goods dealer and owner of a stamp speciality shop in Dresden. As can also be seen from the example of the Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz, the cultural objects that came into the building in 1966 and 1971 originated predominantly from the German colonial period. When they arrived in the Reich, they first went into the Linden Museum, before later being acquired by Mainz University. [38] It should be noted that the arrivals from Cameroon occurred with a time lag and extended beyond the historical key dates of the colonial era. This is true for almost all the museums studied in Germany. [39]

Stakeholders involved in the confiscation of cultural property and their profiles

Sebastian-Manès Sprute's careful evaluation of all "Cameroon" inventories in German ethnological museums yields a list of more than 1600 (predominantly German) names associated with the cultural objects received from Cameroon. [40]

Although the stakeholders involved in the confiscation of cultural property have been the subject of previous research on colonial *raffen*, the focus is usually solely on Germans who were active in the colonies. [41] Hardly any mention is made of Cameroonian stakeholders in the sources used in such research. Their names rarely appear in museum inventories of the colonial period, so they have been mostly ignored by researchers so far. We know little about the rulers or groups of people who disposed of objects in Cameroon, [p.70] had to dispose of them, or forcibly lost their cultural property as part of missionary or military actions. [42] Equally little research has been done on anonymous workers, not infrequently women or children, who carried the tons of cultural objects that were to be transported from Cameroon to Germany. [43] Furthermore, the stakeholders who were involved in this system of the removal, relocation and circulation of cultural property in the metropolis, who have also hardly been taken into account by research so far, come into view. The fact that the colonial *raffen* broke scientific disciplines and the object categories established by museums will also be a topic: ethnographica, so-called human remains, zoologica, mineralogica, botanica and iconic appropriation - photographs, films [44] - were often withdrawn by the same stakeholders, bundled as a whole and shipped. Throughout the chapter, reference is made to a selection of biographies presented separately in this volume. [45]

Undocumented (Cameroonian) stakeholders

From whom were the testimonies of material culture accumulated en masse in European museums today taken, and through whose hands did they come to Europe? These questions bring into focus the local stakeholders who - it is important to emphasise - were by no means entirely passive despite the pressure of epistemic, structural, physical and psychological colonial violence [46].

Local rulers looted and blackmailed

Local rulers appear to be the main losers of cultural goods in that most of the art treasures of a kingdom were often kept in the chiefdoms (royal palaces) to serve various rituals. The local rulers were therefore their legitimate custodians, just as they looked after the sanctuary of the village. [47] In fact, however, they did not always handle them; there was a person in charge of each area who undertook the ritual on behalf of the ruler and the community. The material elements for such rituals are still considered sacred and objects of power today. [48] This is especially true for sculptures or objects covered with beads and cowrie shells. The Cameroonian art historian Jean Paul Notué writes about this:

"Some objects of art (statues, masks, musical instruments, royal seats, récipients, costumes, etc.), réceptacles of the *kè*, play an important role in the functioning of the

chefferie gung and in the survival of the group.), réceptacles du kè, jouent un rôle si éminent dans le fonctionnement de la chefferie gung et dans la survie du groupe, que leur disparition remettrait en cause, aujourd'hui encore, l'autorité du fo (le roi) et des notables, c'est-à-dire du royaume lui-même et des sociétés secrètes qui en constituent le soutien. " [49]

[p.71] According to Notué, the chiefdoms were thus not only the political but also the spiritual-sacral centre of the local communities. [50] By systematically plundering such centres, the colonial conquerors therefore sought not only to destroy the power of the rulers, but also to shake the communities' right to exist. Because of the cultural-sacral power of the kings and their dignitaries, they were also privileged targets for the missions to fight against the supposed power of darkness. [51] Rulers of the chiefdoms such as those of Baham under Fô Poukam I, [52] Bamenon (today Bamera), Bangu and Bansa in today's western region, are among these barely documented local stakeholders whose looted cultural treasures are exhibited today, for example, in the Humboldt Forum in Berlin. [53] Attributes of power and sacred entities taken from the Bekom, Wum and Nso chiefdoms in today's Northwest Region are also on display there. The Sultan of Tibati, Hamman Lamou → Bio, 392, lost not only more than 300 of his compatriots but also 30 huge ivories and more than 150 individual pieces in 1899 when the commander of the Schutztruppe, Oltwig von Kamptz (1857-1921), had his palace looted and set on fire. [54] Furthermore, the Vute ruler Ngran III (Neyon) → Bio, 411 mourned killed people in 1898 and 1899 and suffered the loss of large shields, ivory and weapons when Kamptz and his troops looted his palace. [55] Some Maka rulers → Bio, 402 including Aulemaku, Bobele, Ngoen and Bonanga, were executed by the German colonial power in 1910. Not only their lives, but also important cultural property was taken from them. [56] Just over 1200 inventory numbers with reference to the Maka are now in 45 public museums and collections in Germany.

In addition to these cases of looting, one also comes across cases of extortion, e.g. with the throne of Sultan Njoya → Bio, 417 (1873-1933) in Foumban. → Bildheft XLVIII [57] He was first spotted in 1902 by German invaders: the former captain and general agent of the Colonial Society of North-West Cameroon, Hans von Ramsay (1862-1938), Lieutenant Martin Philipp Ludwig Sandrock (1870-1905) and a certain Habich. Afterwards, his photograph in Globus magazine triggered a "scramble" for the throne among museum people in Germany. In order to maintain power over his kingdom, which had been subordinated to the German colonial station of Bamenda since 1903, Njoya gave in after tough negotiations with Captain Hans Glauning → Bio, 386 (1868-1908), commissioned by the director of the Department of Africa and Oceania at the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde, Felix von Luschan (1854-1924), and 'donated' his father's precious heirloom to Kaiser Wilhelm II in 1908. [58] In Foumban even today, the supposed gift is equated with extortion and fraud. As the director of cultural affairs at the palace in Foumban, Ndji Oumarou Nschare, pointed out in an interview, it would be a "curse" if the Bamum and the Cameroons did not reclaim the throne today; after all, Njoya → Bio, 417 [p.72] had been lied to and never received the promised army. "How many autonomous rulers do you know who voluntarily give their thrones to another ruler as a token of friendship?" [59] Instead of the throne promised as a counter-gift by the German Emperor, Njoya received an orchestration which, according to the artist and Cameroon traveller Ernst Vollbehr (1876-1960), had "long since lain broken" barely three years later. Vollbehr also remembered "the old pearl throne chair of his [Njoya's] ancestors, from which Njoya parted with great difficulty at that time, for no less than fourteen rulers had sat on it". [60] Njoya's futile balking and his involuntary separation from the throne are striking evidence of the pressure exerted on him; the "rescue rhetoric" apparently served to justify the colonial collection activities of an extortionate accumulation policy. [61] Conversely, Njoya's ruthless treatment of the orchestration can also be understood as a form of resistance and at the same time an expression of a vassal's powerlessness vis-à-vis the colonial regime.

This resistance is also evident among some local people such as the guardians of sacred objects or places when they resisted the deprivation of their cultural objects. The European object takers not only used violence, but also committed bribery. The naturalienhandlung in Hamburg, operating under the name Museum Umlauff → Bio, 432 wrote an internal report in 1914 as an advertisement for its Cameroon collection. It shows how the Germans on site proceeded in 1912/13 against the resistance of the owners, the so-called rulers. The taking of photographs was often the first step in the expropriation mechanism:

"As soon as they [the guards] noticed that one showed interest in them [the objects], they immediately disappeared and only after a long palaver did they sometimes manage to bring them back, if only to photograph them. Thus the above-mentioned chief of Bamendjo could only with difficulty be persuaded to at least allow the giant drums decorated with elephant heads to be brought out of the hut specially built for their storage for a short time in order to photograph them." [62]

In Fouban, if one wanted to have the magnificent pieces or at least take a photo, the palaver was followed by a bribe:

"A pipe solicited from his collection could only be obtained by a rich counter-gift worth a hundred marks, and only by bribing the keeper of this interesting collection of pipes was it possible to get the same out of the hut for a short time for photographing." [63]

In fact, it was clear to the local rulers and their assistants (chindas) as well as the notables that photography played a role in the deprivation of their cultural goods by revealing their existence. Through the photos, it was possible to advertise to the patrons and thereby arouse the interest of the museums. The museums, for their part, were aware of the role [p.73] of photography. They equipped their commissioned collectors with cameras, as was done, for example, at the Leipzig Grassi Museum under the direction of Karl Weule (1864-1926) with the dealer Adolf Diehl → Bio, 378 (1870-1943). [64]

Women, rulers and children as suppliers

In order to learn more about the extraction of cultural goods locally, women and children are also to be considered as suppliers, although such practices were not very common. Contact with Europe had not only transformed the meaning of local art, but had also drawn the attention of local societies to the industrial goods produced in Europe. Local art objects could be exchanged for them and some could be produced to order to supply the increasingly important art market. Fouban, as a major centre of art, played such a role in the colonial period, and women were instrumental in shaping it. For example, the Cameroon traveller and artist Marie-Pauline Thorbecke → Bio, 429 (1882-1971), who accompanied her husband Franz Thorbecke (1875-1945) on a trip on behalf of the German Colonial Society in 1911/12, reported on her purchases in Fouban: [65]

"Our house is a pure museum; we have traded fabulous treasures, mostly from women who literally stormed our house when they realised that they could get money, tobacco, fabrics, perfumes, mirrors for their braids, baskets, jewellery and pipes from us. There were probably 300 to 400 women there at once, all shouting [sic] at the same time, holding out their things to us." [66]

Her husband's good relations with Sultan Njoya, as Thorbecke saw it, had also led to the sultan showing the couple rare and old things about his "chinda", selling them and probably also giving them to him: "The chinda told us about the pipe with the heads, that no white man had ever seen it before, and Njoya only gave it to us because he had known Franz for so long and was his friend". [67]

Previously, the couple had been in Dschang, where they secured a deceased woman's neck ring "studded with red pearls and cowrie shells" under questionable circumstances. At first, as she freely confessed in her diary, some 15 women had refused to sell it at the prices offered. Eventually, however, through the intermediary of the cook, "a ghastly, one-eyed fellow [...] came at dark, showed the ring and demanded 12 marks for it." [68]

One example of the delivery of a headdress stands out in particular because children or young people were involved. In his 1912 travelogue *Mit Pinsel und Palette durch Kamerun* (With Brush and Palette through Cameroon), the painter Ernst Vollbehr reports on the offer of a magnificent piece in the Dschang- district: "Late in the evening, two missionary pupils [p.74] from Bagam appeared with an old, large dance bead headdress depicting a giant lizard, which I was able to purchase for the cheap price of 4.50 marks. Man must be lucky to obtain such a thing!" [69] Clearly Vollbehr was talking about a sacral attribute of power, which is still used today on the occasion of great ritual dances. Strange, however, is the fact that Vollbehr - like Thorbecke in Dschang with regard to the neck ring - did not ask

himself where the missionary students got the headdress. Whether they acted on their own initiative or were urged to do so by relatives, whether it was a matter of contraband or fraud, is difficult to say. However, the influence of the mission is clearly revealed: as part of its Christian mission, it trained cultural iconoclasts who contributed to the destruction or deprivation of the supposed "demon stakeholders" or "fetishes" [70].

In the museum archives, the involvement of local (mission) teachers in the deprivation of cultural property is far better documented than that of mission students. One example is the Baptist auxiliary teacher Nacho/Carl Steane from the Victoria district, who had travelled to Berlin around 1900, where he and the founder and leader of the Cameroon Mission, the preacher Eduard Scheve (1836-1909), [71] visited Felix von Luschan. Luschan took the opportunity to ask, among other things, for human skulls from Cameroon, as Steane's letter shows: "Dear Professor, when Preacher Alfred [sic] Scheve and I visited you one day, you said that you did not yet have a Cameroon skull; since I have the opportunity to get one, I take the liberty of sending it to you as a gift [! This letter reveals the manipulative intention of the museum people, since around 1900 many ancestral skulls from Cameroon had long since reached the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin. This did not prevent Luschan from making Scheve and Steane believe that he did not yet have any "human remains" from Cameroon. In this way, he was able to win the two protagonists over to his plans. [73] In addition, men should be mentioned who were quickly trained as hunters or trained to catch insects and produce preparations. [74]

Men, children and women as means of transport

It would be unfair, with regard to the undocumented stakeholders, not to take a look at the countless anonymised, invisible or made invisible men, women and children who carried not only rubber, weapons or goods, but also captured or acquired cultural goods. [75] This means that the looted populations were also used as transport infrastructure by the looters. They were simply the colony's "organic capital stock", which the colonial doctor and tropical physician Friedrich Otto Ludwig Külz (1875-1938), who was in office in Togo and Cameroon, classified as the "human economy", the "main colonial value", [76] i.e. the capital that made the exploitation [p.75] of the other types of capital possible in the first place. Thus, the Thorbecke → Bio, 429 couple was travelling under the supervision of the colonial soldiers with 75 to 170 porters, including old men and adolescent boys. [77] If the porters resisted, the Thorbeckes threatened them with "Twenty- five" (25 lashes) or tried to lure them with "dash" (tips), [78] and were thus able to drag along more than 1,300 cultural objects, which helped them to gain renown. [79]

However, it also happened that these local porters were forcibly taken to Europe. A striking example of this is provided by Hans Dominik's companion → Bio, 380 (1870-1910) named Mahama, whom the officer forced to travel to Germany in order to have him work as an animal keeper in Berlin. [80] Dominik had no regard for Mahama, his feelings or his family.

Documented stakeholders in Cameroon

The profiles of the German colonisers who took cultural goods are highly diverse. Moreover, mixed profiles or profile changes can be detected. At least ten groups of stakeholders involved in the confiscation of Cameroonian goods can be distinguished: Administrators, officers, ship captains, missionaries, teachers, (ethnographic) traders, scholars/travellers, artists, plantation owners, colonists and doctors. In addition, there are people who worked for missionaries without being professional missionaries, especially women. However, in view of the source situation, it is currently not possible to outline an exact statistical distribution of the stakeholders who were responsible for the incorporation of the original approx. 56,000 inventory numbers from Cameroon in German museums. The reason for this is the gaps in the archives, in which many stakeholders appear, for example, without first names or with abbreviated first names.

Administrator

The category of administrators subsumes those stakeholders who functioned as members of the colonial administration. These range from the consul general or consul, later the governor and

governorate secretaries, to district bureaucrats and station chiefs. [81] Consul General Gustav Nachtigal (1834-1885), who made Togo, Cameroon and Namibia German 'protectorates' in 1884, delivered 132 objects from Cameroon to the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin during his short term in office (July-December 1884), while his deputy and successor Max Buchner → Bio, 375 (1846-1921) delivered 21 inventory numbers to the Völkerkundemuseum in Munich. [82] He is still known today for the violent theft of the magnificent Tangué → Pictorial Booklet LIV by Kum'a Mbat'a Bele ba Dooh alias Lock Priso → Bio, 397 (1846-1916). When the German navy bombed the latter's houses in the Cameroonian [p.76] coastal area of Douala-Hickory Town (now Bonaberi) in retaliation at the end of 1884, Buchner → Bio, 375 seized the opportunity to get hold of the ship's beak and send it to his home town of Munich. [83] Names such as those of Governor Jesko von Puttkamer → Bio, 422 (1895-1906), with 19 in the Berlin Museum, and Eugen Zimmerer (1891-1895), with 179 numbers in the Munich Museum, are also worth mentioning because, as the highest representatives of the authorities in the colony, they not only obtained cultural objects but also supported the processes of seizure in consultation with museum people such as the director of the Department for Africa and Oceania in Berlin, Luschan. [84] The latter, for example, pleaded with Puttkamer for ethnographica and skulls from Cameroon:

"We would be indebted to the Imperial Government if it would continue to support our scientific endeavours in the future as it has done in the past. Large stretches of the country are as yet almost completely unrepresented by us, and especially in the new expeditions, consideration of the Royal Museum would be of the greatest value to us. We would also attach great importance to ethnological collections. We have received so few skulls and skeletons from Cameroon, that our ideas about the anthropology of the country are still quite unclear." [85]

The Linden Museum in Stuttgart also benefited from the delivery of Cameroonian cultural objects by the colonial administrators. For Martin Preuß, the deputy district administrator in Sanga Ngoko, 811 inventory numbers are to be mentioned here, for Paul Dorbritz, the former district official in Kribi, 676 or the governorate secretary Philipp Glock 753 numbers. [86] In addition to these administrators, who are to be seen as multipliers of colonial withdrawal, there were colonial stakeholders with mixed profiles or profile changes, who, for example, first worked as doctors or military officers and only later as administrators or district bureaucrats or plantation leaders. For example, the doctor Alfred Mansfeld (1870-1932), who became district officer in Ossidinge in 1904, or former members of the Schutztruppe such as Lieutenant Eduard von Brauchitsch (1891-1908), who later became district officer in Douala, Captain Hans von Ramsay, who switched to plantation management, or First Lieutenant Adolf Schipper (1873-1915), who became the civilian administrator of the station in Dume after his time in the Schutztruppe. Schipper's name is linked to 555 catalogue numbers in the Übersee-Museum Bremen alone - including loot items [87] - and to as many as 1022 entries in the Linden-Museum Stuttgart, and as an officer he represents a good example of military raiding of cultural property. [88]

Officers

Officers form the group of stakeholders through whom the majority of cultural goods were stolen or confiscated. However, many so-called human remains, botanica and zoologica are also associated with their names in the museum inventories. [89] For example, von Brauchitsch, station chief in Edea and later district official of Douala until 1908, sent five skulls to Luschan in 1898. [90] Dominik → Bio, 380 sent skulls to Freiburg after his punitive expedition against the Maka in 1909/10, [91] while Oscar Foerster brought back not only skulls but also 'living' hair from the Nsimu and Ntumu from his border commissions in the south of the colony in 1901/02 and 1904/05. [92] Gustav Adolf Wilhelm Laasch (b. 1873) sent skulls and probably a whole skeleton of the Bulu to Berlin after his "punitive expedition" against the Bulu (1899/1900). [93] Kurt Strümpell (1872-1947) in turn sent hundreds of cultural objects, including at least 60 of the Bangwa, to the Braunschweig Municipal Museum after punitive expeditions and in administrative functions in the Bangwa area in 1901/02 and in the north, which have recently been investigated as part of the PAESE project (Provenance Research in Non-European Collections and Ethnology in Lower Saxony). [94] Through Karl Adametz (b. 1877) more than ten human skulls [p.78] from the grasslands, animal skulls and skins as well as insect species reached Berlin. [95] They were the ones - as leaders or members of so-called punitive expeditions -

who came into direct confrontation with the local populations, valuing violence as the only way to obtain foreign cultural goods. Although some military officers spent little time in the colony, they nevertheless gathered numerous objects, e.g. Hans Houben (1871-1942) with 104 inventory numbers in Stuttgart or Wilko von Frese (1882-1915) with 112 catalogue numbers in the Landesmuseum Hannover. [96] In contrast, only one blow horn made of ivory in the Ethnological Museum Berlin can be traced back to Emil Rausch → Bio, 424 (1877-1914), who spent more than twelve years in the colony as station chief in Tinto and Dschang. [97]

Confrontation with the local population was generally characterised by intimidation and brutality. For this reason, cultural property with a military connection is often associated with a context of violence. [98] Apart from weapons, it often includes magnificent sacred pieces and attributes of power such as coats of arms, double bells, village drums, war helmets, etc., which were neither for exchange nor for sale and consequently could only be appropriated by force. [99] They in particular are the focus of restitution demands or provenance research, such as a sculpture taken to Hanover by Wilko von Frese → Booklet XXXIX from Bakoven. [100] Between 1894 and 1901, 370 "ethnological" objects in the Übersee-Museum Bremen and approx. 50 from his Ngolo expedition in 1897 in the Ethnological Museum Berlin, and there too to Glauning → Bio, 386 between 1901 and 1910 alone more than 380 objects, to Dominik → Bio, 380 between 1894 and 1910 more than 1000 objects including skulls in various museums, to Freiherr Ludwig von Stein zu Lausnitz (1868-1934) 323 in Berlin and more than 995 in the Linden-Museum Stuttgart, or to Peter Scheunemann (1870-1937) from 1900 to 1909 76 objects in the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum (RJM) Cologne, etc. [101] In their reports they make no secret of the killing of resistance fighters, the summary execution of local rulers [102] already mentioned, and the looting of objects on the battlefield. [103] Among the 18 people who had sent more than 100 cultural objects to the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin were nine officers. For the year 1891 alone, the receipt of 460 cultural objects from Cameroon is documented here. These were mainly supplied by punitive expedition leaders such as Captain Curt von Morgen (281 catalogue numbers), Lieutenant Hans Tappenbeck or from his estate (9 numbers), Eugen Zintgraff (46 numbers) and Captain Richard Kund (124 numbers). [104] Kund and Tappenbeck were the leaders of the first expeditions into the interior via Kribi to Yaoundé, where they established the first station in 1889. However, this was not achieved without war against rebelling communities such as the Bati, the Dogots or the Malimba. [105] Moreover, in the [p.79] museum inventories, officers appear almost exclusively as previous owners, although far more non-commissioned officers, privates and sergeants were involved in the fighting. As with the naming of supposedly newly "discovered" localities, mountains, lakes and rivers, where often only senior officers had a go, there seem to have been unwritten laws in this regard as well. The non-commissioned officers made loot or even deals for the officers. This is tangible in the case of the former commander of the Schutztruppe, Colonel Kurt Pavel → Bio, 420 (1851-1933). The Nso figure Ngonso, to cite a currently much-discussed example, was 'donated' by Pavel to the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde, although he was on a punitive expedition near Lake Chad at the time of the storming, looting and burning of the Nso kingdom in June 1902 by Lieutenant Hans Houben. [106] The staff doctor of his company, Zupitza, testified:

"As leader of the expedition and commander of the troops, he [Pavel] naturally had the lion's share of all the things and also the most beautiful things. Most of it had to be given to the Berlin Museum. After all, Mr. Pavel may still have retained some - perhaps even particularly precious - objects for himself." [107]

Of the 60 largest consignors of all ethnological museums in Germany, to whom a total of approx. 35,000 inventory numbers can be traced, nearly 25 were military. These alone are associated with approx. 14,000 numbers. This accounts for almost a third of the Cameroon holdings of the 45 institutions studied. [108] Nevertheless, the cultural objects from a context of military violence represent only the visible part of the iceberg, since many captured pieces were sold to other interested parties. [109] For officers like Karl Adametz (133 inventory numbers in EM Berlin), punitive expeditions were the best way to make rich loot. [110] The prospect of this even served as motivation for their soldiers. [111] But civilians also profited from the punitive expeditions. Thus Bernhard Ankermann → Bio, 370 (1859-1943), Adolf Diehl → Bio, 378, Johann Heinrich Gustav Umlauff → Bio, 432 (1833-1889), Ernst Vollbehr, Georg Zenker → Bio, 437 (1855-1922), etc., reported how they received entire collections as gifts from the military or bought them. [112] In addition, information has

come down to us from missionaries such as Jakob Keller → [Bio, 394](#) or Georg Schürle (1870-1909) about their cooperation with the state-military apparatus of violence. [\[113\]](#)

Ethnographica traders/merchants

The assumption that merchants, including ethnographica dealers in particular, unlike colonial militaries and officials, obtained cultural goods from unproblematic trade networks can be refuted on the basis of a few examples. Adolf Diehl, for example, has 2344 inventory numbers in Stuttgart alone and 1605 in Leipzig. He demonstrably bought [\[p.80\]](#) many objects from officers who had taken part in punitive expeditions:

"I am pleased to see from your letter that you liked the last collection. I have now received some very beautiful things from the Banzoi campaign. Mainly bronzes (pipes, drinking cups, bells, etc.). Captain Glauning has once again collected a great deal, but I assume for Berlin." [\[114\]](#)

The former representatives of the Woermann company in Cameroon, Wilhelm Jantzen (1839-1917) and Johannes Thormählen (1842-1909), operated one of the largest plantation areas on the west coast of Africa on Mount Cameroon, based on land grabbing and the exploitation of local labour. [\[115\]](#) In Berlin, they took part in the colonial exhibition in 1896 and sent "numerous ethnographic objects from Cameroon" to the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg in 1899 via their company J & T. [\[116\]](#) For 25 objects with the provenance Jantzen & Thormählen, neither the date of receipt nor the area of origin are documented. Gustav Conrau (1865-1899) worked as a trader and recruiter of labour for this trading company, but also for the Westafrikanische Pflanzungsgesellschaft Victoria founded by Zintgraff and Max Esser (1866-1943) in 1897. [\[117\]](#) He was also active as a commissioned collector on behalf of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin. His name is associated there with 136 cultural objects, mainly Bangwa. Among them is the famous "Bangwa Queen", which was later sold to the USA and finally to the Musée Dapper in Paris. [\[118\]](#) In addition, Conrau sent many zoological collections to the Museum für Naturkunde Museum Berlin, [\[119\]](#) as well as human remains. [\[120\]](#)

Missionaries

As a separate chapter on the role of missionaries in the transfer of cultural property to Germany in this volume shows, this has so far been misjudged. The missionaries [\[121\]](#) not only took cultural objects for their own mission museums and exhibition agendas [\[122\]](#), which were cited as illustrative or proof material for the so-called progress of the missionary work among the supposed "heathens". [\[123\]](#) Rather, they also supplied public museums and traded in the confiscated pieces. [\[124\]](#) Thus, among others, Wilhelm Müller of the German Baptist mission supplied the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin, as did the Basel missionary Jakob Keller → [Bio, 394](#) (1862-1947), and his Basel colleagues Rudolf Widmaier (1880-1957) and Julius Ziegler (1884-1949) supplied the Linden Museum in Stuttgart, with Ziegler's consignments coming to the Museum Witzenhausen via Fritz Borns. [\[125\]](#) One can speak of a network between mission, state and military in the transport of seized cultural objects because they often worked in synergy, across nationalities and across institutions. [\[126\]](#) This is true of the network of the American missionary Harris [\[p.81\]](#) Richardson (1879-1887), who worked for the English Baptist mission in Bakundu Land and sent cultural goods to Adolf Bastian via Eugen Zintgraff and/or the governor Julius von Soden (1885-1891). [\[127\]](#) In the Ethnological Museum Berlin, his name is today associated with 30 inventory numbers. [\[128\]](#) This also applies to the missionary Müller, who sent 68 cultural objects of the Bassa, Bali etc. to Felix von Luschan on 17 December 1903. [\[129\]](#) Hardly tangible in the collection inventories, on the other hand, are missionaries such as Anna Rein-Wuhrmann → [Bio, 434](#) (1881-1971), who maintained closer contact with local women and girls by teaching them household chores or sewing and embroidery.

Teachers and teachers' assistants

Apart from the mission schools, there were the German government schools in Cameroon that employed teachers. The best-known representative of this group is Theodor Christaller (1863-1896),

whose name in Frankfurt is associated with a "headdress" made of parrot feathers that King Bell allegedly gave Christaller around 1894. [130] The occasion could have been Christaller's intervention with the governorate on behalf of the Duala population, who were accused of having participated in the uprising of the Dahomey police soldiers in German service in 1893. [However, the headdress only came into the museum in 1949 via a certain Dr Ludwig. Another teacher named Schröpfer is associated with a figure in the Linden Museum in Stuttgart. [132]

Colonists, planters

Many colonists, i.e. Germans who had established themselves in the colony with the firm intention of staying for a longer period of time, were always in contact with museums in Germany such as the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin, the Linden-Museum Stuttgart or the Grassi Museum Leipzig, which supplied them with cultural objects according to their orders. Heinrich Picht, a planter in Cameroon, [133] supplied the Museum für Völkerkunde Berlin with 78 collection items in 1908 and 1909. However, the best-known colonist in the Cameroonian colonial context, whose name, incidentally, is represented by at least 447 numbers in the Berlin Museum and 174 in the Grassi Museum Leipzig alone, is Georg Zenker → Bio, 437 (1855-1922). [134] After working on behalf of the colonial administration as head of the station in Yaoundé, he settled in Bipindi in South Cameroon, where, building on his experience as a gardener, he ran plantations for coffee, cocoa and rubber. On behalf of Berlin's museums of ethnology and natural history, Zenker sent not only ethnographica but also human remains, zoological and botanical "collections" to Berlin and Leipzig, among which were loot items. Governor von Puttkamer → Bio, 422 described Zenker's house as a [p.84] veritable museum when he visited it on 3 January 1897 on his way inland:

"Here I visited the former long-time station manager of Yaoundé, Mr. Zenker, who now has his own estate in Bipindi and is building highly interesting collections for several local scientific societies. His spacious residence, made entirely with indigenous funds, was a perfect museum, full of ethnographic curiosities, photographs, oil and watercolour sketches, herbaria, animal skins and skulls, weapons, fetishes, bird skins and the like." [135]

Doctors

There were two types of doctors in the colony, civilian doctors and military doctors, who can be associated primarily with the human remains in German collections, but besides that, like all other groups of stakeholders, helped themselves to a wide range of cultural goods. Dr. Theodor Berké (1870-1949), who took part in "punitive expeditions" against the Bangwa in Fontem and the Anyang in the Cross River region in 1901/02 and 1904 in the grasslands in what is now the South and Northwest regions of Cameroon, [136] extracted about 100 human remains, which are now in the Institute for Anatomy in Strasbourg. [137] In addition to cultural objects, a Dr. Esch sent at least twelve skulls to the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde. [138] Approximately 200 human remains from the regions of Yaoundé, Jabassi, Edéa, Vute, etc. are associated with Dr. Hans Schäfer, naval surgeon and assistant physician, in the Museum für Früh- und Vorgeschichte Berlin, as well as some inventory numbers in the Museums für Völkerkunde Berlin and Dresden. [139] Dr. Paul Hösemann (1868-1922) delivered 35 catalogue numbers to Berlin, including human remains. [140] Dr Hans Ziemann → Bio, 439 (1865-1939) not only stole hair of living people, but sent both ethnographica to Stuttgart and zoologica to Berlin. [141] That doctors acted out of economic calculation beyond scientific interests is attested to by the example of Dr Alfred Mansfeld, who, as mentioned, had replaced Count Pückler-Limpurg, who had died in a "punitive expedition" in the Odissinge region, as district official in 1904. Mansfeld, represented by 84 numbers in the Ethnological Museum in Berlin, sent 500 ethnographica and 300 zoologica to Germany in 1908 alone. [142] These were initially destined for the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg. Due to a more lucrative offer of 6000 marks, they eventually went to St. Petersburg in Russia. [143] The route taken by these convolutions is telling evidence of the networks that were able to form in the ethnographic trade, but also of the history of loss that was the consequence of profiteering: of the 500 pieces of ethnographica, only about 217 can still be traced in today's Kunstkamera in St. Petersburg. [144]

[p.85] Scientists, scholars, travellers

This category of stakeholders was already involved in the translocation of cultural objects from Cameroon before the formal colonisation from 1884. This applies to African explorers such as Hamburg-born Heinrich Barth (1821-1865) or Eduard Robert Flegel (1852-1886), whose cultural objects brought with them can be found in the Ethnological Museum in Berlin or the Roemer and Pelizaeus Museum in Hildesheim.

The scientists are generally regarded as harmless. However, their activities inscribed themselves in the colonial asymmetry of power because they were often supported and accompanied by the police or military apparatus of violence. [145] Researchers such as Leo Frobenius (1873-1938), Franz Thorbecke, Ernst Emil Kurt Hassert (1868-1947), Bernhard Ankermann → Bio, 370, Bernhard Weißenborn (1858-1889), Carl Passavant, MD (1854-1887), or Dr Otto Karl Siegfried Passarge (1866-1958), who even signed the 'Confession of German Professors to Adolf Hitler' in 1933, left their mark on many museum collections. In 1907/08, for example, Thorbecke and Hassert undertook a geographical research trip to the colony of Cameroon on behalf of the Landeskundliche Kommission des Reichskolonialamtes. In 1911/12, Thorbecke accompanied by his wife Marie Pauline Thorbecke → Bio, 429 travelled to Cameroon for a second time, this time on behalf of the German Colonial Society. [146] They brought a wide range of ethnographica (116 numbers to the Ethnological Museum Berlin, 758 numbers to the Reiss-Engelhorn Museums Mannheim) [147] as well as anthropological, [148] pictorial (800 glass plates) and cartographic material back to Germany. Her estate is now part of the total holdings of the Reiss-Engelhorn Museums and the University and City Library of Cologne (map collection).

Artists

Among the stakeholders in the withdrawal of Cameroonian cultural heritage, the group of artists also deserves mention. With the intention of pictorially capturing and popularising the German colony, they wanted to make their contribution to the colonial oeuvre. We have already mentioned Marie Pauline Thorbecke and the extensive "collection" of material heritage that the couple owed to their stay in Cameroon. [149] This is also true of Ernst Vollbehr, who travelled to Cameroon in 1911/12 among other German colonies in Africa and produced more than 160 works during his trip. That he later put his painting in the service of National Socialism is basically not surprising, since he already represented the ideology of the master race in colonial times. [In Vollbehr's case, hardly any information is available about the whereabouts of his ethnological collections, which he took with him from Cameroon. His autobiography of 1912 shows that he collected purposefully [p.86] or received gifts, e.g. from the then station chief of Bamenda, First Lieutenant Karl Adametz. On the other hand, he did not say a word about the circumstances under which Adametz, who was involved in so-called "punitive expeditions" in the grasslands - Bafum, Bascho, Baminge, Alkasum, Munchi, etc. - between 1905 and 1913, obtained the cultural goods given away to Vollbehr. This is how Vollbehr praised the donation:

"It is already very difficult to get old, genuine pieces and here they just flew to me. So the other day I was speechless with happiness and joy when the station chief gave me his extremely valuable collection on the sole condition that I make it accessible to quite a few people in Germany. I will therefore let these beautiful things, as well as my many other ethnological objects, wander through the German cities together with my pictures." [151]

Stakeholders in Germany

The stakeholders directly involved in the transfer and circulation of cultural property in Germany were the Reich government in Berlin, museum representatives, commercial and colonial warehouses, auction houses, shipping companies, associations and moulding works. [152] It is clear from the archival material that the government and the museum people knew very well that many of the objects they received came from wartime activities and were therefore loot.

Through the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office, the government financed so-called expeditions to acquire various ethnographica, zoologica, botanica, mineralogica and anthropologica. This funding was

provided by the Afrikafonds, founded in 1878, which made available annual sums of around 150,000 Reichsmarks for the "scientific exploration of Africa". [153] The fund also helped to finance colonial newspapers and the production of maps or colonial atlases. [154] As already mentioned, the German government also enacted several laws and circulars from 1889 onwards to secure the "fruits" of cultural property confiscation first for the museums in the imperial capital and then to divide them between other home institutions. There was unease about this among civil servants and officers. Some, such as Lieutenant Emil Rausch → Bio, 424, even wrote letters to Luschan asking him to send the cultural objects he had received to their respective home towns. [155] Scientific societies or institutes also participated in this process of deprivation of cultural heritage. [156] They sent members or amateurs with travel experience, financed "expeditions" and bought objects in which museums had directed their interest. For example, the trained natural scientist Eugen Zintgraff, who took part in the early so-called research expeditions, was a member of the Berlin Society for Ethnology, Anthropology and Prehistory (BGEAU), which had emerged from the "Berlin Anthropological Society" created in 1869 by Rudolf Virchow and Adolf Bastian, among others [p.87]. The society purposefully supported excavations and expeditions of its members. The same applies to the "Hilfscomité zur Vermehrung der ethnologischen Sammlung der Königlichen Museen". Annette Lewerentz describes its functions as follows:

"The scientific aim of this committee was to collect and purchase ethnological objects for the Royal Museum of Berlin and, from 1886, for the newly founded Museum für Völkerkunde. The Völkerkundemuseum in turn purchased these objects from the committee and the proceeds enabled the latter to make further collection acquisitions and related expeditions; i.e. the committee made advances to travellers for the acquisition of ethnographica and the museum reimbursed the committee for the acquisition costs." [157]

Other associations such as the German Anti-Slavery Committee, the German Cameroon Society or the German Colonial Society, which emerged from a merger of different colonial associations, can be found in the inventories of the museums in Berlin and Hamburg as consignors; in some cases they had business relationships with colonial merchants. [158] As much as they shaped the colonial infrastructure in the metropolis, their importance for the mediation of confiscated cultural objects from Cameroon must be considered rather marginal on the basis of the sources researched so far. In contrast, the Württemberg Association for Commercial Geography and the Promotion of German Interests Abroad (later the Society for Geography and Ethnology in Stuttgart), which was founded in 1882 and from which the large Linden Museum emerged in 1910, was much more important. Shipping companies and ship captains, transport and forwarding firms played a central role in the circulation of the objects taken away between the colonies and the German museums. First and foremost, the Woermann Line dominated the Europe-Africa traffic via West and South West Africa. In 1906, the line had no fewer than 46 steamers of various sizes. [159] The steamer "Gouverneur von Puttkamer" → Bio, 422 was even inaugurated personally by Colonial Secretary Strübel in 1903. This testifies to the degree of cooperation in all areas, from the transport of people and goods or cultural goods to troop transports. In this context, warships did not only serve troop movements, they were also used in the process of cultural property relocation. [A glance at museum inventories proves that captains also supplied museums directly. The names of Captain Wichmann (12 numbers in the MARKK), A. Knutzen (6 numbers in the MARKK), A. Dücker (1 number in the MARKK) and Spring (6 numbers in the Linden Museum) can be cited here. Unfortunately, the documentation situation is poor, so that it is difficult to find out more names, also of other consignors. Ship captains and seafarers even founded an association, the Verein deutscher Seeschiffsfahrer in Hamburg, [161] through which at least 18 cultural objects [p.88] came to the Hamburg Museum für Völkerkunde. In addition, a dozen forwarding companies have so far been identified in the museums' files, including the companies Berliner Spediteur-Verein Aktien-Gesellschaft, Albert Meyer Leipzig-Speditions-geschäft-Express-Packet-Verkehr, Kai Express-Spediteur W. Homann & Co. (Hamburg), Gustav Knauer Spedition-Möbeltransport-Speicherei Breslau or Constantin Württenberger Bremen, which took over the transport on land and were the museums' closest partners. On 6 September 1905, for example, the Transport-Comptoir transported the aforementioned "12 collis of ethnographic objects" in the name of First Lieutenant Putlitz for his father Major Putlitz, with the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin as the

final destination. [162] The "collection" of Leopold Conrads, former station chief in Lolodorf in 1895 and Johann-Albrechts-Höhe (today Kumba) from 1895 to 1899, from the Bakundu country arrived in Berlin in 38 boxes with more than 700 objects. [163] Even though in this case the transport company is not documented, these figures give an idea of the extractivist dimension of the culture and anthropology of the colonial period.

In trade networks, auction houses in particular ensured the circulation of cultural goods in addition to ethnographic and art dealers such as the repeatedly mentioned Umlauff → Bio, 432 Julius Konietzko (1886-1952) or also Carl Hagenbeck (1844-1913), who, in addition to cultural goods, had living people and animals from Cameroon brought to Germany for ethnological shows and zoos, [164]. [165] They thus also participated in the transformation of meaning of works from different contexts: Sacred entities became commodities. Many artefacts taken away in Africa had specific functions in rites, cultural practices, local healing or in the accession of rulers. Ironically, it is these that were and still are praised in the highest terms by auctioneers. [166] There is evidence of some form of art trade between local communities before the colonial period, [167] but it would not have been supplied with sacred or attributes of power. To this day, by the way, auction houses contribute to the appreciation of African cultural goods with their auctions, but they also encourage smuggling. [168]

It is worth mentioning that the industries that developed in Germany around Cameroonian, indeed more generally around African cultural heritage, did not only concern trade and logistics. Worth mentioning are photo studios such as the Vienna studio of Michael Frankenstein or the Photo-Centrale der Kolonialkriegerdank GmbH, which accepted commissions from the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde and thus contributed to the media dissemination of the Cameroon holdings as well. [Another common method of reproducing objects was the plaster cast. For example, Luschan had a particularly beautiful sword embroidered with pearls and an equally richly decorated drinking horn from Putlitz's "collection" from the Northwest region cast in plaster by a specialist, August Köhn, [p.89]. [170] Since he was still in negotiations with Putlitz about acquiring the two valuable objects and was not sure whether he would eventually purchase them - he offered RM 300 for both - he provisionally decided on a reproduction. Duplicates are thus one dimension of cultural property displacement and bring to light other stakeholders involved in it.

The withdrawal of cultural property from Cameroon demonstrably led to the emptying of the country of magnificent old pieces in favour of the metropolis. These cultural assets have contributed to the enrichment of private individuals, families and associations, to the formation or reinforcement of branches of knowledge and professions in Germany through their multiple changes in meaning or value, admittedly almost exclusively in favour of Germany. A number of experts came to light, artists became known to their contemporaries mainly through their travels in Cameroon. Museums continued to specialise, shaping the knowledge or ignorance, tastes and stereotypical patterns of perception of the public. The massive and often unlawful, even violent, extraction of cultural objects from Cameroon has undoubtedly left many voids in the communities of origin. The paradox is that the same rhetoric that preached a rescue of foreign cultures legitimised forcibly taking away people's cultural goods and thereby destroying the cultures concerned.

"Carrier Calamities. Deprivation of cultural assets and the destruction of labour power

SEBASTIAN MANÈS SPRUTE

Map Text [p.94]

1. Hans Glauning (1868-1908) appropriated the drum at the end of 1905 when he passed through the village of Banssa with the soldateska he led during a military venture.

Since 60 porters could only move the 450 kg heavy and bulky drum the distance of a two-hour walk in two days, Glauning had the drum buried in the village of Bamungom on 13 December 1905.

3. in order to simplify the removal, the drum was dug up again after the undertaking, sawed into four pieces and taken to the Bamenda military station.

4 The further transport of the drum to the coast also proved to be problematic, so that a first attempt had to be abandoned in March 1906. A porter was killed by parts of the drum.

5 After months of uncertainty about the whereabouts of the drum, its trail was only found again at the end of January 1907, when the head of the Johann- Albrechtshöhe station reported a carrier convoy heading for the coast.

The drum arrived in Douala a little later and was loaded onto the "Eleonore Woermann" of the Woermann shipping company on 8 February 1907.

After a month at sea, the drum reached Hamburg, from where it was transported by rail to Berlin on 7 March 1907 by the Ernst Kraft shipping company.

8 After a year and a half of wandering, the drum was finally incorporated into the holdings of the Ethnological Museum. Its director Felix von Luschan (1854-1924) confirmed its receipt on 5 April 1907.

Map legend

Route of the drum with elephant and buffalo head from Banssa to Berlin. 1905-1907 → [Picture booklet XVIII](#)

The map shows the first stage of the translocation history. Moved out of storage during the Second World War, the drum was taken away to Leningrad by the Red Army in 1945 and restituted to the GDR (Leipzig) in 1977. When it returned to Berlin after the reunification of Germany, the buffalo head was missing.

In view of the gigantic quantities of exported rubber, ivory and the like, cultural goods represented only a small part of the colony's total exports. Nevertheless, the expropriation of cultural goods represented one of the greatest material losses suffered by local societies at the time. As in the colonial economic sphere, the sponsorship also represented an indispensable and at the same time immoderately exploited and instrumentalised element in the context of this sell-out and dislocation of Cameroonian cultural heritage.

The role that porters played in this process not only led to a profound dislocation of the bodies and identities of the subjects, but not infrequently forced them into complicity with the colonial system of domination, thus making them complicit in the process of destruction, robbery and looting of the local cultural heritage landscape: "In the context of the shared (travel) 'adventure', porters could become, intentionally or unintentionally, intermediaries between travelled 'natives' and travelling Europeans: Porters were those closest to the strangers." [1]

An impressive photograph from 1905, now kept in the archives of the Linden Museum in Stuttgart, shows how a "large carved wooden drum, representing a large animal with 2 heads" is buried next to or in a house in "Bamungom" (near present-day Bafoussam) in December 1905 under the direction of a German so-called Schutztrupp soldier (Fig. 1). [2] Hans Glauning → Bio, 386 (1868-1908), the senior Schutztruppe officer to whom this photograph is attributed, told the then head of the Africa Department of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde, Felix von Luschan (1854-1924), in a letter dated February 1906: 'The drum took 2 days to transport for 2 hours by 60 porters. It was then buried during our battles, as it could not be transported any further; later it was sawn into 4 pieces and brought to the station.' [3] The procurement of the drum falls within the context of the military occupation of the highlands in the north-western part of the colony. Glauning participated as a central figure in the process of the military conquest and subsequent pacification of the areas mentioned. Why he was [p.96] in "Bamungom" at the end of 1905, when the photograph was taken, is unclear. However, the military purpose is clear, as he mentions in a letter to Luschan of 24 November 1905 that much work awaited him and that he [would] have to fence in the "Southern District", i.e. the southern part of the district in which "Bamungom" is also located, in December and "probably in Bansso [in] February." [4] From Glauning's → Bio, 386 bloody campaign against the Nso population group ("Bansso"), which ultimately took place from 15 April to 20 June 1906, numerous pieces of booty also found their way into the Berlin and Stuttgart collections. The drum mentioned is not only war booty, but also probably the largest and heaviest single piece of Cameroonian cultural heritage exported during the German colonial period. Its transport, even though it was dismantled into four parts, must have been an immensely difficult undertaking. However, it has not been possible to find out exactly how the transport of the drum was managed logistically.

[From the military station Bamenda mentioned in the quotation, the centre of the administrative district of the same name in the north-western part of the colony, the large drum was supposed to be transported as quickly as possible to the coast in Douala by the governorate's porters. At the end of May 1906, however, Glauning reported to Luschan not only that he had already "[sent] all objects [...] from here to the coast", but also that a "porter [...] had already been killed by the bass drum on the way". [5] The further transport of the large drum, which had been dismantled into four parts, seems to have led to further problems or to have been interrupted, [6] as its trace is then lost for several months. In a letter of December 1906, Luschan complained that "a very large drum is still missing, a unique and incomparable masterpiece of its kind". [7] It was not until mid-February 1907 that, following his own investigations, he received the news from the station chief of the "Johann-Albrechtshöhe" post (today Lake Barombo near Kumba) in Cameroon that "a larger column of porters had arrived at the end of January this year with a larger drum divided into four parts". [8] The drum parts were finally loaded onto the steamer Eleonore Woermann bound for Hamburg in Douala on 8 February 1907, [9] from where they were sent on to Berlin by rail on 7 March 1907. [10] Luschan confirmed their arrival in the collection in a letter to Glauning dated 5 April 1907. [11] Glauning invoiced the museum for the transport, stating that it was carried out "by 50 convict labourers from Bamenda to the coast" and allegedly took only 25 days of marching, for which he estimated "187.50 marks" in catering costs. [12] On the other hand, nothing is mentioned here about difficulties during transport or even deaths. After an odyssey of more than a year, during which the drum was first dragged out of a war zone under inhumane conditions, buried and sawed to pieces, and then brought in another inhumane forced march over what is now about 300 kilometres from Bamenda to Douala, the drum finally arrived in Berlin.

Further details about the transport of the monumental object are not documented. However, the transport method used by the Schutztruppen officer Jesco von Puttkamer → Bio, 422 (1876-1959) to transport a similar piece, now in Stuttgart, [13] but only about half the size, can serve here to illustrate the process:

"The drum was [...] carried to the coast by 120 porters [...], of which [sic!] 30 porters carried at a time and had to be relieved every half hour. I had long tough tree trunks splinted on both sides and [sic!] carried 15 porters on the right and 15 on the left at the same time. At river crossings, there were about 30 [sic!] rivers (rainy season) to cross, [p.98] the drum was pushed into the water, a soldier sat up and was [sic!] pulled across the whole story on a long rope woven from vines." [14]

Colonial transport and sponsorship in Cameroon

All cultural goods exported from Cameroon during the German colonial period, regardless of size and weight, ultimately took a similar route and almost always had to be transported the entire distance in the colony out of the country on the heads or backs of usually conscripted locals (Fig. 2).

"Until 1914, all economic progress in Cameroon was achieved primarily with the most anarchistic of all productive forces, the muscle power of the people. Whether it was the production of export goods, the management of pending transport tasks or infrastructural development work, human labour, which was cheap to hire, always formed a component of the economic calculation."^[15]

With regard to the colony's transport system, this policy was accompanied by the fact that the porter system remained the basis of the colonial export economy throughout the entire German colonial period: "The entire trade, as well as the colonial administration and the troops - remain completely dependent on porters for the transport of trade goods, supplies and equipment". ^[16]

In this context, the transport of cultural goods, commodities or resources rarely took place via such well-developed transport routes as the north-western so-called "Bali Road" between Douala and Bamenda, via which the drum was exported. Along with the southeastern so-called "Gouvernementsstraße" from Kribi to Yaoundé (in German contemporary sources: Yaoundé), this rather represented one of the two comparatively well-developed main transport routes of the colony.

Difficult environmental and road conditions characterised transport conditions on the extensive territory of the colony in many places throughout the entire German colonial period. Even the best-built colonial road between today's capital Yaoundé and the coast was too simple an engineering construction to withstand the local environmental influences in the long term:

"Even the [...] newly constructed, broadly hewn larger connections, even if they serve busy caravan traffic, usually deteriorate almost back to their original state after only one rainy season, due to fallen logs, the effects of the water and the ever overgrowing vegetation [...]. [...] Thus the great road Kribi-Bipindi-Lolodorf-Ok'älänsámā-Nyong-Ya'ündestation (governorate road), [...] has already been hewn out several times 3 to 4 m wide along its entire length, freed from fallen ^[p.99] trunks and branches and provided with rough wooden bridges over the many watercourses. In spite of their extraordinary traffic (about 35,000 porters in six months), however, scarcely a month passes, especially during the rainy season, in which fresh pressure does not have to be brought to bear on the residents of any stretch of the road to arrange for extensive cleaning and restoration work." ^[17]

In addition, heat, humidity and unhealthy climatic and hygienic conditions, especially in the southern regions of the colony, combined with a lack of sanitary facilities, accommodation and medical care, led to the spread of diseases among the porters. ^[18] "Intestinal diseases"^[19] were widespread, but also rampant were

"Malaria [...] [and] numerous other diseases [...]. According to Rudin, 85 percent of the people were infected with diseases. Syphilis was brought in by the Europeans and spread widely under colonial conditions. Sleeping sickness was rampant, [but also] tuberculosis and anaemia carried off [...] countless people."^[20] ^[p.100].

Carrier services were always centres of the mass spread of infectious diseases. ^[21] In 1904, the government physician Hans Ziemann → Bio, 439 (1865-1939) reported on the situation on the main north-western route from Douala via Buea to the north-west of the colony, caused by increased porter traffic: "Venereal diseases (gonorrhoea) are said to be extremely widespread on the Balistrafse, also leprosy." ^[22] Epidemics such as smallpox, which struck the colony several times during the German colonial period, ^[23] also spread primarily through the colonial state transport network and especially through the ever-growing masses of carriers. ^[24] The fact that quite a few of them died from it is evidenced by a watercolour painting by the merchant Georg August Zenker → Bio, 437 (1855-1922), who managed a plantation in Bipindi directly on the main transport route between Kribi and Yaoundé

from 1896 to 1922. [25] In addition to plantation workers (in 1904, for example, 380 on 54 hectares[26]), Zenker himself had to employ numerous porters to ship the agricultural produce of his farm, such as in 1903 "the first harvest of cocoa weighing 1250 kg"[27] or the numerous "medicinal plants, botanical and zoological preparations",[28] which he sold mainly to Berlin museums. [29] He also supplied ethnographic collections, including 447 items of Cameroonian cultural heritage to the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin[30] and 174 to the Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde Leipzig. [31] In the foreground of his disturbing 1906 watercolour, the decomposing corpse of a porter lies on a bank lined with lush vegetation. Not far from the corpse, two porters pass by without taking any notice of it. The sheet bears the cynical inscription "Trägerloos" (Fig. 3). On the framing passe-partout there is also the annotation "Pocken Epidemie 1906". Zenker's watercolour documents the horror of the health situation as well as the indifference of German colonialists to the suffering of local societies. In the same year, the Schutztruppen officer Peter P.F. Scheunemann (1870-1937) expressed general criticism of the porter system, especially of the severe health hardships, but only had in mind the "millions to be saved in porter wages and the capital value of the [...] porters doomed to die":

"As long as thousands of able-bodied people are systematically ruined in health year out, year in, on groundless, unsafe jungle trails with the most meagre accommodation and food as porters, there can be no hope of a fruitful economic development of the landlocked country." [32]

[p.101] Porter services as forced labour

Cultural goods were primarily exported by means of porter services of the Schutztruppe or the colonial administration, but at the same time were not infrequently transported onwards in stages by civilian transport service providers such as the trading and missionary companies. The specific circumstances of porter services varied depending on the transport service provider with whom the porters were contracted. But ultimately, portage always represented a form of forced labour that was more akin to slavery than the ideal of the wage labour sector envisaged by colonial rule. [33]

Even before labour recruitment was taken over "almost exclusively [...] [by] colonial authorities" from 1905 onwards, [34] mostly government agents had carried out forced labour recruitment: "The labour recruiters, who were quite content to use such means as fraud, threats, [p.102] alcoholism, blackmail, corruption, in order to impose the yoke of wage slavery on the Africans, made themselves as hated by the population as the 'Schutztruppen' expeditions." [35]

The "policy of forced labour recruitment, implemented by representatives of the Schutztruppe and legitimised by colonial rule, brought immeasurable suffering and misery to the Cameroonians." [36] For the Schutztruppe, on behalf of the governorate, ran a lively "business of human trafficking", [37] which, according to Adolf Rüger, ultimately reduced itself to the fact that the "'Schutztruppe' took numerous prisoners" on its war campaigns and forced "the provision of convict labourers" from the warring tribes. The latter were then, depending on need, "delivered" to the colonial economy [38] or used for government purposes, here mostly as porters. [39] The recruitment and treatment of conscripted workers by German colonial rule was correspondingly "barbaric", [40] as illustrated by the example of the "notorious 'Schutztruppen' officer [Hans] Dominik" → Bio, 380 (1870-1910), who "took women and cattle into so-called pledged custody on one of his expeditions in the Yaoundé district in 1901/02 in order to force the provision of porters. He had the people 'recruited' in this way led bound to the Yaoundé station. On the transport, six of them were shot." [41] Incidents like this were not an isolated case, but the rule. [42] In conjunction with forced recruitment measures, the growing demand for labour even led at times in the districts of "Jaunde, Edea and Johann-Albrechts-Höhe to radical dissolution of village societies." [43]

It is not possible to determine exactly how many porters were forcibly recruited or employed in total, as hardly any statistics are available. [44] It is demonstrable that the 'Schutztruppe' itself sometimes had the greatest need for porters in the early years,

"for the expeditionary force alone, which advanced north from Yaoundé to conquer Adamaua in 1898, was composed of 12 European officers, 265 African soldiers and no fewer than 620 porters and 150 other service personnel ("boys" and women)." [45]

The administrative control and economic exploitation that set in as a result of increasing military conquest of the colonial territories then led, from the mid-1890s onwards, to the fact that more and more porters were needed in the administrative, but above all in the private commercial or transport sector.

If, contrary to the widespread estimate "that in 1913 about 80,000 porters were employed on the Kribi-Jaunde route", [46] the information of the Schutztruppen officer Ludwig von Stein zu Lausnitz (1868-1934) is used instead, who counted "35,000 porters in six months" [47] for this route as early as 1900, then a much higher number must be assumed in principle. Especially since these figures only refer to one of the colony's two main traffic routes [p.103]. An indication of the actual size of the porters is provided by the statement that between 1904 and 1905 "seventeen times as many porters as plantation workers" [48] were employed in the Yaoundé district. Geographically, the recruitment of porters was distributed very unevenly, especially in the southern regions of the colony. In 1907, for example, 60,000 people from the Yaoundé district alone were engaged in labour services on the plantations or as porters. [49] Most porters were recruited from the areas directly affected by the trade, namely from the population groups living along the main export route. [50] As a forced labour measure, portage could ultimately affect anyone. And even though the Schutztruppe preferred robust, strong male porters, women and children were always found in the ranks of porters. [51] Governor Theodor Seitz (1863-1949), for example, reported that among the "thousands of porters" or "caravans and caravans", "men, women and children, strong and weak" who travelled on the main route between Kribi and Yaoundé in 1907, [...] there were over a third women and children". [52]

The working conditions of the sponsorship

For a long time, the working conditions were not subject to any official regulation, and the porters were therefore mostly at the mercy of their superiors. The "hardship of the porters' work" combined with "poor and insufficient nutrition" led to "physical exhaustion of the porters, often resulting in death. In principle, the "length of the porters' working day" depended on the "daily marching destination chosen". [54] However, porters' duties were usually not limited to carrying and also included camp work of all kinds, searching for food, etc., which additionally lengthened the working day. [55] If the carrying weights of the administration and Schutztruppe averaged a moderate 30 kg for reasons of maintaining operational capability [56], [57] inhumane carrying loads are known especially from the commercial sector. In 1907, for example, "at the Kribi district office, the following weights of loads were recorded, for men loads of up to 55½ kilograms for women, even more so for frail and old, loads of 42 to 44 kilograms, for a girl who was 1.20 m tall, a load of 20½ kg." [58] Even under state conditions, however, "soldier and porter women [...] sometimes with small children on their backs, can be found having to overcome heavy obstacles" with loads of up to 35 kg. [59] Dominik described the carrying method of the "mostly small women" in one of his carrier hawsers as follows: They "carry the loads with their backs and heads, skilfully passing a broad cloth or strap under the [p.104] load and away in front over the forehead, so that they work the strong muscles of the neck like oxen at home when ploughing." [60] (Fig. 2)

In the colony, portage was one of the lowest paid labour services. [61] As "punitive work, it was tantamount to an aggravated form of slavery, despite the wages provided, as long as the punitive labourers had little chance of survival until beyond the turn of the century, and their entitlement to wages was extinguished with their death." [62] Moreover, the porters were often cheated in the payment of wages, which for a long time could be paid not only in cash but also in kind, despite colonial state efforts to the contrary. Of the companies settled on the Batanga coast at that time, for example, it is known,

"that in 1904 they charged their porters an average of 14 marks per clap, in return for which they handed out goods at the time of payment whose factorial selling prices reached 8.40 marks at the best, so that the porter was cheated out of at least 5.60 marks at each payment of wages." [63]

In the trade sector, the duration and payment of a work engagement were often not made known to the porters at all; the Schutztruppe commander Wilhelm Müller → [Bio, 408](#) (1850-1921) stated in 1907 that 'porters who were promised 200 marks in cash by the [...] traders [only] received a wage of 30 or 40 marks after a year's work, with very meagre rations'.^[64] The rations provided for the porters during the caravan tours sometimes consisted merely of "[a] handful of unripe cassava without salt [and] a drink of putrid swamp water"^[65] or a "daily ration [of] 2 leaves of tobacco",^[66] with which food was to be exchanged. Porters also generally received their full wages "only after the transport task was completed."^[67]

Working conditions remained dehumanising and largely unregulated for porters throughout the colonial period. Initial regulations enacted as part of the first local workers' ordinance of 1902, but relating only in part to portering, were discriminatory and "curtailed the workers' freedom of action, chained them to the companies and stamped any rebellion a priori a punishable offence."^[68] A 1908 decree on porters did at least bring "formal progress in that the limits of what was permissible in the porter system were now precisely defined in law", but due to the "lack of state control bodies" it in no way ensured "that caravan traffic was also fundamentally reformed in practice".^{69]} Many of the provisions of the decree could be circumvented by the "imprecise wording of individual paragraphs, such as § I 'Only fully grown, fit for work and [\[p.105\]](#) healthy people', allowed for a generous interpretation." ^[70] Significantly, the aforementioned paragraph was supplemented in a draft by a second paragraph to the effect that "children and young girls [...] may under no circumstances, [...] be used"^[71]; however, it was not included in the final version of the provision. Violations of the porters' ordinance were numerous in the years that followed. ^[72] The colonial politician Wilhelm Solf (1862-1936) was still impressed in 1913 by "the still sad situation of the countless porters on the trade route from Yaoundé to Kribi" and "the sight of this misery". ^[73]

"Barbaric" manners and "brutality" characterised the treatment of porters in the context of the administration and the Schutztruppe in this respect since the early expeditions of the colonial official Eugen Zintgraff (1858-1897) between 1886 and 1891, whose behaviour had led to "mass desertions and indiscipline", as well as 200 runaway porters, of whom he had "released 70 [...] himself". ^[74] Abuses and deaths among porters were mostly in the context of the Schutztruppe's military operations and wars, for example in the context of the so-called "Punitive Expedition against the Bangwa and Keaka"^[75] from 8 February to 14 September 1900 in the Cross River area in the north-western part of the colony, led by Schutztruppe officer Bernhard von Besser (1862-1914). In the course of the punitive expedition, which was founded as a reprisal against "the murderers of the trader [Gustav] Conrau" (1865-1899), not only were villagers mistreated and villages plundered, hostages were also taken, who had to work as porters and who

"were simply [...] [beaten to death] when they could go no further, even in places that had nothing to do with the events around [...] Conrau. As an officer who had taken part in the expedition later reported, Besser deliberately neglected the provisioning of the camp in Nssakpe, so that 60 to 70 porters starved to death. Besser explained that "he just wanted the pigs to die". Often porters were left lying in the bush, exhausted by hunger. Besser specifically ordered such people to be thrown further into the bush so that the corpses would not pollute the air. Several times the abandoned porters were then found, still breathing, eaten by animals." ^[76]

Rubber trade, war, carrier crisis - the dislocation of Cameroon's cultural heritage

Such incidents were also not an isolated case, but the rule. Such working conditions characterised the porter system throughout the entire German colonial period. Cultural goods were regularly part of the cargo transports. This also applied to transports in the trade sector, because merchants were also involved in the dislocation of Cameroonian cultural heritage. It is not without reason that the merchant [\[p.106\]](#) Adolf Diehl → [Bio, 378](#) (1870-1943), with a total of 4046 inventory numbers, heads the list of the largest intermediaries of Cameroonian cultural heritage to German collections, as could be determined within the framework of this research project.

Basically, however, the times when contingents of cultural objects became available for transport out of the country were the military operations and wars of the Schutztruppe and the colonial administration against the indigenous population. The "unfortunate carrier calamity"^[77] during the suppression of resistance movements in the areas of the "Maka and Njem"^[78] in the southeast of the

colony between 1904 and 1910 will be used in the following to exemplify the dislocation of Cameroonian cultural heritage under wartime conditions.

Cynically, this conflict, in which numerous carriers died as victims of the fighting between the colonial government and the local population, was rooted in a situation in which the carriers initially acted as perpetrators against the local population. For the region, as a result of the "ruthless overexploitation of natural rubber resources"[79] represented a "battleground" of competing colonial trade interests and capitalist exploitation beyond compare: [80]

"The area was partly flooded with an army of coloured traders and shoppers, partly criss-crossed with large caravans of goods peddling. [...] Hundreds of traders and porters lay for weeks and even months on the main caravan roads, in the villages, stole from the farms, raped the women, etc. The area was still relatively sparsely populated. The country, which was still relatively little cultivated and not equipped for such through traffic, was not capable of feeding such crowds." [81]

The devastation of the porters' caravans destroyed the livelihood of the local population. In addition, further forced recruitment decimated the local labour force, already weakened by the Schutztruppe's wars, to such an extent that signs of the disintegration of village societies could also be observed here: [82] "A medium-sized village is powerless against a caravan of 100-200, albeit unarmed men, and they are masters of the situation." [83] The situation took on such bizarre features that the Schutztruppen officer Oswald Jacob (1878-1914) even had regular defences erected in Ebolowa against carrier caravans in 1905: "Immediately at the station, the villages are enclosed by 2 m high fences for protection against the carriers [...] and the soldiers." [84] The pressure on the population by porter caravans was eventually so great that conditions led to conflict and a local resistance movement in the spring of 1905, which was fought by the German colonial government in various "protracted battles [...] 1904-1910"[85].

The anger of the local population was initially directed against the porters of the trade caravans themselves and led to hundreds of porters being killed immediately as a result of the first [p.107] attacks. According to the commanding Schutztruppe officer Scheunemann, further "significant losses of porters" were then registered in the first half of the conflicts up to 19 October 1905. [86] It is also known from the so-called "Southern Expedition", which was carried out from "the beginning of June 1905 to the end of August 1906" to combat the resistant population, [87] that "the loss of life affected 25-30% of the porters"[88]. The Schutztruppen officer Horst Heinicke (1868-1922) reported in this regard the shock "of the Buli at the quite disproportionately large loss of life to be recorded among the porters provided for the Southern Expedition",[89] as well as their "quite unbearable unwillingness [...] to do any portering at all",[90] since in the "Njem area [...] this had not unjustifiably acquired the significance of a fairly certain death [...]". [91] Heinicke notes in this regard:

"In the matter of the porters in the Southern Expedition, I cannot leave unmentioned that serious mistakes must have been made in some cases. That the mortality rate could have been considerably reduced with more appropriate treatment [...] Incidentally, most of the people did not die in the companies, but after their discharge on the return march from Lomie. [...] Every additional day that the Buli porters, whose health had previously been very weakened, remain with the expedition means new entries." [92]

It is no longer possible to clearly reconstruct how many porters were actually deployed during the first major conflict, which lasted almost two years, and how many of them died. In the first six months of the conflict alone, the Ebolowa station provided the "Southern Expedition" with 1700 porters, [93] and by July 1906 at the latest, another 1000 porters each from the Kribi district office and the Lolodorf station[94] as well as at least 350 more from the Yaoundé station. [95] Scheunemann, one of the senior German officers, merely remarked with regard to the recruitment of further porters during the enterprise: "[a] lot of usable human material was ruined",[96] and summed up the general situation during the conflict: "Prospects of booty, gambling, booze and broads, the usual means of traction of all mercenaries, white or black, were not to be hoped for in this dark blood-soaked primeval mud." [97] It is particularly irritating that Scheunemann, with his Schutztruppen detachment, also found the time to escort a "transport of 1500 kg of government ivory" on the way in "the country that had been hard hit by the war"[98]. [Moreover, senior German officers of the Southern Expedition did not fail to profit

from this conflict by sending numerous cultural objects to German museums. Of the Maka, a total of 1203 inventory numbers are still in German collections today, of the Njem 505, the main part in both cases in the Linden Museum in Stuttgart. An analysis [p.108] of the holdings there shows that through the company commanders Stein zu Lausnitz and Hermann Bertram (1872-1914) [100] alone, who were involved in the conflicts, as well as the head of the nearby government station Molundu Dr. Martin Preuß, about 25% of the total German holdings of cultural objects of these two population groups were received in the Linden Museum during the conflict years from 1905 to 1907. [101] A quarter of the currently still existing holdings can thus clearly be declared as war booty and were transported out of the country by prisoners of war or forcibly recruited porters.

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

"Only to be obtained by force". Military Violence and Museum Collections

YALL LEGALL

In April 2022, I visited the depot of the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum in Cologne together with Ohiniko Mawussé Toffa and Elias Aguigah. [1] While rummaging through Togolese, Ghanaian and Cameroonian possessions that had been looted by German colonists, my attention was drawn to a drum that is more than 1.5 metres high and bears the inventory number 35222. The provenance researcher at the museum, Yağmur Karakis, informed me that the museum's database attributes this drum to the Bakoko[2], communities from the Nyong and Sanaga estuaries who are known to have strongly resisted German colonial rule in southwest Cameroon. At my request, the museum let us have the archival documents belonging to this object. The thin archive folder contained only a list of 36 cultural objects from Cameroon, Tanzania, India and Samoa that had allegedly been purchased from Cologne in 1922 from the Museum für Völkerkunde in Rostock. The list contained vague information about the cultural affiliation as well as sketches of some objects, [p.114] including one of this "very large drum". The drum was traced back to Déhané, a town on the Nyong River. Unlike other examples in this list - and, for that matter, unlike most lists found in museum archives - a specific reference to the context of the acquisition of this instrument was added to this entry. It read: "(hard to have), only obtained by force". [3]

In fact, the Germans attacked the Bakoko communities three times in less than a decade. The first expedition took place in July 1891 and was led by Max von Stetten (1860-1925) and Lieutenant Krause against Kings Musinga and Nsonge. [4] The second expedition against the Bakoko was conducted in October 1892 under the leadership of Ernst Wehlan, who even led a second campaign two months later. [5] The third and final campaign took place in April 1895. In this so-called punitive expedition, Max von Stetten again played a leading role, supported by Hans Dominik → Bio, 380 (1870-1910) and Ludwig von Stein zu Lausnitz (1868-1934). According to their own accounts, the Germans killed more than 300 people besides King Nduniebayang. They then forced the kings Madimanjob, Etutegase and Etangambe to submit. [6]

This drum and its accompanying one-liner are rare but not exceptional. While the story of the looting is coming to light again and treasures such as the Benin bronzes and the Ngonnso are being returned to the Edo and the Nso, the issue of archives and other types of intangible heritage remains largely unaddressed. [p.115] Museum archives are not only difficult to access for external researchers, with gatekeeping and old German manuscripts being the biggest hurdles. They have also been largely ignored in critical historiography on the colonial past. Publications on German colonisation in Cameroon, [7] Togo, [8] East Africa[9] and South West Africa[10] have dissected the archives of the colonial administration and military. These authors have provided an insight into the pervasiveness of colonial violence and oppression during the empire [p.116] in the above-mentioned regions.

Surprisingly, however, museum archives seem to be completely absent from their bibliographic corpus. Until recently, these documents were the personal garden of ethnologists who carefully monitored access to them. In the last decade, however, a number of scholars and authors have turned to museum archives. Some argue that they represent "a unique index" and an important source "to make these [colonial] pasts visible", [11] others respond to the debates on looted art and restitution with micro-historical approaches to colonial loot. [12] In their widely acclaimed report commissioned by the French government, Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy also identified museums and their collections - including archives - as "magnificent custodians of human creativity and at the same time the custodians of an appropriation dynamic that is often violent and still too little known to the public." [13]

In the early noughties, Glenn Penny and Andrew Zimmerman offered important insights into the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde's insistent, sometimes even aggressive tactics on the international market to obtain looted African heritage. [14] Direct correspondences between colonial officials and (de facto male) museum staff, however, received little attention in Penny's study, apart from the case of the looting of Beijing in 1900. [15] Zimmerman, in turn, investigated what he called "anti-humanism" among German anthropologists. To illustrate his argument, he cited a statement by the former deputy director of the Royal Museum in Berlin, Felix von Luschan (1854-1924), who claimed that the institution would

be "the most beautiful and magnificent monument to our Schutztruppen."^[16] In addition, Zimmerman exposed money transactions between the museum and the navy for the targeted confiscation of cultural objects^[17] and unearthed a letter in which Luschan admitted:

"It is in the nature of things that a warship in particular frequently finds itself in the position of acquiring larger carvings and whole series of important collection objects for nothing or for a disproportionately low price, while a private citizen [...] can acquire such things, either not at all or only for such high prices that the further purchase must appear difficult or impossible for a museum." ^[18]

If museum archives and repositories are full of such open confessions of theft, to what extent do they add to the already overwhelming history of colonial extraction?

In the first section of this paper, I show the visible tip of the iceberg: Loot found in acquisition registers, databases, correspondence and inventories on various contexts of German colonial rule in this region. In the second step, the limits of archival excavation become tangible as I present examples of ^[p.117] extractive destruction in the form of material, spiritual as well as human losses. Third, this archaeology of looting turns to the gaps in archives, the absences that seem at odds with the museum's role as a temple of preservation, but are evidence of deliberate destruction and human negligence. The paper ends by acknowledging anti-colonial figures and multidirectional connections between histories of resistance. With these concluding statements, I aim to counter the museumisation, de-socialisation and monumentalisation of Cameroon's cultural heritage and to re-centre the debate on human loss and empowerment.

The mechanisms of looting

(Omni)Presence of Colonial Officers

The first of our observations is the omnipresent presence of members of the so-called Schutztruppe in museum acquisition books. From 1884 to 1915, more than 280 convolutions arriving at the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde came directly from the hands of colonial officers in the German colonies on the African continent (Fig. 4). In 1889, the Bundesrat (Federal Council) had passed a law stipulating that all collections confiscated during expeditions financed by the Kaiserreich were to be handed over to the Berlin Museum as the central repository. ^[19]

Some of these colonial stakeholders, such as Hans Dominik → Bio, 380, Hans Glauning → Bio, 386 (1868-1908) or Kurt Strümpell (1872-1947), are still widely known in Cameroon today because they led numerous military expeditions against the local population, which refused to submit to colonial rule. ^[20] Their loot has already been the focus of studies on translocated Cameroonian heritage and its origins, ^[21] while their names can be found in museum exhibitions in Berlin, Hamburg, Stuttgart and Hanover. They are also notorious for having provided natural history specimens that - in the case of mammals - were often captured or shot during, or at least on the fringes of, military campaigns. ^[22] The same weapons and ammunition were used to forcibly subjugate the local population to colonial rule.

Individual colonial officers appear in these registers on an occasion-specific basis. Often their shipments arrived during their home leave, and the designations of the objects in these shipments matched the names of the local population they had attacked during military expeditions. This is the case, for example, with Hermann Nolte. He landed in Hamburg in May 1900 after almost four years of service in the colonial forces and offered his loot to the Völkerkundemuseum ^[p.118] in Stuttgart at the end of 1900. The director at the time, Karl von Linden (1838-1910), wrote shamelessly:

"The collection, which consists of 200 numbers, is at least outwardly respectable and was assembled in four years of expeditions. It is characterised first of all by the fact that its content is very valuable, because it mainly comes from areas which have only been opened up in recent years after difficult battles. ^[23]

Many officers took their loot with them on the Woermann ships that brought them back to Germany. There were usually three destinations for the looted treasures and personal African possessions: some ended up in a museum, some in the hands of art dealers and the last in the private rooms of the officers and their relatives. For example, investigations by the governor Jesko von Puttkamer → [Bio, 422](#) against the commander of the Schutztruppe Kurt Pavel → [Bio, 420](#) (1851-1933) reveal that the officer had 'declared the ivory captured and received as gifts, as well as all other loot, to be the private property of the members of the expedition, in direct contravention of the regulations in force here by order of the Colonial Department'. Puttkamer lobbied for Pavel's punishment because he saw in it the danger that expeditions "would from now on bear the character of raids and loot and would be in no way inferior to the heroic deeds in the Congo state" - a Eurocentric and hypocritical remark, which in turn legitimised the exploitation of African property by the Foreign Office. [\[24\]](#)

If the pieces went directly to the Royal Museum in Berlin or to Stuttgart, it was not uncommon for the officers, anxious to enhance their prestige, to receive a medal. [\[25\]](#) Nevertheless, museums were not the most lucrative trading partners. Since gifts to museums were generally not financially lucrative, many officers tried to sell African cultural property to middlemen. Traders sometimes bought [\[p.119\]](#) the officers' loot at a price above what the museums were willing to pay. Finally, officers often kept the last of their loot to embellish their own interiors with what some of them called "souvenirs" of their wars, or to give to family members [\[26\]](#) - macabre souvenirs of their acts of violence at the expense of the resistant population.

Military intelligence and the mandate to plunder

The gears of this well-oiled colonial machinery did not turn in only one direction. In this "political economy" [\[27\]](#), officers did offer their loot to museums to make a profit or earn accolades, but the museums were not passive recipients of stolen goods. Sometimes it was they who held the leverage. Zimmerman, and more recently Götz Aly, have provided evidence that museums commissioned colonial officers and administrators to seize cultural goods and ship them to Europe. The former reveals that as early as 1874, the Berlin museum director "persuaded the navy to commission the survey ship SMS Gazelle, bound for the South Pacific, to acquire 'everything collectible' from the ports of call." [\[28\]](#) Aly, in turn, describes how Luschan coveted traditional houses and boats from the Pacific. [\[29\]](#)

In the case of colonial Cameroon, similar correspondences demonstrate that the museum commissioned the looting of local heritage. Moreover, these archival documents show that intelligence information was not a prerogative of the imperial colonial office. The museum staff was well aware of the modus operandi of the colonial forces. Luschan knew that the death of a white European in a town in Cameroon resulted in weeks of asymmetrical warfare and colonial massacres in the surrounding area, and he and his colleague Karl von Linden in Stuttgart were regularly supplied with information about the whereabouts of the colonial troops. They were even involved in decision-making on matters of colonial conquest and actively tried to influence the officers on the ground to enrich themselves with important pieces of African cultural heritage. In 1901, Hans Glauning wrote → [Bio, 386](#) to Karl von Linden in Stuttgart:

"Nevertheless, I am generally not on the station very much and am often away on expeditions, which I still prefer to staying on the station. Whether I will take part with my company in the large Bangwa-u Bafut-Bandeng expedition planned for November is still undetermined; if not, I intend to advance in November into the as yet unknown areas north and north-east of the Cross River on the German-English border and as far as grassland." [\[30\]](#) The expedition will take place at the end of November.

A few months later, he resumed work and informed the museum director:

[I am no longer station chief of the Cross River Station, but after the end of the war campaign against Bafut-Bandeng I am now on the staff of the commander Lieutenant Colonel Pavel, with whom I will march in a few days to Tibati, Ngaundere and Joko. I hope to acquire many a pretty ethnogr. piece in these areas." [\[31c\]](#)

This correspondence continued until January 1908. Needless to say, much of the information about the movement of Glauning's → Bio, 386 Truppen reached Linden and Luschan before the official reports in the *Deutsches Kolonialblatt*. Another letter, this time from Luschan, shows the extent to which the anthropologist was aware of confidential matters concerning the colonial military:

"Otherwise, everything is proceeding in the most beautiful order and smoothly. The Ausw. Amt has sent us a magnificent collection of fetishes and other carvings of a completely new kind, from the Ngolo punitive expedition of Hauptm. von Kamptz - worth a good 2-3,000 Marks, a quite splendid acquisition. In addition, one of my current listeners, Ltnt. von Arnim, will join a new, large punitive expedition against the Ngolo (strictly secret!!) in October. So we can prepare ourselves for quite brilliant things. Herr v. Arnim has been informed exactly what we need and will endeavour to do something quite proper. The costs will presumably be zero." [32]

This passage was part of a four-page letter to his colleague Albert Grünwedel (1856-1935). The Austrian anthropologist first informed him that he had just learned that "six hundred!!!" carved tusks from the Kingdom of Benin would soon be auctioned. The letter, dated 25 July 1897, six months after the British Royal Navy had burned down the palace of Oba Ovonramwen, testifies to the speed with which British colonial booty entered the art market and how this sudden supply of magnificent pieces astonished European museums. After asking Grünwedel for his opinion on acquiring "as many such tooth[s] as possible", Luschan continued in a profane tone with a brief report on the museum's current activities. Bouncing from one "punitive expedition" to another, the anthropologist seemed all too familiar with the deployment of military troops to West Africa, be they British or German. The fact that thousands of Africans had lost their lives in these wars was not worth mentioning to him. Luschan was pleased that the fruits of colonial conquest filled the shelves of his museum. He expected even more consignments, because his professional network overlapped with the higher ranks of colonial officers. His former student Albrecht von Arnim (1872-1899) had joined the so-called Schutztruppe and apparently provided Luschan with information on troop movements. Three years before Germany ratified the Hague Convention on the Laws and Customs of Land Warfare - the first supranational text to prohibit the looting [p.121] of property in military conflicts - Luschan unabashedly admitted to encouraging the seizure of cultural property.

It is precisely this passage that has had a prominent afterlife in the recent restitution debates: It was first published by journalist Lorenz Rollhäuser in an article for the TAZ in April 2018. At that time, the Humboldt Forum was still under construction, and Rollhäuser tried to support activists and academics in their criticism of this "house of the white masters". [Six months later, Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy quoted this passage in their report to the French government. There, Luschan's words were meant to illustrate how "the military incursions and so-called punitive expeditions of England, Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and France in the 19th century [did] in fact provide the opportunity for an unprecedented appropriation of cultural property." [34] However, Rollhäuser, Sarr and Savoy did not investigate whether this letter was also followed by the acquisition of war booty. Did Arnim send artefacts to Berlin? Were two expeditions undertaken against the Ngolo people and if so, where did the loot end up?

Jeanne-Ange Wagne and I have been able to trace three expeditions against the Ngolo communities, one of several groups of Okoro-speaking people in southwest Cameroon, near the Rumpi Mountains: one in March-April 1897 led by Major Oltwig von Kamptz (1857-1921) accompanied by Lieutenant Hermann Nolte. Material evidence of looting during this military campaign can be found in Berlin, Leipzig, Bremen (Kamptz) and Stuttgart (Nolte). [35] In his report to the colonial government, Kamptz even wrote unabashedly: "A collection of curiosities from Ngololand, including some skulls found in the houses, I am obediently sending with the address 'Auswärtiges Amt Kolonial-Abteilung' [...] to the Museum für Völkerkunde for highly appreciated transfer". [36] The second expedition took place in June 1898. It was led by the future governor Theodor Seitz (1863-1949), who was accompanied by Lieutenant von Arnim. [37] Arnim died of dysentery in 1899, but his father sent 16 objects from his war booty to the museum in Berlin. Nevertheless, we have not been able to find any clear traces of loot from this expedition. [38] Finally, a third expedition was sent in 1901 to put an end to anti-colonial resistance. It ended with the public execution of a Ngolo resistance figure: Nakeli Nw'embeli. [39] This brutal, asymmetrical conflict was led on the German side by Captain Franz Karl Guse (b. 1864),

supported by Lieutenant Paul Lessner (b. 1870). In the archives of the Linden Museum in Stuttgart, Lessner openly admits that some of the valuable objects he sold to the museum were "captured" by local leaders - further evidence that German museums were well aware of the provenance of many of their collections. In the 1930s [p.122] Lessner was a prominent member of the NSDAP. He vehemently advocated the return of former German colonies to German rule, supported the idea of "Lebensraum" for "the German people" and predicted economic prosperity thanks to the exploitation of African resources[40] - apparently the rhetoric of colonial extraction outlasted the German colonial era.

Extractive destruction

There were also cases of commissioned looting, which had different outcomes. Bernhard von Besser, a captain known for his "brutal and even sadistic advances"[41] was indirectly approached by the Royal Museum. Luschan, who had got wind of an upcoming expedition, wrote to the Colonial Department of the Foreign Office in early 1900:

"Photographs [...] show that the [...] Fon[42] of the Bangwa owns a most curious pillared house [...]. In the event of a punitive expedition being undertaken, the Royal Museum would have a very great interest in ensuring that this house is not burnt. In the scientific interest, it is urgently desired that at least the pillars and long beams carved with figures be preserved and brought to Berlin. In addition, before the destruction, the recording of exact ground plans and elevations as well as cross-sections of both the pillared house and the adjacent dance house would be very desirable. Likewise, it would be very meritorious if the [king's] large signal and dance drums, as well as whatever other carvings, "fetishes" etc. are found in his possession, could not be destroyed but rather sent in." [43]

After the troops had left and decimated the population, Besser reported that "in the burning of the city of Fontem the conscious house [...] was also burned, likewise other signal, dancing drums and fetishes, which were present in small numbers, mostly inferior".[44] It is not clear from this cynical answer whether Besser and his troops actually took nothing or whether he was trying to conceal the fact that they had indeed looted the palace before burning it down. Given the customs of the time, the latter seems more likely, but there is no trace of Besser's loot in the databases of German museums. Indeed, it would have been a feat of strength for Besser to loot the house, for he treated the bearers of his expedition as prisoners, even enslaved. Many escaped, "[o]therwise it was announced that any porter who escaped would be liable to be shot down." [45] Those who remained were tied up. Accordingly, from the beginning, "the transport of the loads was a very difficult one", perhaps the main reason for the immediate destruction of the houses, which, according to Besser, "had been built with the utmost care and were, in a sense, works of art." [46]

[p.123] In this case, it is interesting to note that Luschan's demand went beyond the confiscation of cultural property; it also included obtaining architectural data before demolition. The anthropologist wanted to know how the people of Fontem had built this palace. He wanted to display the most beautiful ornaments, but he turned a blind eye to the fact that the troops burned down the entire complex. This is by no means a paradox. The destruction of the city of Fontem and the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde's explicit interest in its architecture exemplify the prototypical process of extraction. Just as Achille Mbembe described how Africans* were transformed into "bodies of exploitation" through "ossification, poisoning and calcification" - i.e. through discursive and physical dehumanisation - the heart of an African society, in this case a central building, was transformed into an "ore from which metal is extracted" through rescue ethnology, mapping and finally calcification. [47] In other words, local knowledge in the fields of engineering, planning, woodworking, carpentry, interior design, but also local symbolism and collective memory are adopted into colonial knowledge production. The colonial gaze conveyed through photography makes the house a potentially extractive body, something that is separated from its social function and from the people who built it, renovated it, gathered in it or even lived there. It can be relocated, and in the context of colonial destruction, its relocation seems like the right thing to do to save it from the flames and display it as a sign of pre-colonial architectural mastery. Thus, on the one hand, the final destruction of the palace relativises the assumption of an enduring complicity between anthropological science and the colonial military. On the other hand, it is evidence of a complicit logic of utter disregard for the social fabric of African societies, with Luschan opting for removal and Besser for demolition. In both cases, the house and its

inhabitants are forcibly separated from each other. One should therefore perhaps speak of "dislocation" rather than "translocation". [48] At the centre of colonial practice is the production of black people through racist discourse. Because the house (and only the house) matters to Luschan, the Black body is conceived as extractable; it can be "squeezed out", "removed" and "disposed of". Although the goals of the anthropologists differed from those of the colonists, the result for the locals was the same, a "life of calcined remains":[49] After this expedition, Besser was removed from his post after a scandal in the German press revealed his cruel methods, including causing famine and decimating the local population.

[p.124] An iceberg of loot: gaps and absences

Like Besser, other officers of the colonial military are conspicuous by their absence in the acquisition books of the Berlin Ethnological Museum. Does this mean that they were not involved in the plundering of a continent? Obviously not. This is the case with Christian von Krogh (1863-1924), who led several military expeditions between 1905 and 1912. Rummaging through the acquisition registers, I could find no trace of him and therefore assumed that while Krogh was quite capable of murder and destruction like his contemporaries, he was perhaps less inclined to plunder. I was proved wrong when I came across his name in the database of the Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde in Leipzig. This unique entry concerns a piece of cloth described as a "blanket" from the town of Hina in northern Cameroon. Interestingly, this piece is attributed to both Julius Konietzko (1886-1952), an art dealer from Hamburg, and Christian von Krogh. [50] This double attribution is a rarity among the thousands of museum entries associated with the supplying art dealer. Moreover, this entry fits perfectly with one of Krogh's military expeditions: according to his own account, he attacked the town of Hina-Mbanga in January 1908. This personal object (and possibly other Cameroonian possessions of the Konietzko convolute) in the collection of the Grassi Museum can therefore be directly linked to a military action. [51] In another case, it was an exchange of letters between a museum director and a former officer that indicated the removal of traces of looting. The person in question was Karl Adametz (b. 1877), former station chief in Bamenda, who eagerly supplied the Royal Museum in Berlin. His name appears both in the acquisition books - five transports between 1907 and 1914 and a total of 392 inventory entries - and in the exhibition hall on "Colonial Cameroon" in the Humboldt Forum. There, visitors can admire massive doorposts from the grasslands attributed to him → [booklet XXXIV](#). The museum informs that Adametz "participated in a series of punitive expeditions against local African chiefs and communities", thus reproducing the propagandistic language of retaliation, a colonial logic that Dan Hicks describes as follows: "An alleged insult or offence is registered to justify unbridled brutality by the supposed victim, who is in fact the aggressor [...]. The ideology of militaristic colonialism blames the enemy for the crimes of the imperialist." [52] Eva Künkler agrees with Hicks that these campaigns were an "actual colonial instrument of domination" rather than appropriate retribution, [p.125] even if colonial discourse presented them as such. "Often they were undertaken or commissioned by the district bureaucrats, district or station chiefs operating in the so-called hinterland, not infrequently without formal authorisation and on minor occasions". [53] an analysis supported by our examination of the military reports published in the German colonial papers. [54] In contrast to his omnipresence in Berlin, Adametz is conspicuously absent from the museum databases of Leipzig, Stuttgart, Frankfurt, Bremen, Munich or Cologne. Similar to the fleeting appearance of Christian von Krogh in Leipzig, however, his name appears in the archives of the Museum am Rothenbaum - Kulturen und Künste der Welt (MARKK) in Hamburg. The director of the Ethnological Museum in Hamburg, Georg Thilenius (1868-1937), namely approached him with a question in 1929:

"For the museum I have acquired a set of panpipes from the trade. [...] According to the seller, this set was specially made by a [ruler] of Bagam on the occasion of your arrival there. [...] [S]o it would be of special interest to me to know more about the course of your entry, especially the reception by the [ruler]." [55]

To which Adametz replied:

"I humbly reply to your letter of 20.9. that I cannot remember the exact occasion when the [ruler] of Bagam greeted me with pan pipes. It will probably have been on the occasion of

the installation of the young, talented [Fo] Tetang, who was attached to German rule, after his predecessor and uncle had been deposed by me for opposition to our government and cruelty to his [G]enmates (1911 or 1912)." [56]

This proves once again: although officers are invisible in the databases, this does not mean that their loot did not indirectly end up in the depots. It also shows the extent to which the acquisition of African cultural heritage is embedded in both physical and epistemic violence: physical, because it took the brutal removal of a ruler for these instruments to end up in the hands of officers, and epistemic, because the use of the term "pan flute" has erased the name of these instruments in the Mengaka language. Moreover, the flutes were never meant to be placed on shelves or in display cases. By erasing local knowledge and cultural practice, Thilenius' taxonomy and legacy has permanently silenced an entire musical tradition.

In addition to the confiscation of cultural objects in Cameroon, Adametz also exemplifies the forcible removal of zoological specimens. While trying to map his collections in German institutions, I came across the archive of the Berlin Museum für Naturkunde. [57] There, a list and a letter inform that Adametz offered the museum the remains of antelopes, guenons, hyenas, hippopotami, chimpanzees, gorillas and baboons that the [p.130] self-proclaimed "hunter" had killed and skinned. He also offered a whole skeleton of a "Homo sapiens" and the skull of a human being, without giving any details about the origin of these remains. Adametz wrote in his letter of August 1908 that "due to an unforeseen prolonged stay in the protectorate, he was only occasionally able to bring [the above-mentioned consignment] to [his] return to Germany". Unfortunately for him, however, "political and other circumstances" hindered his "collecting activities" in the "Bascho area". [58] In fact, Adametz, together with Harry Puder (1862-1933), had led a military expedition against several villages near the Nigerian border from March to June 1908. The troops reportedly killed 491 people, including two leaders, [59] and took 84 prisoners. Thus, in addition to massacres and looting, there was also zoological "gathering". As for the mechanisms and various forms of extractivism, it is worth mentioning that in this context the colonisers imposed punitive fees in the form of ivory tooth and rubber payments, that they temporarily enslaved indigenous men through forced labour, that they allowed (and some may have participated in) gender-based violence against indigenous women, [60] and finally, that Adametz diverted the transport costs for the shipments reimbursed by the museums as donations to the Cameroon Rubber Company - a joint-stock company founded in 1905 with a capital of several million marks to develop rubber plantations in colonial Cameroon. [61] Only a comprehensive understanding of racist, androcentric and anthropocentric thinking and its manifestation as physical, economic and epistemic violence can reveal the interdisciplinary and transnational entanglements of dehumanisation and colonial exploitation.

The two cases of Krogh and Adametz testify to the sheer scale of the loot: museums acquired African cultural objects from art and ethnographic dealers such as Julius Konietzko or Johann Friedrich Gustav Umlauff → Bio, 432 (1833-1889), who in turn had left dozens of looters unmentioned in their purchase books. This makes it clear that carefully conducted provenance research can indeed contribute to the study of the German colonial period in Cameroon and serve as a basis for possible restitutions: Direct transports from the colonial military to the museum depots are indeed easy to reconstruct, so that it does not take much effort to trace certain objects as loot and thus also to identify them as possible restitution pieces. On the other hand, the limitations of such provenance research become clear, since in many cases the structure of the art market around 1900 helped to make the concrete, violent mechanisms of numerous museum acquisitions "invisible". This provides a further argument for [p.131] recognising colonialism as a regime of injustice, [62] in that all stakeholders involved in the apparatus of colonial looting could be recognised as wrongful owners.

Finally, this critique of provenance research should also include another kind of absence in museum collections: the simple disappearance of documents. In early 1902, Hans Glauning → Bio, 386 sent no fewer than 80 Cameroonian objects to Berlin, including a quiver from the royal palace in Ngaoundéré, [63] carvings from the Cross River region, [64] ancestral remains from the [p.132] Anyang and from Bali. [65] It probably also included a letter and a list, but these are missing (Fig. 5). [66] The portfolio is now part of a vacuum in the Berlin Ethnological Museum. Such absences from the museum are sometimes the product of unintentional circumstances - such as the loss of much of its photographic collection during the Second World War - and other times the result of deliberate erasure - such as the deliberate destruction of some of its holdings. [67] In the case of German Togoland, our team experienced a similar setback when we discovered that two key documents had been lost and were

now part of these records of disappeared documents: [68] one concerned a collection of thousands of objects from the north of Togoland (with eastern Ghana), stolen by Friedrich Rigler (1864-1930); [68] the second would have informed about the fate of 45 ancestors from the region of Kara and Bassar, whose remains were looted by the colonial administrator Hermann Kersting (1863-1937). [69] This loss means that knowledge about these cultural objects, subjects and people can only be restored today by opening up these collections to Togolese, Ghanaian and Cameroonian stakeholders.

From a "monument to the troops" to "loud and dirty" resistance

Relying solely on colonial archives to tell colonial history is questionable at best. As Ann Laura Stoler has argued, these documents are "rhetorical sleights of hand used to erase the facts of subjugation, classify petty crimes as political subversion, or simply erase the colonised." [70] There is little hope of gaining an empowering perspective from the victor's narratives, or even of finding resistant voices at all. [71]

And yet Germans admitted that Cameroonians* resisted the appropriation of their cultural heritage. [72] Umlauff, → Bio, 432 one of the best-known dealers in African art, weapons and possessions in Germany at the beginning of the 20th century, approached the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde in 1914 to sell parts of his Cameroon collection, including pieces he had acquired for sale from Hans Dominik → Bio, 380 and Lieutenant Jasper von Oertzen (1880-1948). In an appendix to his catalogue he wrote:

"When one looks at the rich material of idols, masks, carvings, drums, weapons, household utensils, etc., one might be led to believe that such things are easy to obtain and procure without difficulty. In reality, the situation is quite different. Only the [p.133] transport of such large pieces [...] is extremely difficult and extremely expensive. Then the [Africans] are very attached to their things and especially to old, inherited family pieces. Under normal circumstances they can hardly be persuaded to give them up and even less to give up old masks and fetishes. Even for objects of ordinary life they have to bargain for a long time, and they are only available for rich gifts in return. The conditions are more favourable only in times of war or in the case of great expeditions, whose display of power is capable of exerting a certain pressure." [73]

This testifies not only to the preferred *modus operandi* of the colonial masters - namely violence and plunder - but also to the active resistance of the Cameroonians to giving up signs of their cultural identity. This puts Götz Aly's statement into perspective that European collectors and colonial "exterminators" were "not troubled by a lack of conscience": "On the contrary, with pride and the conviction that they had acted well and righteously, they published their misdeeds in journals, travel books and memoirs". In fact, these private correspondences rather point to a conscious admission of theft. More pertinent is Aly's call to view ethnological collections not as "monuments to the troops" but as "monuments to shame." [74]

Nevertheless, critical studies of ethnocolonial museums (including this one) have helped to refocus attention on this institution as a site of culture. This "predicament", according to Wayne Modest, [75] may make advocates of decolonial fallism uncomfortable. Critical studies of colonial holdings and archives often pursue an agenda of holding on to the colonial house and addressing its crisis by making it relevant again and seeing the museum as a site of knowledge that is essential to the reappraisal of colonial history. Even die-hard critics of cultural institutions have argued for such introspection [76] and this "strategic self-reflexivity" has recently justified provenance research and increased public financial support. [77] This was a concern of Clémentine Deliss, who sees anthropological criticism as only a first step, as Senegalese author Issa Samb advised her: "By criticising [anthropological] bias, one begins one's work. [...] Only in this way will all these objects overcome their aesthetic status and eventually regain their human dimension. You will be able to socialise every object you find, and in this way you will breathe life into them." [78] "How could you activate the collection in the context of an intersectional debate when the environment of the museum itself is housed in architecture that corresponds to the colonial period?" asks Deliss. [79] A few pages further on, it states:

[p.134] "The irony is that this new verve leads back to the origins in order to reconstruct missing information that was omitted at the time of acquisition. All this is done under the guise of object biographies and provenance research. There are many arguments for and against restitution, but while the initiatives are being debated, work needs to be done on how to deal with these vast collections held in the vaults of European museums. How can these collections be processed in the 21st century? Which ethnographic holdings remain shrouded in invisibility? What might such a decolonial process mean in practice?" [80]

Felix von Luschan was well aware that the drafts of his letters would remain in the museum's archives, even though they were not publicly accessible at the time. Hence his warning in brackets: "Strictly secret!!!!". Recently, the Ethnological Museum Berlin has begun to digitise its archival records, making them more accessible and publishing scans of its acquisition books online in 2021. Thanks to a century of tireless work by African scholars, artists and activists, the history of the violent appropriation of immense treasures and unique testimonies of material culture is increasingly being recognised and atoned for. But what are the real goals of these numerous reinterrogations of colonial archives? Against this background, I can only suggest an evasion of this history of violence. Although it is difficult, even sometimes "impossible", [81] to locate counter-narratives, Alexander Weheliye reminds us that racist systems "can never erase the lines of flight, the dreams of freedom, the practices of liberation and the possibilities of other worlds." [82] I cannot claim to be able to generate Afrofuturist narratives, but I can think about possible lines of flight. For example, an online search brought me to a space that, following Michael Rothberg and Ariella Aisha Azoulay, brought me to a multidirectional reading of colonial entanglements that incorporates a critique of the persistence of imperialist relations. [83] I discovered a piece of music called "Bakoko" by the band Bantou Mentale while researching the history of the Bakoko. Scan the QR code and read how the band describes their sound themselves while listening:

"You are in a Parisian club - the "Djakarta" perhaps, the "Mbuta Lombi" or the "Lossi Ya Zaza". Not just anywhere in Paris, but in the little African village they call Chateau Rouge. Where things are rough and feverish. In the tenth arrondissement. It almost feels like being back in Matongé, or in downtown Kinshasa, or on the Grand Marché in the centre of the city. You feel at home. But outside it's freezing cold. Exactly, you are in Europe. Cops with tear gas on their belts roam around harassing the illegal traders, the little shégué street kids who hang around the metro entrance advertising wig shops and nail salons or sometimes trying to sell you [p.135] cheap phone cards so you can call home and tell mum and dad that you're fine, that you're still alive, that you're "having fun". The cops ask young black people for their papers. But you ain't got none. Shit happens when your luck runs out. A life like this has no safety net. The music turns up, loud and dirty." [84]

This text began with a Bakoko mute drum that remained untouched for more than a century. Probably Max von Stetten, Hans Dominik → Bio, 380 or Ludwig von Stein zu Lausnitz took it, but who cares? What mattered then was what came out of the drum before it was silenced. The speeches of the Bakoko rulers Musinga, Nsonge, Nduniebayang, Madimanjob, Etutegase and Etangambebe have not been recorded in written archives, but the drum's skin may have heard and transmitted the speeches before their homeland was reduced to rubble. The drum knew the sound, the language, the shouts and the answers. What matters today is the fact that it had to stand untouched in Germany for a long time, while some descendants of the colonised knock on the doors of "Fortress Europe" and are forced to live a "life without a safety net". The exposure of these violent and silent archives therefore ends with this call inspired by Bantou Mentale, a call against the monumentalisation of heritage, against the silencing of property, a call for a "loud and dirty" future for these subjects of history.

[p.139] [Objects]

141 - **Museums, Missions and Colonial Cultural Relocation** (Richard Tsogang Fossi)

157 - **Misunderstood, Missing, Coveted.** Power Objects from Cameroon in Germany (Mikaél Assilkinga)

173 - **Parts of Living People as Museum Objects.** The Appropriation of Hair in a Colonial Context (Richard Tsogang Fossi)

185 - **The "first German elephant".** A Cameroonian elephant on order (Lindiwe Breuer)

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.141] Museums, Missions and Colonial Cultural Relocation

RICHARD TSOANG FOSSI

"By the way, I believe that the idol Ekongolo is not yet for sale. I have never managed to see it and any native who sees it and does not belong to the society of swindlers will be killed. I only learned that it was about 2 m high and was made inside [sic]." [1]

These lines were written by the missionary Wilhelm Müller from the German Baptist mission station Victoria (today Limbe) on 11 October 1900 to the then director of the Africa Department in the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde, Felix von Luschan (1854-1924). At that time, Müller had been in the Victoria region at the foot of Mount Cameroon in what is now the south-western region of Cameroon for about eleven months. In his letter, he referred to Ekongolo, a sacred figure highly respected throughout the coastal region from Victoria to Douala, two to four metres high and composed of wood, fabrics, plant fibres and other materials. This composite figure, as well as the Elong - a similarly outstanding, sacred and monumental figure from the same Cameroonian coastal region or Douala - had attracted the attention of the Berlin Museum and the Grassi Museum in Leipzig, among others, a few weeks earlier. The Elong is now considered "destroyed" according to the Grassi Museum's inventory.[2] The story of the brutal removal, transportation and treatment of the sacred figure until its destruction in Leipzig throws a harsh light on several phenomena at once: On the role and methods of the missions in the extraction of sacred testimonies of culture in Cameroon; on the cooperation of missions and museums also across borders, between Basel in Switzerland, the English and the German Baptists, and Berlin in what was then Prussia, or even Leipzig; but not least on the destruction of outstanding cultural assets by precisely those institutions (museums, namely) that in the colonial context often legitimised their extraction work with the narrative of rescue[3] - and in some cases still do so today. Furthermore, this example can be used to illustrate diverse forms and consequences of loss on the ground in Cameroon, because the loss of the figure in the local Duala society also entailed the loss of the sacral know-how attached to it due to the confrontation with the Christian religion and the colonial authority. The processes of loss of these sacred figures already began with their profanation, [4] for [p.142] they were forcibly removed from their cultic context by uninitiated hands and introduced into another context, alien to them, with new attributions of meaning, where instead of their original vitality they were subjected to rigidity, instead of veneration to a colonial voyeuristic, dehumanising curiosity of the museum world. How was religious foreignness linguistically constructed among the missionaries in order to legitimise the will to exterminate and take away? How did museum people make use of the willingness of the godmen and traders to realise the interests of their museums? Did the deprived populations remain passive?

[p.143] Cameroon as a "mission field"

With the expression "mission field" in the title of his book published in 1909, the Basel missionary Paul Steiner[5] (1849-1941) wanted to take stock of the fact that Cameroon was particularly suitable as a place for missionary work. What Steiner obscured, however, was the power with which the missions destroyed local religions and customs. Missionising manifested itself in the actual "occupation" of areas by mission stations and the schools associated with them as means of civilising mission, [6] alongside medicine and agriculture. The church-mission-schools-medicine triad all too often made the missionaries appear as bearers of modernity, bringing "European religious rituals in competition with foreign magical practices" to supposedly "pre-modern societies." [7] However, Cameroonian literature and oral culture suggest that missionaries purposefully used modern medicine or technology to force the conversion of people to Christianity and ipso facto to steal or destroy religious objects of those so "cured". [8] Even more: mission farms were places of unpaid agricultural labour on many hectares under the guise of "education for work", [9] which often remains hidden in the "official" religious historiography [10] and only reveals itself to a subversive gaze that gives a place to the traumatised African memory. [11]

The first Christian mission settled in Cameroon in the 1840s. By 1830, the will had matured among former slaves in Jamaica to return to Africa to evangelise the remaining population there. This took

place during a period of mutually driving economic and political interests, when the so-called English Niger Expedition sailed to West Africa to explore and clear trade routes from the Atlantic coast to the Niger hinterland. The London Baptist Missionary Society agreed to the project of missionary settlement on these shores and sent the first missionaries John Clark (1802-1879) and Dr Prince; they were soon followed by Joseph Merrick (1808-1879), Joseph Jackson Fuller (1825-1908) and the former engineer Alfred Saker (1814-1880) in Cameroon, where they began working among the Duala and Bimbia or Isubu. [12] The Baptist Mission remained active in this coastal area of Douala, Bimbia and Victoria (now Limbe) until the formal colonisation of Cameroon by Germany in 1884. In 1886, it was replaced by the Basel Evangelical Mission before returning to the colony around 1899. In 1890, Catholics from the Pallottine Missionary Society also settled under the leadership of Father Heinrich Vieters (1853-1914), who became the colony's first apostolic vicar in 1904. [13] Other mission societies such as the American Presbyterian Mission from 1878 and later the Steyl Mission were also active in the colony. [14] The replacement of the English Baptists [p.144] in 1886 enabled the empire to entrust the important field of missions preferentially to German citizens who were to promote the "introduction of German essence", i.e. the Germanisation of the colony [15]. [16] The missions were thus perceived by the state as a component of colonial policy. [17] In the process, as the Basel mission pastor Carl Paul (1857-1927) criticised, "spiritual and secular power often merged, or secular, i.e. perverse, means were used for the conversion of the peoples." [18]

What the missions had in common was to regard the African societies they found as "heathen people" deeply entrenched in "polygamy", "sorcery" and "fetishism." [19] The local religious or sacred entities were thus unilaterally condemned as "fetishes", demonic instruments and means of sorcery. According to the Cameroonian philosopher F. Eboussi Boulaga, the demand to abandon one's own religion and convert to Christianity was based on quasi-military principles. [20] The dances, an essential element of the local rituals, [21] were considered by them to be the deployment moments of the so-called demon stakeholders par excellence, because masks, bells, dance rattles, etc. were used. [22] The "mission field" of Cameroon thus became a battlefield on which the Christian missionaries waged a relentless psychological or spiritual war against the local customs and religions, which they considered "retrograde", "demonic", "pagan" and "superstitious" [23]. This repertoire of terms manifests the colonial or missionary rhetoric common at the time. [24] However, the attitude of the mission not only had a destructive impact on local customs, but also a devastating effect on the artefacts that the missionaries took away or destroyed.

Elong and Ekongolo in sight

The area between the Cross River and the Wuri River had magnificent and powerful cultural or religious objects. [25] The dikoki - in stone [26] or wooden [27] - form, the nyati, the koso, the leopard or elephant masks, etc. were among the rich spectrum of sacred, anthropomorphic, zoomorphic or tower-like objects. [28] The belief system was carried by a number of covenants [29] - known in the coastal area as "Losango" [30] - who had the power to handle such sacred, agency [31] artifacts. [32] Among them were Ekongolo and Elong, two superhumanly large figures who occupied a prominent position in coastal religions. [33] Because of their fascinating appearance and the power they embodied, they had aroused the imagination but also the desire for appropriation of European museums on the one hand and the rage for destruction or the desire for appropriation [34] of the missionaries on the other.

[p.145] From the historical and contemporary, but also oral [35] sources on the two representative figures, it is evident that they were particularly coveted by museum directors in Germany, namely by the Völkerkunde Museum in Berlin and the Grassi Museum in Leipzig. In their quest for completeness, [36] their directors engaged in a race to acquire spectacular cultural objects from Africa and Cameroon respectively, which would put their own stamp on their collections. [37] To this end, they not only used funds, but also offered their "commissioned collectors" the prospect of medals as motivation. [38] In addition, they equipped their beau fftragten with technical means, above all with cameras, [39] with which the coveted pieces could be documented pictorially and their removal prepared. The following statement by the Baptist missionary Wilhelm Müller provides information about Luschan's order to the missionary:

"At present, in accordance with your wishes, I have endeavoured to obtain the image of the idol Ekongolo, but have not been able to see it without danger to my life, as it is

connected with a secret society which anxiously keeps away every uncalled-for person and is not exactly choosy in its choice of means for this purpose." [40]

[However, the cooperation of the ethnological museums with the missionaries did not begin with Wilhelm Müller. Already in the early years of German colonialism in Cameroon, Adolf Bastian (1826-1905), then director of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin, got in touch with the American missionary Harris Richardson (1879- 1887) from Illinois. Richardson had been working in the Bakundu area of Cameroon as a missionary of the English Baptist Mission since about 1879. When Cameroon became a German colony in 1884, Richardson "collected" for Berlin before leaving Cameroon in 1887, when the English Baptists [p.147] were replaced by the Basel Mission. [41] The arrival of the Basel missionaries opened a new era for religious artefacts in Cameroon, namely that of a formidable confrontation with the local religious associations - the Bünde - and a systematic destruction, but also the forcible removal of the artefacts for the benefit of European institutions. Last but not least, the missions did business with them. [42] In 1911, the Basel missionary Martin Göhring (1871-1959), who had been working in Fumban, now Foumban, since 1906, wrote to Bernhard Ankermann → Bio, 370 from the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde that he had "brought a large number of ethnographic objects with him" and "would sell them to a collection if the proceeds were good, where they would serve the general interest better than they do with me". [43] Moreover, Luschán instrumentalised the church for the delivery of Cameroonian skulls and skeletons:

"But I can well imagine that you of all people would be able to make your compatriots understand that in the damp climate of Cameroon their bones perish very quickly and without a trace under the earth, while with us they are beautifully cleaned and washed, carefully preserved in cabinets of glass and iron, and remain unchanged through centuries and millennia. I believe that such an idea should not be without impression on your less educated countrymen." [44]

Last but not least, the missions helped transport war booty from the hinterland to the coast and ship it to Germany. In return, they received military support, e.g. in the abolition of rituals and customs that the missionaries considered unchurchlike. The confederations were the supreme political-religious authority. Because of their ability to handle sacred objects, i.e. their ritual authority, they regulated politico-social relations and also acted as a judicial authority. For these reasons, the decisions of the covenants or the priests were rarely questioned, because it was assumed that they were inspired by the ancestors. In addition, their decisions transcended the statuses and the covenants, and were thus respected by the entire community. [45] Such a sphere of influence of the rulers and priests who embodied political and religious power [46] could not be tolerated in the colonial situation, neither by the local colonial government nor by the mission. The real or fictitious supernatural, supposedly even "dangerous" efficacy of the objects was cited by the missionaries as legitimisation for the removal of sacred elong and ekongolo figures. Their magical-sacred power, which allowed them, for example, to communicate with the ancestors and to demand blessings from them for society, was dismissed by the missionaries as mere sorcery and hocus-pocus. [47] Accordingly, they condemned the covenants and their objects in harsh terms: "The covenants are a stronghold of all paganism, especially of the belief in power, of totemism and thus also of the belief in witches." [48]

[p.148] This confrontation of the Christian mission with religious artefacts of the colonised communities obviously led to a transformation or shift in meaning of the (religious) objects found. [49] For the local communities, they were sacred because of their sacral power and their use in rituals [50] and could not be done without at any price, [51] as the "expedition leader" Eugen Zintgraff (1858-1897) learned in 1887 during his own attempt to buy sacred artefacts in Bakunduland. [52] For Europeans, however, they acquired a different value, which was based on the expectations in the destination country, namely those of museum people, researchers, auctioneers or missionaries. [53] While the transformation of meaning for museum representatives was linked to the exotic aesthetic-symbolic value of the objects, [54] for missionaries, however, this transformation connoted something dangerous that called for destruction in the name of Christ. Thus, in 1899, the Basel missionary Jakob Keller → Bio, 394 (1862-1947) had numerous sacred objects, which had been degraded to "idols", collected and burned down in many localities of Mangambas, Kokis and Bombes. What is downright grotesque about this is that the local population sometimes became the agent of destruction in order

to provide proof of their conversion. This emerges from the account of an unnamed companion of Keller:

"Again, idols and other badges of idolatry are being dragged in quantity. Like a triumphant commander, Keller led his war booty in his retinue behind him to the next village, Bonaku, where he had to perform some baptisms. Full of wonder, the Christians gathered for this celebration saw the heaps of captured idols; this spurred on equal zeal." [55]

Keller himself admitted that he was able to "save" some of these forcibly taken away artefacts before they burned. However, these "rescued" pieces were not intended for the local community, but for the headquarters of the Basel mission and the museums in Europe. [56] The sensitive collections thus include not only ritual but also cultural objects taken by force and deceit. [57] The burning triggered the indignation of Luschan, who even speculated in his complaint to the Foreign Office "that Herr Keller has no knowledge of the existence of this great royal museum and also of the existence of ethnology as a science". [58] Luschan's complaint was by no means directed against the destruction of entire cultures, but against the destruction of magnificent pieces that he wanted to secure for his museum. He made no secret of his intention and hoped that "from the authoritative side" it would be made clear to the "pious man of God",

"that for the state protection enjoyed by the missions, some other kind of return can be expected after all than the relentless extermination of precisely the most important and interesting things that are at all still present in the interior of our protectorates at present." [59]

[This situation finally gave rise to a collaboration between the Basel missionaries, the German Baptist mission active in Cameroon since 1899 and the Museum für Völkerkunde. The director of the latter, Adolf Bastian, wrote a long letter to the inspector of the Basel Mission in this regard. [60] The cooperation was expressed, for example, in the scientific support of the collection activities of the missionary Müller, [61] to whom Luschan sent copies of his booklet *Anleitung zum ethnologischen Beobachten und Sammeln*. However, cooperation could also be established between missionaries and the local colonial government, as the mission needed the help of the apparatus of violence to carry out its "crusades" against the local religions, to take away their sacred objects or to eradicate the sacred sites, as is handed down in a message from Adolf Diehl → Bio, 378 (1870-1943) to the director of the Grassi Museum in Leipzig, Karl Weule (1864-1926): "The Basel Mission, which has a school in almost every major Duala village, has successfully contributed to the eradication of the Elong and has burned down hundreds of Elong huts. A specimen of the 'fetish' is said to be in their museum in Basel." [62] Diehl's words give the impression that the missionaries systematically burned everything. In fact, such moments provided the opportunity to take significant cultural objects and museumise them. Thus, today, the total inventory (approx. 340,000 inventory numbers) of the Museum of the Basel Mission contains no less than 1100 inventory numbers from Cameroon (out of 2500 in total from Africa), which were received mainly before the First or Second World War. [63]

It was by no means pity for the local population that resonated in Diehl's letter to Weule. He himself had been commissioned by the director of the Leipzig museum to "acquire" such a colossal piece, and Diehl had succeeded in getting hold of one of the last Elong figures remaining in Cameroon: "It is the last one still in existence and it cost me a great deal of effort to put myself in its possession." [64] Diehl concealed how he came into possession of the figure. Diehl's and Weule's joint action proves once again how much the missions of museums in Europe contributed to the destruction of entire cultures ostensibly in the name of science or the fight against "demonology" and the theft of their goods. The burning of Elong huts described by Diehl, however, had even more far-reaching consequences. For in the "huts" not only the coveted figure itself was kept, but a whole system of material and immaterial heritage. This is evident from the statement of Johannes Ittmann (1885-1963), another Basel missionary in Cameroon, in 1914: "Other boards were also kept in the pámba; commemorative signs were carved into them and the teacher and leader of the initiates used them as mementos. Drums and other equipment were kept in the pámba." [65]

[p.150] Resistance of the local population

The population did not accept the mission's struggle against local customs and religions without resistance, even if this resistance was insufficiently documented. Only a few reports reveal moments of resistance. One example is the reaction of the population in some grassland villages such as Bangu, Bamendjo or even Foumban, as can be seen from a report by the company J.F.G. Umlauff [66] → Bio, 432 from 1914, which aimed to draw customers' attention to special "collections" of the house and thus conclude lucrative deals with them: "Then the natives are very attached to their things and especially to old, inherited family pieces. Under normal circumstances, they can hardly be persuaded to hand them over, and even less to hand over old masks and fetishes". [67] The report of the Umlauff house contradicts the assumptions, common then as now, that cultural goods are insufficiently protected in Africa or end up in smuggling networks again soon after their restitution due to widespread corruption. [68] The case of Umlauff clearly shows that it was not the ostensible conservation or scientific motives that were at work in the theft of sacred objects from a sacred site - in this case in the village of Bangu [69] in what is now the West Region of Cameroon - but rather their appropriation for later speculative profits. The resistance of the local communities or their rulers when their cultural heritage was stolen by Europeans is clearly evident in the case of the grassland village of Bamendjo (now Bamedjou) not far from Bangu:

"Often we had to bargain for a long time over small things. For example, it took 14 days to negotiate with the chief of Bamendjo about a dance rattle, and when he finally gave it away, he first cut off 4 strands of bells because they were heirlooms from his great-grandfather. It is therefore to be understood that they are still more attached to the carvings, which mostly represent ancestral figures." [70]

Further evidence of such moments of resistance can be found in the abolition of the Panga League in the village of Songo Pongo, not far from Douala. The Basel Mission had requested the help of the local colonial government, which sent a small warship. Paul Wurm, theologian and director at the Basel Mission House, reported:

"When the steamer was gone again, they came to the missionaries with the request that they hand over their idols to the missionaries so that they would not be captured by the governor. The speaking drum announced upstream, downstream, that the panga had come to an end. Missionary Schürle said, "We set a day for them to show us their belongings and then we were going to burn them in front of everyone. The panga people did not want that, but we pushed it through." [71]

[p.151] Far from the euphoric reports according to which the Christian faith spread rapidly in the colony, this contribution has outlined how the introduction of Christianity in reality brought with it material, cultural and psychological violence. In the end, the competition between museums, the functionalisation of missionaries, along with its devastating consequences for local communities deprived of their sacred artefacts, came to nothing: Luschan never received the longed-for Ekongolo for Berlin, and the Elong "acquired" for Leipzig by Diehl → Bio, 378 was destroyed. The Basel mission itself had only fragments of the Elong abducted around 1900. The material absence of the figure, however, is contrasted to this day by its immaterial presence [72] in the collective memory of the Duala.

Misjudged, Missing, Coveted. Objects of Power from Cameroon in Germany

MIKAËL ASSILKINGA

In 1916, Germany lost its colonies. Cameroon became a French and English protectorate. 1 January 1960, Cameroon's Independence Day, marked the end of a long period of European colonisation. Basically, however, this continues to have an effect, because the form of government and the borders of today's Cameroon, which was never a firmly defined territory, are also a colonial legacy. Even the names of the four different cultural spheres "Fang-Beti" (administrative regions of the centre, south and east), "Sawa" (coast, southwest), "Grassland" (northwest, west) and "Sudano-Sahelian" (Adamaua, north and high north), into which Cameroon is usually divided, were created during the colonial period. [1] Moreover, a substantial part of Cameroon's cultural heritage is now kept in the former colonial powers of France and England, but especially in Germany, where they play a kind of "proxy role" for the country that was lost from the German point of view. This role is particularly delicate when the museum pieces kept in Europe are royal statues, thrones, regalia, prestigious weapons and similar objects whose removal by the colonial powers was linked to the project of depriving the opponents (in this case the local rulers in Cameroon) of both the symbols of power and power itself - and thus possibly empowering themselves. In the following, I call these objects "objects of power" in full awareness of the inadequacy of the term, since from the perspective of those who lost them, many of these things were not passive things (object comes from the Latin *objectum*: "that which is set before the mind"), but rather endowed with a soul, an agency, a power, a might - in other words, subjects, which often also have a name.

Cameroonian objects of power in German museums

Among the thousands of artefacts that Cameroon lost during and after colonisation are countless objects of power that, with a few exceptions such as the throne chair of the Bamum → [Image Book XLVIII](#) or the Tangué → [Image Book LIV](#) of the Duala, have so far received little attention. [2] They include weapons (swords, lances), communication [p.158] and musical instruments (drums), regalia (in addition to thrones, e.g. sceptres, elephant tusks, royal arm rings, drinking horns, pipes), architectural elements, religious objects or even ruler's costumes. They were in great demand among the German colonists. In June 1905, for example, the officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#) (1868-1908) and his troop attacked the royal palace in Baham (West Cameroon). [3] Before burning the palace, they stole a vast amount of cultural artefacts. The most important of these were the symbols of power: whole sections of the palace architecture, primarily large door frames → [illustrated booklet XLV](#) and tall wooden columns decorated with narrative motifs, the king's throne → [illustrated booklet XIV](#) and other thrones of deceased kings kept in the palace. However, it was not only in Baham, but also in other places in the Grasslands, in Balessing, [Bamenom](#) → [Pictorial Book XXVIII](#), Bameta, Mambila, etc., that Glauning destroyed palaces and appropriated architectural fragments. [4] In northern Cameroon, the Schutztruppe led by officers Hans Dominik → [Bio, 380](#) (1870-1910), Oltwig von Kamptz (1857-1921), Hermann Nolte and company attacked the Laamio Palace in Tibati year 1899 in the course of one of the so-called punitive expeditions. The great spoils of war consisted of the throne and the sword of Laamios, elephant teeth and lances. Numerous other objects of power were stolen under similarly violent circumstances and taken to Germany. [5] Accordingly, they are present in almost all ethnological museums in this country. Baham's throne and architectural elements have been in the Ethnological Museum in Berlin since 1906. [6] The war booty from Tibati is part of the holdings of the Übersee-Museum in Bremen, the Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde in Leipzig, the Ethnological Museum in Berlin, the Museum Fünf Kontinente in Munich, the Museum für Völkerkunde in Dresden, the Reiss-Engelhorn-Museen in Mannheim and the Linden-Museum in Stuttgart (1901). [7]

I take the above examples as an opportunity to discuss the different meanings of the objects of power before and after their forced translocation. The aim is to better understand, in the words of Yağmur Karakis, "both the (colonial) past and the (postcolonial) present" of the so-called objects of power. [8] The structure of this article is based on the concept of object biography and begins with the definition

of the term power object. This is followed by an overview of the different categories of power objects in the Cameroonian context. The focus is on a particularly significant example, the sword of Tibati in the Linden-Museum Stuttgart. The sword was chosen because it is well suited to show the particular structure of power in a martial context. In addition to the inventory lists of the museums that were available to our research project, the article is based on interviews that I conducted in Cameroon.

[p.159] Object of power: a definition of terms

What is an object of power? Texts that deal with the concept of "power" on a theoretical level in relation to Cameroonian cultural objects are rare. [9] The definition of the term given below is based on studies by Reinhard Bernbeck and Johannes Müller[10] on the one hand and by Jean-Paul Notué and Bianca Triaca[11] on the other. Although Bernbeck and Müller, archaeologists and prehistorians respectively, do not deal with the cultural past and present in Cameroon, they formulate insightful thoughts on the relationship between things and power from a cultural anthropological and archaeological perspective. Notué and Triaca's work, on the other hand, is a historical study of Cameroon's cultural heritage in particular. In the general understanding, power is the "rule of people over people".[12] In Cameroon, the sharing of power or the assumption of power is done by the royal line. [13] The holder of power remains king for life or - depending on the language and region - "Laamio" (in the north) or "Fon" (grasslands); he is accompanied in his exercise of power by secret societies whose members fulfil a regulatory function as counter-power. Bernbeck and Müller emphasise that in societies organised by social and political hierarchies, exceptional objects are produced to mark high-ranking individuals. [14] In other words, in "objects with a ritual, symbolic or magical character", "the legitimacy and power of the king and the secret societies" materialised, as did "the significance of the various cults and rites".[15] The scope of power is thus not exclusively limited to the political field. [16] Power also had a supernatural dimension or is linked to invisible forces. There is an interaction between the visible and the invisible, between politics and religion. "The history of religions as well as political systems provides a myriad of examples of how religion and politics need, use and exploit each other [...]. Since in so-called 'primitive peoples' the political ruler is endowed with supreme political and religious power, it is pointless to ask who rules whom." [17] Indeed, religion is an integral part of all life here, including politics. Luc de Heusch even suggests that "the sacred is part of the core structure of power, and of every power" [18]

In the northern part of Cameroon, another dimension of power is added: the military. Because of the warlike situation since the 11th century, [19] almost all kings are both great warriors and military leaders. Martial skill was the common measure of power. So the structure of power varies from one sphere to another. In the north, many things represent power that is political as well as religious and military. Invisible forces rooted in the respective [p.160] Cameroonian traditions feed the warlike potency and are at the same time an essential part of it. Power is accordingly a mixture of the visible and the invisible, materialised through objects. "The difficulty of perceiving the invisible world, the problem of showing the aspects of supernatural power while concealing those reserved for the initiated, implies the use of symbols"[20] - but also of things. Ultimately, power is multimodal. In various disciplines that have material things as their subject matter (in such contexts, designations such as "things", "objects" or "objects" are forbidden), the terms "prestige", "prestige goods", "status", "domination" and "authority" often emerge "as elements of power"[21]. Differentiating between them is important for understanding the function of objects of power. They are all very close to each other and each describes an aspect of power, but are in no way synonyms. Domination can be understood as the "exercise of power". In contrast, according to Bernbeck and Müller, "authority" is "the ability of an individual to gain recognition by others, which gives him a position of power." [22] Since the assumption of power in Cameroon is guided by traditional rules, recognition of the enthroned king is automatic. "Status, according to common sociological definition, is a fixed position in the social structure that is independent of the particular individual who fills it." [23] Being king is a status that comes with entitlements. The better the status holders fulfil the expectations placed on them, the higher their prestige. [24] Ultimately, "goods can serve to mark prestige positions (for example, due to the accumulation of even everyday artefacts). A special form of these prestige markers are goods that are obviously acquired specifically to represent prestige because of their elaborateness." [25] Nevertheless, such goods do not necessarily lead to power, which is the central and highest position in a traditional Cameroonian society. Servants of a king not only have prestige goods, but they also acquire prestige through their position at court. In this sense, some prestige goods are indeed objects

of power.

In this paper, objects of power are understood to be artefacts used in everyday life or occasionally for highly significant cultural practices that symbolise the power of a king or queen in centralised societies or that of the leading group in non-centralised communities. They represent both the power and the sovereignty of a kingdom. They are displayed as part of public ceremonies and serve genuine demonstrations of power involving the invocation of invisible forces. [26]

[p.161] Classification of Cameroon's objects of power

The structures of power and associated insignia are closely related to the historical context and landscape (forest, mountains, savannah) of each sphere. The cultural spheres of Cameroon have their particularities, but nevertheless show similarities. Accordingly, the objects of power can be divided into three categories across spheres: The local objects of power apply only to a particular community and some neighbouring communities. The pipe → [picture book](#) in the grasslands is an example of this. The regional ones are recognised in a whole cultural sphere, such as swords in the north (Sudano-Sahelian) or door frames in the grasslands. The Ethnological Museum in Berlin has 118 examples of these. [27] The supra-regional power objects are mainly regalia found in every community in Cameroon or outside Cameroon, such as thrones and sceptres. A famous example is the Mandu Yenu → [Pictorial Booklet XLVIII](#). [28]

However, their material and functional diversity - in today's independent as well as in colonial Cameroon - fundamentally distinguishes the objects of power. As already mentioned, they can appear in the form of thrones, sceptres, ivory teeth, communication and musical instruments (bells, wind horns, drums, trumpets, flutes), door frames, weapons and armour (shields, spears, swords), religious objects (amulets), ruler's clothing (royal clothing, cap, cloak, arm rings), royal pipes, drinking horns, arm rings made of animal components for rulers.

Thrones, sceptres and ivory teeth

Thrones are the highest material sign of the power of a king or laamios. The forms vary from one region to another. In the Grasslands, every kingdom has at least three or four thrones, as every king must have at least one after his enthronement. [...] The panther, the elephant and the figure of the king are central to the royal thrones. While the animals usually appear in the form of caryatids, the human figures usually form the back. The thrones are reserved for kings and certain royal dignitaries, thus allowing for classification in society [and in the royal court] [29]. [Author's translation]

The throne itself consists not only of a special sculpture, but also of accessories that are usually always placed near it. Two large ivory teeth flank it. During an official act of the king, they are held by his servants. Right next to the throne, a servant holds the king's pipe, which is specially made for him and has a special design. As a sign of prestige, it is always decorated with pearls. The antelope, lion or leopard skin is spread out in front of the throne. In addition, [p.162] massive sceptres are often stuck into the ground at the side of the throne. Similar things can be found in other African countries. In this regard, a study from the early days of anthropology by Willy Schilde states:

In Kiamtwara on Lake Victoria, unclothed girls had to drag the burden of amulets, household gods and ancestors after the sultan. In addition to cow and antelope horns, there was also an elephant's tooth in which the ancestor was supposed to be enclosed. [30]

The seat of a Laamio in the northern part of Cameroon, on the other hand, consists of a special bed and several "mats rolled into each other." [31]

"The higher the rank, the higher the seat [...]. In Morocco, as far as the upper Guinea coast, the rulers like to support themselves on their mats, sometimes also on thrones, by means of cushions, which are usually made of leather. [...] Fulbe and Haussa have introduced them to the rulers as far as the coast. The distribution [...] roughly coincides with the following evidence: Fez, Galam, Malli, Mandingo, Lundamar, Nupe, southern Nigeria, Adamaua, western Sara." [32]

After a punitive expedition to Tibati, a throne → [Bildheft XXXVI](#) of this kind was consigned to the Übersee-Museum Bremen. [33] The total historical stock of Cameroonian cultural objects in Germany included 180 thrones, of which 105 have survived. [34]

Thrones, like the pillars of palaces, are among the fundamental objects of power whose translocation

or absence can lead to the termination of power. In the course of my conversations in the various communities, it became clear: depending on their importance, there is a clear division between indispensable and important, yet dispensable objects of power. The first category includes thrones, doorposts of palaces, drums, swords and amulets. "Without them, there is no power," explains Albert Nomekong, curator at the Baham Royal Museum. [35] An example of this is the "bom dye" looted by Hans Glauning → Bio, 386 → Bildheft XLV, the doorframe of the palace from Baham. The second category, i.e. the royal pipes, ivory teeth or headdresses are significant, but their absence does not prevent the exercise of power. The absence of these objects does not always have to be the result of looting, but can be a consequence of the lack of craftsmen. It happened, for example, that court artists were killed in wars or sent into exile. To meet the demand, artists were sometimes brought from neighbouring kingdoms with which good relations existed. [36]

Instruments of communication and music

Drums, along with thrones and amulets, are among the most important objects of power in the northern part of Cameroon, [37] as the Laamio of Tibati explains:

"Each of my exits obeys a set of manners and rules that have developed over two centuries in Tibati. I [p.163] must abide by them to ensure the continuity of the traditional institution. [...] Every time I go out, I receive the allegiance of my court: [...] within the palace and when I return to my private residence." [38]

These greetings and expressions of loyalty are indeed paid with songs and drums. "I always return from the tour of the city during the fantasia [horse races] with this melody of the flute and the drums, which take up a song of the warriors of Tibati." [39] The drum has another essential role: "The drum, with its sound that can be heard from afar, is the given instrument with which the ruler summons his warriors. It is in his court for this purpose, so that gradually, quite involuntarily, the idea of an insignia is associated with it." [40] In this sense, the drum is also an "insignia of war".

In the grasslands, drums are used to accompany the king in ritual dances. Ceremonies in which these instruments are used are official occasions when the king, his dignitaries and members of secret societies dance together. [41] The number of dances in which the king personally participates is limited. Their importance is all the greater. Drums are beaten on the day of the official enthronement of a king, as well as on the occasion of the "Nyang Nyang" celebration, an initiation ritual for the transition of children into adulthood. Finally, the dignitaries of the kingdoms in the grasslands use communication instruments to mourn the king during his official funeral. Here, communication is not always verbal but encoded and takes place thanks to insignia that give meaning to royal events. Such rituals form a communication between the visible and the invisible world. Drums are mediators of information between the worlds of the living and the ancestors.

Objects of power in the collections

Power objects from the former colony of Cameroon are not necessarily visible in German collections, but are nevertheless represented in impressive density. For their counting, search terms were used which, on the one hand, are common and sometimes racist in quite a few inventories, such as "Thron" ("Thronhocker, -sessel"), "Häuptlings (-stuhl, hocker, sitz)", "Sessel", "Tor", "Türrahmen", "Schwert", on the other hand, are used in a more museum-specific way, such as "Häuptlingsstab" (Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum or Hamburg, Museum am Rothenbaum - Kulturen und Künste der Welt). Depot and archive visits or even photographs have also helped to correctly classify imprecise object designations, as in the case of the throne of Hamman Lamou in the Übersee-Museum in Bremen, which is listed in the inventory as "bed". Among the largest ethnological museums in Germany, [p.164] the Linden Museum in Stuttgart has 2588 inventory numbers in this category, the Grassi Museum in Leipzig 1402, the Ethnological Museum in Berlin 998, the Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum in Cologne 896, the Museum Fünf Kontinente in Munich 603 and the Übersee-Museum in Bremen 581 numbers. [42] Eleven other collections of varying profiles, including the Museum der Weltkulturen in Frankfurt, the Reiss-Engelhorn-Museen in Mannheim, the Niedersächsische Landesmuseum in Hanover, the

Museum am Rothenbaum - Kulturen und Künste der Welt in Hamburg or the Städtische Museum in Braunschweig, count between 100 and 700 inventory numbers of this kind. [43] Whether in state, university and municipal museums, in musical instrument collections and other specialised museums, whether in the remote provinces or in overarching museum landscapes - power objects are part of the holdings almost everywhere. In their entirety, it will hardly ever be possible to record them or determine them more precisely, because collection documentation, like any colonial archive, is full of gaps and errors. Thrones, for example, are erroneously inventoried as "chairs", drums as mere "musical instruments". [44] Imprecise information on the origin - "Cameroon" - instead of clear indications of location usually do not allow supposed everyday objects to be identified as objects of power. [45]

That some subcategories of power objects are more strongly represented in collections, some less so, is due to the nature of the objects themselves and their acquisition contexts: Monumental architectural elements, remains of destroyed palaces, are rather rare. Not all palaces in the colony were equipped with elaborately carved door frames. Moreover, only palaces of kings who resisted the German colonisers were burnt. Thrones and sceptres are also basically not widespread, since a king used only one throne for his entire life. Weapons and amulets, on the other hand, outnumber any other category of objects of power. This may be because they took less time to make, they were used by several people or warriors and their transport to Germany was not difficult.

German colonial literature and the objects of power in Cameroon

Some images of important cultural objects from the colony of Cameroon circulated in German newspapers and colonial literature before they actually reached Germany; they caught the public's attention for the emblems of the various kingdoms such as thrones, drums, door frames and swords. [46] One source that discusses Tibati war objects in detail is Curt von Morgen's illustrated travelogue *Reise durch Kamerun. From South to North*. In it he describes the power in Tibati and the objects associated with it. This is no coincidence: the Adamawa region or the Lamidat of Tibati represented a strategic point, since it was from here [p.165] that one sought to conquer the hinterland of Cameroon. However, resistance in northern Cameroon was greatest in Adamawa or Tibati: "Hamassambo I and later Nyamboula had a more or less obvious ambition to build Tibati into an emirate on the model of Yola and to free themselves from Yola - with whom relations were often shaky." [47] Yola is the capital of Adamawa State in Nigeria and, prior to German colonisation in Cameroon, was the centre of a large Muslim emirate whose influence and borders extended into the present-day Cameroonian city of Tibati. Regarding the extent of the Laamios' power, Morgen wrote:

"At the side of it rose the large, spacious reception hall. In front of it there were probably fifty rulers with their retinues, who came here to give their reports to the king, to ask him his wish and his opinion, but also only to offer him their morning greeting: 'Allah sabenani', i.e. 'the Lord protect you'." [48]

In Morgen's chapter on Tibati, the description of weapons occupies a large space. He assigns the sword as a weapon to a class of people close to the Laamio. With regard to the cavalry, he writes: "All horsemen were armed with a long lance ('Labu'), only a small number also carried broad swords over [p.166] the shoulder." [49] (Fig. 1) There are about 120 of these weapons in the museums in Berlin, Bremen, Dresden, Leipzig, Mannheim, Munich, Oldenburg and Stuttgart, a large number of which have never been exhibited.

Objects of power in Cameroon, museum objects in Germany

Thrones, fragments of palace buildings, swords as well as drums have entered the ethnological collections in Berlin, Stuttgart, Leipzig, Munich, Dresden, Mannheim, Oldenburg and Bremen as war booty. An object from Cameroon is only an object of power if it is used in its context. When the craftsmen made it, the laamio and his servants determined the specific context of use. The invisible (prayers and rituals) and the visible (use) formed the context of the sword in Tibati in the environment of continuous wars. The initiation through rituals, its use and war are interdependent, together forming what constitutes the object of power. But what happens to such an object when it is transferred to a collection? It is removed from a found order, which is thereby changed, and inserted into a new context. [50] The sword from Tibati was accepted by the Linden Museum in Stuttgart in 1901. The

weapon, which had been an object of power in Tibati, changed its status, becoming a museum object. "An ethnological object thus passes through many orders, and in the process becomes a multi-layered bearer of meaning." [51]

In Bremen, the sword and other weapons of resistance against the Germans in Cameroon are on display. They thus enter a "place of showing". Gaëlle Beaujean-Baltzer sums up their significance from the perspective of the colonial stakeholders with the example of the royal statues and thrones from Abomey (today in the Republic of Benin) brought to Paris:

"The gift and arrival of these sculptures in the public [museums] express first of all the expansion of the [German] territory and the victory over an elaborate political structure. However, the works are not only proof of a military success. Their novel, even exotic iconography and monumentality provide material evidence of [Germany's] colonial domination of [Cameroon]." [52]

Quickly, however, the objects gain another dimension of meaning in their new environment, which increasingly pushes their ideological perception as trophies into the background. For as much as the work of the ethnographic museums was favoured by colonial policy, they saw themselves as scientific institutions. Their establishment was closely linked to the development of historically oriented cultural studies, which used material culture as a source for researching [p.167] societies without writing. [53] Ethnographic museums, according to Christine Stelzig, "were the answer to the influx of new information about the abundance and diversity of human cultures." [54] Like all other cultural objects from Cameroon, the objects of power became objects of research in ethnology. Scientific investigation placed them in the status of things.

The debates about the acquisition context of Cameroonian artefacts in German museums have been going on since Cameroon's independence and have also gained public presence in recent years. For example, there is a dispute over the Mandu Yenu. [55] The unresolved key question is: gift or loot? [S.168] The first demands for restitution in the early 1980s came from Douala and the Nso people from near Bamenda. They claimed the Tangué → Pictorial Book LIV, a ship's beak, and the statue of the mother deity Ngonnso → Pictorial Book III, who founded the Bango kingdom. The figure is also a memorial throne. [56] The tangué, like all elaborately and artistically carved prows of racing or war canoes in the region, is a carrier of messages and, above all, of power. [57] Tangués represent a community and can serve to atone or intimidate.

Negotiations were and still are tough, although in the case of Ngonnsos, an agreement on repatriation has since been reached. Recent visits by kings from Cameroon also clearly show that they have by no means forgotten the symbols of power of their respective kingdoms. [58] A Bangwa royal delegation seeking the return of a sacred wooden figure was received at the Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum in Cologne in July 2022. [59] Shortly afterwards, in November, the King of Nso, the kingdom from which Ngonnso originates, was in Berlin on a working visit to the Humboldt Forum and the Cameroonian Embassy. [60] Similar to the developments around Ngonnso, the visit of the delegation from Tibati to Bremen in October received strong media attention, especially in the German regional press. [61] In Tibati itself, the meaning of the sword has also changed: "Since the time of wars is over, people no longer use the sword as they used to. Nevertheless, it has remained a sign of highness in the royal court of Tibati." [62] The manufacture of swords in Tibati continues. But the lamidate itself and its context have also changed considerably. The borders with Yola or relations with other lamidates and chiefdoms (kingdoms) have changed. Since the creation of the modern state of Cameroon, which now exercises central power, Tibati is no longer an independent lamidate but part of a republic. This fact affects Tibati's relations with the other chiefdoms. "Nowadays, the sword is a prestigious commodity" [63] and "war is no longer the best means to solve problems with its neighbouring countries." [64]

The Tibati sword is receiving more attention these days and is gaining in importance, perhaps even power. An expression of this is that the Vute-Adamaua Expedition's convolute is at the centre of a restitution discussion between the Laamio Tibati and the Übersee-Museum Bremen. The debate itself is not new, as Europe was already "discussing the restitution of colonial museum holdings to Africa 40 years ago [...]. The talks came to nothing." [65] But this debate is new in Tibati. The visit of His Majesty Elhadj Hamidou Mohaman Bello and Prince Mohamadou Abdala to the Overseas Museum from 23 to 28 October 2022 is a sign that the sword and other weapons or armour have not been forgotten.

[p.169] In Cameroon, as in Germany, it plays a political role in bilateral relations today.

Objects of power of Cameroon in Germany bear traces of a long history of colonial violence and of a struggle against local powers in different territories. As symbols of a subjugated power in the colony, they first appear as spoils of war and emblems of the victory of colonialism. Their presence in ethnological museums pushes this status into the background, without, however, being able to erase it completely. When they are exhibited, they become so-called ethnografica and sometimes curiosities. After 130 years as museum objects in various museums, power objects like the sword enter a new phase in which they regain power and attention. This power is of a different kind. It owes itself to the presence it has gained through the restitution debate.

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

Parts of living people as museum objects. The appropriation of hair in a colonial context

Richard Tsogang Fossi

In addition to so-called ethnografica, zoologica and mineralogica, anthropologica, especially human remains, are at the centre of current debates about collections from Cameroon. Skeletons of deceased people, individual bones, skulls, jaws, skin or preparations made from bone parts are still stored today in various scientific institutions of the former colonial power Germany. [1] Some research projects have been launched to investigate their exact origin and prepare their return to Cameroon. [2] In addition, there are also remains from living people, such as hair, whose appropriation and storage in museum depots raises its own legal and ethical questions. [3] This starts with terms and categorisations. There is no doubt that these are body parts. But can we speak of "remains" even though they have been taken from living people? Is this even conceivable without the use of coercion and violence? Why and under what specific circumstances did hair come into the possession of the Germans? And what significance did it have for local societies in the colonies before they were given object status in the course of the transfer to the metropolis?

With these guiding questions in mind, this chapter focuses on collections that not only elude the usual categories, but have also hardly been researched in the context of German-Cameroonian history. Yet there is ample evidence that the "exotic" hairstyles fascinated travellers, colonial officers and missionaries. In memoirs and in colonial travel and expedition literature, detailed descriptions of hairstyles have survived, admittedly in the clichéd, racist diction typical of the time. For example, the first interim governor of Cameroon, Max Buchner → Bio, 375 (1846-1921), already referred to the hairstyles of women in Douala:

"Only the hairstyle [...] requires a more precise description. That the shaping of various mounds is so coquettishly asymmetrical in snail and meandering tours over the narrow elongated head, as the Cameroon women know how to do, surpasses everything I know in this way." [4]

[The long-serving Pallottine missionary in Cameroon, Father Hermann Skolaster (1877-1968), was also impressed by the "artistry and pleasingness" of the hair. In his opinion, they sometimes even surpassed those of the Europeans. [5] On the other hand, as Karl Hörhold noted during an expedition to the interior of the country commissioned by the German Foreign Office, the "head adornment" gave the men of the Vute a "wild warrior-like appearance". [6] The "head adornment" of the Vute gave the men of the Vute a "wild warrior-like appearance".

From a European perspective, the unusual bonnet-, hat- and helmet-like hair of the Vute, Ngumba, Buli/Bulu, Ntum/Ntumu, Nsimu, Bamum or Duala inspired amateur researchers and ethnologists to undertake research trips in the various regions of occupied Cameroon. [7] Günter Tessmann (1884-1969), for example, reported in detail on the elaborate helmet hairstyles of the Ntumu. He sought to meticulously record their style and the materials used - buttons, cowries, beads and brass nails. [8] He even described the richly decorated hairstyles of the Pangwe, which were Tessmann's real interest, as one of the main characteristics of this population group.

[p.175] While the "exotic" appearance of the hair and its locally specific forms were highly popular in the popular and (pseudo-)scientific literature of the empire when it reached its peak as a European colonial power, countless hairdos, detached from the bodies of their wearers, had long since made the journey from Cameroon to the "mother country", where they were in demand as collection objects in museums.

Terminological misleading

If one consults the inventory lists of ethnological and natural history museums, in which the severed hair was documented with the help of neutral terms in the sense of the Western order of knowledge, they cannot even be identified as a group of objects, however, because a wide variety of terms were

used for them. They are, for example, "headgear", "headdress", "helmet" or "headdress".

A simple search under the search term "Kopfbedeckung" in the list of the Ethnological Museum in Berlin (EM Berlin) yields 46 hits, in the list of the Museum am Rothenbaum - Kulturen und Künste der Welt in Hamburg (MARKK) four and in that of the Linden Museum Stuttgart 13. [9] The Stuttgart list has only one entry for a "helmet" under the name of Hans Ziemann → Bio, 439 (1865-1939), who was stationed in Cameroon as a government doctor and chief of staff from 1899 to 1912. [10] "Headdress", on the other hand, occurs more frequently, for example in the inventories from Munich, Cologne or Nuremberg. If one takes a closer look at the material details, in most cases one comes across human hair interwoven with cowries and glass beads, as in the case of the acquisitions of Jakob Keller → Bio, 394 (1862-1947), the Basel missionary in Cameroon for many years, and the dealer Zipplius in the list from Nuremberg. [11] In the entries for 'headgear' and 'headdresses', which the colonial officer Oscar Foerster (1871-1910) gave to the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde, beads, leather, cowries and brass nails are listed, but only occasionally human hair. [12] Under another widely used term, "hair ornaments", the material is clearly described as "human hair with cowries". [13] The "helmet" acquired by Oberstabsveterinär Jäger of the Munich Museum Fünf Kontinente is reported to consist of "plant fibre; cowries; beads; upholsterer's nails; shirt buttons", while human hair is not mentioned. [14] Nevertheless, the shape and name correspond almost entirely to those of Hans Ziemann's object. Further examples that reveal how unsystematic, even misleading, the terminology in the museums' inventories was could be found. Sometimes the terms refer to a similar object, namely hair with real hair, but sometimes to "caps" or caps or certain helmets and bonnets made of feathers or raffia, which, depending on the society of origin, were used for example in war, [p.176] racing and fishing, or served to protect the head against the burning sun. [Euphemistic expressions such as "jewellery" in "headdress" or "hair ornaments" give the impression that they were harmless, ornamental accessories. The fact that there is actually human material behind it is lost.

What has also been lost in the process of classification according to the Western-European model is the knowledge of the former functions that hair had in their original societies. These cannot be exhaustively described here. But a few hints suffice to realise that the removal of hair must have been perceived as brutal, even identity-destroying. For they did not only serve the purpose of beautification. Rather, depending on the customs of the respective societies, they were assigned a supernatural or shamanic dimension, comparable to sacred art that had a special decoration. [16] In the family circle, hair were used to preserve the memory of ancestors, for example among the Ekoi; in conflict situations, they were used to acquire the power of an enemy. The body or parts of the body such as hair or tattoos were perceived as media. [17] Thus, in the western region of Cameroon, it is still customary today for people who possess the oracular gift to wear long hairstyles decorated with kauris, which are temporarily anointed with a red tree powder. [18] This is done for the duration of the initiation. Only after a certain time and some rites may these hairs be cut off [p.177] by competent persons, while others retain them for life. In Batoufam and other neighbouring societies, initiates are given the name "Soufo" - friend of the king. An alternative name is "Kamsi" - God's dignitaries - because they see what the common man does not see and can predict events. Indeed, in the local view, rulers are not ordinary people. The initiation rites at their accession to the throne have the function of "awakening" their supernatural dimension. This enables the chief to enter into communication with the ancestors who assist him in the administration of the community. In addition, economic and social aspects should not be neglected. In the southern part of the colony at that time, hair were a precious commodity for their owners. The buttons, glass beads and cowries were obtained by the local people as funds through the sale of their land products to the European occupants or foreign visitors. Hair can thus be seen as a kind of purse, if not living treasury, which at the same time made them status symbols. Hair, or rather the cutting of hair, could also be used as a means of chastisement, humiliation or triumph. Fallen opponents, for example, had their mop of hair taken as a trophy. [19] In view of the ambivalent symbolic power of hair, its appropriation and removal by representatives of the colonial regime can only be interpreted as violent encroachments endured by force.

Contexts of withdrawal and provenance

This can be vividly demonstrated by the examples of Ziemann and Foerster, who, as mentioned, contributed to the accumulation of hair in German museums. First to Ziemann, who as a doctor held leading positions in the administration and the military apparatus in Cameroon for years. In

the Linden Museum alone, his name can be found in inventory entries for 26 numbers, which, according to inventory terminology, include an "idol", "male sculptures", a bottle for poison, hunting bags, a "palaver chair" and a ship's beak of the Duala, a crossbow, a dance mask etc. [20] According to the list, the hair costume probably comes from Kribi (Oli locality) and was appropriated by Ziemann in 1904. In that year he undertook one of his trips to Kribi, which served, among other things, to "collect material for animal examinations". [21] This is what we read in the diary of his sister Grete Ziemann, who accompanied him. Her notes also provide information about how unscrupulously Ziemann appropriated the hair of two members of the Fang. In order to give as accurate an impression as possible, the passages in question are quoted here in greater detail, even though this reproduces the historical language that violates human dignity:

[p.178] "Occasionally on a visit we saw a fan-warrior and a fan-woman locked up ourselves. So these were not painted [!] and trained man-eaters. The woman's headdress was so original that Hans had it cut off with scissors with her permission. The hair was all so tightly intertwined and matted with each other by art and nature that the whole hairstyle was completely preserved. It will again form a contribution to our ethnographic collection, glued on about half a coconut shell. The black, frizzy hair was braided from front to back in innumerable, thin plaits, encircling the head in front like a diadem. [22] The man's ornamentation was similar, except that here the hair ended at the back in a number of long, hanging, narrow plaits into which glass beads were woven. [...] The procedure of cutting the hair was endured by the woman of medium height, without making a face, after she had been promised some tobacco leaves." [23]

Against the background of the power relations prevailing around 1900, it can certainly be assumed that the siblings were accompanied not only by porters, but also by representatives of the German military or police apparatus. Since the diary is a typical example of the colonial archive, which is characterised by missing parts, it is neither possible to clarify who managed the cutting of the hair on behalf of Hans Ziemann → Bio, 439 nor where or why the couple, whose identity likewise remains unknown, were held captive. However, it was common practice to imprison and beat up the local population in order to collect supposed debts. [24] Excesses of violence were not uncommon, as the local administrative officials and military saw themselves as the untouchable representatives of a "white master race" whose "prestige" and power always had to be demonstrated to the oppressed blacks. [25] So it sounds paradoxical when Grete Ziemann says that her brother specifically asked for the prisoners' consent before he had her shorn, even though she was considered a lowly person according to the prevailing ideology. In her diary, the sister undoubtedly wanted to put her brother in a good light. If the woman had actually consented, this would again be explained by the hope of regaining her freedom. In the same style, Grete Ziemann disparaged the man whose hair was also shorn and taken away. Even more, she attributed deceit to him, reported accusations of theft against him and stylised him as a cannibal: [26]

"The fan warrior was slim and not overly powerfully built, his facial expression dopey. However, you could tell from occasional brief, lurking sideways glances that there was some pretence involved. Soon he began to shake all over, just to, as our companions agreed, arouse our pity. Yes, he was downright ridiculous to look at with his artificially broken posture and his arms still hanging limply in front. But all this did not prevent him from being one of the most dangerous Hallunks [!] there could be. With him, as with all these six-foot-tall, almost completely unclothed and very tattooed Mpangwes, the incisors were filed to a point, which really gave the mouth [p.179] something indescribably wild and predatory. As he had already paid the factories a very unpleasant visit several times because of his lust for other people's property, it was a good thing that he was kept tightly locked up in leg irons. I can think of more pleasant fates than being reduced to a "roast beef" to satisfy the appetite of a cannibal's stomach. When a photographic apparatus was placed in front of him, one could see a deadly fear rising in his face, which he tried in vain to suppress. Surely he believed that in the next moment the supposed gun would send his black soul to n*heaven. When, after minutes of anxious suspense, this did not occur, the old stupid and dull expression soon returned." [27]

The man's behaviour in front of the camera, as described by Ziemann, makes it clear that he had been photographed without his consent, which corresponded to common anthropological practice both in the colonies and in the metropolis - for example on the occasion of ethnological shows. [28] However, it is also clear that the author consciously used the racialising rhetoric of the time, including all the available clichés of the wild, dull-witted man-eater, to justify her own actions and those of the German colonisers in general. [29] In this way, the coveted hairdos of the natives could be stolen with a clear conscience.

What about the headdresses that came to Germany via Foerster? During the South Cameroon border expeditions carried out between October 1901 and the end of 1902 as well as in 1904/05, which served to demarcate the borders between the French and German-occupied territories and of which Foerster was first a member and later the leader, he had many favourable opportunities to steal cultural objects. [30] Apart from ethnographic objects, he took human skulls and hair from the Ntumu - not without great difficulty [31] - which he delivered to the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin. [32] The latter are the subject of eight entries in which the terms "headdress" (for women) and "headgear" (for the "chief") are used, all from the Nsimu area. [33] The materials given are leather, beads and cowries. [34] However, a closer look at the objects reveals that they are also made of human hair. As mentioned, braided, ornamented headdresses also had an important function in the southern part of the colony as war ornaments, symbols of power and status, which the owners did not voluntarily discard. [35] This was already evident in the example of Ziemann and the imprisoned Ntumu couple. This is emphatically confirmed in an article in the Official Reports from the Royal Art Collections from 1906 on Foerster's so-called acquisitions, which also goes into more detail about the process of shearing than Ziemann did in her diary:

[From Southern Cameroon, Captain Foerster has made a large collection, among which a number of very difficult-to-obtain hair styles of the Ntumu are particularly noteworthy. They are used to mat the living hair into large, very bizarre structures and to decorate them with cowries, European buttons, [36] nails, etc. Captain Foerster succeeded in cutting several such hair so close to the scalp that they could be transported like ready-made wigs and placed here on lifelike painted plaster heads." [37]

As is emphasised, cutting required a high degree of attention and precision, which suggests that injuries could occur during the removal of hair. Instead of the "coconut shells" used by Ziemann for the presentation, the article refers to "plaster heads" that were "painted true to life", which opens up another variant of curatorial practice at the time. Above all, however, it is important to emphasise that the official organ of the Berlin museums speaks of "living hair", although the inventory - like the entire process of museumisation - had led to nothing other than their reification. The question remains, however, how these hairstyles, severed from the living body, are to be regarded today. As human remains, as dead material of long-dead persons? Who gets to decide that? Last but not least, the colonial treatment of the hairstyles, shown in the examples of Foerster and Ziemann, opens the door to a much larger subject area: the trade and money-making with human parts in the colonial era, which has hardly been systematically studied so far.

The "first German elephant". A Cameroonian elephant on order

LINDIWE BREUER

In the issue of the *Deutsche Kolonialblatt* of 1 September 1899, there is an inconspicuous announcement that Hans Dominik → [Bio, 380](#) (1870-1910), officer of the "Schutztruppe" for the German colony of Cameroon, had "arrived in Germany for home leave". [1] What the readers do not learn is that the *Eduard Bohlen*, a ship of the *Woermann Line*, [2] also brought a live cargo from Cameroon: a young elephant. *Ludwig Heck* (1860-1951), then director of the Berlin Zoological Garden, [4] had wanted this elephant, or rather the "first young German elephant" [3], as an exhibition specimen for the zoo. This young animal was also later to be used to describe the species of African forest elephant (*Loxondota cyclotis*) by *Paul Matschie* (1861-1926), curator of the mammal collection in the *Museum für Naturkunde in Berlin* [5]. Dominik complied with Heck's order and arrived in Hamburg on 27 August 1899 with the longed-for elephant as a gift for the zoo. [6]

Dominik's years of service as a member of the military and administration in the German colony of Cameroon did not only benefit the zoo director. Today, there are 1034 inventory numbers in the German ethnological museums whose arrival can be traced back to Dominik's stays in Cameroon. The majority is distributed among three German museums: the *Linden Museum in Stuttgart* (802), the *Museum am Rothenbaum - Kulturen und Künste der Welt (MARKK) in Hamburg* (112) and the *Ethnological Museum in the Humboldt Forum in Berlin* (110). [7] But the traces of colonial appropriation, absorption and extraction lead beyond the borders of the German ethnological museums. The shipments of other animals to Germany, for example, can be linked to Dominik's name just as much as those of human skulls. [8]

Like Dominik, other stakeholders in the military also ensured that various scientific collections expanded. But even at the German Colonial Hunting Exhibition, the separation of disciplines was not taken too seriously. In 1903, hunting weapons and everyday objects belonging to people from the German colonies, including Cameroon, were presented alongside captured animals. [9] The names of the officers stationed in Cameroon, *Oltwig von Kamptz* [p.186] (1857-1921) [10] or *Leonhard von Chamier-Glisczinski* (1870-1952) [11], for example, appear in the corresponding catalogue. Kamptz can be linked to 428, Chamier-Glisczinski to ten inventory numbers in German ethnological museums. Other officers of the so-called *Schutztruppe* for the colony of Cameroon who left ethnographic goods as well as animal remains to German museums are *Curt Morgen* (1858-1928, 350 inv. no.) and *Karl Adametz* (b. 1877, 135 inv. no.) [12] The name of the colonial official and plantation owner *Georg Zenker* → [Bio, 437](#) (1855-1922) is also found in ethnological collections (with 621 inventory numbers) as well as in the collections of the *Museum für Naturkunde in Berlin*. [13] The *Deutsche Kolonialblatt* regularly reported on consignments for scientific purposes from the colony of Cameroon. [14] Reading the reports quickly confirms that the colonists working in Cameroon never limited themselves to a single scientific field.

Starting with the elephant mentioned at the beginning, whose skull is now stored in the depot of the *Museum of Natural History*, [15] this chapter is dedicated to the transdisciplinary "collecting" of the turn of the century, which was linked to widely ramified networks between colonial stakeholders and knowledge institutions. On the one hand, it takes a look at the respective personal and institutional interests, on the other at the meanings attributed to the elephant in changing contexts. How did it become a representative of an entire species? The article sheds light on the objectification that not only sacred entities endowed with power underwent in Germany, but also living wild animals.

Artificial nature

In October 1898, news of the captured elephant was received by Zoo Director Heck, as he himself writes. [16] We learn about the hunt near the administrative station "Yaoundé" from Officer Dominik → [Bio, 380](#). [17] Yaoundé is today the capital of Cameroon. At the time, Dominik was an officer in the "Schutztruppe" for the colony of Cameroon, but was repeatedly employed by the Foreign Office as station chief of the "Yaoundé" administrative station. As can be seen from numerous descriptions in his own publications, he hunted a wide variety of animals in Cameroon, many of them big game. [18] The

establishment of zoological gardens throughout Germany during the 19th century boosted the business with animals in the colonies. [19] As in the case of the elephant destined for Berlin, young animals in particular were hunted at the time, as they were not only easier to catch but also fetched a higher price. [20] For the officers, however, the decisive factor was less economic interests - they often gave away their live prey to the German zoos, such as Dominik the Cameroonian elephant - than prestigious honours. [21] For its part, the zoo became the [p.187] "multiplier of the colonial programme." [22] The book in which Dominik describes the hunt for this and other elephants can be understood both as colonial propaganda and as heroic self-dramatisation in a nationalist tone. Accordingly, many of the African people on whose labour and expertise he relied for the hunting of the Cameroonian elephant as well as for its transport remained nameless or barely mentioned in his descriptions. [23]

In an illustrated book published by Heck in 1899, the Cameroonian elephant is pictured next to a black keeper. Most of the animals in this volume are seen without keepers, others with keepers, some of which are discussed in the descriptions of the pictures. [24] However, not here. The keeper shown may be Mahama, who, as Dominik himself explains, travelled to Germany with the elephant. [25] Apart from Dominik's statements, no other sources can be found on this keeper. The description under the illustration begins Heck enthusiastically: "The best that the German colonies have delivered so far in our [p.188] 'Zoological'! How often have I had the word 'elephant' mentioned in conversation and correspondence with 'Africans' since I succeeded in gaining friendly acquaintance with these circles!" [26] Dominik → Bio, 380 is also mentioned. What is interesting about this is not only Heck's almost casual but at the same time boastful assertion that he maintained close contact with the colonists, or the suggestion that he was already able to exhibit many animals from the German colonies in the zoo. Particularly noteworthy is the designation of the Germans living in the colonies as "Africans", which can also be found in Heck's memoirs. [27] There, in his illustrated book as well as in Dominik's descriptions, the actual African people are almost made into phantoms and, despite their omnipresence, are rendered nameless and invisible, whereas the German, white stakeholders shine in the portrayal. The staging of the image is equally revealing: the black keeper stands in work clothes next to the elephant in the outdoor enclosure and puts his finger in the animal's mouth - a gesture of affection, familiarity and care. [28] A white visitor in Sunday best (whether staged or accidental remains unclear) has made it into the photo, observing the scene and leaning relaxed against the fence in front of the enclosure, smoking a pipe.

Thus, the imagery of this illustration expresses a form of racism [29] that found its cruel climax in the ethnological shows of zoos and animal parks, in which people and animals were exhibited side by side in supposedly authentic staging. The gaze emanates from the Germans, the object of observation are people and animals from the colonised and exoticised regions. [30] Such stagings reveal ideas of nature and culture of the time that were by no means free of contradictions: The zoo as a sphere of artificially created and controllable nature (the tamed animal in the enclosure), which was nevertheless supposed to appear authentic. [31] Animals were understood as representative exhibits of their species, people as representative of their ethnicity, [32] whereby African people were claimed to be particularly close to animals. [33] Although the organisers primarily wanted to earn money with the ethnological shows, they were also intended to make it possible to study people from a supposedly scientific point of view and to arouse interest in the colonisation project. [34] The display and staging of animals, which may seem harmless or apolitical at first glance, also expressed a racist world view influenced by colonial romantic ideas. However, it was not only the elephant that became an object in the sense of an exhibit. The people associated with the animals were equally objectified and became a projection surface for racist ideas of German zoo visitors.

[p.189] "[U]nser kleiner Kameruner": [35] Assimilating an elephant

Although elephants, presumably even from West Africa, had been on display in German zoos before, it seemed to be a special honour for Heck to be able to exhibit that very young animal from Cameroon in Berlin. [36] This is illustrated by an exchange with Heck about the elephant that Dominik recalled in 1911:

"For when, during my last holiday in Berlin, I told Director Heck [...] about my elephant hunts in Yaoundé, he had explained to me that the day on which I succeeded in delivering

the first young German elephant to the Zoological Garden would be a day of celebration for him and that I would be caught up with kettledrums and shawms." [37]

The idea of a "first elephant" in the sense of an elephant that was hunted for the first time within the German colonies and brought alive to Germany also drove other contemporaries. The wildlife photographer and hunter Carl Georg Schillings (1865-1921) [38], for example, admitted how much he would have liked to be the one to bring "the first East African elephant from German or English East Africa to Europe" [39] and looked enviously at the "Cameroonian" captured by Dominik. [40] The wildlife filmmaker Hans Schomburgk (1880-1967) [41], on the other hand, proudly described that through him "the first East African elephant had reached Europe" [42]. The elephant named Jumbo was given to Carl Hagenbeck's zoo in Stellingen (today a district of Hamburg). Schomburgk left unanswered why Heck seems to have had no interest in the animal.

Such colonial-romantic adventure narratives, in which life and work in the colony of Cameroon were portrayed as strenuous, sometimes even dangerous, but the protagonists staged themselves in a heroic manner as conquerors of all efforts, [44] were not rare. They were used to emphasise the necessity of the colonisation venture and the steps required to achieve it. The extensive descriptions of elephant hunting that were often included in the narratives were framed, among other things, by reflections on the use of African elephants as livestock, modelled on Indian elephants, as well as by reflections on the ivory trade, [45] which was an important source of income. [46] In Dominik's writing, the elephant immediately becomes a nationalist projection surface:

"I wonder if he [the elephant] sometimes thinks of his distant homeland? - I believe it! [...]
"It is German land and shall always become more German, a thousand ties bind it tightly to us," I thought as I stood at Arnim's open grave the day after my arrival. There they lowered him into it, who like many a brave man died for Greater Germany, for Cameroon!" [47]

[p.190] By means of such anthropomorphisms, the elephant in Dominik → Bio, 380 becomes a stylistic vehicle for the narrative of dutiful national heroes who were prepared to go to extremes for the supposedly necessary colonisation of the country.

In the desire for the "first German elephant" and in the zoo director's and hunters' constant reference to the German colonies, a claim to ownership of the living environment, in this case of an animal from Cameroon, is articulated that is nationalistically justified. Those elephants that had already been taken from Africa to Germany beforehand recede into the background, meaning that the situation and history of the area before colonisation had lost all meaning for the Germans. The talk of the "first German elephant" is to be understood as a reference to nationalist claims to power and as an attempt to consolidate them. The elephant was at the same time victim, witness as well as testimony to German violence and appropriation in the colony and, in the context of a colonial strategy of legitimation, fulfilled the function of an argument as well as a supposed proof of the economic and cultural benefits of an expansion of German territory. The extraction of Cameroon's natural environment is to be understood as part of the expansion and civilisation project of German colonialism, for which the acquisition and production of knowledge were necessary prerequisites for the strategic exercise of power. [Interestingly, the narrative around the elephant also circulated later in the zoological garden between projections about its supposed German-ness or foreignness. The constantly established connection with the Cameroonian elephant presumably represented an honour for the officer Dominik that was intended to distinguish him not only as a national hero of science, but certainly also as the brave conqueror of an animal to which greatness and strength were attributed.]

Loxondota cyclotis: entry into science

During the German colonial period, a wide variety of animals were brought from the colony of Cameroon to the Berlin Zoo and the Museum für Naturkunde. [49] A popular example of a zoo animal from Cameroon is the chimpanzee Missie, who was captured by the aforementioned plantation owner and colonial official Zenker → Bio, 437. [50] She is known for a photograph in which she is shown smoking a cigarette. [51] The sculptor Anton Puchegger also dedicated a statue to her in 1916/17, which is now in the Alte Nationalgalerie. [52] In this case, too, the traces of Cameroonian colonial history thus lead beyond the boundaries of a single institution.

In order to receive the animals in a usable condition for the museum, "Instructions for Collecting, Preserving and Packing Animals for the Zoological Collection of the Museum of Natural History in Berlin" was first published in 1896. [53] This procedure [p.191] was also common for ethnological objects. [54] Hunting, transport and captivity meant great hardship for the animals; many did not survive these journeys, others died already on site in the colonies or succumbed to the poor keeping conditions in the zoos. [55]

The young elephant was transported to Germany by the animal transport company of Carl Hagenbeck (1844-1913), [56] who, in addition to being an animal trader, was also the founder of the well-known Stellingen Zoo. [57] Arriving in Berlin, Heck informed Matschie of the arrival of the elephant, [58] which had to join the zoo curated by the director. As briefly discussed in connection with the Ethnological Shows, the enclosure was to express both authenticity in the sense of naturalness and scientific systematics. During Ludwig Heck's directorship (1888-1931) [59] various buildings were erected, for example the Elephant Gate, the Stilt Bird House or the Ostrich House, [60] which, according to Heck, were intended to fulfil not only an aesthetic but also an ethnographic-educational function. [61] Other zoo directors at the time also pursued this dual goal, of which Hagenbeck is another and prominent example. [62]

Education was a matter close to the heart of Heck, who had a doctorate in zoology, at least as he conveyed it in various places. [63] For him, this meant on the one hand "bringing together in the garden what belongs together by nature and system", [64] thus presenting animals of one species side by side - as in a museum exhibition of natural history. [65] This was intended to facilitate the study of similarities and differences between animals, both for those outside the field and for the specialist public, and to make the zoo a place of education. [66] The curator of the Natural History Museum Matschie, for example, was inspired in an article to make a comparison between the Cameroonian elephant, whose ear shape was striking, and a neighbouring elephant. [67] The zoo should not only be a place of amusement or a recreational oasis, but also part of the scientific landscape. Particularly "rare animals" [68] - and certainly the Cameroonian elephant represented one for him - should also find a place in the Berlin Zoological Garden. It may seem paradoxical, but the Berlin Zoo was at the same time intended to be, like other metropolitan zoos and animal parks, a place of "truly natural[ly] nature" [69]. However, this could also be understood as Heck's claim to depict the evolutionary order of the animal kingdom according to scientific standards. In this respect, the concept of nature taken as a basis here is to be understood both in the sense of the supposedly wild and of the evolutionary order. [70]

It was Matschie who described the species *Loxodonta cyclotis*/ round-eared elephant/ forest elephant on the basis of the Cameroonian elephant. The classification is found for the first time in the meeting report of the Gesellschaft Naturforschender Freunde zu Berlin of 16 October 1900, in which Dominik's name is also mentioned. [71] The classification is still [p.192] valid. [72] The description of the species by Matschie on the basis of the elephant did not only have the consequence that the elephant could be assigned in the taxonomic system and thus, in a certain way, only attained reality in the scientific-zoological order. It also meant the beginning of a gradual objectification in the sense of a scientific object, which later became an archival object and proof of the existence and naming of the subspecies. An elephant on which a new species was described and which was thus not only an elephant of this species, but the model (species type) for it, fitted perfectly into the director's ideas of the zoo as a place of scientific landscape. The financial value of the elephant for the zoo was accordingly high, amounting to 7,000 marks, at least in 1903. [73] The museum, in turn, not only benefited from the opportunity to study living animals through its relationship with the zoo, but also regularly received consignments of deceased animals, which became part of the museum's collection as objects for exhibition and research. [74]

Inanimate exhibition of live animals

After the death of the Cameroonian elephant in 1907, the Berlin Zoological Garden gave its skull to the Berlin Museum of Natural History, where it remains (Fig. 2). [75] It has become part of an inanimate collection that provides information about living animals outside or extinct animals. [76] A painted star reveals that it was the model for the taxonomic classification of the species of forest elephant. The skull also bears the inscription "*Loxodonta cyclotis* Mtsch" and "Area v. Yaoundé, Cameroon", and the Mars symbol indicates the sex of the elephant. The inventory number from the entry catalogue of the mammal department is also found on the skull. [77]

Natural history collections, beyond their educational function or scientific significance, can be understood as products of the objectification of formerly living animals. In the case of the elephant, it becomes clear that the biographies of objectified animals can provide information about the various contexts of meaning from which they originate. Likewise, they provide information about the different meanings attributed to them depending on the context. What an exhibition object is or means can thus not be said unequivocally, but is determined by the respective object biography. Or, to illustrate it again with the example of the Cameroon elephant: Depending on the specific context, the meaning it had for the stakeholders in their function as colonial officer, zoo director or museum curator is revealed. It also shows that the stakeholders of the "protection force" for Cameroon, the zoo and the natural history museum were dependent on cooperation [p.193]. In all these cases, the elephant from Cameroon was shaped into an object: an object of projection, contemplation and research. In Dominik's → Bio, 380 Narratives, this objectification takes place in the narrative instrumentalisation of the animal for his nationalist heroic epic. Heck's curious wish for a "German elephant" shows how strong the desire for the appropriation and exhibition of Cameroonian fauna was for the zoo and to what extent the elephant had to be both German and exotic in order to serve as an argument for colonisation. The systematic incorporation of the Cameroonian elephant into the zoo's collection and into science through Matschie's description of the species shows how the Cameroonian elephant was made useful by and for science. In all of this, the elephant was turned into living proof of the German colonisation project, into an argument made flesh for the German colonial fantasies of a supposedly exotic, foreign world to be cultivated.

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original.
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.197] [Benefit]

199 - **Unrecognisable.** Cultural Objects from Cameroon in German Image Production, 1905-1989 (Andrea Meyer)

229 - **In the Name of Science.** On the Research History of the Cameroon Holdings in Berlin in the 20th Century (Bénédicte Savoy)

265 - **Chaos in the Museum.** Taking stock and ordering knowledge (Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

Unrecognisable. Cultural objects from Cameroon in German image production, 1905-1989

ANDREA MEYER

"I went very extensively to the Ethnological Museum [sic!] to study the means of art of 'primitive peoples' [...]. I was finally left wondering and shaken by the carvings of the Cameroons, which are perhaps only surpassed by the sublime works of the Incas."^[1]

In January 1911, under the impression of his visit to the Berlin Ethnological Museum, Franz Marc (1880-1916) put into words his fascination for carvings from the Cameroon region in a letter to August Macke (1887-1914). Shortly afterwards, a reproduction of a Cameroonian wooden post, which the colonial officer Max von Stetten (1860-1925) had left to the Royal Ethnographic Collection in Munich in the 1890s, was included in Macke's contribution "Masken" (Masks) in the Almanach of the Blaue Reiter.^[2] The architectural element, decorated on both sides with faces and animals, had probably been photographed especially for the publication by Marc and Wassily Kandinsky (1866-1944) and, significantly, still bears the title "Blauer-Reiter-Pfosten" (Blue Rider Post) in the museum today.^[3] The highly abstracted masks were the inspiration for Macke's work.

The strongly abstracted figures with which Ernst Ludwig Kirchner (1880-1938) had already designed the title vignette and the initial of the Brücke manifesto cut in wood in 1906 were inspired by crouching carrier figures of decorative bowls from the Fungom region.^[4] Similar to the Blue Rider in Munich, Cameroonian objects thus played a less obvious but central role in the programmatic positioning of the Dresden artists' group away from the academic art establishment. The fact that Kirchner continued to carve furniture and other utilitarian objects in a style typical of the grasslands into the 1930s, after the bridge had broken up in 1913 and he had long since moved to Switzerland, was brought into focus by the exhibition Ernst Ludwig Kirchner and the Art of Cameroon in Zurich and Frankfurt in 2008. ^[5] One of the most striking consequences of the massive transfer of cultural objects from Cameroon to Germany, the examples referred to suggest, was the great resonance they had in artistic circles. The present article therefore sets itself the task of a more detailed exploration of the artistic reception of things **[p.200]** from the area that had been declared a German colony at the Berlin Africa Conference in 1884/85.

Cameroonian cultural heritage in the (post)colonial metropolis

Opportunities to encounter Cameroonian cultural heritage in Germany abounded: the trade in so-called curiosities and exotica had already picked up strongly with the world exhibitions established in the mid-19th century. Since the 1860s, ethnological museums had sprung up not only in Munich and Berlin, but also in other German cities such as Dresden, Cologne, Hamburg or Leipzig, whose collections expanded enormously with the rise of the Empire as a European colonial power. ^[6] The artists, who were networked with each other and often also began to furnish their studios with non-European objects, exchanged specific exhibits, as Marc's letter to Macke vividly demonstrates. Postcards and letters, for example, that Karl Schmidt-Rottluff (1884-1976) and Kirchner sent to Max Pechstein (1881-1955), Erich Heckel (1883-1970) and his partner Milda Frieda Georgi alias Sidi Riha (1881-1982) between 1909 and 1912 contained sketches of figures that supposedly came from Cameroon. ^[7] It has since been shown that the originals were wooden sculptures from what is now the Democratic Republic of Congo, Bénin or Nigeria. ^[8] However, erroneous attributions that circulated in ethnological collections around 1900 and were adopted unchecked initially reinforced the impression that the Expressionists had developed a preference for cultural objects from this region of Central Africa.^[9] More recent research is divided on this.^[10]

What is beyond doubt, however, is the artists' eclectic approach to non-European cultural artefacts par excellence. The comparison Marc made between Cameroonian and pre-Columbian exhibits before the outbreak of the First World War is unmistakable. Combined with an anti-bourgeois lifestyle, participants of the Brücke and the Blaue Reiter drew on the material culture of supposed "primitive peoples" to

throw formal conventions overboard and reinvent European or German art. Their Western white gaze was primarily directed at the aesthetics of the insignia of power, ritual and everyday objects, while they were hardly interested in the functions these had in their originating societies. [11] Moreover, because the artefacts were often taken over in fragments, in deliberately simple forms and in different media, combined with those from other historical and regional contexts and thus placed in new contexts of meaning, the colonial structures shaped by [p.201] violence, which were the prerequisite for their transfer to the metropolis and their reception there. [12] "Primitivism", as Hans Belting observed in the mid-1990s in the context of an art history increasingly opening up to cultural studies, postcolonial theories, "was a strategy of classical modernism in which only its imperial claim to take possession of all other cultures was expressed". [13] In contrast, Frank Ugiomoh recently attests to the Expressionists' willingness to expose themselves to the "fertility of the unexpected" by interpreting the diasporic dissemination of African artworks, which continues to this day, as an "act of recognition". [14] Whether one agrees with Ugiomoh or with Belting, it is clear that colonialism provided the socio-political and ideological framework for the intellectual-artistic appropriation of objects from overseas within the borders of the German Empire.

It is primarily for this period that Expressionist research has largely opened up the Cameroonian sources that representatives of the Brücke and the Blaue Reiter drew on in their works. [15] As a representative example of artistic practice at the turn of the century, we shall therefore focus on just one case study, the painting *Man, Woman and Cat* from 1912 by Emil Nolde (1867-1956, Fig. 1). The choice falls on Nolde's work because it shows a figure of a particularly prestigious ruling symbol from Cameroon, the throne called *Mandu Yenu* by Fon Njoya → [Bio, 417](#) (1873-1933) from Fouban → [Bildheft XLVIII](#). Between 1892 and his death in exile in 1933, he ruled over Bamum, one of the largest kingdoms in the Grasslands. [16] The two-piece throne of solid wood, set with pearls and cowries and flanked at the back by two twin figures, originally belonged to his father Nsa'ngu. It has been in the collection of the Ethnological Museum Berlin since 1908 and is on display at its new location in the Humboldt Forum, which opens in autumn 2021. In contrast to Ngonnso → [Pictorial Book III](#), the founding queen of the Nso, who can also be found there in the form of a bowl bearer, or the *Tangué* → [Pictorial Book LIV](#) (*Ship's Beak*) by Kum'a Mbape (1846-1916) from the Museum Fünf Kontinente in Munich, no restitution claims have yet been made for Njoya's throne. [17] However, the description of the throne as a "gift" from the king is controversial in the current discourse on dubious provenances, as it refers to the local tradition of exchanging gifts to strengthen social relations, while the unequal power structure and the pressure exerted on Njoya by the German colonial rulers are ignored. [18] Nolde's painting or its reproduction is almost omnipresent in relevant studies and exhibitions on Expressionism or so-called Primitivism. [19] Hardly ever, however, is there any mention in this context of the biography of the throne, its media distribution and museum staging. [20] Taking into account current research in [p.202] ethnology, museum studies and African art history, it is therefore necessary to study the adaptation and transformation processes controlled by the artist's hand as well as their effects in a more differentiated way in Nolde's work.

The significance of Cameroon's cultural assets in the German art world after the defeat of the empire in the First World War and the end of formal colonial rule is virtually unexplored. Did they remain of interest to first-generation Expressionists despite the political and social upheavals, as could be ascertained for Kirchner until his suicide in 1938? What effects did National Socialism, the Second World War and the division of Germany have on the late work of the Brücke artists who survived Kirchner? Did a renaissance of "primitivist" painting occur during the Cold War, or did it lose all relevance under the auspices of the supposed awakening in West and East? And what about the ethnological museums? Were they able to hold their own as "workshops" for artists seeking access to world cultures under the difficult conditions of the post-war years? [21] The first answers to these questions will be sought on the basis of Schmidt-Rottluff's still lifes as well as works by Fritz Winkler (1894-1964) and Paul Wilhelm (1886-1965), who, like the Brücke members, began their artistic careers in Dresden shortly after 1900 and continued to be active there - in contrast to their more renowned artist colleagues - in the Soviet Occupation Zone (SBZ) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR). In the 1950s and 1960s, they chose masks from Bali and Njoya's → [Bio, 417](#) Throne as the motif source for two watercolours, which are printed here in colour for the first time (Figs. 2 and 3). [22] Their example can be used to draw attention to long-forgotten traces that Cameroonian cultural property left behind in the German-German pictorial household after 1945.

[Lost in the Museum. Nolde and the Throne

Emil Nolde spent the winter months of 1910/11 and 1911/12 in Berlin and repeatedly visited the Ethnological Museum on Königgrätzer Straße - he might have met Marc on one of his forays through the various departments. On site, Nolde made over 120 drawings of exhibits from Africa, Asia, the Pacific region and Central America, which, beyond their origin, also differed in terms of age, size and the material used. [23] The artist drew on these studies, which in turn ranged from simple pencil sketches made as if by a child's hand to sheets with coloured figures and masks executed in crayon or chalk, for a series of almost 30 painted still lifes on which he worked until 1913. Despite the change of medium, the motifs that Nolde transferred to canvas can usually be effortlessly traced back to their original, as the comparison between the study (Fig. 4) and the painting, each with one of the two life-size twin figures of Njoya's throne, shows. Nolde made only slight changes: He turned the kneeling figure into a full figure whose upper part of the body is no longer rendered in three-quarter but in strict profile view. In contrast, he retained her arrangement in the right half of the picture and the vertical format.

Reference has already been made to the chaotic conditions that accompanied Nolde's stays in the museum. [24] In rooms that lacked exhibition space since the opening of the representative building designed by Hermann Ende in 1886, the virtually exploding collections piled up in, in front of and even on top of the almost ceiling-high glass display cases. [25] Two rooms on the first floor were originally planned for the Africa Department, the management of which passed from Felix von Luschan (1854-1924) to the curator Bernhard Ankermann → Bio, 370 (1849-1943) at the beginning of 1911. De facto, it began to expand at the turn of the century to include further halls on this and the third floor; in addition, the gallery of the atrium was used for the display of large-format artefacts. [26] Of the nearly 49,000 objects that made up the department's holdings, more than half were in storage, but there were still about 23,000 exhibits on display. [27] However, it was not only cramped. Rather, it was also not possible to maintain the geographical arrangement of the collections that had once been envisaged, which left the lay public in particular disoriented. [28] In view of the drastic problems, Ankermann pushed ahead with the plans for an extension already demanded by Luschan and proposed the division into a display and a study collection. The outbreak of the First World War, however, prevented the realisation of any changes for the time being. It is obvious that the cramped, overcrowded rooms did not remain without influence on Nolde's work process. He himself commented on the situation in contradictory terms: on the one hand, he went there "often and gladly", [p.204] on the other hand, he condemned the "overcrowding": "I am not a friend of these gatherings that kill through the masses." [29] Nolde's statement is characteristic of the way avant-garde artistic circles viewed the institution of the museum. Whether it was Kandinsky or the Futurist Filippo Tommaso Marinetti (1876-1944), they too complained about the detachment of the collection pieces from their historically grown contexts and the arbitrary arrangement in the museums, which they equated with junk rooms and cemeteries in the tradition of anti-scientific cultural criticism. [30] However, no anti-colonial stance can be derived from their critique, for example against the appropriation of cultural objects under the conditions of asymmetrical power relations or their objectification, which was carried out via museological-scientific practices such as cleaning, surveying, inventorying or classifying. [31]

Cameroon was, as the museum guide of 1911 put it in the typical language of the time, "extraordinarily richly represented in the collections". [32] Between 1884 and 1916, during the years of German colonial rule, the museum in the imperial capital recorded around 5,800 object acquisitions from the occupied territory. [33] The collecting expedition financed by the Prussian government, which Ankermann → Bio, 370 undertook to Cameroon from 1907 to 1909, alone brought the Africa Department into possession of almost 1700 ethnographica, photographs and phonographic recordings. [34] With the expedition, the grasslands became the area whose material culture was most comprehensively documented in the Africa Department.

Apart from Ankermann, the colonial officer Hans Glauning → Bio, 386 (1868-1908), who was stationed in Cameroon from 1901 until his death in 1908 and was in lively exchange with Luschan, contributed most to this. [35] Since Glauning was put in charge of the German government station in Bamenda and the company of the so-called "Schutztruppe" (protection force) based there in 1905, he played a key role in the military conquest of the highlands in the north-western area of the colony. He waged permanent war against recalcitrant populations in Bamenda and adjoining districts, which facilitated his access to cultural assets. Between 1901 and 1908, when he was shot during one of his campaigns of war and loot, Glauning's submissions from the grasslands added nearly 740 inventory numbers to the Völkerkundemuseum in Berlin. [36] Among the wood carvings he sent to the museum were large-

format door frames → [Bildheft XLV](#) and heavy drums → [Bildheft XVIII](#), which Luschan initially presented in special exhibitions at the neighbouring Museum of Decorative Arts in 1907 and 1908. [37] In an illustrated contribution for the *Amtliche Berichte aus den Königlichen Kunstsammlungen* published in May 1908, he discussed them in detail and announced a 'new and important gift' that was 'already on its way to Berlin', the 'alte[n] Thron' of Njoya's ancestors → [Bio, 417](#), one of the "most gifted and amiable chiefs in all of northwest Cameroon." [p.205] It was an "ethnographically and historically highly significant piece", Luschan continued, whose acquisition had come about thanks to the renewed mediation of the now deceased Glauning. [39]

Race for the Bamum power emblem

Richard Tsogang Fossi has already mentioned in his overview of the stakeholders of cultural property pawning that a race for the emblem of power had broken out among German museums since the magazine *Globus* had printed a photograph by the former colonial officer and amateur photographer Hans von Ramsay (1862-1938) with Njoya on the throne in front of his palace in Foumban - admittedly in reverse - in 1905. [40] Luschan wanted to win this competition by all means and turned to Glauning, who was supposed to convince the king to give the throne to the Berlin Museum. This was because Njoya maintained strategically close diplomatic and political relations with representatives of the German colonial power, including Glauning, in order to secure his own position of power as unrestrictedly as possible, although Bamum had been under German administration since 1902. He even joined a campaign by the captain and his troops in the spring of 1906, as it was directed against the hostile Nso who had beheaded his father in battle in the mid-1880s. After a peace agreement imposed on the Nso by the Germans, colonial officer Karl von Wenckstern (1878-1968) gave Njoya the head of Nsa'ngu. The reunification of head and body allowed for a funeral that conformed to the specifications of a royal funeral ceremony and made Njoya the legitimate heir to the throne. [41] The Fon thanked Glauning with a prestigious pipe. [42] Even after the captain's death, he had a male, pearl-embroidered figure → [Pictorial Booklet XLI](#) conveyed for his grave or to his surviving relatives. [43] As Christine Stelzig impressively demonstrated by analysing the correspondence between the officer and Luschan, Glauning, in consultation with the Berlin custodian, had pulled out all the stops to change Njoya's mind, who was initially by no means willing to give up the throne. [44] Luschan had been prepared to pay up to 1000 marks so that Glauning could purchase the throne chair. Should this not be possible, he was interested in a copy, for the production of which he would supply pearls, if desired. Finally, Luschan proposed an exchange between the original throne and a "pompous-looking theatre throne", which he would have built in Berlin for this purpose. [45] Glauning's first attempt, which predated the repatriation of Nsa'ngu's head, was unsuccessful, although he promised Njoya the aforementioned sum of money and suggested that he could exchange a ruler's seat of equal [p.206] value from the emperor's possession for the throne. It was not until the second attempt in the following year, 1907, that Glauning → [Bio, 386](#) mentioned that the throne chair would be housed in the Ethnological Museum. He again left no doubt about the personal interest of Wilhelm II (1859-1941). He no longer held out the prospect of money for a copy, which Njoya → [Bio, 417](#) had in the meantime agreed to make. Because the new version was not ready in time for the emperor's birthday, the Bamum king set off with Nsa'ngu's throne, weighing about six hundredweight, accompanied by soldiers and at least 200 porters to Buea, the official residence of the governor Theodor Seitz (1863-1949), who had it conveyed to the Imperial Colonial Office via another official. [46]

Media presence of the throne

Once again, a photograph of the throne circulated in the metropolis before the courtly object of prestige had arrived there, let alone been on display in the Ethnological Museum. In the photograph, which the magazine *Kolonie und Heimat* printed in 1908, Njoya could be seen with an entourage. [47] In contrast to Ramsay's photograph, in which the king had presented himself in an opulent robe with a Hausa-style turban, he was now wearing a uniform made on his behalf and based on that of the German colonial troops. [48] As in the photo in the *Globe*, the throne was cut in the area of the footstool. It was extensively commented on in the text:

"The foot [sic!] of this throne consists of a carved step to which is attached a circular row of fetishes. On this step rise two beautifully carved leopards and several serpents, which

support the chair, richly adorned with cushions and provided with a large [sic!] back of two idols almost the size of a man [sic!]." [49]

Although the author may have only seen the photograph, which in fact hardly shows that the cylindrical armchair and the footstool represent two separate parts, it remains puzzling why he mistook the two rifle-carrying warriors for leopards and made out cushions on the seat. Carelessness and misinterpretation in the encounter with regalia, whose symbolic content and aesthetics were unfamiliar, stand out here. They are typical of the way the throne was handled and over-formed its public perception.

Thrones in the manner of the Mandu Yenu embody the "essence of kingship and the worldview of the Bamum", as Christraud M. Geary has pointed out. [50] Typically, they were reserved for kings who sat on them at audiences, ceremonies and festivals. [51] The fact that Njoya had used his father's throne for years was by no means unusual, especially as the manufacturing process was lengthy and the material precious. For example, the wood from which the commissioned artists carved the seat had to dry for one to two years before it was covered with cloth [p.207], which in turn was embroidered by other specialists with pearls imported from Europe and rare cowries from the Indian Ocean. All its elements, moreover, were committed to a fixed iconographic programme: The servants leaning on each other in the footstool, dismissed as "fetishes" in the jargon of the time in the magazine *Colony and Homeland*, stand for the court, while the two soldiers with rifles represent war as Bamum's productive force. The double-headed serpent, according to Sylvain Djache Nzefa, symbolises powerful, indomitable kingship, while the triangles, changing in colour, evoke a leopard's skin. [52] The life-size twins, equipped with belts, loincloths, bracelets and headdresses and thus marked as highly placed members of the court, were attributed supernatural powers in Bamum society. Only the king knew how to tame them. The pair thus emphasises his power rather than protecting him. The male twin raises his right hand to his chin, which can be interpreted as a gesture of respect. A drinking horn for palm wine clasped in his right hand and a bowl of kola nuts in the hands of the twin woman are signs of community and hospitality.

Although Luschan, Glauning and the commentators in the journals had little knowledge of such details, which are indispensable for unlocking the complex meaning of the throne, they were aware of its representative character in view of its impressive size, weight and elaborate [p.208] manner of making. [53] The photographs of the king on the Mandu Yenu in the *Globe* and in *Colony and Homeland* alone convey an idea of the central function that Njoya → Bio, 417 himself attached to the throne seat as a symbol of his rule. The photographs, as well as the 'gift' itself, nourished the German myth of the Bamum king as a civilised, 'noble savage'. In terms of colonial propaganda, this myth promoted the impression that Cameroon was a model colony of the empire, which in turn saw itself confirmed in its self-image as a successful colonial power. [54]

While the photographs at least showed a faint reflection of the courtly use of the throne, any reference to its original function was lost when it was placed in the Berlin collection. The very first colour illustration Luschan published of the throne vividly testifies to this (Fig. 5). Occupying a separate sheet, it accompanies his contribution of just under 40 pages, "Rassen und Völker" ("Races and Peoples"), for the first volume of Ullstein's *Weltgeschichte* of 1909. [55] With the multi-volume *Weltgeschichte*, for which, in addition to Luschan, respected scholars such as Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919) or Karl Lamprecht (1856-1915) were recruited, the still young Ullstein-Buchverlag established itself as one of the leading publishers in Germany. [56] A readership that, as in the case of the journals, extended far beyond the professional world, is therefore likely to have taken note of Luschan's article. The throne probably caught the reader's eye, as it was in fact the only item in the richly illustrated article that was printed in full-page colour. In contrast to the previous black-and-white photographs in the *Globe* and *Colony and Homeland*, the colour photograph of the royal seat, which is also presented in spatial depth for the first time due to the angle at which it is photographed, makes it possible to perceive the colour tone of the bead embroidery carried by various shades of blue, red, yellow, black and white. In addition to the brief caption, the white ground in particular turns the ruler's emblem into a mere museum object. Yes, its status as a masterpiece in front of a white wall seems anticipated.

Creating order - the museum staging of the 1920s

A photograph of the historical exhibition situation with the throne as Nolde experienced it does not (no longer) exist. [57] Nor was it presented at the special exhibitions that the Ethnological Museum held at

the Museum of Decorative Arts in 1910 and 1912. [58] Surprisingly, there are also no references to it or its installation in the museum guides. The guides published between 1908 and 1918 only provide information that larger architectural elements such as house pillars and door frames as well as the slit drums were exhibited on the gallery of the atrium or even free-standing in Room I of the Africa Department [p.209], while bead-embroidered individual figures or chairs, carved masks and beds from the grassland region were stored in cabinets. [59] The throne is not specifically mentioned until after the much-publicised reorganisation of the museum, which reopened during the more politically and economically stable phase of the Weimar Republic on 26 June 1926 - on the centenary of the birth of the museum's founder, Adolf Bastian (1826-1905). The Africa department had been transferred to the second floor and was now spread over more than 20 rooms. For the first time, the guide published in the same year provided information about the "Throne Chair of Njoia" adorned with "coloured pearls" and its presentation in room 11. [60] Some views of the rooms taken on the occasion of the extensive reforms have survived; one is printed in the 1926 and 1929 editions of the museum guide. [61] The photographs give a vivid impression of the airier arrangement of the display collection. [62] Instead of the dense rows of display cases that were common in the Empire, a few cabinets were set directly into colourfully structured walls. The spatial design and furnishings met the requirements of current museological standards, which emphasised clarity and transparency in order to provide the lay public with an aesthetic educational experience in the spirit of the new democratic government. Emphasising their artistic character, larger exhibits were presented on pedestals along the walls or free-standing in the room.

For the guide, the curator in charge of the department, Alfred Schachtzabel (1887-1981), Ankermann's successor → Bio, 370, had significantly chosen a photograph of Room 11 with Njoia's throne. It stood exactly in the centre of a niche on a specially installed, stair-like pedestal that allowed the cylindrical seat with the twin figures and the footstool to be presented at different levels. This allowed an unobstructed view of the double-headed snake supporting the seat. The fact that Njoia → Bio, 417 had placed the feet on the bench or also on the soldiers' rifles, on the other hand, was no longer obvious. In addition, the strictly symmetrical arrangement of carved throne stools, figures, top masks and one of the Bansa slit drums → illustrated booklet IV ensured that the Mandu Yenu stood out as the central object of the entire ensemble. [63] As much as the Prussian Ministry of Culture wanted to distance itself from the imperial museum policy of the Empire with the modernisation of the Ethnological Museum, the staging is ultimately based on a model that Wilhelm von Bode (1845-1929), now officially retired, had used when establishing the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, which opened in 1904. Even under Bode, similarly meticulously balanced object arrangements were intended to direct the public's gaze directly to the gallery's "masterpieces." [64]

[p.210] Nolde's radical counter-image before and after the political upheaval of 1918

In view of the sources available, we can only speculate whether the throne, like other monumental objects that came to the Berlin Ethnological Museum via Glauning's → Bio, 386 mediation, was presented in the winter months of 1911/12 on the gallery of the atrium or as a free-standing object in one of the rooms of the Africa Department on the first or third floor - the latter accommodating recent acquisitions. [65] That it could have stood out as the centrepiece of the Cameroon collection is questionable in view of the abundance of objects prevailing at the time. Whether Nolde was aware of the photographs in the illustrated journals and in Ullstein's Weltgeschichte, or whether he knew of Fon Njoia's extraordinary importance for the colonial project of the empire, is equally uncertain. [66] However, both the artist and the German public were definitely unaware that the acquisition had been preceded by a negotiation process that had dragged on for several years and was marked by tactical calculation, amounting to a trophy hunt. Nolde's decision to keep the female twin figure in profile in his sketch certainly favoured the location and placement of the throne in the museum. Measured against other drawings [p.211] from the ethnological museum, the figure study is rich in detail. Nolde did replace the triangular pattern with a uniform blue hatching, which suggests a rapid execution. Otherwise, however, he felt the patterning of the belt, the shell and the headdress almost faithfully and worked predominantly with colours that corresponded to those of the beads and cowries. He changed the red face colour into a brown tone, which he applied more strongly in places to mark shadowed areas. The materiality of the coloured glass beads and the cowries on the belt, the wrist or even the shell, on the other hand, cannot be guessed at all.

The situation is similar with the portrait format entitled Man, Woman and Cat, in which Nolde combined

the twin with a standing female wooden figure, possibly of Yoruba origin from Nigeria, and a leopard borrowed from a door also from Nigeria. [67] Nolde arranged the figures close to the lower edge of the picture in the foreground, as if they were facing each other on a narrow stage. The leopard seems to be placed behind them in the narrow picture space due to the overlapping. The figurative elements of the still life, painted in strong brown, yellow, green and blue, stand out against the background, which consists exclusively of earthy colours applied in a gestural style. The darker parts look like shadows of the towering figures, which enlivens the static composition determined by verticals and horizontals. As rigid and wooden as the objects appear, their arrangement on the supposed stage makes us forget their status as things - an effect that is greatly enhanced by the title. Nothing points to Nolde's former encounter with the throne twin, the door relief and the wooden sculpture in the museum room. The scene has a narrative character, centred on the eroticised relationship between man and woman, removed from time and place, as described by Jill Lloyd, for example. [68] In fact, unlike in his study, Nolde had made a male figure out of the female twin figure of the throne. [69] What is not addressed, however, even in the most recent, postcolonially grounded commentaries on Nolde's work in the German- and English-speaking world, is the strong change in the face shown in profile: instead of round shapes, Nolde gave it an extremely protruding upper and lower jaw and an angular chin in both the drawing and the painting, the angularity of which is emphasised by the black contour line. [70] In addition, the painted figure shows teeth instead of closed lips. Nolde adapted the twin, who was closely associated with the courtly culture of Bamum and stood for royal power and social values such as community, to the contemporary racist clichés of the primitive, "savage black". [71] Literally disfiguring the figure, the artist could hardly have created a more radical counter-image to Njoya's coveted "gift" that served colonial patterns of perception.

[p.212] In the very year it was painted, the still life was on show in a solo exhibition dedicated to Nolde at the opening of the New Art Salon in Munich. [72] Remaining in the artist's private possession, it was shown several times from 1918 onwards at exhibitions of art associations and galleries in Germany, and in 1927 also at a much-acclaimed anniversary exhibition. It took place on the occasion of his 60th birthday in the Municipal Exhibition Building and the Galerie Neue Kunst Fides in Dresden, then made stops in Hamburg, Kiel, Essen and Wiesbaden and spurred the growing cult of Nolde as an exceptional national artist. [73] With the travelling exhibition, the image of the twin from Bamum, adapted beyond recognition, circulated outside the Berlin Ethnological Museum in the German art world. In the first comprehensive Nolde monograph published by Max Sauerlandt (1880-1934) in 1921, which included an illustration of Man, Woman and Cat, the then director of the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe in Hamburg defended the still lifes with non-European artefacts against accusations that they stood for "the undeveloped" and the "abandonment of irreplaceable artistic values". [Sauerlandt countered with a eulogy that stood in the tradition of the idealistic modern discourse emphasising the autonomy of art and the originality of the artist, and at the same time was to prove groundbreaking for the art-historical classification of Expressionism in the post-war period: Nolde had "remelted the art of the savage" into something that belonged to him alone". On the "sonorous abundance" of his colours, as the rapturous tone goes on to say, "the grotesque form is heightened to the uncanny". The enthusiasm for Nolde's expressive treatment of form and colour, which was typical of the early apologists of Expressionism, left no room for a discussion of the motifs, so that any memory of the twin figure and the throne from Cameroon was extinguished in art literature only a few years after the painting was created.

Defamation on a grand stage and retreat - Schmidt-Rottluff's still lifes with motifs from Cameroon during National Socialism and the post-war period

While Nolde had finished his series with non-European museum objects before the outbreak of the First World War, the artefacts originating from the former colonies occupied Kirchner, Pechstein and above all Schmidt-Rottluff more enduringly. [75] However, he did not seek out public museums for still lifes that he created during the National Socialist era, but instead drew on his own collection, which he had begun in 1913. [76] Polemical attacks from völkisch and National Socialist circles had already been directed since the late 1920s [p.213] against the Expressionists' formal and motivic borrowings from "foreign races", against their "cult of primitiveness". [77] While there were indeed numerous supporters within the National Socialist ranks who spoke out loudly against the reaction of the völkisch traditionalists in the summer of 1933, the defamation campaigns culminated, as is well known, in the

confiscation of works of all modern styles from the art museums in 1937. Another low point in the campaign against modernism was the propaganda exhibition "Degenerate Art" in Munich that year, which featured over 100 paintings by former Brücke artists. [78] Among them were still lifes by Schmidt-Rottluff from the 1910s and 1920s, the central elements of which were a leopard stool and a pipe bowl from Cameroon (Fig. 7). [79] The fact that at the same time he began a renewed engagement with African artefacts has often been interpreted in research as a gesture of protest against National Socialist rule. [80] This contrasts with the view that he had taken flight to remote worlds. Regardless of his artistic intention, it can be stated: The still lifes, confiscated from the Städtisches Museum in Dresden and the Städelinstitut in Frankfurt, had been instrumentalised in Munich for a more than dubious spectacle that unfolded before some two million visitors. [81] Thus the artefacts from Cameroon, which the artist had transferred to canvas, were given great visibility in the infamous "shame exhibition" of all places.

[p.214] Schmidt-Rottluff's preoccupation with his own collection characterises his work beyond the Second World War and the end of the National Socialist regime. Returning to Berlin from Chemnitz in 1946, where he accepted a professorship at the Hochschule für Bildende Künste, he staged a buffalo essay mask of the grassland region with other African objects in one of his still lifes of the 1950s, *Afrikanisches* (1954, Berlin, Brücke-Museum). [82] In an interview Schmidt-Rottluff gave in June 1954, he also cited the sculpture of Cameroon as the "most important source" for the Brücke artists in their engagement with cultural objects from Africa. [83] His return to the heyday of the artistic appropriation of objects from the former colony may have been favoured by the framework conditions that had fundamentally changed since the end of Nazi rule. In West Berlin and the young Federal Republic, Expressionism was particularly appreciated in the immediate post-war period, when the art and museum landscape lay in ruins. [84] In an effort to distance themselves from National Socialism in terms of cultural policy as well, and at the same time to seek proximity to the Western powers, it was necessary to rehabilitate the previously defamed Modernism - Schmidt-Rottluff and Pechstein's appointment to the Hochschule für bildende Künste alone clearly signals this. A high point of the efforts to make amends was undoubtedly the first major exhibition in the Federal Republic of Germany, the Kassel documenta of 1955, at which the German Expressionists were celebrated as representatives of an artistic language understood as timeless and universalistic. [85]

Dresden - Showcase of Socialist Reconstruction after 1945

In the Soviet Occupation Zone, too, the art persecuted by the National Socialists was initially held in high esteem in the process of denazification and re-education of the Germans driven forward by the Soviet Military Administration (SMAD). [86] In the course of the escalating East-West conflict around 1948, however, which led to the division of Germany in 1949, Expressionist painting was increasingly rejected as formalistic and late-bourgeois decadent. According to SMAD and Socialist Unity Party (SED) functionaries, it was not Expressionist but Socialist Realism that artists had to orientate themselves towards in order to deliver easily comprehensible, ideal images of the new society that was to be formed.

It is all the more astonishing that so-called primitivism was also revived in East Germany after 1945, specifically in Dresden, and that Cameroonian cultural heritage played a role in this context that should not be underestimated. The city on the Elbe, where Heckel, Kirchner, Schmidt-Rottluff and Fritz Bleyl (1880-1966) had formed the [p.215] Brücke group of artists in 1905 and received decisive impulses for their engagement with non-European artefacts in the Royal Zoological and Anthropological-Ethnographic Museum, quickly became the central scene of cultural reconstruction in the SBZ and the early GDR, despite the severe destruction caused by the war and the looting of the collections by Soviet trophy brigades. [87] Even before the opening of the General German Art Exhibition in Dresden in 1946, the military administration of Saxony had ordered that a Saxon Central Museum be established in Pillnitz Palace. Shortly afterwards, the Directorate of the Dresden State Museums was newly created. In 1955, the return of masterpieces from the Dresden Gallery that had been taken away by the Red Army, staged as a gift from the USSR to the German ally, tipped the scales in favour of the reconstruction of the Semper Building, their location at the Zwinger. [88]

Under the roof of the Zwinger was also the State Museum of Ethnology - renamed several times in the meantime - which had been founded in 1875 by Adolf Bernhard Meyer (1840-1911). In 1941, during the war, the staff began the elaborate relocation of the collection to castles and stately homes in the region, thus saving about 90% of the holdings. [The return to the Zwinger took until the summer of

1946. In 1949 and 1950, special exhibitions were held for the first time in makeshift rooms under the provisional direction of the art historian Rose Hempel (1920-2009), before the museum moved to the Japanische Palais. These exhibitions, too, were entirely devoted to the restoration of cultural life, because they were intended to nourish the public's hope that significant parts of the collection had been preserved despite all the losses caused by the air war, looting and vandalism. [90]

For the second and at the same time last show at the Zwinger, Hempel chose just under 100 works, primarily from West and Central Africa. [91] Cameroon was prominently represented, for example with round throne stools supported by animals and figures, a couch made of carved wood with a leopard as a headrest, several masks and an ancestor figure with an infant. Like the exhibits from other regions, Hempel arranged them in newly made showcases, on low pedestals or directly against the brightly whitewashed walls and on the floor. The unadorned staging may have been due to wartime destruction and a shortage of materials, but it was a seamless continuation of the exhibition practice of the 1920s, which had primarily focused on conveying the aesthetic qualities of the exhibits. The fact that the title N*plastik was identical to that of Carl Einstein's 1915 paper, which pointed the way to the perception of African masks and figures as works of art, can hardly have been a coincidence. [92]

[p.216] Back to the Future - In the Footsteps of Nolde and the Bridge

One visitor to the exhibition was Fritz Winkler, who had begun his training at the Kunstgewerbeschule in Dresden a few years after the founding of the Brücke artists' group and interrupted by the First World War, continued at the Kunstakademie. [93] In the 1920s Winkler worked as a freelance artist, press artist and illustrator. After the National Socialists came to power, he joined an informal circle of artists, the Sieben Spaziergänger (Seven Walkers), who exchanged ideas and studied nature on joint walks in Dresden's surrounding countryside. [94] During the Second World War he was drafted for military service and his remaining oeuvre in the studio was destroyed in the hail of bombs. Winkler resumed his artistic activities after the British Allies released him from captivity in 1946. He mainly produced animal, landscape and circus depictions. He bequeathed his hitherto unexplored legacy, which comprises 300 paintings as well as 5000 watercolours and graphic works, to the Dresden State Art Collections. [95]

This collection includes a watercolour in landscape format, which owes its origin to the N*plastik exhibition, although this is not obvious at first glance. A comparison with one of the black-and-white photographs taken on the occasion of the special exhibition (fig. 8) is indispensable for a closer determination of the subject. With its help it can be determined that Winkler chose a section of a wall with exhibits of Cameroonian provenance as his motif. Two masks cut from the upper edge of the picture and reproduced in a brownish-bluish colouring are easy to identify despite the alienating blue. According to the inventory of the Museum für Völkerkunde, both come from Bali. [96] One of them is a buffalo mask, similar to the one that Schmidt-Rottluff made the main motif of his still life Afrikanisches of 1954, and the other is a dance mask with a human face. They entered the collection as gifts in 1902 and 1910. In contrast to the background, which Winkler created with rapid brushstrokes and left unworked in places, the strongly contoured masks appear more carefully worked out. Like Nolde in his still life Man, Woman and Cat, he used drop shadows to give the representation additional spatial depth. The yellow-orange tones with which he emphasised the eyes and ears of the masks are applied over a larger area at the right edge of the picture. The fact that this is the back cloak of a dance mask from Bafum, crowned by a wooden buffalo head, can only be understood with the help of the photograph. [97] It also allows us to identify the rectangle protruding into the lower right of the picture as a fragment of a poster explaining the use of the masks.

No further work by Winkler that refers to the exhibition or shows non-European cultural artefacts has been found to date. Meanwhile, the Dresden Kupferstich-Kabinett, in whose care is the extensive legacy of Winkler's prints, preserves a relevant drawing from the artist's direct environment: the frontal view of the male twin of Njoyas reproduced as a three-quarter figure → Bio, 417 Throne by Paul Wilhelm. [98] Wilhelm, eight years older than Winkler, had graduated earlier from the School of Applied Arts and the Academy in Dresden, but was also a member of the Seven Walkers in the 1930s. [99] Shortly before the end of the war, he, like Winkler, was called up for military service and ended up in American captivity. He was represented with several works at the General German Art Exhibition in 1946. Thanks to several solo exhibitions organised by the Kupferstich-Kabinett Wilhelm from the late 1940s onwards, his oeuvre, unlike Winkler's, [p.218] has become more accessible. [100] Similarly rich

in watercolours, it includes portraits, garden and architectural views as well as still lifes. Both artists were repeatedly associated with the Expressionism of the Brücke group of artists, namely with Nolde and Kirchner, in reviews on the occasion of exhibitions, milestone birthdays or even in obituaries in the regional daily press. [101] In the process, the GDR media referred to their moderate expressiveness or independent interpretation of the Expressionist painting style in the sense of the official cultural-political stance. [102] According to some voices, Wilhelm's work in particular embodied a typical "Dresden painting culture." [103]

Wilhelm's portrait format with the twin figure from 1962 also owes its origin to a visit to the museum. According to Werner Schmidt (1930-2010), the long-time director of the Kupferstich-Kabinett (Museum of Prints and Drawings) and later general director of the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden (Dresden State Art Collections), it was created from a graphite sketch that Wilhelm had already made "around 1956" at the Völkerkundemuseum in Berlin-Dahlem. [104] Wilhelm frequently stayed in the divided city, among other things on the occasion of the solo exhibition he put together and hung himself, which the Berlin National Gallery (East) organised for his 70th birthday in the winter of 1956/57 after stops in Dresden and Chemnitz (then Karl-Marx-Stadt). [105] For its opening on 13 December 1956, he had Fritz Winkler put on the guest list. [106] Beyond the duration of the show, however, further visits to Berlin until the summer months of 1957 are documented in correspondence between Wilhelm and the National Gallery's employee Vera Ruthenberg (1920-2009). [107] Accordingly, it can be assumed that he made the sketch later than Schmidt assumes, namely after the official opening of the museum's Africa department in July 1957. [108] In Berlin, as in Dresden, measures had been taken to secure the collection during the war and in 1942 its removal to mines had begun. This did not include larger prestige objects from Bamum, such as the Throne of Njoya → Bio, 417, which remained in Berlin. [109] After the end of the war, the Ethnological Museum then actually held special exhibitions in Dahlem. Here, on the outskirts of the city, a multi-part building complex had been planned for the non-European collections, of which only the Museum of Asian Art was under construction when the First World War broke out. In 1923, the Ethnological Museum's study collection moved into the building, which had been rededicated as the museum's storeroom. Because the main building on Königgrätzer Straße had become a ruin during the war, it was used for exhibition purposes from 1946. In 1948, the museum moved for good, and in 1949, it reopened at its new location in Dahlem, even before the collections that had been removed from storage could be transferred there in the mid-1950s. At the beginning of July 1957, the museum opened its African collection to the public in a separate showroom on the ground floor, which exclusively contained objects that were considered "valuable" and "well-made" by European standards. [110] Kurt Krieger, the curator in charge, wrote an article on the occasion of the opening in which he singled out Njoya's throne and described it as "characteristic of the diverse figurative-plastic arts and crafts in the grasslands of Cameroon". [111] It was, Krieger continued, freely exhibited and appealing "by its colourfulness". [112] Radiant blue tones characterise the watercolour on delicate Japanese paper that Wilhelm created based on his sketch captured on location. With the exception of the headdress and the ears, he has kept closely to the given colour scheme of the figure and the decorative patterns of the bangles, loincloth and drinking horn. The vertical lines covering the body can be interpreted as an attempt to translate the structure of the elongated glass beads into the medium of watercolour. Whether the ornamental band on the right edge of the picture refers to the furniture or another exhibit in the museum hall, or is a free addition, cannot be conclusively determined. Deviating from the original, Wilhelm's twin holds the drinking horn at a flatter angle in front of him, while his left hand seems to have slipped lower under his chin, as if he were struggling for air. Overall, however, Wilhelm's variant of the twin figure comes closer to the courtly formal language of Bamum, from which Nolde had radically distanced himself exactly five decades earlier when he transformed the female twin of the throne into a male one and reinterpreted it as the incarnation of the "savage". The designs thus mark the extreme poles between which the artistic reception of a prestigious symbol of rulership from Cameroon, exciting from the Empire to the Cold War, settled.

Stored and hidden in a divided Germany

In comparison with Nolde, Kirchner, Schmidt-Rottluff and other renowned Expressionists, Winkler and Wilhelm are almost forgotten, although they belonged to the same generation of artists. [113] One reason for this is certainly that they remained committed to the Dresden art scene throughout their

lives, beyond the caesura of the Second World War and the division of Germany, but that the examination of GDR art after the fall of the Wall was approached hesitantly and focused strongly on commissioned art on the one hand and on resistant artists on the other. [114] In the SBZ and GDR, Wilhelm was able to continue his career successfully even more than Winkler, as can be seen from the award of a professorial title, museum acquisitions, and several group and solo exhibitions, such as the one at the Berlin National Gallery. [115] His pearl-adorned figure from the throne chair of King Nschoja of Bamum was exhibited at the retrospectives organised by Schmidt Wilhelm for his 80th birthday in 1966 and for his 100th birthday in 1986/87. [116] Otherwise, however, neither Wilhelm's print with the twin figure nor Winkler's watercolour with the Cameroonian masks received attention in the [p.220] art world of divided Germany and the post-reunification period. In 1980, both prints were to be shown at the Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde in Dresden. However, this did not happen. Frank Tiesler (1938-2021) from the Museum für Völkerkunde had prepared an exhibition in which he wanted to bring non-European works into dialogue with contemporary abstract positions by Dresden artists. After criticism of his concept by SED representatives, Tiesler was willing to compromise and expanded the planned exhibition to include historical works of art and figurative-representational works. Nevertheless, there was no chance of its realisation, because the political-ideological pressure on the museums under Erich Honecker (1912-1994) at the head of the GDR state had again increased sharply since 1971. [117] What remained was the catalogue, which was published in reunified Germany in 1992, supplemented by Tiesler's detailed documentation of his failed project. [118] That Wilhelm and Winkler were following in the footsteps of Nolde and Schmidt-Rottluff with their choice of motifs in order to place themselves in the tradition of modernism and thus consciously distinguish themselves from official art-making in the GDR is hardly likely, given the singularity of the two works in their oeuvre. However, it cannot be ruled out that their encounter with the "foreign" masks and sculptures from Cameroon offered them a welcome opportunity to escape the political restrictions of everyday life. Stored in a depot, the sheets, like thousands of stored cultural objects from overseas, have been hidden from public view for years. Bringing them back to light means becoming aware of a pictorial production that is based on the artistic appropriation of museum objects of Cameroonian origin, but which survived the interwar period and even the period after 1945 and thus goes beyond the usual canon of modernism. Last but not least, it can be seen from their example that the ethnological museums in Berlin and Dresden continued to prove their worth as "contact zones" between artists and the cultural heritage from the former German colony, despite drastic losses during the war, changes of location and rearrangements during the years of the Cold War. [119]

In the Name of Science

On the History of Research on the Cameroon Holdings in Berlin in the 20th Century

BÉNÉDICTE SAVOY

The guide to the Museum für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig in 1919 announced right at the beginning that "researchers and scholars passing through can access the collections for study purposes at any time during office hours". [1] At the time, museums, especially in Germany, saw themselves as places of scholarship. At the same time, around 1900, this claim to scientificity functioned as a legitimisation for the appropriation, removal and museumisation of entire cultural ensembles from many regions of the world in Europe.

Against this background and in view of the fact that German museums have kept the largest stock of Cameroonian cultural objects in public hands worldwide since around 1920, the question arises as to what scientific yield was generated at all by the tens of thousands of statues, thrones, masks, drums, bells, reliquaries, building elements, beds, vessels, spears, shields, robes, dolls and textiles that were collected from ca. 1884 until the end of the German colonial period in 1919 from what is now Cameroon to Berlin, Stuttgart, Leipzig, Hamburg, etc. What role did German museums play in the international reception of the art, cult and cultural objects that were increasingly researched from the mid-1950s at the latest in Cameroon itself, in the USA and in France under the umbrella term "Arts from Cameroon"? Or, to put it more pointedly: Has the material accumulation of objects from Cameroon in German public museums over the past 100 years benefited science, and which science? To answer these questions, this chapter focuses on the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde, now the Ethnologisches Museum. It enjoyed a privileged position as an institution in the capital of the empire, which was reflected in its furnishings and its scientific aspirations.

Museum Studies

Whether in Berlin, Paris or London, three scientific-rhetorical constructs accompanied the establishment of large ethnological museums from the last third of the 19th century onwards. Firstly, the motive of salvation: the [p.230] historically grown cultures were in the process of dissolution due to the colonial wars, the intensive missionary work and the imposed administrative, linguistic and cultural integration into colonial empires. Therefore, they had to be travelled and collected quickly and systematically in order to be able to explore them at least in the future. A second form of legitimation postulated an intimate knowledge of the colonised societies in order to be able to manage them better. To this end, the still young disciplines of anthropology and ethnology should and wanted to make a valuable contribution with their collections and museums. Thirdly, by 1900 at the latest, the idea had become established in the competition between European nations that the legitimate guardian of world cultures was the one who possessed the most splendid and complete museums with the most modern workshops for conservation, restoration, reproduction and material examination, not to mention specialist periodicals, permanent exhibitions and top-class museum scholars, ideally equipped with the obligatory academic titles in German-speaking countries. Conversely, nations and institutes disqualified themselves if they were unable to maintain their holdings scientifically or at least pretend to do so. Nations, museums, scholarship and the material and ideal claim to world cultural heritage went (and still go) hand in hand.

A recently resurfaced text by the young Marcel Mauss (1872-1950), celebrated today as the forefather of anthropology, illustrates this. In 1907, just as the systematic extraction of cultural objects was reaching a peak in the German "colony of Cameroon", he reported from Paris in an unpublished statement on the German ethnological museum landscape:

"In Germany, theoretical and museum studies are best represented. Around Bastian in Berlin (died 1905) a whole school was formed, a great institution, the Museum für Völkerkunde, which spread all over Germany. In Dresden there was once A.B. Meyer, who organised a considerable museum and issued huge publications. In Munich, Lübeck, Bremen, Hamburg [...], Cologne, where the Joest Museum has just been opened, there

are magnificent ethnographic museums which are becoming better equipped, the latest vying with the old museums in richness and luxury of collections, materials and publications. In Vienna, a considerable part of the Natural History Museum is devoted to ethnography. But in Berlin, the seat of a kind of mother house, is still the centre of all studies. There is a huge museum there for which a new building is to be erected (2 million marks), as it is already suffocating in a building erected especially for it. All the work of all the researchers is concentrated in this museum. In some years there have been up to 18,000 new entry numbers for the collections. [...] Altogether, a scientific staff of 17 paid employees, where we [in Paris] have only two." [2]

[Since the unification of 1871, not only museums but also other places of science such as universities, research institutes, academies, etc. had become a political issue, even a place of national assertion in the German Empire. In the competition between European nations, the aim was to provide Germany, the imperial latecomer, with a beacon museum that could rival London and Paris. It is no coincidence that at the same time as the famous Berlin Congo Conference of 1884/85, at which the conditions for the division of Africa among the European states were created, gigantomaniac museum plans were underway in the capital of the German Empire: a spectacular architectural competition for the expansion of the Museum Island was announced in 1884, [3] and in 1886 the new building for ethnological collections, characterised by Mauss as a "gigantic museum", opened on Potsdamer Platz. The ostentatious Ethnological Museum in the middle of the pulsating new imperial capital saw itself as a place of science from the very beginning. Its founding director was Adolf Bastian (1826-1905), a prominent physician and academician who was also one of the founding members of the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory (BGAEU), established in 1870. [4] At that time, science in the museum was not understood to be fundamentally different from science at the university - with one major difference: the presence of collections. In addition to the usual writing of scientific publications, the museum had the task of inventoring, conserving, managing and presenting enormous quantities of objects in the most informative way possible. The contributions by Andrea Meyer and Sebastian-Manès Sprute in this volume deal with aspects of this museum-specific science - on the one hand with questions of the presentation of objects from Cameroon → chapter Meyer, 199 ff., on the other hand with the scientific documentation of the holdings → chapter Sprute, 265 ff.- and state considerable deficits in German museums around 1900, up to epistemological "chaos" and the total failure of ethnological nomenclatures. [5] But also and especially with regard to the numerous and, at first glance, scholarly-looking publications, a sobering finding emerges: Apart from Njoya's Throne [6] → Bildheft XLVIII and the so-called bronzes from the Kingdom of Benin (today Nigeria), whose spectacular acquisition on the British art market was reflected in a high-calibre, systematically arguing, still frequently cited and richly illustrated publication by the Berlin Africa curator Felix von Luschan (1854-1924), [7] the colossal African holdings of the Völkerkundemuseum remained virtually absent from the museum's own publications until the Second World War and beyond. This was summed up by Christine Stelzig in her groundbreaking study *Afrika am Museum für Völkerkunde zu Berlin 1873-1919* as early as 2004 when, after meticulously evaluating all of the museum's journals [p.232], she stated, "The growth of the African holdings [...] had no effect on the number of publications in the museum periodicals." [8] Museum ethnologists hardly used the collection's potential for publications and these "to a far lesser extent as a forum for communication than had actually been intended." [9]

If one now looks specifically for studies dealing with objects from Cameroon, the results are even thinner. Up to and including 1939, fewer than 25 objects from Cameroon - out of the 6044 that were in the museum in 1919 [10] - were precisely discussed or illustrated by staff members of the Berlin Museum, and almost exclusively by Felix von Luschan. Neither his predecessor Adolf Bastian (in office from 1886 to 1904) nor his successor Bernhard Ankermann → Bio, 370 (1849-1943, in office from 1911 to 1924) dealt with objects from the Cameroon collection in substantial scholarly studies. Even after the First World War and the loss of the German colonies, the situation did not change. If one adds up all the articles on Cameroon objects of the Museum of Ethnology in Berlin written in the museum periodicals or by museum scholars up to 1939, one arrives at a modest 15 pages of scholarly production. The scholarly analysis of the cultural objects from Cameroon that were brought to Berlin en masse with so much aplomb came to a standstill. There was hardly any scholarly discussion about them initiated by the museum itself, neither in the German-speaking context nor on an international

level.

The first four objects from Cameroon published by Luschan appeared in 1894 on two and a half pages as a "wholly improvised" and "preliminary" note in the *Ethnologisches Notizblatt*, a journal started by Adolf Bastian for the rapid dissemination of current research results. [11] It was about an extensive collection of pipe bowls from the northwest of Cameroon, which the notorious colonialist Eugen Zintgraff (1858-1897) and his travelling companion Franz von Steinäcker (life dates unknown) had given to the Berlin Museum shortly before. Four pipe bowls were shown as accurate outline drawings in the article, but without caption and inventory number - the lack of inventory numbers was the rule in the museum's own publications for a long time; presumably the flood of incoming objects in those years prevented the prompt allocation of such identification features. Without an inventory number, however, an object in the museum remains like a book without a title and signature in a library: useless. The lack of inventory numbers in the Museum für Völkerkunde's publications, which are sparse in any case, therefore meant a considerable diminution of their scholarly usefulness, since scholars outside the museum or in retrospect are hardly in a position to identify the objects discussed and to conduct their own research on them. In his note of 1894, Luschan [p.233] mixed - in a manner typical of him - extremely precise, appreciative, iconographic observations on the objects with blunt statements on German colonial policy. For example, he began by stating that the pipe bowls came from the "region in the hinterland of Cameroon, which for a time had appeared to be the future actual and natural centre of our West African colony, but which is now [...] to be left without European supervision". [12] This, however, increased the singular value of the Berlin collection, as other German or even European museums would not get hold of such objects so quickly. "A detailed publication of this valuable collection appears to be much desired and will be made possible in the not too distant future." [13] However, the Berlin institution stuck to this "preliminary communication" of 1894 - a more detailed treatment of the pipe bowls could not be found in the museum's series of publications.

In addition to the four pipes, Luschan published a dozen other objects from Cameroon in three brief collection articles in the *Amtliche Berichte aus den königlichen Kunstsammlungen* (Official Reports from the Royal Art Collections), which appeared regularly from 1880 onwards and were designed for a generally educated audience. [14] The first was two and a half pages long (January 1908). [15] In it, Luschan described seven 'new acquisitions' from Cameroon: a monumental beaded figure with bowl from the grasslands, [16] acquired by the officer of the so-called Schutztruppe Hans Glauning → Bio, 386 (1868-1908), whose 'present station is favourable to ethnographic studies to an outstanding degree', as the note euphemistically noted, [17] a drum, 'Precious old piece, gift of Herr Leutnant v. Putlitz'; [18] a drinking horn; [19] a carved staff with no indication of provenance; [20] two drinking vessels donated by the Breslau merchant Theodor Glücksmann (life dates unknown) [21] as well as the hair depicted in Richard Tsogang Fossi → Chapter Tsogang Fossi, 173 ff. which the Schutztruppe officer Oscar Förster (1871-1910) had cut off "close to the scalp" of an adult man in Southern Cameroon. [22] Each object was photographically depicted. The short note was intended both to publicise the museum's entries and to pay tribute to their colonial procurers.

A second article (May 1908) was devoted entirely to the estate of Glauning, [23] who had by then been killed west of Bamenda during a military attack on the local population. It contained three pages describing and illustrating two monumental slit drums now on display in the Humboldt Forum → Bildheft IV; → Bildheft XVIII [24] as well as architectural elements from the burnt royal palace of Baham → Bildheft XLV and another palace in the same area. [25] The drums had been 'developed as a kind of wireless telegraphy or proper telephony', which also served to resist the German troops, so for Luschan it was 'only an act of compensatory justice if two particularly excellent [p.234] drums of this kind, historical pieces from the possessions of great chiefs, have now found their way into the Berlin Museum'. [26]

The third note (July 1910) was a scant page long. It presented two masks made of fired clay that the Thorbecke couple → Bio, 429 said they had acquired in Babungo in the Bamenda district. One of them was photographically depicted in front and back view. [27] Here Luschan mainly discussed the date of origin of the singular piece, which he was reluctant to classify as modern. After these short essays, museum staff did not publish any further studies on Cameroonian cultural objects in the museum's periodicals until 1939 - not even in the Baessler Archive, which replaced the publications from the Royal Museum of Ethnology from 1910/11 and still serves as the institution's scholarly journal.

But even outside the institution, Berlin museum scholars hardly published an object-related study on Cameroon. A single exception, hardly noticed by researchers so far, is a five-page article with illustrations from 1903 in the *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, the organ of the BGAEU. Under the misleading

title "Schnitzwerke aus dem westlichen Sudân"[28] Luschan presented here the famous figure of Ngonso, now exhibited in the Humboldt Forum → Bildheft III and → Kapitel Cornilius Refem, 331 ff. (in the article without name or inventory number), as well as a sculpture from the palace of Bafut that is no longer in the collection - both works looted during violent military expeditions. [29] Curiously, the scholar's terse note was primarily concerned with the use of so-called tinfoil, a thin layer of tin that had been used since the 17th century to cover mirrors, among other things. For Luschan, the presence of this metal on the Ngonso statue was a strong indication of European influence on Cameroonian handicrafts, although the occurrence of tin in Africa was proven in an "impeccable manner": "There can be no doubt about the European origin of these very thin foils, which were undoubtedly produced in a factory and not by hand; [...] I have not yet seen any African carving that was really covered with tin foils that were certainly indigenous".[30] The isolation of a "pure" African portion, considered particularly original and "worth saving", from a European-mixed one was ubiquitous in the research literature at the time.

Other cursorily discussed and illustrated works from Cameroon in Luschan's 1903 essay were three privately owned stools then on loan to the museum and two masks in the form of a stylised elephant's head, one owned by Schutztruppen officer Friedrich Langheld (1867-1917), the other a 'gift' to the museum from officer Kurt von Pavel → Bio, 420 (1851-1933). [31] As Luschan noted with scholarly probity, the museum possessed another series of "elephant masks" from Cameroon, but in their case lacked any information on the context of their creation [p.235] and removal. Thus he concluded his short essay with an urgent appeal to research, reminiscent of traditional allegories of science as the revealer of truth: "Perhaps this brief note here will help to lift the veil hanging over these peculiar masks before it will be forever too late to do so." [32] The author was aware that museum objects are lost if they are not published and no information about them circulates. However, no systematic publication strategy grew out of this awareness at the Berlin Museum, quite the contrary. Luschan's successor as head of the African-Oceanic Department, Bernhard Ankermann, was not interested in individual objects. Although he acquired about 1500 of them during his official trip to Cameroon in 1907 to 1909 and had direct access to them in the course of his long career in Berlin until 1924, he concentrated primarily on theoretical studies. In his 1910 travelogue, he depicted some objects without specifying whether he had acquired them for the museum - e.g. the floor stones of the royal palace he photographed in Kumbo → Pictorial Booklet XVII, which he probably had uprooted and which are now in the museum. [33] According to Stelzig, Ankermann published "including his dissertation, only five object studies", [34] including a single one with a (very thin) Cameroon reference. It appeared in 1913 in the Zeitschrift für Ethnologie under the title "Negerzeichnungen aus Ostafrika und Kamerun" (Negro Drawings from East Africa and Cameroon), whereby twelve children's drawings from the Kingdom of Bamum were mentioned only in the very last paragraph (without illustration) - again as evidence of the intrusion of European motifs. According to Ankermann, they are

"multi-coloured, but without regard to the actual colour of the objects depicted, and [...] preferably depict Europeans and European objects, but also natives. They are made by children who have not enjoyed any schooling, but could have drawn inspiration and models at most from European illustrated magazines, which occasionally stray to Bamum." [35]

These drawings, 41 in number, survived the Second World War and are still in the collection of the Ethnological Museum. [36] In view of the rich and original written and pictorial culture in Foumban - not mentioned by Ankermann with a syllable - they certainly deserved a study of their own.

Museum guide

Not only the museum's own specialist journals, but also the widely distributed guides to the Ethnological Museum designed for the general public posed as scientifically serious publications until they were discontinued in 1929. They appeared from 1872 onwards in a total of 19 editions. On page one, the academic titles of the museum curators listed (in 1929 exclusively [p.236] professors), several fold-out maps and a section (not available in every edition) entitled "Scientific Material on the Collections" guaranteed the publication's scientific seriousness. However, on closer inspection, this section in particular proved to be far from up-to-date and in keeping with the scholarly standards of the time. The titles listed did not reflect the state of research, not even the publications of the museum staff

themselves appeared here. In these museum guides, until the end of the German colonial period and beyond, "there was apparently no particular interest on the part of the African-Oceanic department in providing appropriate references to literature", Stelzig states. [37]

But the Berlin museum was also apparently not interested in imparting knowledge about the presented objects themselves. This is quite surprising: despite the worldwide attention for the diversity of African forms that had been aroused at the latest since 1914 with the groundbreaking exhibition *Statuary in Wood by African Savages - The Root of Modern Art* at the New York Gallery 291, the Berlin museum guides downright ignored the objects in the museum rooms until the end of the 1920s. In them, they served only as vague supporting material for scientific-sounding (race) theoretical constructions and explanations of African "tribes". A brief glance at the "Africa chapter" of the last edition of the museum guide, published in 1929, reveals the museum's ideological superstructure. After a characteristically ex negativo introduction - "The population of Africa forms neither ethnically nor linguistically nor culturally a cohesive unit"[38] - the museum guide offers a "tour of the collections" that is primarily characterised by stereotypes and assertions without reference to the objects on display. For example, the museum guide divides the continent into two large regions, one "inhabited by the white race", the other "populated by dark-skinned people who are used to be called Negroes".[39] A subsequent description of their supposed morphology is intended to make clear at this point what kind of racial doctrine based on supposed physical characteristics was already linked to the precious statues, thrones, masks, drums, bells, reliquaries, building elements, beds, vessels, spears, shields, robes, dolls and textiles from Africa for the general public here in the museum a few years before the National Socialists came to power:

"The common physical features, apart from the dark skin colour, are mainly the flat, depressed nose, the thick, bulging lips and the short, hard, frizzy, spirally twisted hair. Actually, only the last characteristic is constant [...]. And instead of the typical negro nose, one often finds narrow high-backed, even noble-shaped eagle noses." [40]

[p.237] In the museum guides (and in the ethnological logic of the museum), the objects had no independent place. In their cabinets and display cases, they merely served as stand-ins for groups of people, representing "tribes", their supposed skills and idiosyncrasies. In the last edition of the guide, about five pages were devoted to Cameroon, and it is difficult to decide which passages are most disturbing: The ranking of Central African populations by Berlin museum people for progress, intelligence, commercial prowess and artistry, when it says, for example,

"the Bamum people - under the leadership of their intelligent prince Njoia, who invented his own script - form by far the most advanced people of this area." [41]

Or the dismaying, purely descriptive arbitrariness in the mention of the vast majority of exhibits, for example in the section on the Adamaoua region in central Cameroon:

"In the case of the clothing housed in cupboard 45, penis sheaths, straw hats and leather skirts capture the attention, while in the case of jewellery, the richness in the use of metals (iron and brass) is most striking." [42]

After 1929, the Berlin Ethnological Museum no longer published a general museum catalogue. To this day, the scientific community and interested parties are waiting for the publication of a reliable inventory catalogue of the Africa Department. A scholarly overview of the Cameroon collection is just as overdue as the establishment of an online accessible database. However, history shows that in the course of the 20th century, the most important studies on the Berlin Cameroon holdings did not originate within the institution, but outside it. This development began as early as the late 1920s.

Research from outside

One of the most important names that is still mentioned in international research literature in connection with the reappraisal of the rich holdings from Cameroon in German public museums is that of the art historian Eckart von Sydow (1885-1942). After Carl Einstein (1885-1940) and the Russian

artist Varvara Bubnova (1886-1983) and her husband Voldemārs Matvejs (1877-1914), who died at an early age, he was one of the first to publish objects from Africa and thus made a significant contribution to their cross-border publicity and photographic circulation without being employed by a museum himself. The first three - Sydow, Einstein and Bubnova - were children of the colonial era, born in the immediate months after the Berlin Conference, when [p.238] the expansion of non-European collections in Europe began to boom and the huge Museum für Völkerkunde (Museum of Ethnology) opened its doors in Berlin, into whose depots countless objects - not only from Cameroon - entered day after day. The primitive accumulation of African cultural objects was part of their presence.

Sydow, the son of an estate tenant from the West Pomeranian town of Dobberphul (today Dobropole Gryfińskie in Poland), studied in Berlin and Halle, where he received his doctorate in 1912 with a narrow art-scientific thesis on Christian altars in the early Middle Ages. [43] He is a typical representative of that generation of art historians (and a few female art historians) who either abandoned their academic studies in the decade before the First World War or turned their backs on academia after completing their doctorates in order to seek a balance to historical scholarship and a financial livelihood in the study of contemporary, later non-European art. The structure of the subject of art history at the time did not permit any involvement with contemporary art, and before the First World War there were in any case hardly any opportunities for employment at a museum or university. Sydow moved to Berlin, completed a traineeship at the State Museums and published a monograph on the only slightly older Swiss painter Cuno Amiet (1868-1961) as early as 1913. This was followed by essays and reviews on current art topics and philosophical questions, and only after the war also on the holdings of ethnological museums. Sydow was co-editor of *Weltkunst* and wrote for magazines such as *Cicero*, *Die Kunstauktion* and *Kunst und Künstler*. He also played an important role in the milieu of the still young psychoanalysis in Berlin. [44] Lisa Zeitz, who has produced one of the best-informed biographical sketches of this otherwise little-illuminated, go-getting man, sees him as a "pioneer of modernism." [45]

Carl Einstein, who was of the same age and has become an icon of the reception of African art and has been excellently researched, had a similar career start: [46] born in the Rhineland, moved to turbulent Berlin, did not complete his studies in art history, first successes as a poet and art critic, soon influential journalistic activity at the interface between art and the market, galleries and avant-gardes, France and Germany, ethnology and art history. However, one essential biographical trait distinguished both men: while Einstein, as a German Jew, persecuted and exhausted, saw no other way out in 1940 than to take his own life in exile in France, Sydow joined the NSDAP as early as 1933, [47] received a permanent position at the Art History Institute of the Berlin University in the same year, which had not been granted to him until then, and taught there without interruption from the summer semester of 1933 until his death in 1942. [48] His obituary was written by Martin Heydrich, the notorious director of the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum in Cologne, who had also belonged to the NSDAP [p.239], was briefly a member of the SA and participated in the Nazi art theft in occupied Poland and the Rhineland. After a short interruption, Heydrich was allowed to work again as director of the Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum from 1948, and from June 1949 until his retirement in 1958 even as a full professor of ethnology at the University of Cologne. [49] In Germany, the conditions for a preoccupation with African cultural objects coming from outside the museum were evidently closely linked to the political framework conditions in the first half of the 20th century.

In Varvara Bubnova's case, the beginnings were naturally different. Born in St Petersburg, she studied fine arts at the local Academy of Fine Arts, where she met the Latvian painter and art theorist Voldemārs Matvejs. In 1919, under his pseudonym, Bubnova published a joint survey of African art conducted throughout Europe a few years earlier - a sensational contribution that was probably hardly considered by researchers for a long time due to the language barrier. [50] In 1923, as an active and recognised member of the Moscow avant-garde, Bubnova moved to Japan, where she worked as an artist and translator until 1958. Returning to the Soviet Union in 1958, she did not die until the early 1980s, almost 100 years old, in Leningrad. In their early publications on African objects in ethnological museums, these young figures of the European avant-gardes succeeded early on in activating the potential of individual African works outside the institution of the museum, which had until then been used by museum ethnology primarily as undifferentiated evidence for racial constructs, especially in Berlin. But not everyone was interested in Cameroonian forms right from the start; the boom here set in somewhat later than in the case of Benin or the Congo.

In Carl Einstein's works *Negerplastik* (Negro Sculpture, 1915, 2nd ed. 1920) and *Afrikanische Plastik*

(African Sculpture, 1921), a total of 153 works are illustrated in large format, including a few that have subsequently proved to be non-African. [51] Whereas in *Negerplastik* there was no geographical indication of the origin of the reproduced works, the names of the institutions or collectors that preserved them, and no concrete iconographic comments, in *Afrikanische Plastik* a "Tafelverzeichnis" provided precise information on this, including inventory numbers; the accompanying text gave a catalogue-like account of the objects depicted, which were in both museum and private ownership. While no works from Cameroon are depicted in *Negerplastik*, *Afrikanische Plastik* contains photographic reproductions of an Ekoi mask from the Berlin Völkerkundemuseum [52] as well as seven other privately owned works. Four of these came from Einstein's own collection: a "dance attachment" from the "Bafum landscape, Mbang locality"; a "head attachment" from "Fungong"; a vessel "from Wum, Bafum landscape"; [53] in addition, a monumental door frame from the "chief's hut of [p.240]Bangu". [54] In addition, there was a pair of posts from the same palace of Bangu; one of the world's rare specimens of a Batcham mask from Bamendjo, now in the Museum Rietberg in Zurich, and a "palaver chair from Bandenkop"; finally, another vessel "from Wum" with no indication of ownership. [55] All in all, Einstein's early publications must be regarded as a valuable contribution to the "science of showing and sharing", even independently of their stimulating textual parts, in a way that ethnological museums of the years around 1920 did not pursue.

This ability to activate museum-externalised objects from Africa is also highly attested to in the impressive study *Искусство негров* [*Iskusstvo negrov*, *Negro Art*] published by Varvara Bubnova in 1919. [56] It brought together over 120 photographs of individual museum exhibits that the Bubnova/Matvejs couple had taken in 1912/13 during an extensive tour of European ethnological museums in Paris, Berlin, Hamburg, Cologne, Leipzig, London, Leningrad, Copenhagen, Christiania, Leyden, Amsterdam and Brussels. In addition to these photographs, the book contained a long treatise, complete with hand drawings, which followed scholarly standards with footnotes and a bibliography. In her preface, Bubnova emphasised the special quality of this original artistic research work, "on the one hand dreamy-intuitive contemplation, on the other conscious analytical thought work". [57] The editor Levkiy Zheverzhev also saw in it an example of genuine artistic research. [58] In view of the abundance of Cameroonian objects in the German museums visited by the Russian artist couple on the eve of the First World War, it is surprising, however, that not a single figure from Cameroon is depicted in their publication, as in Einstein's 1915. Possibly the young people did not get to see such pieces: "Berlin and Leipzig, which have the richest collections, gave me relatively little," Matvejs complains at the very beginning of the book. [59] The focus of his and Bubnova's interest at this early stage was apparently more on sculptures from the Congo. The aesthetics of the Benin bronzes, which were the talk of the town at the time, were explicitly rejected by both of them. [60] In contrast to the pioneering works of Einstein and Bubnova/Matvejs, both of which were written before the First World War and thus still during the great accumulation period of African collections in Germany, Sydow only began to deal with African art in German museums after 1919, i.e. with now stabilised holdings. Cameroon played an increasingly important role for him. Already in his first substantial work on non-European art, the 1921 volume *Exotische Kunst. Afrika und Ozeanien*, five pieces from Cameroon were illustrated: a large bowl owned by the ethnographica dealer Umlauff → Bio, 432; [61] three masks and a large figuratively carved seat from the Völkerkundemuseum in Leipzig, which [p.241] Sydow himself had probably photographed on site. [62] In contrast, no object was to be seen from the Berlin Museum, whose African-Oceanic department does not seem to have been particularly open to external research during Luschan's directorship. Nor did the book, which had an expressionist layout, claim to be scientific. It began with a reproduction of an early cubist painting by Pablo Picasso [63] that was in private hands in Wroclaw at the time and did not spare itself heavy late expressionist metaphors. Thus, right in the introduction, after a hymn of praise to the "collections of artworks by primitive-exotic peoples", it said that they were "the only museums that mean anything essential to us today":

"Creativity is here still a direct matter: close to the blood, penetrating the blood, welling up from the blood and with the blood [...]. Forebodingly, the creative blood of the ancestors stirs." [64]

African art and the early German blood-and-soil rhetoric entered into an unholy alliance in this study. For Sydow, it was the beginning of a more precise and more expert study of the African holdings of German museums, especially those from Cameroon in Berlin, which continued over the course of two

decades. Two monumental publications by Sydow are still cited in this context today: *Die Kunst der Naturvölker und der Vorzeit* (The Art of Primitive Peoples and Prehistory) of 1923 and the *Handbuch der afrikanischen Plastik* (Handbook of African Sculpture) published by Reimer Verlag in 1930: Volume One: West African Sculpture. Before and after this, Sydow published a long series of essays in international journals as well as monographs in which Cameroonian objects are also sporadically mentioned. [65] Worth mentioning is his study *Religion der Naturvölker* (Religion of primitive peoples), published in 1926, in which eleven objects from Cameroon are illustrated and catalogued in a so-called descriptive index with inventory numbers, seven of them (four masks, an Ekoi figure, a Byeri and a doorpost) from the Museum für Völkerkunde (Museum of Ethnology) in Berlin; furthermore, a pipe bowl from Braunschweig and a chair from Leipzig. [66] In 1932 Sydow published the typologically and scientifically precisely structured essay "Die Abstrakte Ornamentik der Gebrauchskunst im Grasland von Kamerun" in the Baessler Archive with over 30 illustrated wickerwork, vessels, drinking horns, bowls and bags primarily from the Kingdom of Bamum, all from the Berlin Museum of Ethnology. [67] In 1923 Sydow dedicated his compendium *Kunst der Naturvölker und der Vorzeit* to the painter Karl Schmidt-Rottluff. In the text section, the author did not systematically deal with individual objects, but attempted to characterise the "creative power" pervading them in general terms. The tone was more matter-of-fact than in the first book, even if racist or stereotypical formulations were not absent, for example in an absurd-seeming passage on the relationship between figurative and abstract ornamentation, which Sydow sought to discuss using the example of pipe bowls from Cameroon:

[p.242] "As, then, in general, by the manner in which the pipe is formed, the general character of a people is well discernible, since smoking is a - one may say the - favourite pastime of the negro." [68]

But the real attraction and value of this volume lay less in its text section than in the more than 100 large-format illustrations of several dozen works from all over the world in many museums in Europe. The "Africa" section was dominated by Berlin pieces from Cameroon with 24 plates, three of which were in colour - a technologically and financially expensive form of aesthetic appreciation in the early 1920s. As expected, such colour plates showed Njoya's throne as well as two palm wine bottles covered with pearls; [69] furthermore, an Ekoi mask, drums, a pipe, clay vessels, jewellery, masks, utensils and drinking horns of the Bamum - all in the possession of the Berlin Museum. Instead of a simple index of images, the volume offered a systematic "Catalogue of Illustrations" at the end, which gave precise formal and iconographic information on each piece. [70] Sydow expressed his gratitude for the cooperation: "I owe a special debt of gratitude to the General Directorate of the National Museums in Berlin, which gave me a free hand in the selection of pieces from the Prehistoric Museum and the Museum of Ethnology." [71] However, it was not until the subsequent project that the cooperation between the enterprising art historian and the hitherto rather closed Berlin institution intensified.

Sydow's next project, the *Handbuch der afrikanischen Plastik* (Handbook of African Sculpture), presented in 1930, was designed from the outset as a scientific project. It was funded by the still young "Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft", a predecessor institution of today's DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) founded after the First World War to arm German research. It approved Sydow a series of repeatedly extended grants between March 1926 and 1930 and beyond, as well as three travel grants for the preparation of the standard work (and some sub-projects). [72] Sydow envisioned a richly illustrated catalogue raisonné of African objects in all European public collections, presented typologically according to geographical and stylistic criteria "using all available material" [73] as he wrote in the preface. Apparently the result was indeed available in this form, but shortly before going to press the author had to do without both the descriptive index of the individual works and illustrations on a large scale, which actually diminishes the value of his study considerably. Yet in view of the continuing lack of a reliable publication on the Cameroon holdings in German public museums, Sydow's handbook remains an irreplaceable source to this day.

On 110 pages, the art historian attempts to classify the art production of the individual regions of Cameroon on the basis of concrete collection objects. [74] Particularly revealing [p.243] are his methodological assessments of the quality and status of the existing museum documentation: they support in many points the findings of Sebastian-Manès Sprute in the present volume → [chapter Sprute, 265 ff.](#) and allow one to sense between the lines the despair that must have gripped the scholar, who had never been to Cameroon 100 years ago, on some days:

"In addition to all these difficulties, there is another source of ambiguity, which has its roots in the names of the villages, etc. The different names, such as Bali, Bamum, etc., do not merely designate a place, but also a tribe and its territory. The different names, such as Bali, Bamum, etc., do not only refer to the place, but also to the tribe and its territory. Thus, one does not know whether a Bali piece originates from the locality or from the larger landscape of Bali. Furthermore, the names of some landscapes are not fixed in their circle, but are often used cartographically in different meanings. Bamilike, for example, is not only used as the name of a small special district, but also as a summary of smaller landscapes. Thus, sometimes the origin of a piece is doubtful even if the museum catalogue mentions, for example, Bamilike as the place of acquisition." [75]

A methodological decision Sydow made in the mid-1920s is also reminiscent of the one the authors of the present atlas had to make a hundred years later: he had to "be content to work on the [poor] basis as presented to us by the museum material".[76] That the German museums and the umbrella organisations responsible for them, especially the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation, have not used the past century to remedy this state of affairs is significant and shameful.

It would go too far here to go into detail about the more than 80 objects from Cameroon mentioned by Sydow in the handbook. It should only be pointed out that his study was based almost exclusively on the holdings of the Ethnological Museums in Berlin, and to a lesser extent on those in Stuttgart and Leipzig. Sydow certainly spent hundreds of hours in the Völkerkundemuseum; he mentions the "card catalogue", which was only accessible internally, at various points in the handbook and which he obviously used intensively. This raises the question of how the collaboration between the institutionally unaffiliated art historian and the staff of the Berlin institution, which until then had been rather reserved towards external research, might have turned out. One answer can be found in the handbook itself, another in the exhibition programme of the city of Berlin for 1932 and a third in the course catalogue of the Friedrich-Wilhelms University there. In the handbook, Sydow warmly thanks "Prof. A. Schachtzabel", who "made the material of his exhibition and study collection accessible to him in the most liberal manner".[77] Since 1925, Alfred Schachtzabel (1887-1981) had been the director of the African-Oceanic department of the Berlin Ethnological Museum, where he had worked with interruptions since 1911. The self-confessed Nazi, who was not employed after 1945 because of his NSDAP past, apparently liked to surround himself with like-minded people at the museum: In the year he took office as [p.244] head of department, the then 23-year-old ethnologist Hermann Baumann (1902-1972), also an early supporter of National Socialist ideas, was given the only permanent staff position in the Africa department; Baumann joined the NSDAP in 1932 and participated in plans for a colonial reconquest of Africa by the German Reich. [78]

Although it can only be clearly substantiated for the period after 1933, it is reasonable to assume that as early as the mid-1920s, political affinities greatly facilitated Sydow's access to Berlin's Africa holdings. In 1932 he acted as catalogue editor and presumably also as curator of the exhibition "African Sculpture" organised "by the Berlin Secession in conjunction with the Berlin State Museums", which showed objects from the museums in Berlin, Cologne and Hanover as well as from private collections. [79] Some of the courses he offered on the subject of "primitive peoples" at Berlin University from the summer semester of 1933 were the only ones in the Kunsthistorisches Institut's course catalogue to include museum tours, for example the lecture "Kunst und Kunstgewerbe in den ehemaligen deutschen Kolonien, mit Museumsführung" (Art and Applied Arts in the Former German Colonies, with a Museum Tour) held in the winter semester of 1934.[80] From the winter semester of 1935 onwards, Sydow's lecture was entitled "General Introduction to the Art of Primitive Peoples and its Racial Foundations"[81] for three semesters in succession - in view of his conspicuous privileges and his choice of topics as a lecturer, there can hardly be any question of Sydow's being a mere fellow traveller, as occasionally suggested in the current research literature. [82]

The fact that *The Art of Primitive Peoples* and *The Handbook of African Sculpture*, studies that are still cited time and again today, were penned by a scholar whose research was facilitated, if not made possible, by National Socialist networks certainly does not diminish their scholarly quality. But especially in the context of the reappraisal of African works, the affinity of a scholar to Nazi ideology geared towards racist discrimination and the extermination of "others" is a special circumstance. Sydow's art historical expertise and enthusiasm for form, style, ornamentation, lines, surfaces, colours, indeed for the soul of African objects, was a purely aesthetic phenomenon, detached from consideration of their social foundation. In 1936 and 1939 Sydow travelled twice to Nigeria. The first

time with the support of the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures, founded in London in 1926,[83] and the banker Eduard von der Heydt, for whom Sydow had already been working for years in an advisory, writing and now also collecting capacity, [84] the second time in 1939 "with the support of the German Research Foundation and on behalf of the Cologne Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum of Ethnology", to which he also bequeathed some objects. [85] An application for funding from the Nazi organisation [p.245] Ahnenerbe apparently failed.[86] A few weeks before his death, Sydow published a final essay inspired by these travel experiences in the journal *Koloniale Rundschau*. Titled "The Future Prospects of Negro Art", Sydow added a particularly perverse vision of art politics and art history to the narrative of the salvation of African culture that had been widespread since the late 19th century:

"We can - if we only want to - bring about a new flowering of African sculpture. It cannot be our intention to create proletarianised hordes of helots, but we want to dominate tribes and peoples who move freely in their own cultural sphere. This also applies to the field of art. Its full stream is present in the near memory, - it has not yet completely dried up. It is only a question of finding understanding teachers who succeed [...] in striking again the original, powerful vein of Negroid artistic production. [...] The aim of the control [must] be to keep the artistic production on the African style path and to eliminate outsiders. [...] However, the question remains open as to whether a government ethnologist without an art historical education is suitable for assessing and sensing the African essence in pictorial works." [87]

Steering, chilling, reviving past tradition thanks to art-scientific expertise to cement a relationship of master and subject. Whether Sydow was trying to recommend himself here for such a future task? One thing is certain, however: the German museum expert, Africa expert, university lecturer and National Socialist Eckart von Sydow could not have cast a more disturbing light on his art-scientific expertise a few weeks before his death.[88]

Lost and mendacious

Between the end of the German colonial period in 1919 and the beginning of the Second World War, the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin had 20 years to exhibit, research and publish the Cameroonian masks, thrones, architectural elements, statues, jewellery, utensils, textiles, pipes, drums, etc. in its possession and, in the age of their technical reproducibility, to make them known to the international scientific community. While the museum's scientific activities with regard to them were virtually non-existent until 1939, from 1921 onwards an external researcher, the art historian Eckart von Sydow, contributed to their first scientific classification and cataloguing, first within the framework of an editorial project of the Ullstein publishing house, then with DFG funding, even though due to a lack of funds his plan to photograph as many of them as possible and thus to circulate them internationally, at least visually, fell by the wayside in 1930. On the eve of the Second World War, when the Berlin museums began to move out their collections and were soon to close their [p.248] doors, at most 100 objects from Cameroon (out of the 6044 that were in the museum in 1919) had been photographically documented in publications - shockingly few.

What followed is well known: [89] As early as 1934, museum staff were instructed to draw up lists of objects that, in the event of war, should either be immediately removed ("irreplaceable pieces"), moved to safe places in the museum building ("particularly valuable parts of the collection") or left to their fate ("all remaining objects").[90] In 1938, the actual seizure of Group 1 and, in part, Group 2 began. The main building of the Ethnological Museum not far from Potsdamer Platz remained open to the public until mid-1941 with a reduced display collection. By autumn at the latest, the exhibits were temporarily stored in the so-called Flaktürme Friedrichshain and Zoo (including the two monumental drums from Cameroon) as well as in the deep vault of the Reichsmünze in Berlin, and then partly "from the end of 1942 and increasingly from July 1944 until shortly before the end of the war, they were moved to foreign salvage sites - primarily the Schönebeck and Grasleben mines".[91] The collections, which were not located in the main building of the museum but in the "Study Collection" in the Dahlem district, were also moved to supposedly safe locations in 1943. The largest part of the African collections thus came to Schräbsdorf Castle (today Bobolice Zabkowicki) in Silesia. In May 1945, the Red Army occupied the castle, appropriated the boxes with the African objects found there as war

trophies and transported them to Leningrad. There they were re-inventoried and stored for several decades until the USSR decided in 1975 to restitute them to the socialist brother country GDR, specifically to the Ethnological Museum in Leipzig. From 1977 onwards, the museum received 23,000 African objects (among many other ethnographica). They remained there unpacked until the end of the GDR. In the context of the Cold War, the West Berlin museum administration was not to learn of their presence in Leipzig.

It was only after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the reunification of Germany that these parts of the collection were returned to Berlin in several costly transport operations between February 1991 and January 1993. In the process, it became clear that many of the cultural objects from Africa that had still been in Berlin until 1939 were still missing - until today. Whether they will one day reappear or have to be considered destroyed in the war is uncertain. The Berlin museums have not yet published a precise list of the wartime losses of ethnological or African objects, unlike for the European collections, whose losses have been documented in detailed scholarly catalogues for many years. It also remains incomprehensible to this day why the Berlin museum administration did not take the opportunity in the mid-1990s of the laborious reintegration of 23,251 (!) African cultural objects from Leipzig into the depots of the Berlin museum to publish a systematic [p.249] catalogue of at least these pieces, which made up a third of the total African holdings in Berlin, estimated today at 75,000 inventory numbers, or at least to record them in a database in accordance with international museum standards, as had long been customary in many other countries in Europe and the USA at the time and was soon also made accessible online. [Instead, a great deal of (and well-documented) effort was spent on "disinfesting" them once again in 1992:

"Occasional feeding traces - more in the packaging area than on objects - of wood beetles and moths signalled [...] the importance of disinfesting all objects made of organic material as a precaution. With our old boiler plant we were not able to cope with the quantities produced, especially as there were doubts about the safety of the process for a long time and technical retrofitting was slow. With the help of a professional disinfestation company and its "bubbles", but also from our own efforts and in many working hours of the employees, this bottleneck was finally overcome." [93]

Except from a conservation point of view, the African collections in Berlin obviously had no priority at all at the beginning of the 1990s. Some of them were not even returned to the actual museum building in Dahlem, but to a so-called additional depot "on the former air-raid shelter floor of the study collection building". [94] It is hardly surprising that under these circumstances the museum did not engage with them academically.

But back to the post-war period. After initial uncertainty about the whereabouts of the parts of the collection that had been removed during the war but not taken to the Soviet Union, the Ethnological Museum in (West) Berlin was able to resume its work in the mid-1950s with an African collection of well over 30,000 pieces - including several thousand from Cameroon, which had been awaiting systematic scientific treatment since their removal during the colonial era. However, instead of beginning this work and finally giving the Berlin collection the international visibility it deserved due to its size, quality and historicity, Kurt Krieger (1920-2007), who had been employed in the African department since 1940 and served as its director after 1945, concentrated on to fill the gaps "created during the war as far as possible through appropriate acquisitions" [95] - according to the museum's own information, it had acquired 8483 new objects from Africa by 1973 - and "to resume the tradition of having museum staff carry out collecting and research trips after many years of forced pause". [96] The first catalogue-like publication of Cameroonian objects on the part of the museum did not take place until 1960, 15 years after the end of the war, half a century after the loss of the colony, in the form of 80 short catalogue entries, 29 of them with black and white illustrations in the first volume [p.250] of the "Neue Folge" of the publications of the Museum für Völkerkunde Berlin. In addition to Krieger, the head of the department, Gerdt Kutscher (1913-1979), a specialist in ancient American studies, was the editor of the volume, who had edited Sydow's posthumous work *Afrikanische Plastik* (African Sculpture) (1954) for publication shortly before. Under the title *West African Masks*, they offered here a thematic cross-section of the Berlin Africa Collection, with each object accompanied by concise details and, when first published, a large-format illustration. "The material offered is intended to make the holdings of the Berlin Museum known and to serve as a basis for further research," the introduction to the catalogue stated. [97] A scientific discussion was explicitly avoided. Even if no

comparative, typological, bibliographical, ethnological, art-historical or scientific classification of the holdings took place here, some works from the Berlin Museum's Cameroon collection, which is unique in the world apart from Stuttgart and Leipzig, achieved visibility outside the depot rooms for the first time. This dynamic continued with the publication of the partial catalogues of the holdings West African Sculpture I (1965, including 101 catalogue entries on Cameroon, 94 with illustrations), West African Sculpture II (1969, 69 entries, all with illustrations) and West African Sculpture III (1969, 120 catalogue entries, all with illustrations), [98] which also simply created the basis for scientific continuation without any art-historical, ethnological or theoretical pretensions: Transparency. In 1969, exactly 60 years after the end of the German colonial period in Cameroon, about 300 of the approximately 6000 objects from Cameroon that had entered the Museum für Völkerkunde by 1919 had thus been published at least once by the institution that kept them, with an illustration and basic information.

But it was also time. For by this time, the worldwide interest in Cameroon's material cultural heritage had long since led to publications and exhibitions, not least in Cameroon itself, which offered a differentiated classification and appreciation of art and craft products there, especially for the grassland region. In 1953, the famous pan-African publishing house "Présence Africaine" in Paris published the richly illustrated volume *Les Bamiléké. Une civilisation africaine* by Raymond Lecoq was published, which treated the material culture in the grassland region as an artistic feat. [In the same year, the Milwaukee Public Museum in the US state of Wisconsin exhibited for the first time impressive Cameroonian works from the collection of Paul Gebauer, a missionary who was born in Silesia, emigrated to the USA in the mid-1920s and worked in western Cameroon from 1931 - with far-reaching consequences for the reception of Cameroonian art in the USA. It would go too far here to list all the exhibitions that have shown Cameroonian works since the 1960s and 1970s, mostly from the grasslands. [100] The only one worth mentioning here is one organised by the British Museum's curator of Africa, [p.251] William Fagg, in 1964 under the title *Africa. 100 Tribes - 100 Masterpieces* in ... West Berlin (!) and Paris, in which a few works on loan from the Berlin Ethnological Museum were also exhibited. [101]

By this time at the latest, all international circles interested in Cameroon's material cultural heritage must have become aware that Berlin contained a huge, yet scientifically virtually unprocessed collection. Conversely, the people in charge of the Berlin museum could not have been unaware of this worldwide interest in their barely published collection. However, this did not seem to have prompted them to undertake any substantial publication or exhibition project: No further partial catalogues of the collection appeared after 1969. The Berlin museum also hardly ever appeared internationally with loans from its Cameroon holdings in the context of exhibitions. This is particularly evident in the compilation of works presented by the US curator Tamara Northern in her first exhibition, *Royal Art of Cameroon* (1973), now widely recognised as a scholarly milestone. [102] She emphasised in the preface that only in Germany could one find holdings that reflected the pre-colonial diversity and differentiation of Cameroon's material cultural heritage, i.e. old objects, while the numerous collections in the USA were full of examples "from the 1930s and later". [103] Accordingly, the exhibition featured 30 pieces from the Linden Museum in Stuttgart (the curator expressed her "special appreciation" to its director Friedrich Kussmaul) [104] and six from the Völkerkundemuseum in Frankfurt am Main. Northern explicitly pointed out that the exhibits from these museums "all date from the turn-of-the-century or earlier, [and] have never been exhibited outside Germany, and for the most part have not been previously published". [105] No loans came from Berlin, only photographs: a reproduction template for the image of the monumental pair of statues of the Kom (III C 20681 and III C 20682 → *Bildheft XIII*), [106] which Sydow had already published in 1923 and Krieger in 1965, as well as five historical field photographs by the museum ethnologist Bernhard Ankermann from the museum's image archive, with Northern proudly pointing out their publication achievement: "this and the following field photographs are here published for the first time". [107] The museum's image archives were also used to publish the photographs.

We can only speculate about the reasons why Berlin did not provide objects but only photographic material in 1973. [108] Perhaps in the opening year of its spectacular new building in the Dahlem museum complex, which was to function as a counterpole to the museums of the GDR in East Berlin, the house did not want to be without an important exhibit? Perhaps it was too preoccupied with itself and its reorganization, as a historical outline suggests a historical sketch also published in 1973 by Kurt Krieger, which reduced the 100-year history of its Africa department at the Berlin Völkerkundemuseum reduced, as it were, to a history of accumulation, space problems, [p.252] and relocations, concluding with the terse sentence: "future work is to be devoted to a greater extent than hitherto to the

scientific evaluation of the collection holdings". [109] Perhaps, however, the occupation status of West Berlin did not permit international loans between museums, or at least made them complicated. Be that as it may, the precious Berlin holdings from Cameroon remained scarcely visible internationally even in the 1970s and 1980s and were hardly worked on scientifically. In addition, UNESCO-supported restitution claims by some African countries that had become independent, above all Zaire (Congo) and Nigeria, led precisely at this time to the Foundation of Prussian Cultural Heritage and the National Museums in Berlin explicitly deciding not to publish any more object inventories, let alone compile them, in order "not to arouse any covetousness", as it was put in a later confidential defence paper against restitution:

"Both our ethnological museums and the cultural administrations warn against the compilation of such lists. This would only serve to arouse covetousness. Lists of our collections must be avoided in the texts at all costs. This is a particularly important postulate." [110]

In the 1980s, the chances of outsiders learning anything about the African holdings of the Dahlem museum were extremely poor. In 1982, the art magazine read: "Speaking of catalogues - in the modern Berlin Völkerkundehaus, one is treated more kindly, but there are no complete catalogues either". [111] Even high-ranking politicians in the Federal Republic of Germany had hardly any access to information about the collection. This is clear from an exchange of letters between Hildegard Hamm-Brücher (1921-2016), then State Secretary for Culture in the Federal Foreign Office, and an employee of the Office's field office in West Berlin in the summer of 1982. At that time, Hamm-Brücher had publicly announced restitutions to Cameroon and Togo on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the Berlin Conference in 1884; she was also considering holding an exhibition of such holdings to mark the occasion. So the staff member went to Dahlem to the Ethnological Museum to obtain information about the holdings from Cameroon. His sobering reply to the State Secretary on 1 September 1982 was:

"My enquiries have brought to light the following:

1. there is no published catalogue of the holdings of the Africa Department of the Museum für Völkerkunde: a full overview of these holdings could only be obtained by consulting the museum's internal records.

A (thoroughly inexperienced) inspection of the exhibits in the Dahlem Museum revealed that there is quite an extensive collection from two cultural groups in Cameroon. [...]

[p.253] The Cameroon Collection contains a number of exhibits which, without implying anything about their artistic or cultural-historical value, could also be impressive to a larger audience due to their size and nature - these include the gifts for Kaiser Wilhelm II described in the enclosed information sheet.

Prof. Krüger [sic], who was responsible for the African department, explained that there were other objects in the stored holdings that were certainly suitable as exhibits, e.g. for a special exhibition. All in all, however, he said that only a few of these objects had a significance beyond the exemplary; in general, equivalent objects were still sufficiently available in the countries of origin.

4 Prof. Krüger [...] incidentally pointed to the holdings of other museums - e.g. Stuttgart and Munich." [112]

This letter does not require a long commentary: the deliberately organised lack of transparency (not only) of the Cameroon collection was joined in Berlin by an obvious unwillingness to arouse interest in this globally unique collection. The blatant downplaying of its importance to a representative of the state can be seen in the light of Krieger's intimate knowledge of objects from Cameroon, which he himself had partly published in the three-volume work *Masken und Westafrikanische Plastik* (Masks

and West African Sculpture), but even more so in the light of the internationally booming research on art from Cameroon at the time, which - like Tamara Northern in the above-mentioned statement - repeatedly pointed out the historical uniqueness of the objects preserved in German museums, can only be understood as a deliberate deception on the part of an expert museum scholar, and his references to Stuttgart and Munich as a specious attempt to divert attention from "his" holdings. Moreover, the fact that Krieger speaks of supposedly "equivalent" holdings remaining in the "countries of origin" reveals a degree of cynicism that is astonishing in view of the extent of the colonial-era extraction of cultural objects in Cameroon, from which the Berlin museum profited to the highest degree and which he himself had described in an outline of the museum's history in 1973. That the Africa curator of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde, as an ethnologist, was convinced of the lack of value of the Cameroon collection kept there cannot, of course, be entirely ruled out. Elsewhere, outside Berlin, this view was not shared at the time.

[p.256] Ex-Berlin

Apart from a brief window of time between 1960 and 1969, when the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde systematically made known a modest part of its Cameroonian holdings in the four inventories Masks and West African Sculpture I-III, virtually nothing happened with them within the institution in terms of research until the end of the 20th century. Until 1999, they were only scientifically classified and appreciated outside Germany, in individual essays or on the occasion of exhibitions or in overviews of art in Cameroon. In the two publications by Tamara Northern *The Art of Cameroon* (exhibition catalogue, 1984) and Pierre Harter *Les Arts du Cameroun* (1986), which are still considered standard works today, a total of 37 pieces from Cameroon in the possession of the Berlin Museum are illustrated. For Northern's exhibition, curated on behalf of the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service and shown in Washington, New Orleans, Houston, Chicago and New York in 1984, the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin granted twelve loans from Cameroon, which have been newly recorded for the catalogue, four of them in colour. [113] For his part, the French doctor and collector Pierre Harter (1928-1991), who had settled in Cameroon, placed some 70 pieces from Berlin in the general context of the art production he had systematically researched in the grasslands, 25 of which are illustrated in black and white. [114] These publications testify to the high level of international interest in the Berlin collection in the mid-1980s, the curator of which claimed at the time "that only a few of these objects had any significance beyond the exemplary". [115] The disdain shown for the collection, or perhaps the real disdain - however, had a history in Berlin with far-reaching consequences - this should be recalled in conclusion.

If one leafs through the catalogues of the holdings of major international museums such as the Musée du Quai Branly-Jacques Chirac in Paris or the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, one name in the provenance chain repeatedly catches the eye in connection with their Cameroon objects: Speyer. [116] This is particularly true of a number of icons of the "Arts of Cameroon": for example, the life-size, free-standing and beaded representation of a man from the Kingdom of Bamum on display today in Washington's National Museum of African Art (Inv. 85-8-1), described by Tamara Northern as an "extraordinary statue" [117] → [Pictorial Booklet XLI](#). [118] Or the figure of a king (Inv. 70.2017.66.3), recently donated to the Musée du Quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, which had previously been the subject of numerous publications and at least ten exhibitions from the USA to Japan since the 1970s, and which changed hands in 2008 for over a million euros, eventually being donated to the Paris institution. [119] And even more so for the so-called Bangwa Queen of the Musée Dapper in Paris (Inv. 3343), the [p.257] statuette with a broken arm from the Fontem region in western Cameroon, which had already become an icon in the 1930s and which Man Ray photographed in Paris in 1934 with a naked white woman, thus creating one of the most famous photographs of the 20th century. [120] From the 1930s to 1966, Bangwa Queen was part of the legendary collection of US cosmetics entrepreneur Helena Rubinstein (1872-1965); it has been featured in numerous exhibitions of African art since 1935, from the epoch-making show *African Negro* (1935) at MoMA in New York to *Heroic Africans. Legendary Leaders, Iconic Sculptures* (2011) at the Metropolitan Museum, also in New York. What all three works have in common is that they actually come from the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde. They were - among many others - removed from the inventory in the 1920s thanks to good personal connections of the internationally networked art dealer Arthur Max Heinrich Speyer (1894-1958), also known as Speyer II, to the staff of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin and ceded either for payment or in exchange for other objects to Speyer, who resold them in the international art trade or directly to

museums. In Berlin, the literal deletion of these pieces from the museum inventory ("main catalogue") took place in 1926 and 1929." [121]

In total, according to current knowledge, Speyer, together with his father, whose business practice he thus continued, acquired at least 5540 (!) individual objects from the Berlin Museum's inventory between 1919 and 1939, of which at least 175 were from the African collection, a large part of them only after 1925, when Schachtzabel became responsible for the African-Oceanic department. [122] Compared to the approximately 600 objects from the Oceanic Department, which the museum also ceded to Speyer from 1925 onwards, the number of African objects is hardly significant at first glance. However, the pieces that the museum parted with were far from being so-called duplicates, i.e. dispensable pieces that were present several times in the museum's storeroom and unnecessarily took up space there. Rather, they were absolute top pieces of a colonial-era collection that existed nowhere else outside Germany.

For the visibility, circulation and scholarly research of these objects, indeed more generally for the study and publicity of the "Arts of Cameroon", these levies were certainly beneficial, especially as they would never have received the attention in Berlin that they did after leaving the Ethnological Museum - assuming they had survived the Second World War at all. Nevertheless, and despite the financial and spatial constraints of the institution in the 1920s, these disposals must be interpreted either as a form of blatant misjudgement of the importance of the pieces, or as complete indifference towards them - after all, the museum had not made any particular effort to publicise them - or as a source of easy money - downright cynical and inconsistent [p.258] with the propagated image of an institution oriented towards noble scientific principles. In total, the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin received 13 other (non-African) objects from Speyer in exchange for seven ceded objects from Africa; in addition, 10,000 gold marks in 1923/24 for 98 pieces and at least 6000 Reichsmarks in 1928/29 for 71 pieces from Africa [123] - sums that do not seem very high in comparison with, say, the average price for African objects in the art trade centres of Europe at the time. [124] If one were to take it a step further, one could not help but get the impression that the Berlin Museum acted as a fundus for the art trade in the interwar period. Whether the museum staff also profited personally from this could perhaps be determined within the framework of an independent investigation.

And now?

The sobering answer to the question posed at the beginning of this article about the scientific benefit of the 100-year presence of approximately 6,000 historical objects from Cameroon in Berlin's Ethnological Museum (later the Ethnologisches Museum) is: until 1999, it yielded next to nothing. Until the very end of the 20th century, the owning institution only in a few cases dealt scientifically with the cultural objects extracted from Cameroon during the German colonial period, mainly by military personnel under often brutal circumstances. It only made its presence known to the scientific community late (between 1960 and 1969), for a short time and only partially, in the form of catalogue-like information and illustrations of about 300 objects of the total collection. It was not until 1999 that Hans-Joachim Koloss (1938-2013), a Cameroon specialist and curator of the Africa Department of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde from 1985 to 2001, attempted to give the collection a scholarly appreciation: The catalogue Africa. Art and Culture. Masterpieces of African Art was the first Berlin publication to discuss (only) just under 30 objects from Cameroon in detail and to provide bibliographical references (which, however, did not take the international discussion into account).

[125] Later, accurate and intensive discussions of parts of the Cameroon collection, such as those undertaken and partly published by Michaela Oberhofer in 2009/10 for the valuable works from Foumban, [126] were not included in any of the museum's larger research or cataloguing projects. Oberhofer soon moved to the Rietberg Museum in Zurich as curator and has since maintained close contacts with the Palace Museum in Foumban from there. [127]

However, the lack of scholarly engagement with the collection does not mean inaction on the part of the Berlin museum. In the 100 years since the end of the German colonial period, the institution has concentrated on treating the pieces from Cameroon, mostly made of organic material such as wood, [p.259] raffia or feathers, with chemicals to make them "immortal" for future generations of mortals in good museum tradition: Many are now so heavily contaminated that handling them is life-threatening for humans. Another activity of the museum in the same century was to, among other things, moving the Cameroon holdings back and forth a lot within the city or the museum premises, initially for lack of space (1926), later in the context of removal from storage during the Second World War (1938-1942)

and the post-war turmoil (until 1955), then on the occasion of the opening of the large museum complex of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation in West Berlin (1973), and in the course of the reintegration of the parts of the collection returned from the Soviet Union via the GDR (1990); soon afterwards, because of the idea of a separate accommodation of the ethnological exhibition collection in the palace, which arose with the demolition of the Palace of the Republic and the rebuilding of the City Palace in the centre of Berlin (approx. 100 objects in the Cameroon Room of the so-called Humboldt Forum, approx. 180 in the "Modul Schaumagazin Afrika" - with no indication of their origin) [128] and the rest (approx. 4700 objects in various depots scattered across Berlin, hardly accessible to the public and experts).

During this time and despite the multiple manipulation of the objects, no systematic and reliably usable documentation of the holdings was created. Everything or almost everything that was done scientifically with the Cameroon objects in the possession of the Berlin Museum in the years between 1900 and 2000 was done outside the institution: in the 1920s/30s by the National Socialist art historian Eckart von Sydow, who continues to be widely cited in the research literature; from the 1970s onwards by international experts on art from Cameroon, mainly in Cameroon itself (e.g. Jean-Paul Notué). e.g. Jean-Paul Notué, the USA (e.g. Tamara Northern, Christraud M. Geary) and France (e.g. Pierre Harter) used the partial Berlin inventory catalogue published between 1960 and 1969 for hypotheses and analyses; in the past two decades mainly by freelance researchers (e.g. Andreas Schlothauer, Bettina von Lintig). The only objects from Cameroon that have received scholarly appreciation in the last 100 years are among those that the Museum für Völkerkunde disposed of in the 1920s. It was their departure from Berlin that brought them international fame.

Text Map [p.246/247]

1 In Berlin in the 1920s and 1930s, the African and Cameroonian collections were located in two places: the "exhibited" part in the magnificent building of the Völkerkundemuseum in the city centre and a much larger part in the depots and the "study collection" of the museum in Dahlem. Their fate during the Second World War also depended on this division. The museum formulated its first evacuation plans for the event of war as early as 1934.

2 From 1938, the parts of the collection in the Prachtbau (Berlin Mitte) were moved to the basement of the institution according to a priority plan (I, II, III). The exhibits deemed less valuable remained in the halls. The reduced display collection was open to the public until mid-1941. From November 1941, the museum's goods were moved within Berlin, among other places, to flak towers. From the end of 1942 to July 1944, they were systematically transported to safe places outside of Berlin, mostly to the mines of Schönebeck and Grasleben.

3 At the end of 1943, the relocation of the African parts of the collection from Dahlem to Schräbsdorf (today Bobolice Zabkowice) in Silesia began. By 23 July 1944, seven transports had been carried out with 25,000 objects in 318 wooden crates as well as 1031 free-standing large objects.

4 From 8 May 1945 until at least April 1946, the Red Army occupied Schräbsdorf Castle and transported all packed and unpacked objects to Leningrad. In addition, they seized 75 boxes of objects from the Ethnological Museum in Berlin that had already been packed but not evacuated. Until the 1970s, nothing was known about the whereabouts of the collections; they were considered lost.

5 On 6 August 1975, the Central Committee of the CPSU decided to transfer the ethnological objects that had been transported to the USSR in 1945 to the socialist brother state of the GDR. The choice fell on the Ethnological Museum in Leipzig (today the Grassi Museum).

6 In 1977/78, the Leipzig Museum actually took over 727 wooden crates and 293 individual packages (500 m3) from Leningrad. The boxes, about half of which were filled with African objects, were stored unpacked.

7 In January 1990, only a few weeks after the fall of the Berlin Wall, negotiations began on the repatriation of the Leipzig "Leningrad Collection" to Berlin. Some 23,000 African objects were reintegrated into the Museum für Völkerkunde in Dahlem between August 1990 and July 1992, most of them of Cameroonian provenance. Some objects were damaged, many were missing and are still missing.

Legend Map

Transport routes, places of removal and storage of the African collections of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin. 1938-1992

The majority of the collections brought from Cameroon to Berlin during the colonial period remained invisible in the capital of the German Reich for several decades or were no longer in the possession of the Museum of Ethnology. Exact research on the fate of the Cameroon holdings during the Second World War and the Cold War is urgently needed.

Text map [p.254]

- 1 before 1899. Origin of the figure in the Bangwa region, artist's name not documented.
- 2 1899. Acquired by Gustav Conrau on behalf of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde.
- 3 1899. Entry into the inventory of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde (Inv. III C 10522).
- 4 1942/43. Removal to Schrödsdorf Castle in Silesia (today Bobolice northeast of Zabkowice Śląskie/Poland).
- 5 1945/46 Deported to the USSR, stored in Leningrad.
- 6 1977/78. Restitution to the GDR, stored in the Leipzig Museum für Völkerkunde (now Grassi Museum).
- 7 1991/92. Return to the depot of the Ethnological Museum Berlin.

Legend map

Stations of a "standing male figure" of the Bangwa. 1899-2023

The 34 cm high wooden figure from the Bangwa region is one of the thousands of African objects in the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde that were transported to Leningrad by the Red Army as war trophies in 1945. The USSR restituted around 23,000 African objects to the GDR in the mid-1970s. They only returned from Leipzig to Berlin after reunification. In the handwritten main catalogue of the Ethnological Museum, only a small blue stamp bears witness to the war-related journey of the male figure : "zurück aus L.".

Change of ownership (colonial period)

Transfer routes (due to the Second World War)

Text map [p.255]

- 1 before 1899. Origin of the figure in the Bangwa region, artist name not documented.
- 2 1899. Acquired by Gustav Conrau on behalf of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde.
- 3 1899. Entry into the inventory of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde (Inv. III C 10529).
- 4 1929. Sold to the dealer Arthur Speyer, Berlin.

5 before 1935. Resale to the dealer Charles Ratton, Paris.

6 c. 1935. Resale to Helena Rubinstein, Paris/New York.

7 1966. auction of the Rubinstein Collection by Sotheby's/Parke Bernet.

8 1966. Sold at auction by Harry A. Franklin, Los Angeles, who bequeathed the figure to his daughter Valerie Franklin in 1983.

9 1990. auctioned by Sotheby's and purchased by the Musée Dapper, Paris (Inv. 3343) for USD 3.4 million.

Legend map

Stations of the "Bangwa Queen 1897-2023"

The 82 cm high wooden figure from the Bangwa region is one of the numerous objects from Cameroon that the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde sold in the 1920s. The departure from Berlin marked the beginning of an international period for many of them.

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German online edition of the book *Die Kunst der Völkerkunde*.
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.12-19>

Chaos in the Museum

Inventory and knowledge order

SEBASTIAN MANÈS SPRUTE

Today, public collections in the Federal Republic of Germany hold a total of around 40,000 objects of Cameroonian origin - this is a central result of our research project. This enormous quantity was previously unknown. Only meticulous reconstruction work has made it visible. The methods on which this work is based, but also the obstacles that stand in the way of making the Cameroonian "continent" visible in German museums, will be explained in the following.

I. SOURCES

Collection institutions

The implementation of any inventory of material cultural heritage in Germany initially encounters the problem that there is no conclusive overview of where and in what quantity what kind of cultural heritage is kept. In the very broad German museum landscape, Cameroonian cultural heritage can be found in all existing museum types - even in institutions whose names, thematic orientation or collection areas do not suggest this. These include, according to the distinction made by the Institute for Museum Research, local and regional history museums, art museums, castle and palace museums, natural history museums, natural science and technical museums, historical and archaeological museums, collection museums with complex holdings, special cultural history museums as well as institutions defined as "several museums in one museum complex". [1]

For our inventory, we were also able to obtain data from mission museums, university collections and one privately owned collection. After we had identified all the larger public collection holdings, we refrained from identifying and recording further holdings, especially microholdings in "off-topic", hard-to-identify institutions. [2] However, it can be assumed that [p.266] beyond this study, further German collection institutions can be found in which Cameroonian cultural heritage is kept. [3]

Furthermore, we have only included institutions within the national borders of Germany, which was reunified in 1990. Collections in areas that were part of the German territory in colonial times but no longer are today were not included, which means that the collections of the former West Prussian Provincial Museum in Gdańsk, the Szczecin City Museum or the University of Wrocław were not included. [4] Nor have we followed up on holdings that were relocated abroad during the Second World War or immediately afterwards, e.g. from the Soviet Occupation Zone to the USSR. [5] Furthermore, with the exception of the publicly presented, extensive private collection of the Daetz couple in the palace of Lichtenstein (Saxony), the German private collections with Cameroon holdings were also not included in our investigation. [6] Although data collection remains incomplete, our project has for the first time undertaken an inventory that covers the Cameroonian cultural heritage held in the majority of all public German collecting institutions.

Our investigation is essentially based on tabular inventory overviews provided by the identified institutions. In the course of collecting the basic data for the subsequent evaluation and further research of the holdings, it became apparent that there are no cross-institutional and often also no internal standards for the structuring of collection documentation in terms of content and form. In many cases, historical collection information has not yet been revised or is available in a wide variety of processing states in a wide variety of formats - from handwritten index cards to digitised database entries. In some cases, the collection data was compiled specifically for our research project. [7]

The willingness to share data that is considered sensitive from a postcolonial perspective is evidence of the critical, self-reflexive reorientation that leading ethnological museums have been working on for several decades. Research on provenance from colonial contexts is being actively pursued in many places, as recently by the research network PAESE - Provenance Research in Non-European Collections and Ethnology in Lower Saxony, to name just one example. [8] Nevertheless, the potentially available historical collection documentation of many institutions is still not available in a unified, uniform and easily accessible form. In the vast majority of cases, it is not yet possible to access

the entirety of historical knowledge. Therefore, the data of the collection documentation, which is mostly kept by the institutions under the heading [p.267] "inventory list", serves as the data basis for our investigation. Even though the information varies from institution to institution and is often not even standardised within the institution, it is the most suitable form for recording relevant data.

Data collection

The documentation of ethnological collection holdings, which is deficient in many respects, has always posed the greatest challenge to their research. As a result, the majority of all colonial-era object holdings in Germany have ultimately "not been retro-catalogued and -processed evenly to this day".[9] Not only that "knowledge about the objects [...] is often incomplete", "the origin and context of many objects [...] are unknown" and even "existing information about them often [proves to be] one-sided or incorrect". [10] The structural deficits of non-standardised documentation and faulty inventorying from the beginning have also carried over into the present day. [11] Moreover, parts of the documentation that belong together are often scattered across different institutions, and in many cases there is no "citable file structure".[12] Ethnological collection holdings thus have no sustainable knowledge order whatsoever and usually not even the beginnings of a resilient knowledge organisation. [13] Following Beatrice Barrois, they can rather be classified as "[H]places of (non)knowledge".

"A neuralgic point in ethnological museums is the incomplete knowledge about objects, provenances, facts, contexts and backgrounds of ethnographic collections. Missing and faulty records and documentation haunt the depots and archives. These museums store knowledge about people who have rarely been allowed to speak for themselves. We hardly know from primary sources how the explored or colonised people acted, thought and felt at the beginning of the 20th century. We encounter areas of half-knowledge or ignorance here. Moreover, the body of knowledge is incomplete because the voices of the explored have, for the most part, been completely disregarded." [14]

The "(non)knowledge" described here manifests itself in the data categories of the collection documentation relevant to our investigation - quantity data, data on stakeholders involved (persons and corporate bodies), typology of objects (material and functional groups), location and time data of the dislocation processes - in terms of incomplete knowledge stocks as well as in a deficient, often not apparent structuring of the data categories themselves - i.e. the breakdown and subdivision of knowledge or the knowledge order or knowledge organisation.

[p.268] The retrieved data sets not only prove that in many cases it is a matter of "outdated ethnological knowledge stocks", "which are in urgent need of revision", [15] but also that so far, with regard to the collection stocks defined as "ethnological", there are no uniform formal conventions as to which data are used for documentation, in how many "recording categories" or "data fields" [16] this information on the objects is then filed or what a standardisation of the content-related information in the fields should look like.

Data categories or data fields serve to "structure the information on the objects according to different aspects, topics and so on". [17] In the Guidelines for the Documentation of Museum Objects of the German Museums Association, for example, the following minimum number of data categories or data fields is specified for the "inventory list" section of the collection documentation:

"Receipt number, inventory number. If applicable, other numbers, date of receipt, date (of accession), object name, short description (if applicable with information on dimensions, material, technique), information on previous ownership, type of accession (for example donation, find, donation, purchase), photograph or reference to a photograph, if applicable also drawing, if applicable acquisition price, date and signature or abbreviation of the name of the person responsible. [18]

The number of data fields in the records evaluated here varies between four and 61 different categories, with the majority of collection documentation making do with ten to 15 data fields. Thereby, three to 25 data categories can conceal central information for determining the origin of the objects, roughly divided into information on persons involved, places and times. On average, four to six data

fields contain information relevant for determining the origin. Larger amounts of data fields can be explained by an enrichment of the classical ethnological collection documentation, which is concentrated on object biographical and collection historical information. This can be achieved, for example, through more extensive information on provenance (e.g. positions for individual links in the provenance chain), but also through supplementary information from the field of restoration (e.g. information on the recommended degree of humidity for optimal storage) or through a series of information on find documentation based on archaeological practice (e.g. longitude and latitude of the find site of an object, its positional orientation at the find site, etc.). In the present case, it is also apparent that the documentation structures of the dominant umbrella institution are reflected in the collection documentation of ethnological holdings that form part of larger museum collections in multi-disciplinary institutions. Ethnological collection documentations in foreign-disciplinary [p.269] museum organisational structures, e.g. from traditional historical contexts often still in natural history contexts, characterise ethnological collection documentations to this day and require a perspective that is more strongly oriented towards natural science criteria.

The lack of standards for the content and form of collection documentation goes hand in hand with a fundamentally different degree of processing of the individual object data sets. On the one hand, one and the same institutional documentation may contain data records that have only just been transferred (and in some cases specifically for project purposes) from historical index cards into a database, reproducing the corresponding data in their original state, so to speak. On the other hand, there are also intensively processed object data sets that have been subjected to multiple scientific revisions and reworkings, the extent of which is often impossible to determine, and have already been migrated several times into another database system.

The very broad spectrum that can vary in collection documentation even within a single holdings can be illustrated particularly well by the Cameroon holdings of the Städtisches Museum Braunschweig: Although a large part - 699 of a total of 769 objects of the total holdings there - has been subjected to intensive provenance research in the course of the PAESE project "(Post)Colonial Acquisition Histories and Object Meanings of the Cameroon Collection of the 'Schutztruppen' Officer Kurt Strümpell (1872-1947) from the German Colonial Period"[19], not yet the remaining part of the relevant holdings (as of April 2023). The collection documentation of the researched holdings therefore now has a relatively comprehensive and up-to-date collection documentation with 61 data fields, whereas the remaining Cameroon holdings continue to be distinguished by the four data fields that were already recorded in historical entry books and index cards. [20]

Due to the very uneven structure of the corpus of the different collection documentation, the retrieved records in most cases do not represent the totality of information available in a given institution. We were not able to take into account changes in the data sets resulting from ongoing or only partially completed revisions, which are not reflected in the retrieved data sets, such as the comparison of named stakeholders and entities with corresponding standards databases such as the Common Standards File (GND) or of object designations with standardised subject group classifications.

The fluidity of the data sets expressed here, which is currently primarily due to a plethora of provenance research projects, also points to an even more fundamental problem of ethnological collection documentation, namely that of the underlying [p.270] "find documentation". From the very beginning, the holdings collected during the colonial period were documented in an inconsistent, incomplete and, from today's perspective, non-scientific manner, not least because the immense increase in objects during this era[21] led to an early processing backlog in the collection institutions of the time, [22] which continues to this day.

Classical object biographical or collection-historical "ethnological" research on the holdings has since attempted to deal with these deficiencies in a wide variety of ways, [23] but has mainly been carried out on an ad hoc basis, [24] but almost never systematically on the basis of larger collection holdings. Studies conducted over decades under different premises and only covering partial holdings have thus also contributed to the inconsistent degree of processing and shape the overall picture of the respective documentation. However, due to the overwhelming lack of notation of changes in the records over time and an equally large lack of history of the documentation guidelines, even obvious breaks in the processing depth of object records cannot usually be proven or quantified.

Even among current research projects, only very few refer to more comprehensive sets of holdings, thus perpetuating the uneven spectrum of processing states of different parts of the collection documentation. Even though knowledge about object holdings is currently growing rapidly as a result of numerous projects on provenance research, it will still take a long time to process the data sets of

the estimated three to four and a half million objects of total holdings of non-European cultural property in German collections in a sustainable and appropriate manner. [25]

It remains to be said that our inventory is based on an extremely fluid data set. As a snapshot of the current state of research on Cameroonian cultural heritage in German collections, it offers an imperfect but more than overdue overview. In this way, it contributes to bringing to light the huge but hitherto invisible and therefore hardly usable stock - the largest stock of Cameroonian cultural heritage worldwide.

[P.271] II. SOURCE CRITICISM

The lack of a knowledge order as well as a coherent approach to the systematic organisation of knowledge in ethnological documentation practice is exemplified in the following by the notational practices in collection documentation of the German Cameroon holdings.

Lack of a benchmark for determining the number of objects

What stands out here is primarily the lack of an orientation yardstick or a uniform set of rules for the quantitative determination of the objects. The difficulties in providing concrete figures on the respective inventory sizes result primarily from three different problems.

Lack of a uniform method of counting

Firstly, any quantitative information on the objects or object data sets in the collection documentation is corrupted by the fact that no uniform way of counting the objects has been established so far. Basically, a distinction can be made between a "multiple counting method" and a "single counting method". According to the multiple counting method, groups of objects that can be understood as an ensemble of several individual parts, such as a dance costume, a warrior's armour, a quiver with arrows or a set of Abbia tokens, are counted as a unit and listed under a single inventory number. In the single-counting method, on the other hand, ensembles of objects are counted in all their identifiable individual parts and each is given a separate inventory number. [26]

Institutional holdings that are counted individually naturally appear much larger in number than holdings in which ensembles of objects are counted as a unit. Depending on the method of counting, the holdings sizes of the institutions are thus inflated or diminished. The stated holdings sizes of the individual institutions have thus not been calculated in the same way and can only be compared to a limited extent due to the numerical distortions and lack of orientation standards.

An extreme example of this distortion of stock sizes can be given by analysing the counting methods of Abbia tokens. These small objects are tokens, mostly made of nutshells, of a gambling game popular mainly in Southern Cameroon. The tokens, which were decorated on one side, were used in the game like coins in "heads or tails" and are particularly suitable as collectors' items because of their often delicate individual engravings with motifs, [p.272] patterns and ornaments. [27] Within the framework of the largest collection holdings of the eleven museums we examined, with more than 1000 objects of Cameroonian cultural heritage, considerable distortions of the stock sizes can be found, for example, in the collections of the Museum Fünf Kontinente Munich, the MARKK Hamburg and the Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum Hannover due to the individual counting of Abbia tokens. In the collection of the Museum Fünf Kontinente alone, 356 Abbia playstones are represented out of a total of 3018 objects of Cameroonian cultural heritage. [28] In the MARKK's holdings, the ratio is even more drastic: there, 275 Abbia tokens make up about one fifth of the total inventory of 1431 objects. [29] A comparable ratio is also found in the Lower Saxony State Museum, where 278 Abbia tokens are found among a total of 1536 objects. [30]

Among the collection documentations examined, both counting methods are used in 17 cases, and in addition, the multiple counting method and the single counting method are used in 14 cases each. [31] In the eleven largest institutions with more than 1000 objects of Cameroonian cultural heritage, both counting methods are even used, whereas in smaller collections with holdings of less than 1000 objects, only one of them is usually followed. In the smallest collections with less than 100 objects, only the single-counting method was increasingly found, which is also due to the fact that, for example, with a total of only ten objects, there are often no examples of the multiple-counting method.

Mixing object genres

A second difficulty in determining concrete inventory sizes is that ethnological collection holdings are often not only composed of objects defined as explicitly ethnological. This is where it comes into play that such designated collection objects often cannot be sharply distinguished from other object categories that are typically kept in other collection institutions. The Cameroonian cultural heritage collections therefore also include objects that would classically be housed in geological, botanical or zoological collections. In the Deutsches Museum in Munich, which specialises in natural science and technology, there is thus also a colonial Cameroon collection that contains numerous geological and mineralogical raw material samples, including raw ironstone, [32] graphite rock, [33] clay samples [34] and magnetite, [35] which, depending on the classification system, would no longer be considered "ethnological" collection objects. Furthermore, in many places, not least, human remains are found, which often constitute an integral part of ethnologically defined objects. This is the case with those objects that have been grouped together under the less meaningful and pejorative, but at the same time "central collection category" of "fetish" or "idols" for ethnological holdings. [36]

[p.273] In addition to these typological distortions of holdings sizes, there is a more orderly practical one, since depending on the institution and database extract, documentary visual (drawings, photographs, film material), audio and written sources (texts, maps, travelogues) were sometimes also inventoried as objects and are therefore listed in country-specific queries of a total holdings quantity. However, such foreign holdings were not counted as objects in the context of this study.

Timeliness of the data

A third and final point in determining the actual inventory sizes concerns the fact that counting object records in database extracts is not the same as counting the material objects in the repository. The date of the last inventory or check of the state of preservation of an object, with which its actual and physically intact existence can be proven, [37] was not given by many institutions or was often several decades ago. This reflects the problem of the varying degree of processing of the object records in the documentations - an indicator of inadequate custody of the objects. [38]

Lack of orientation standard for determining the object type

In addition to fluctuating calculations of the actual number of objects in the collection, ethnological holdings are characterised by the fact that it is often not known what kind of objects they are. Such gaps in knowledge about the social functions and the historical context of use of objects subsequently make it difficult to assign them to specific object genres, subject groups or functional groups.

Due to the incomplete knowledge and limited possibilities for historical reconstruction, it is fundamentally difficult to provide doubtless proof of incorrectly classified objects. However, traces of such classification problems are noticeable everywhere in the collection documentation consulted. For example, in the object description of an object originally described as a "war helmet of the Insum" in the Cameroon collection of the Museum Fünf Kontinente in Munich, there are several references to specialist literature as well as the prominent comment of a "Dr. Küsters": "Not a war helmet but a circumcision mask". [39] The references to specialist publications show that those responsible for the collection took the objections of the visitor, who could not be identified, seriously and noted that the originally assumed function as a "war helmet" was questionable. [40] An ethnological object genre that is typically subject to misinterpretation [p.274] and is represented in large numbers is that of the so-called fetishes. This "category of sacred objects in which a superhuman power resides" was "from the beginning [...] used derogatorily for religious objects of all kinds". [41] The broad spectrum of the object genre fetish subsequently led to an erosion of the meaning of the term as well as to objects being classified inflationarily as fetish - often because they could not be accommodated in other object categories from a European perspective. An unknown person in charge of the collection at the Museum Fünf Kontinente expressed this as early as 1888, when he nonchalantly commented on an object labelled as an "amulet" or "sword-shaped piece of wood with brass rings" in the inventory book: "What you cannot define in ethnographic junk in Africa is called a 'fetish' or an amulet." [42] The term "fetish" was used to describe an object that could not be classified as a fetish.

So-called ethnological collection holdings are more affected by such classification problems than other museum object genres because of their "foreign cultural origin" from a German perspective. The classification problems here are therefore of a fundamental nature and rather concern the handling of material sources or tangible or representational sources in general. [43] Basically, the question is

according to which criteria the objects should be classified at all: "according to internal or external characteristics, cognitive or contextual, factual, spatial, temporal or completely arbitrary criteria? Or according to the carriers, functions, costs, consequences, places of discovery, modes of use?" [44] Since such an order for ethnographic collections has so far been lacking, it is worthwhile to compare it with classification systems in cultural-historical collection holdings. [45] Here, the object classifications of Walter Trachsler[46] and Claude Lapaire[47] in particular have become established. Both studies from the 1980s were commissioned by the Swiss Museums Association and attempt to define object categories of European lifeworlds based on function and material and to locate them in a hierarchical classification scheme. However, these classification systems are Eurocentric and cannot be easily transferred to the object worlds of non-European societies. Trachsler's classification in particular is characterised by narrow categorical subdivisions, including "mountain emergency and avalanche rescue equipment", [48] "Merovingian and Carolingian coins (alphabetically according to mint)", [49] "ticket validation tongs" [50] or "[ü]brige Strafvollzugsgeräte (Pranger, Schandpfähle, Schandbühnen, 'Trüllen'; so-called marriage spoons etc.)". [51] In contrast, Lapaire's approach is based on a much more open conception, which theoretically allows for the integration of natural science and/or ethnology collections into the classification. [52] In most collection documentation, corresponding information is placed under the heading "object designation". However, neither Trachsler's nor Lapaire's systematics are reflected in the subject group divisions there.

Instead, we find at best clear approaches to typological classifications, for example in the holdings of the ethnological collection of the Reiss-Engelhorn-Museen Mannheim. There, the 1789 objects of Cameroonian cultural heritage have been subdivided into ten, but inconsistent categories, which are sometimes based on the criterion of the function of an object, sometimes on the criterion of the type of material: "Weapons and accessories, jewellery, utensils, clothing, dance and music, masks and figures, textiles, pictures and painting, cult and ritual, miscellaneous". [53] The object typology in the collection of the Institute of Ethnology at the Georg August University in Göttingen presents a similar picture. For the total collection of approximately 18,000 objects, a clear system of 14 supercategories was developed years ago, to which another 14 subcategories are attached. However, the categories are oriented exclusively to the function of the objects. [54] Thus, a distinction is made between economic implements, weapons and war implements, domestic animal husbandry, domestic type, art and religion, dignity marks, mementos, etc. The most finely subdivided category is that of economic implements, which includes tools and implements, soil-building, catching, hunting and carrying implements, as well as transport and traffic. [55]

However, even such clear object typologies, whether oriented on the criterion of material type or mode of use, ultimately operate from a Eurocentric perspective, which leads to numerous objects being misunderstood and misclassified. But that is not all: the few, still comparatively clear conceptions are confronted with a confusion of multiple overlapping organisational attempts on the level of material culture within a collection documentation, which in turn present a very heterogeneous picture when arranging objects along the most diverse guidelines. Due to the aforementioned problems, the function of many objects of Cameroonian cultural heritage in German collection institutions cannot be precisely determined for the time being. Their unclear, often erroneous status in the context of museum classification systems unfortunately also ensures that many of the objects cannot be used scientifically outside the institutions concerned and remain invisible.

Lack of guidance on the notation of personal data

Also in the area of the data category, in which information about the stakeholders involved in the collection or delivery of objects is recorded, e.g. address data, occupation, etc., no institution-wide and only in a few cases an institution-internal standardisation of the collection documentation is evident. Thus, neither a [p.276] uniform selection of the bodies, stakeholders and agents involved in the translocation processes to be documented nor a congruent method of structuring, documenting or recording the data is apparent.

With regard to the selection of persons and entities involved in the object translocations, there are mostly only references to the first and last European link in the provenance chain, i.e. the so-called collectors in the colonial territories as well as those persons or entities who ultimately handed over objects to a specific collecting institution. For example, the merchant Adolf Diehl → Bio, 378 is credited with the huge amount of 2344 objects in the Linden-Museum Stuttgart. [56] Interim owners, often including art trade institutions, on the other hand, were only recorded in the rarest of cases, as

were the non-European previous owners and manufacturers. This variable selection of data on the individual stages of the provenance chain is joined at the intra-institutional level by an additional variability in the selection of the documented "consignors" or "object donors". Although in the overwhelming majority of cases only a single person or institution is cited, there are also references to married couples or siblings.

By far the greatest degree of inconsistency, however, can be seen in the orthography of the entries of personal or institution-related data themselves. All information in the data records on persons, for example, i.e. information noted there on names, title affixes, occupational titles and address data, is subject to considerable variation. One and the same person can therefore appear several times within a collection documentation in different spellings, e.g. as "Dr. M. Jaeger", [57] "Dr. med. M. Jäger" [58] and "Dr. med. Max Jäger". [59] Information on the person, if available, always contains the surname but often no first name or only an abbreviated first name (e.g. "Schran, F.A.", [60] "Schran, Herr" [61] and "Schran" [62]). Especially when there are several personal data entries of the same surname in combination with different spellings, missing or abbreviated further information on the person, it is difficult to determine how many persons are actually involved. Moreover, in the vast majority of cases, personal details of female members of the provenance chain were recorded in the discriminatory and uninformative form common at the time as an appendage of their husband (e.g. as "Frau Fregattenkapitän Nobis", [63] "Frau Diplomat Andr. Harkort" [64] or "Frau Baurat Wölber" [65]). Address details are just as often missing completely or were only documented in parts ("Krebs, Kassel" [66]). Occupational titles, which could help to identify the persons involved, were for the most part also not recorded or only form an imprecise supplement (e.g. "Actor's family Paty" [67] or "Merchant Putzler" [68]).

[p.277] Changes in personal status over time, e.g. through marriage or gaining a title, were likewise not indicated in the vast majority of cases, which can lead to further duplicate records of the same stakeholders. Personal data records that were not very meaningful in themselves were sometimes supplemented with additions (e.g. "pupil Bruno Meyer", [69] "secondary school pupil Schneevoigt" [70] or "Jockisch family" [71]), which are of little help in determining the identity of the stakeholders hidden behind them without further information. What has been exemplified here using the example of personal data also applies to a lesser extent at the level of the data records deposited in the collection documentation on corporations and institutions that were involved in object translocations.

Due to the fundamental restriction of the provenance chain to persons and institutions of European origin, as well as the incomplete and inconsistent documentation of personal data, in the vast majority of cases it is not known to whom the objects originally belonged, and in many cases it is also no longer possible to determine who was involved in their translocation. Even in the case of objects where the original indigenous owners are known, their names are mostly concealed and only the names of the first Europeans into whose possession the objects came are mentioned. This is the case with the Tangué or ship's bill (belonging to a Duala canoe), which has been in the holdings of the Museum Fünf Kontinente München since 1884. The significant royal insignia once belonged to the leader of the Bele Bele grouping of the Duala, Kum'a Mbape Bell (1846-1916), also known as Lock Priso Bell → Bio, 397. However, the name of its original owner does not appear at all in the database extract. [72] Instead, the coloniser who brought the looted object to Germany is mentioned as the 'source'. [73] This not only gives him unjustified credit, but also makes the original owner invisible and gives the impression that the object had not belonged to anyone before. That this was not the case is made clear not least by the fact that a descendant of the original owner, Kum'a Ndumbe III, has been demanding the return of the Tangué since 1992; it is thus the component of Cameroonian cultural heritage whose restitution has been demanded for the longest time. [74]

Corresponding to the information on the individual stages of the provenance chain, the temporal information refers to two different moments in the process of object translocation: on the one hand, to the first possession of the object by colonisers, glossed as "collection period", [75] as "dating" [76] or "collection date" [77] among other things, and on the other hand, to the so-called date of receipt, acquisition or [p.278] access, on which objects arrived at a particular collection institution.

The date of receipt is found in all the documentation examined with comparatively precise information, sometimes even to the day. The moment of possession, on the other hand, presents a very diffuse and incomplete picture. With one exception (Reiss-Engelhorn-Museen Mannheim) [78], this category can be found in all collection documentation of the eleven institutions with a Cameroon collection of over 1000 objects, but only four of them (Ethnologisches Museum Berlin, Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde Leipzig, Museum für Völkerkunde Dresden, Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum Hannover) provide

more detailed information. [79] Among the remaining documentations, the category remains completely blank in again three cases (Linden-Museum Stuttgart, MARKK Hamburg, Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum Cologne), [80] and in three others there are almost no entries at all (Museum Fünf Kontinente Munich, Weltkulturenmuseum Frankfurt, Übersee-Museum Bremen). [81]

The deficient time indications for the coloniser's taking possession of the object should be briefly illustrated using the collection documentation of the EM Berlin (there under the classification category "dating"). Dates are rarely more specific than annual divisions and operate mainly on the level of periodisations such as "before 1900". [82] Hardly any more precise divisions refer to the "19th century". [83] as a whole or seek to specify this through additions such as "middle", [84] "2nd half" [85] or "end" [86] of the 19th century. This is again done using varying notations which, as with the turn of the century, can also cause confusion in terms of temporal reference when there are five similar notations at once: "around 1900", [87] "turn of 19th/20th century", [88] "19th century-20th century (beginning)", [89] "19th century (end)-20th century (beginning)" [90] and "19th century or 20th century (beginning)." [91] Despite the confusion of spellings, however, the first beginnings of at least a uniform periodisation can be seen here.

Even if the colonial origin of the dislocation processes can be proven beyond doubt for the overwhelming majority of the objects, their exact circumstances can no longer be clearly traced on the basis of the collection documentation alone due to the little precise and incomplete, in many cases completely missing, information on the moment of seizure. Rather, the documentation practices established over decades have led to the actual act of the often violent and inhumane expropriation of cultural property being rendered invisible. In many cases, the moment of expropriation can be researched, dated and reconstructed just as well as the moment of entry into the collection. However, depending on the context, this requires elaborate case-by-case examinations in which all information on the object of investigation is gathered [p.279], including the available parts of the collection documentation, but also archival sources, diaries, correspondence, etc. and not least local sources, e.g. from oral history studies.

Lack of orientation standards for the documentation of indications of origin

Information on the location of origin of the objects is usually recorded spatially-geographically as well as population-specifically in order to ensure the best possible identifiability. In this area, too, however, only in rare cases is an institution-internal standardisation of the information recognisable. Ignorance, lack of standardisation and a diffuse ordering of knowledge, however, are particularly consequential when the very centre of collection-specific ethnological research proves to be largely dysfunctional and the ethnological practice of collecting and classifying itself is called into question. Even more, the lack of qualified data in this area proves to be momentous, especially for the Cameroonian side interested in reconstructing its own history, by complicating the historical reappraisal of the dislocation processes that accompanied the expropriation of Cameroonian cultural heritage. Intensified research on this area may help to fill gaps in knowledge in the future. However, an object with nothing but the indication of origin "Cameroon" is unlikely to be precisely reassigned.

Yet precisely defined geographical spaces or a comparative collecting practice structured according to geographical criteria as well as collection and exhibition concepts were actually a core competence of early German museum ethnology. [92] Museum directors such as Bernhard Ankermann → Bio, 370 (1859-1943) used maps not least to illustrate, for example, the degree of completeness of their collection holdings over a given population. [93]

Structural mixing of population-specific and geographical categories of order.

The collection documentations reveal an uneven understanding of how geographical and population-specific provenance information is documented. An exemplary evaluation of the ten largest collection holdings that have presented their data in the respective in-house structuring of collection documentation [94] illustrates the range of notation methods (see following table):

In addition to a majority of institutions that report geographical and population-specific provenance information separately, but distributed over a different number of categories, there are also those that have combined these two categories. A mixture of the data with other [p.280] values (e.g. with temporal values) can also occur. The further subdivision of the categories or data fields is also highly incongruent and, in addition to the geographic (e.g. "subcontinent", "region" and "place") and population group-specific (e.g. "ethnicity", "region" and "place") values that are to be expected here, it

also includes the following values e.g. "ethnicity", "culture") rubrics, political-territorial ("state", "country", "district"), actor- or person-centred ("participant", "artist", "primary person") and linguistic units ("language group"). This structural inconsistency is continued and extended at the level of the actual content entries, since despite the categorical specifications, in many cases entirely different measurement variables and values were entered here.

Incomplete, erroneous and inconsistent entries.

In geographical terms, landscape markers such as "Sanaga" River, [95] "Mandara Mountains", [96] "Biafra Coast" [97] or "Rainforest" [98] are also cited, as well as other vaguely defined spatial units such as "German-French border", [99] "Neighbouring Sch. Lake Chad", [100] "hinterland of Cameroon (= Douala)" [101] or "border area between grassland and woodland". [102] There are also numerous indications based on the traditional colonial division of the country into coastal region, grassland, woodland and Sahel. Simply incorrect geographical classifications at all levels (for example, the location of Cameroon in West Africa instead of Central Africa [103]), numerous different, [p.281] partly outdated spellings (for example, in the designation of the region "Adamaoua" also "Adamaua" [104]), frequent spelling mistakes ("Adamona" [105]) and many statements with question marks ("Aumana (?)" [106]) further increase the structural and content-related confusion (Fig. 1).

However, the major difficulty in determining the origin of the objects arises from the fact that a large part of the entries in the geographical classification categories are either completely missing or contain only insufficient information. This applies in particular to those entries that only give location information oriented to cardinal points according to the scheme North, East, South, West, Northwest Cameroon, etc. or are limited to the rudimentary information "Cameroon". Insufficient and hardly meaningful geographical indications of origin characterise a large part of the object records within the institutions. In the collection documentation of MARKK Hamburg, the proportion is over 50%: Calculated on the historical total, 1863 of 3482 entries there are only marked with the indication of origin "Cameroon". [107] Similarly high figures are also found in the Übersee-Museum Bremen, where only "Cameroon" is given for 764 of 2737 records of the historical total. [108] Or at the Museum Fünf Kontinente Munich, where 799 of 3018 records of the current holdings are exclusively labelled "Cameroon". [109] The inconsistency, gaps and errors in the entries in the geographical classification categories are only surpassed by the deficient entries in the population-specific categories. Complementary to the ignorance of the geographical origin of the objects, an even more far-reaching lack of knowledge about their correct population-specific classification is expressed here, as well as, not least, a general failure of ethnological classification itself.

It is precisely here that the varying degree of processing of the inventory data sets becomes evident, which in many cases are based on largely unprocessed amateur documentation dating back to colonial times. In the meanwhile more than 100 years that have passed since the end of the German colonial period in Cameroon, in-depth, systematic research has been undertaken in a vanishingly small proportion of cases, which would have made it possible, for example, to sustainably fill the categories for a contemporary ethnological museum.

The lack of knowledge regarding the population-specific allocation of objects is primarily expressed in the fact that this classification category is by far the most frequently lacking in corresponding information. The values calculated on the historical total holdings are enormous here in the institutions studied and often comprise a third or half of all object records in a holding. For example, among [p.282] 16,670 object records from Cameroon in the total historical holdings of the Linden Museum in Stuttgart, there are 7087 that do not have any population-specific indication of origin. [110] In the MARKK Hamburg, the figure of 1972 out of 3482 [111] records even reaches over 50% of the holdings, and in the Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde Leipzig, with 2877 out of 7432 [112] still a third.

In addition, all holdings contain a more or less large number of object records in which the population-specific provenance information has been marked as questionable by those responsible for the collection themselves, including 641 entries in the collection documentation of the EM Berlin alone [113] and 309 in that of the LM Stuttgart. [114] In addition, there are many entries in which several population-specific indications of origin are given at the same time, e.g. in "Kapsiki; Higi; Fali; Lamang; Higi; Kilba; Sukur; Margi", [115] thus addressing seven possible population groups in the southern Lake Chad region. Similarly, the simultaneous indication [p.283] of three different population groups in "Africa; Cameroon; Dualla, Balüng or Abo" [116] or "Cameroon, Batschinga, Banjong, Vute." [117]

Mixing of population-specific and geographical indications of source in terms of content

In addition to these comparatively easy-to-identify entries with gaps or errors, however, there are also numerous entries where there has apparently been a mixing or confusion of geographical and population-specific indications of origin and the data have been entered in the wrong classification categories or data fields. Whether this is the case can hardly be verified without additional information on the data set if, as in the case of Cameroon, many place and population group designations have a very similar, in many cases identical, spelling. Similarities in spelling stem from the colonial classification of peoples, in which, due to a lack of knowledge of local conditions, population groups were always thought of and named in connection with a settlement territory. [118] The resulting identical spelling of places, population and often also language group names therefore forms the basis of many entries in the documentation to this day.

Absolutely identical nomenclatures can be found in the expressions "Bali" and "Douala", which designate both a place and a population group, right up to the present day. However, many other place and population group designations have identical or very similar nomenclatures only in historical terms, e.g. the place name "Yaoundé" and the historical population group "Yaunde". Parts of the written distortions and the risk of confusion are in turn due to the different language and designation practices of the three colonial ruling systems (Germany, France, England). Similarly written foreign-language translations of indigenous terms further complicate the identification of the entries, for example with regard to the group names "Bagandu", "Bagangu" and "Bangandu" or "Bakom", "Balom" and "Batom", which designate different parts of the population.

Due to the many partially or even completely overlapping definitions of group and place designations over time, some of which were given identical spellings but often represented entities defined very differently in time and space, collection documentation - such as that of the Ethnological Museum Berlin ("Geogr. Bezüge/Ethnie") or the Museum Fünf Kontinente Munich ("Herkunft/Datierung") - that lump together these categories of order make it difficult to identify the entities designated by them. Especially when population group designations such as [p.284] "Duala" can be misinterpreted as homonymous geographical designations, since no further identification criteria exist, these objects cannot be safely regarded as objects of the Douala in a strict sense, since here there is only a geographical indication of origin and in the city inhabitants and traders from numerous local population groups could be considered as sources.

The mixing and confusion of geographical and population-specific data across the respective categories and data fields affects, to varying degrees, almost all of the collection documentation examined here. Often it is not possible to clarify beyond doubt what a particular entry actually refers to without consulting further information and checking individual cases. Especially the Germanised foreign-language designations often refuse to be analysed, and it remains open what kind of designation it is and whether it is in a historical spelling that may no longer be in use or whether it is a translation, transcription or spelling error.

Deficits in ethnological classification

The group-specific indications of origin recorded in the data fields of the collection documentation reflect more than a century of attempts at the scientific classification of Cameroonian population groups, in the negotiation of which the respective institutions themselves were partly involved at the beginning.

The structural and content-related deficiencies in the area of indications of origin therefore refer not least to inadequacies in ethnological classification. For apart from the described deficits in documentation practice, the classification of museum object holdings also suffers from the fact that up to the present day it has not been possible to define a generally valid basic analytical unit for describing and naming human groupings. The term "basic analytical unit" was adopted here as an alternative term for the currently used but equally controversial terms "ethnicity" and "culture" from the Atlas of Pre-Colonial Societies. This is to emphasise that all units of measurement used here to describe groups of people should most likely be understood as "imagined communalisations" that do not make "statements about people's self-perceptions or claims to identity." [119] None of the group concepts constructed for study in the course of the history of science, such as "race", "tribe", "people", "ethnicity" and "culture", represents a precise unit of study that can be clearly demarcated from comparable groupings. The problem of definition and demarcation, which has been known since the beginnings of comparative cultural research methods, can ultimately be seen as an expression of the general impossibility of objective scientific [p.285] classification. The latter is explained by the fact that,

due to the underlying and inevitably subjective value judgements of every scientific classification project, "in principle there can be no definitive, objectively valid classification". [120] Rather, all the concepts mentioned suffer from the fact that they tend to be static and homogenising and cannot grasp the rather dynamic, heterogeneous and multi-perspectival nature of human group identities. This is especially true for Cameroon's broad spectrum of population.

"Empirical studies of group boundaries", conducted in the tradition of the ethnologist Fredrik Thomas Weybye Barth (1928-2016), have pointed out that the consciousness of belonging to a particular human grouping arises primarily "from the mutual self-attributions and external attributions of groups".[121] Group memberships and identities are thus formed, according to current understanding, in a highly variable, dynamic and situation-specific manner:

"Depending on the country and political situation, majority and minority relations, history of intergroup relations, colonial history, and so on, different lines of determination (language, religion/confession, economic mode or tribal and kinship organisation) through which a particular group cohesion is defined may become relevant or fade into the background in a local perspective." [122]

The only basic analytical units of race, tribe and people available for a long time, which still characterise the overwhelming majority of the collection holdings as an indication of origin, could in no way do justice to these multipolar and in part overlapping group identities. [123] Nor do the two concepts of ethnicity and culture that took their place from the mid-20th century onwards, [124] which remain of central importance for ethnology to the present day, [125] succeed in doing so despite a more open and dynamic conception. [126] It has not yet been possible to find "a generally accepted definition of ethnicity", [127] nor a uniform ethnological definition of the concept of culture, [128] which could solve the aforementioned problem of defining and delimiting human group identities. Ethnology has, in other words, lost its central object of study.

The lack of a universally valid definition of the central object of ethnology or the lack of a basic analytical unit for the study of human communalisations is inevitably accompanied by the lack of a coherent group-specific classification system. Even the ambitious and for anthropology trend-setting classification projects of the anthropologist George P. Murdock (1897-1985), which were based on the concept of culture as a generic term for the classification of societies, [p.286] did not succeed in solving the fundamental problem of differentiating socio-cultural units of study from other comparable groupings. [129] Murdock's classification systems are therefore to be regarded less as knowledge orders than as attempts to organise knowledge. [130] The best-known of these, the Ethnographic Atlas (EA), is in this respect also "not an atlas with visualised information", [131] but a "cross-cultural database" in which he assigns 1267 population-specific data sets to 200 "cultural provinces" defined by him. [132]

The problem of demarcation associated with the choice of the concept of culture as the basic analytical unit or the lack of a precise definition of the unit of study is expressed in the Ethnographic Atlas, for example, in the fact that a wide range of socio-cultural group units are used here, "from so-called local units, local communities, face-to-face communities to ethnic units, tribes, peoples, cultures, societies".[133] Accordingly, the underlying definitions are by no means uniform and vary.

"in size and spread, constitution as identity groups or as political entities, etc. [...] - from villages to provinces to population groups on a national scale, from stateless units to state-organised ones, from less complex to highly complex, from historically past to recently described populations". [134]

Since never exactly one and the same community was studied, but also the research content and methods, the spatial and temporal framework conditions, the respective designation practices and classification models used, and last but not least the self-image and self-attributions of groupings always vary, there is often no comparability among the collected sample studies. This is mainly due to the fact that Murdock's datasets were primarily compiled from numerous ethnographic monographs, but ethnographers did not follow "a consistent pattern for determining and naming their units of study." [135] It remains unclear in many cases what population group was actually being studied in a particular study, how it might best be designated, and how it might be distinguished from comparable groupings.

Thus, despite the relatively extensive range of comparisons, even the classification models developed by Murdock offer little guidance in the population-specific classification of colonial-era collection holdings. For not only does the basic problem of ethnological classification, namely the question of the definition and delimitation of the chosen group-specific basic analytical units, remain unsolved in Murdock's system; [136] moreover, for many of the basic colonial analytical units postulated in the Cameroonian context, no group-specific equivalents can be found in Murdock's databases.

[p.287] Especially globally socially oriented representations of the cultures of the world, such as the Atlas of World Cultures published by Murdock in 1981 or the Encyclopedia of World Cultures [137] published in 1995 and based on Murdock's work, suffer from the fact that, due to the scale chosen, they can only offer an outline of the population proportions occurring in a world region in the required brevity. In the Atlas of World Cultures mentioned above, there is only space for a total of 111 African population groups; 14 of these are also found in Cameroon, distributed over seven of the clusters or cultural provinces defined by Murdock. [138]

The Encyclopedia of World Cultures, on the other hand, lists just 33 distinct population groups or ethnic groups for Cameroon. Most of them, however, are treated as mere existence entries, only seven are presented in more detail [139] Moreover, the "eHRAF World Culture" database founded by the HRAF initiative currently lists only four entries on population groups in Cameroon, namely "Aka" or "Mbuti (FOO4)", "Bahigana" or "Masa (FI21)", "Banen (FH26)" and "Bororo" or "Fulani (MS11)". [140] In contrast, the region-specific overview work Africa: Its Peoples and their Culture History, published in 1959 on the basis of the work on the Ethnographic Atlas, [141] lists some 800 African population group units, including 98 that also occur in Cameroon, distributed across 16 of the cultural provinces defined by Murdock. [142] Whereas a much larger number of groupings are covered in the Cameroonian population, since Murdock's culturally defined basic analytical units are basically understood as entities that can themselves include further sub-units. The group unit of the "Duala" accordingly includes, for example, the sub-units of the "Bodiman, Limba (Lemba, Malimba), Mungo (Mongu), Oli (Buli, Ewodi, Eyarra, Wouri, Wuri), and Pongo." [143]

The classificatory organisational model of the Austrian ethnologist Walter Hirschberg (1904-1996), to whom a similar significance can be attributed for German-language ethnology as to Murdock's work, lists a comparably large number of a total of 108 Cameroonian population group units. [144] Despite a subdivision of the local population structured in Hirschberg's work not according to "cultural provinces" but "anthropogeographical aspects, i.e. according to living and economic spaces" [145], Hirschberg's model differs only slightly from Murdock's approach in the final result. Thus, the internal composition of the group unit of the "duala" is composed of the same subgroups in Hirschberg's model as in Murdock's. [146]

All current classification models of the Cameroonian population are ultimately based on the early attempts at classification, which will be subsumed here under the term "colonial state classification of peoples". Within this framework, descriptions of the Cameroonian population as early as 1900 stated a comparatively large number of local [p.288] population group units. The first description of the heterogeneity of the local population covering the entire territory of the colony was the "Ethnographic Sketch of Cameroon", published in 1897 by the geographer Paul Langhans (1867-1952) in his Deutschem Kolonial-Atlas, which listed 53 population group units. [147] Another early general survey can be found in the 1903 cartographic account entitled "Versuch einer titten kartografischen Darstellung" by Schutztruppe officer Franz Hutter (1865-1924), which listed 54 local population groups. [148]

Then in 1909, the geographer Siegfried Passarge (1866-1958) published the "Völkerkarte von Kamerun" (Fig. 2) with already 113 population groups, [149] followed by the overview map published in 1920 in the Deutsches Kolonial-Lexikon with 94 different groupings. [150] By far the most detailed representation, however, can be found in the 34-sheet official "Special Map of Cameroon 1:300,000" published between 1910 and 1914, [151] which located between 250 and 300 population groups. [152]

[p.289] The high figures identified in the colonial state classification of peoples roughly coincide with those obtained by French scholars and the Cameroonian government in the first decades after independence. Thus, geographers of the French Office de la recherche scientifique et technique outre-mer (O.R.S.T.O.M) had already produced a map in 1964 on which they divided the Cameroonian population into a total of 206 ethnic groupings on the basis of 180 distinct characteristics. [153] The historian [p.290] Jean Imbert (1919-1999) arrived at the similarly high number of 201 identifiable population groups in Cameroon in 1979. [154] And the authors of the Atlas of Pre-colonial Societies published in 1999, based on the Atlas de la République Unie du Cameroun by geographer Georges

Laclavère (1906-1994) from 1979, also identified around 200 local population groups. [155] In the most recent population-specific overall inventory, the Encyclopédie de la République unie du Cameroun, published by the Cameroonian government in 1981, these values are confirmed in principle (Fig. 3); however, it does not provide a list of all population units, but only an overview of the largest or most important groupings. [156] A practice of reducing complexity that has persisted in the demographic quarterly reports of the Institut National de la Statistique du Cameroun up to the present day. [157]

More recent inventories of the subdivision of the Cameroonian total population based on the counting of "ethnic" groups are not available, precisely because of the already explained inadequacies of ethnological classification, which call into question many group definitions and how they were arrived at. The problematic or impossibility of ethnological classification was ultimately already known to the theorists of the colonial state's classification of peoples. The geographer Friedrich Ratzel (1844-1904), who is also regarded as the founder of anthropogeography, spoke in this regard of the "great problem of classifying humanity" [158] and compared the difficulty of delimiting different "peoples" from one another with the similarly difficult "fixing" of the concept of "ocean currents". [159] The current state of the art of ethnological classification is also reflected in the fact that it is not possible to classify peoples in the same way.

The most recent indication of the great heterogeneity of the Cameroonian population does not come from ethnological research, but can be obtained by recourse to the language group-based classification of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL). Its "Ethnologue" database, which has been maintained since 1951, represents the most comprehensive register of the world's languages. It confirms the figures determined in the context of ethnological classification models of the Cameroonian population, even if the language group units reproduced are not congruent with ethnologically defined population group units and linguistic group units cannot be clearly demarcated from one another either. [160] A 2019 inventory states:

"The number of individual languages listed for Cameroon is 283. Of these, 274 are living and 9 are extinct. Of the living languages, 270 are indigenous and 4 are non-indigenous. Furthermore, 12 are institutional, 98 are developing, 70 are vigorous, 76 are in trouble, and 18 are dying." [161]

Whether on an ethnological or linguistic basis, the great social heterogeneity of the Cameroonian population that emerges here has always represented a problem area that should not be underestimated for those responsible for the collection who are entrusted with the population-specific classification [p.291] of object holdings in view of the lack of standards for classification. The confusion of categorical subdivisions and designations in collection documentation is thus also based on a corpus of theoretically inconsistent and discriminating socio-cultural group units that has emerged in the course of various classificatory organisational models. Accordingly, since the beginning of documentation, museums have lacked an orientation standard for systematically referencing the population-specific origin of object holdings.

Due to a development of in-house documentation guidelines that is no longer comprehensible in many institutions, as well as the classification models used to process object records, it is often not possible to determine the origin and validity of a specific group designation. The complex mixture of designations of origin, which were defined under different scientific premises, has not yet been subjected to a profound revision in order to question the historical and conceptual conditionality of the designations and to reformulate them according to current criteria. Because of the different conceptual-historical and theoretical contexts of the entries, it is therefore often no longer even possible to determine without a comprehensive case-by-case examination whether two indications of origin, in which identically named basic analytical units are given, ultimately refer to the same human grouping.

The titling of the classification categories, which have mostly been given the conceptual labels "culture" and "ethnicity" - not least because these are to be regarded as the provisional endpoints of theoretical debate and the most viable conceptions in the field - should not obscure the fact that many group designations entered in the data fields were coined under completely different premises. The simultaneous use of linguistic labels ("language group") and actor- or person-centred labels ("participant", "artist", "person") in the respective classification categories, as well as the general mixing with geographical categories or even the renunciation of subdivisions between the categories,

however, unmistakably points to the lack of any standards and a general lack of orientation. Since the inadequacies of ethnological classification persist in the light of current definitions of the basic analytical units of culture and ethnicity and no coherent population-specific classification system could be developed, the core category of ethnological collection documentation also proves to be fundamentally compromised and largely dysfunctional. Due to the problems described above, in many cases it is not possible to conclusively clarify where and from whom the objects were actually acquired.

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.297] [And now?]

229 Plea for a Decolonial Language in the Museum (Albert Gouaffo)

315 Conversations on Absence. An Approach (Yrine Matchinda)

331 Embracing Death to Make Way for Life. Why We Want Restitution (Fogha Mc. Cornilius Refem)

341 Benevolent attempt to clear up misunderstandings A letter after 24 years of waiting (Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III)

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

Plea for a Decolonial Language in the Museum [1]

ALBERT GOUAFFO

In a relatively short time, between 1884 and 1899, Germany rose to become the fourth largest colonial power after Great Britain, France and the Netherlands. [2] In the process of conquering foreign spaces and people, in the course of which the science of ethnology emerged and ethnological museums established themselves as places of research and discovery of the new "national" people and spaces, language played an enormously important role. Foreign people and spaces were inventoried, categorised, mapped, classified and appropriated according to their own colonial expectations. Military officers, merchants, missionaries, civil servants, geographers or explorers were tasked with systematically "collecting" cultural objects of all kinds from their respective fields of activity and supplying them to the ethnological museums back home. The museums collected, preserved, researched and imparted knowledge to the wider European public about the primitive foreign to be "civilised". In these museums, in the instructions for collecting, but also in inventories, wall texts, object signs, even in modern databases, the colonial language remained present for a long time - in some places until today. Terminology in the museum context thus carries violence within it.

The language used to name and describe the foreign should not be understood merely as a means of communication; it was a carrier of knowledge and contributed to the transmission of a world view. Europe needed the non-European world to assert itself, namely in the dialectic of the own and the foreign. But African history also travelled with the African cultural objects. In the host country, where the history and biography of the objects were of little importance, these cultural objects took on new forms of identity in the process of reception. It was not a matter of getting to know the other, but of conquering the other. The process took place from the naming of the objects to their complete domestication through their own new senses and narratives. But the question is: who spoke about these cultural objects and still speaks about them today, for whom and why? In other words, how does the host society deal with its interpretive sovereignty? How do we create a decolonial language in museum discourse in Germany, i.e. a language that [p.300] respects the alterity of cultural objects but also recognises new interpretations of meaning and patterns of appropriation in the host country as added value? How do we find a consensual language for museum discourse? Before I provide answers to these questions, I will analyse the common museum terminology and the social discourse linked to it.

The museum terminology as social discourse in a transfer-analytical perspective

The concept of cultural transfer expresses the attempt to examine several national spaces simultaneously, from their common elements, without limiting this observation to a confrontation, a comparison or a simple addition. The aim is to bring to the fore forms of cultural mixing and cultural exchange that are often faded out in the search for identities, in that this search for identity obscures the mixing that actually takes place, although identities also emerge from the forms of mixing. [3] The representation of foreign peoples and cultures is to be understood from the outset as an interpretative approach, because understanding the foreign depends on understanding the self. Stereotypical forms of representation of the African Other are not necessarily to be interpreted as its appropriation, but as a "thin description" in contrast to the dense description of Clifford Geertz. [4] The knowledge, however, that specifically results from a superficial reading of the Other can be seen as interest-led if it has a decidedly hegemonic tendency. Narratives about psychological and moral traits, or discursive representations and descriptions of people of foreign origin as representatives of a holistic cultural and geographical space, which emerged in the colonial context, were formulated from a particular perspective and interest. The Belgian-Canadian discourse analyst Marc Angenot speaks of social discourse in this case. It is to be understood as a dynamic field in which different discourses compete with each other. Discursive hegemony coordinates the diversity and highlights a dominant one from the mass of discourses, but this is consciously or unconsciously colocated and consumed by the members of society as a global discourse. This dominant discourse has some characteristics, namely regularity and hegemony. Hegemony interlocks discourses and makes a unity out of disparity and

multiplicity. In an argument with Mikhaïl Bakhtine, from whom he takes the concept of intertextuality, Angenot specifies that social discourse emerges from an interaction of disparate interdiscourses. [5] Social discourse exhibits a certain stereotypy that pervades the social body in a given society and in a [p.301] given period of time. Our engagement with the outside world is through selection. People perceive only an extract from reality and complete the rest with their imagination. Man's striving for simplification, unambiguity and preservation of identity causes him to lose contact with reality and to give priority to the stereotype as a preconceived second-hand opinion. Walter Lippmann, one of the pioneers of stereotype research, wrote about this phenomenon in his book *Public Opinion* in the 1920s:

"We are told about the world before we see it. We imagine most things before we experience them. And those preconceptions, unless education has made us acutely aware, deeply govern the whole process of perceptions." [6]

The stereotype has the tendency to become independent, with the danger of being accepted as an all-encompassing totalising explanation. Lippmann's definition shows how dangerous the stereotype can be as an unfounded opinion common to a social group. The museum terminology consists of such stereotypes that, taken as a whole, form a social discourse. They have been shaped by colonial history. They are a categorising language that classifies cultures essentialistically and hierarchically, with the foreign culture occupying a low or underprivileged position compared to one's own European one. In this perspective, the foreign culture designates the periphery of the self-defined centre. Let us now analyse, by way of example, how these myths influence museum provenance research. I have privileged three interdiscourses here, namely the interdiscourse of object lists from Cameroon in the Ethnological Museum Berlin, the discourse of the "Guidelines" of the German Museums Association and that of exhibition texts in the Cameroon Room of the Humboldt Forum.

Terminology in provenance research: case studies

Provenance research, as it has developed and established itself as a discipline in the German-speaking world over the last 15 years, is concerned with the origin of cultural objects. These can be works of art, books or everyday objects in museums. It aims to clarify to whom the objects belonged at what time and under what conditions they changed owners. In art history, it has long been an integral part of scholarly work. It has become much more important since the Washington Declaration of 1998. [7] Provenance research in Germany has so far dealt primarily with cultural objects that were expropriated or looted during the Nazi era. However, the situation is different with regard to the terminology used for collection items from the colonial context. [8] These are [p.302] extremely asymmetrical and culturally different contexts. The same words have a very different meaning from one context to another, i.e. from the societies of origin to the host societies.

The Discourse of Object Lists of the Ethnological Museum Berlin

The Ethnological Museum in Berlin is internationally one of the largest and most important museums of its kind with, according to its own information, about 500,000 objects, including about 75,000 from the African continent south of the Sahara. Assuming that this museum benefited from the support of the imperial government in the constitution of its collections, i.e. received consignments from colonial officers and civil servants in the service, it is particularly suitable for a postcolonial study. From Cameroon as a colony, 7194 cultural objects came to this museum. How are Cameroon and its ethnic groups categorised in the museum's inventory? Methodologically, data was first obtained by entering arbitrarily selected terms from the "colonial library" [9] into the search bar of the inventory list, which we obtained from the Ethnological Museum Berlin for the mapping of Cameroonian cultural heritage in German ethnological museums. [10] In the next step, an analytical grid was developed for the representation of the Other in the Berlin museum, which asks about the following: 1) object designation and frequency in the inventory list, 2) terminology used in the designation of cultural groups, 3) acquisition modalities of the objects in the museum.

As the previous chapter on inventory and knowledge order made clear, the list is a snapshot of museum documentation, which is in an incomplete process in all museums, including Berlin. At this point in time, a review of the inventory shows that of the 7194 objects from Cameroon, 238 bear the designation "magic", 141 "magic figure", one "sorcerer" and 46 the designation "amulet". As far as the

cultural origin is concerned, questionable terminology can also be observed. This is the case with the term "Kirdi" (it appears six times), which means non-Muslim and is actually too general. The term "chief" appears 39 times to refer to Cameroonian rulers. The term "ethnicity" appears twice. The problem with this perception of the Cameroonian foreigner is not the quantity of object designation, but the interpretation of meaning by curators and academic staff. They are the first in the chain of construction of knowledge about the objects that reaches the public. They have the symbolic capital and as such are agents of trust in the museum for the visitors. Finally, alienating for the researcher are the expressions that refer to modes of acquisition. In the [p.303] inventory list it is stated that the objects were "bought", "exchanged", "given" or came to the museum as a "donation".

With regard to object designation in the museum, it should be noted that the terminology used by so-called collectors continues to appear uncritically in the inventory lists. I have selected four of them, namely the terms "chief" (39), "ethnic" (2), "amulet" (46) as well as "spell" together with related words or composites such as "(spell) figure" (379). In view of the low numbers in relation to the total number of objects, one could speak of insignificance. All four terms have found their way into the dictionary on primitivism published by Joachim Schultz. [11] The amulet stands for spirituality or religiosity that stands apart from conventional Christian religiosity and can be described as "primitive". Etymologically, in European cultural history, the amulet refers to an object that, according to superstitious belief, averts harm and danger. However, it is a medieval practice that has long since been abandoned by enlightened European societies. The mode of perception is dichotomous and celebrates the us as a civilised cultural nation in contrast to you, the savages and retards. [12] These terms all derive from European linguistic and cultural traditions. In these traditions, those terms denote the repressed own, an own that one recognises but no longer wants to consider as belonging to one's culture and history. The foreign is instrumentalised as a projection surface for the own, and the encounter with the other is no longer used as a place for getting to know each other, but as a place for self-assertion and positioning. The museum becomes a place where the visitor learns about the origins of human history and assesses for himself the path taken by his society along the axis of development according to the naturalists' theory of evolution. [13]

The digital dictionary of the German language defines a "chief" as the "head of a tribe of a primitive people." [14] Pointing to an obsolete but quite common colloquial usage, the same dictionary defines "primitive people" as an "ethnic group living in a pre-industrial subsistence economy." [15] In the inventory list, the word "ethnic group" appears only twice, but semantically it is by no means marginal. No museum scholar would think of calling people in certain regions of Germany an ethnic group. Suzan Arndt thinks that the term is used as a substitute for race and tribe, but is basically nothing more than a new cloak for racist conceptual content. The basic idea, according to Arndt, is that people are differentiated according to biologicistic criteria such as skin colour, and these in turn are open to mental, religious and cultural interpretation. [16] The museums do not seem to be concerned with describing people and peoples beyond Europe in a differentiated way, i.e. "densely", as Clifford Geertz would like interpretative ethnology [p.304] to do, but superficially to depict the hierarchy between one's own nation vis-à-vis the rest of the world. [17]

Another phenomenon that is disconcerting from an African perspective is the way in which the copyright of the collections in the Ethnological Museum Berlin is legitimised. In the list, under the heading "Object Reference", there is talk of purchase (e.g. "Ankauf Leut. Lessel"), of exchange ("Tausch von Ethnographica Worley, Hamburg", "Tausch Abt. Afrika mit dem American Museum of Natural History, New York") and of donation ("Schenkung von Leutnant Dominik"). These terms have a certain relevance in a symmetrical context like Germany and France. When you buy something in a shop in these countries, you get an invoice. This invoice presupposes that the seller has his own invoice, which he received from the wholesaler. Museums can exchange duplicates with each other. Citizens can donate their private collections to museums for a good cause. The donation process or the acquisition modality wants to suggest that ownership is unproblematic. But when the question is raised as to how the colonial officer appropriated the collection donated to the museum or what the legality of the invoice issued to the museum by the art dealer or other colonial traders is, the hour of provenance research strikes.

In the colonial context, a context of injustice, the use of such terms is problematic. The fact that governors, officers and officials in the colonial service did not trade fairly with the legitimate owners of the objects has been sufficiently demonstrated in previous chapters. "Purchase" in this context is an extorted purchase, donation a forced gift, "exchange" a fraud. Beyond the Berlin case study, basically all terms used in provenance research are euphemistic from the perspective of the global South and

are accompanied by a certain provocation or irritation. Alternative expressions that do not simply reproduce colonial patterns of language and thought could be used: Colonial army instead of "protection force", military aggression instead of "punitive expedition", plundering or robbing instead of "collecting", god soldiers or spiritual robbers instead of "missionaries", cultural property instead of "object", etc.

If one speaks of "collectors", for example, the violence that is in the collections and the blood that is on some objects is transfigured. For the term conveys the impression that the objects were freely available and one only had to pick them up. They then lay in nature like mango fruit under the trees. The appropriate word in the colonial context is rather "plunder" or "rob". Missionaries were soul robbers and officers of the Schutztruppe a terrorist group. In the colonial context of injustice, they could neither receive gifts from the victims of their violence nor engage in fair barter trade with them. Due to their position of power in the social field, they could only confiscate or [p.305] extort the objects. Nevertheless, it should also be mentioned that such "gifts" were, on the one hand, very controlled, and on the other, and above all, only a tiny fraction of the total stock of Cameroon objects in the Federal Republic of Germany. In Germany, however, the terms are misleading for normal visitors to museums and do not reflect the colonial reality. Museums in Europe bought or acquired cultural objects on the European art market in exchange for receipts from "collectors" on the ground in Africa, or they exchanged objects among themselves. The question that was not asked was how the sellers or "collectors" came into possession of the objects sold. Is the museum not a fence in this context? Another stylistic aspect of the argument is the use of euphemisms, as is forcefully explained in the chapter on military violence and museum collections by Yann LeGall. The word "punitive expedition" suggests that colonised people had violated established rules. [18] What, then, had they done to be punished? The correct word is "military aggression" and should be regarded as such in the discourse of provenance research in the future, otherwise no critical reappraisal of German history will be achieved.

The ambivalent discourse of the German Museums Association's "Guide".

In addition to the terminology used in museum inventories that perpetuates the colonial tradition in the present, there are curious patterns of interpretation in the German Museums Association's Guide to Provenance Research, published in 2019, that call into question the progressive and postcolonial intentions of this document. At first glance, the aim of the guide is promising:

"The goal must be to anchor the handling of the colonial heritage and its reappraisal and multi-perspectivist development as a permanent task at the museums. This can only succeed if the museums are able to fulfil their fundamental tasks, which always include research as a central component. Furthermore, international exchange with representatives and scholars from the countries of origin must not only be made possible; this exchange demands a new form of willingness to talk at all levels." [19]

In the discourse, the authors of the guide recognise its function as an instrument for decolonising German museums: "Museums must also be aware that colonial conditions rarely ended with formal decolonisation and in some cases continue to have an effect into the present day". [20]

The suspicion of glorifying or downplaying one's own colonialism begins right away with the definition of colonial contexts: In the guidelines, this is understood to mean circumstances and processes that have their roots either in formal colonial rule or in informal colonial structures. For, the [p.306] reasoning goes, even then, structures of great power-political imbalance may have emerged both between and within states or other political entities, from which networks and practices emerged that supported collection and procurement practices for European museums. [21]

Contradicting such codified administrative language is the finding that entire villages have been set on fire. [22] One cannot want to solve a problem and at the same time write it down. How much of the entire German museum holdings derive from formal colonisation and how much does not? This should be the basis of a critical scholarly engagement with colonial heritage. The Guide's understanding of colonial context, on the other hand, avoids any prioritisation. For German ethnological museums, the colonial context is supposed to be the official presence of the Germans in their own colonies. It is the period between 1884 and 1919 at the latest. Indeed, as is clearly demonstrated in the chapter on chronology and stakeholders → page 61, the highest boom in deliveries to German ethnological museums can be observed from 1900 to 1914, with up to two-thirds of the objects estimated to have

been sent by military personnel and officials in the colonies. In contrast to France, which commissioned so-called trained ethnologists to loot African cultural objects, the German Empire relied primarily on members of the administration in the colonies. It would be beating about the bush to water down the reappraisal of colonialism in German museums in this way. Two volumes of the guide could therefore be published: one for German non-European relations in general and another for formal colonisation by Germany.

There is also talk of dialogue at eye level with members of the societies of origin:

"This publication is the third and final version of the guide. It is the result of a four-year editing process that was transparent and open-ended from the beginning. Professional colleagues and other stakeholders were able to actively participate in the revision of the texts through reviews or comments. In addition, the guidelines were thoroughly discussed in an internal workshop with twelve experts from Australia (Tasmania), Bolivia, Namibia, Nigeria, New Zealand, Samoa, Taiwan, Tanzania, Turkey and the USA (Alaska) in order to be able to give their perspectives and suggestions the appropriate space. [23]

It should be noted that of the former German colonies, only Samoa, Tanzania and Namibia were involved in the conception and publication of this guide, which is considered "final". Cameroon, Togo, Rwanda and Burundi are missing. The impression is given that coming to terms with German colonial history is more or less [p.307] a purely German affair, although the discourse speaks of collaborative and transparent cooperation. Despite the good will, colonial or Eurocentric reflexes still characterise postcolonial provenance research, which the guide aims to help. The accusation of wanting to control museums' reflections on their own colonial past is not unjustified. The colonially influenced or Eurocentric gesture of German museum stakeholders can also be read semantically in the exhibition texts on the objects and their suppliers. This is the case with the Cameroon objects in the recently opened Humboldt Forum.

The Terminology of the Exhibition Texts at the Humboldt Forum[24]

The terminology of the exhibition texts of the "Colony of Cameroon" room on stakeholders and collections from formal colonial contexts is, from today's perspective, a disaster for decolonisation. The perspective of the Ethnological Museum as a narrative site of its own national history is still dominant. The core questions are still: Who were the Germans who worked in the German colonies on behalf of the German Empire? What services did they render to the fatherland?

This grand narrative of the nation can be critically examined at the Humboldt Forum by analysing relationships of suppliers to objects/subjects and of objects/subjects in labels. For this I have chosen two prominent examples: the Ngonnso the mother queen of the Nso, and the Mandu Yenu, the throne of the Bamum, also in the grasslands of Cameroon.

The intention to downplay the biography of officers of the German colonial army as innocent purveyors of cultural objects is striking. Kurt Pavel → Bio, 420 (1851-1933) is presented by the museum as the commander of the so-called Schutztruppe in 1901. This already reveals that he was no friend of the Cameroons. The terms "Schutztruppe" and "protection" in the exhibition space - he tried to bring the area under "German protection" - are put in inverted commas, but this is not enough to explain to visitors what the Schutztruppe was at the time, who it protected and why, although areas where Pavel fought his colonial wars are mentioned: Bangwa, Bafut and Mankon.

As to the provenance of the Ngonnso figure → Pictorial Booklet III itself, another statement from the museum claims: "Kurt Pavel first collected this figure in Kumbo, the capital of the kingdom." However, it is certain that in 1903, as commander of the German colonial army, he waged war against the society of origin. What is the meaning of the verb "to gather" in this context of injustice? Was the figure of the Mother Queen lying in the street when he "collected" her? The intensity of colonial violence is toned down and thus colonial history is normalised and defused in public. No alienation effect[25]

[p.308] takes place among the visitors, which could lead to coming to terms with Germany's colonial past. On the contrary, colonial clichés are served up. Germany's colonial past is sold to the audience as a mere episode in history without devastating consequences. To claim that German colonisation in Africa was very short is only a step from there.

The next example concerns a colonial officer, Hans Glauning → Bio, 386 (1868-1908), who administered the Bamenda station, established in 1902, as district chief from 1905 to 1908. King Njoya

→ Bio, 417 (1873-1933) was thus his subject according to the colonial order. The object supplier's presentation at the Humboldt Forum states:

"Before joining the "Schutztruppe" for German East Africa in 1894, Glauning served in the Saxon army. In 1902 he was transferred to Cameroon. In Africa he led "punitive expeditions" and military actions to enforce colonial rule. He was also an enthusiastic amateur ethnologist and acquired hundreds of objects for German museums." (My emphasis)

The curators make no effort whatsoever to present Africa in a differentiated way; the name of the continent has to be used to designate the two German colonies, German East Africa and Cameroon. Glauning is not explicitly presented as a district leader and military officer whose presence symbolised violence, but as an amateur researcher. While it is true that amateur ethnology was common in the empire, this does not justify adopting the then-common term unchecked. In today's academic world in Germany, it is inconceivable that a soldier without prior university training would be considered a scientist. In a non-standardised space like the colony, however, this is possible. And the verb "acquire", which in itself is unproblematic, also crops up. In its colloquial positive connotation, however, it puts the colonial officer's practice of appropriation in a favourable light precisely with the designation "enthusiastic amateur ethnologist" in the same sentence.

What is not mentioned in the text panel on the presentation of King Njoya's throne, the Mandu Yenu → Pictorial Booklet XLVIII, but would certainly be significant for a decolonial perspective of the exhibition, is that Glauning was involved in the negotiations on the "donation" of this throne to Kaiser Wilhelm II. It should be briefly recalled that Njoya was under pressure from 1903 to 1907 over the throne inherited from his father. [26] Felix von Luschan (1854-1924) had commissioned Glauning to acquire it and had even suggested having "a facsimile" made to exchange for the "original". Finally, Njoya himself had his throne carried to the then capital of the colony, Buea, to "present" it to the Emperor on the occasion of his birthday. This was an enforced gift, and all museum visitors should know this. It was part of Njoya's strategy to retain power "over his people", although his kingdom was subject to the German [p.309] colonial station. Here one is once again confronted with an extremely colonial selection of information, which stands against a transparent and emancipative approach to colonial history as shared history.

Towards a decolonial language in the museum

There are three ways in which provenance research can move from colonial to decolonial patterns of interpretation.

Abandonment of the colonial library, resemantisation of objects, correction of regional classifications[27].

The alterity of the objects is to be respected so that they tell the story with which the societies of origin, their producers associated them. Translocation should not rob them of their identity. Only in this way can they fulfil their function as ambassadors of the respective cultures. Problematic categories such as "purchase", "gift" and "exchange" should disappear, as they stem from a legally hegemonic culture. The same applies to the naming of objects. These objects were appropriated by the German language by being analogically interpreted as corresponding but bizarre objects of the German culture of reception. The simplistic terms "fetish" and "amulet" can serve as examples. All cultural objects so designated in museum inventories have proper names in their respective societies of origin and should be presented in museums in their singularity and alterity. The Digital Benin platform, prepared over many years by an international team of experts and recently launched, points the right way in this direction. [28] Only in this way can they enrich German culture as cultural ambassadors. If the colonial heritage is to be shared, then all those involved must agree with the terms used.

Recognition of their new identity in the host society by the societies of origin.

Artistry is a quality that characterises every society. Although objects from Africa have been used as evidence of primitiveness, there have always been well-meaning art critics like Carl Einstein who have appreciated their excellence. Artists such as Pablo Picasso, Wassily Kandinsky and Franz Marc have, in their own way, extricated this art from the ghetto of ethnicising ethnology as colonial science. In the

translocation of the objects, the local but also the global should be recognised in them, so that they can circulate globally with dignity like other cultural assets (e.g. the Mona Lisa). It is also necessary to recognise the dynamics in the reception process. Objects as works of art generate new synergies in the process of translation [p.310] and cannot be interpreted as representing a fixed identity forever. The "Blaue Reiter post" in Munich's Museum Fünf Kontinente has been given a second home and identity there. This appreciation in foreign lands is said to be known in Cameroon, even if this sacred object had a different name and function in Orokoland, where it came from. The post was part of an ensemble that was taken apart. In Munich, only its material aspects were appreciated in the reception process. It is not a reproach to the art critics, because perception always happens selectively. In the museum in Munich, in addition to the name given by art critics, the object/subject should also bear its original name, namely "Ndo'obe' banto Oroko". The object belongs to the Abo in Cameroon and forms their pride and joy in the postcolonial context.

Revised self-image of ethnological museums and new museum formats

Germany has long since become an immigration society, and the unity of language, history and religion no longer quite matches up in the new constellation. The majority society is now confronted with a minority. Both components enjoy the same responsibilities and rights in a republic. The African diaspora feels insulted and insulted in today's ethnological museums. I advocate turning our backs on a concept of identity that draws a dividing line (Us versus Them) to a new one that celebrates togetherness in the common world (Us and Them). An ethnological museum oriented towards this new identity format must emphasise diversity. The previous museum discourse must be decentered and allow for polyphony. In such a museum as a world museum, German objects should also be present as components of unity in multiplicity.

The interlocking of cultural transfer (Espagne), social discourse (Angenot) and stereotype (Lippmann) shows how knowledge emerges linguistically in discourses. Language and knowledge are interrelated and reflect what a society can know. The utterance in discourse is a site of reality construction, and the argumentation of knowledge stakeholders pre-shapes reception. Museum language, which guides perceptions of non-European foreignness, is not exempt from this. Colonialism is not only history - it has always been above all language or terminology.

After a critical review of the three interdiscourses - the terminology in the inventory list of the Ethnological Museum in Berlin, the text panels on Cameroonian cultural artefacts in the Humboldt Forum and, finally, the guideline of the German Museumsbund - it can be stated: With its guide, the Museumsbund [p.311] has taken a new, progressive course in provenance research. The confrontation of the various interdiscourses with each other shows that we are still far from the goal of decolonial provenance research. There is a discrepancy between theory and practice. The museum discourse landscape is still dominated by Eurocentric perspectives, and the desired dialogue at "eye level" with the representatives of the regions of origin of the objects in the museum turns out to be a dialogue of Germans among themselves. A neo-colonial or racist basic attitude still shapes today's discourse on cultural objects from the colonial context. The objects do not tell about themselves, but words are put into their mouths and the stakeholders of the translocation are exonerated from their atrocities through linguistic trivialisation. This has a negative impact on the critical coming to terms with the colonial past, because visitors to the museums cannot question their stereotypical and racist ideas about Africa. A visit to an ethnological museum still corresponds to a journey to primitive Africa in an armchair. [29] The violence of colonial stakeholders in looting objects in Africa is linguistically euphemised and undermined. In order for us to escape the colonial prison in which ethnological museums still find themselves, I propose that a new consensual vocabulary or lexicon be developed for categorising objects, regions and societies of origin. The terminology used so far is useless in the broadest sense. An ethnological museum should no longer be understood as a place where its own history (the history of the empire) is told, but as a third space in which the globalisation and diversity of Germany as an immigration society is articulated.

Conversations on absence. An approach

YRINE MATCHINDA

"A person whose memory has been erased will not find his way home." [1]

From January 2020 to August 2022, as a PhD student in German Studies, I travelled through Cameroon as part of our research project to have conversations with different people in different regions about cultural objects that are now in public museums in Germany. I myself was born in Mbouda and grew up in Bafoussam (both cities in West Cameroon). Since 2015, I have been attending the University of Dschang in Cameroon's "Ouest" region. Equipped with a recorder, photocopied museum lists and photographs of exemplary collection items, [2] I captured voices about being away from home from people who were mostly twice my age; they had no distinct museum experience, or none at all, of the kind one can gain in Europe. Some of them had already been to the US, Europe or other countries on the African continent. Most had not. The following pages offer a brief aperçu of their voices on cultural heritage that is no longer in Cameroon.

When cultural property is moved, its life horizon also moves, new meanings are added. When we look today in Berlin, Paris, London or New York at things that were taken away from the African continent during the colonial period, we ask ourselves with Léopold Sédar Senghor what these and all those have to say to us that were called "fetishes when the gods departed from them". [3] In the European or American museums where they are kept today (if they are exhibited at all and not lying dormant in repositories), they are naturally regarded as evidence of certain cultures and associated with the people who once created them. [4] But what about from the perspective of those who live - on the African continent or in our case in Cameroon - so far away from them? What role does collective memory play in the process of a possible reintegration or rehabilitation of African cultural heritage in Cameroon? What are the memory and history policy challenges that the absence of the objects poses for the cultural life of the people living where they were once taken from? What can [p.316] reverse provenance research reveal about the relationships between cultural heritage and the so-called communities of origin? What is the use at all of talking about the absence of things that may have left the country many decades ago, but have not infrequently been replaced locally or so radically forgotten that their far-flung existence - in German museums, for example - has no tangible reality for the descendants of those once affected? Answering these questions requires an examination of the groups affected by spoliation and the relationship that may exist today between them and the artefacts that no longer exist. This chapter will for the first time outline the extent and consequence of the void, the absence of cultural property in Cameroon.

The interviews I conducted between January 2020 and August 2022 with members of communities whose ancestors, houses, palaces or villages were ravaged during German colonial rule and who lost important material goods show that many still remember objects from the (pre-)colonial period, even if their decades-long absence creates a void for some that contemporaneity cannot fill (Fig.1). On the ground in the localities of Nguila, Yaoundé, Atok, Lolo Village, Kribi and Bamougoum, I met specialists in the protection and transmission of cultural memory. I endeavoured to hold discussions in all four "sphères culturelles" - Fang Beti, Sawa, Grasland and Sudan-Sahel - as well as in six of Cameroon's ten administrative regions. I was able to exchange views with people in more than 20 communities on cultural, historical, identity and memory issues related to Cameroon's material [p.317] heritage preserved in German museums. My interlocutors were among the Maka, Béti, Vute, Ngumba, Mabea, Bakweri, Bakoko, Duala and Bamiléké communities. The starting point for the discussions was the observation that the objects have not been present in their place of origin, Cameroon, for more than a century, and that restoring a memory of them is not a matter of course.

Absence and loss of memory as consequences of colonialism

The actual meaning of the term "absence" or "the absent" (English "absence", French "absence") refers to the fact that someone or something is not in the place where one expects him or her to be. One could also add that someone or something does not exist or is missing. [5] Mikkel Bille, Frida

Hastrup and Tim Flohr Sørensen refer to absence as a normal phenomenon in the social life of individuals that reveals the meaning of presence. According to them, absence is not exclusively an aspect of material culture. [6] It can also be an immaterial absence, such as the absence of certainty, recognition, knowledge, etc. It takes shape in a person's life through the traces left by the missing subject. In our context, the word "traces" refers not only to objects in museums, but also to the aftermath of their absence in community and cultural life in Cameroon.

At the level of the communities of origin, the absence of old cultural objects mainly leaves a feeling of a close relationship between the ancestors/past and the cultural life of the present generations. For some, the old cultural objects remain mementos marking a time they did not live through and where an intergenerational link has been severed. For example, Rogatien Nzouango, a Ngumba citizen who is king in the village of Bikala [7] and to whom I showed the photo of the relic figurine "Byeri" [8] from the Museum Fünf Kontinente in Munich, reacted by saying: "I remember that my grandfather often had this kind of object by his bedside, but I can't tell you anymore exactly what he did with it. I only know that he always told us never to touch them, and after his death I never heard anything about them." [9] Nzouango's powerful words affirm that the broken bond is a consequence of non-transmission between generations, which can also be linked to the absence of objects. For cultural objects that no longer exist in Cameroon today are also a link between the population and the past. The historian Alexandre Kum'a Ndumbe III explained in an interview in 2016:

[p.318] "Oral tradition is very important in African tradition. A person who cannot speak is not a person. That means that one has been brought up to speak. Because the word has power in this culture. The word has power. With the word, you can bring life." [10]

Oral tradition is indispensable in the process of intergenerational transmission and the safeguarding of memory. One could agree with Aleida Assmann who writes:

"Communicative memory develops in a milieu of spatial proximity, regular interaction and shared ways of life, experiences. Such a milieu is the generational memory of about forty years, after which the memory profile of a society shifts noticeably. A generational shift does not completely dissolve the earlier one, but it increasingly loses its binding force and representativeness." [11]

In order to protect history and memory over several generations, transmission becomes a must in a society influenced by cultural changes and mixtures.

The displacement of cultural practices through Christian missionisation

"Ancestral objects", [12] especially the ritual objects in the colonial collections, are actually considered by some as fetishes and are, in the eyes of those who are now Christians, the mirror of a past governed by magic and witchcraft, as King Shoun Kouang makes us understand during the 2020 talks in his house in the town of Bigbally-Lolodorf: "I can't even know what it's about, because when we were born, our parents and grandparents didn't show us any occult practices." [13] Accordingly, when asked if they still use these kinds of objects in the community, the answer is: "How can I explain this to you clearly? I told you I am a Christian now, I can't explain it clearly anymore. Our parents used them for fetishes and traditional services in the village. Today I am a Christian and I have long forgotten all these things." [14]

Kouang's understanding is consistent with the descriptions of ethnographic museums that use terms such as "fetish", "idol", "god", "figure", "sorcery", "witchcraft", "spell", "magic figure", "ritual object" [15] etc. when cataloguing, all of which refer to "fetishism." [16] The absence that is noticeable in the life of the communities is not only a result of translocation during the colonial period, but is also accompanied by Christian and Muslim religions, which are now affecting the cultural habits of the communities, even their ways of looking at and naming cult objects, traditional religions and local traditions.

[p.319] One of my interlocutors in eastern Cameroon among the Maka in the village of Atok likewise clearly expresses the convergence between colonisation and evangelical missions. He believes that these two stakeholders are responsible for the emptiness that can be observed in their localities

today. Aman Jean, dignitary and prince of the Chefferie (Kingdom) of the Atok-Bebend group, elaborates:

"The fact that we are a lost community (peuple) today is because of the colonial masters! When we were born, we were taught to go to church. My parents sent me to Father André of the Catholic mission [...] to grow up. My grandmother told me that at the time of the colonial masters, they killed their husbands and came to them to flatter them and force them to hand over all their "fetishes" and give away their children so they could move in with the priests. They were soundly beaten if they refused, and sometimes they were even raped before everything was taken away [...]. Hm. I don't know how you managed to still have something like that, because the settlers had already destroyed everything before they left us. Today we have nothing, everyone has become a Christian and others who don't go to church are just there." [17]

Among the Béti communities in Yaoundé, it is also noticeable that a number of objects used in the initiation and transition cult commonly referred to as "Sso"[18] have disappeared from the lives of the younger generations. These are necklaces, bracelets, and so-called penis cases,[19] which played an important role in this ritual that celebrated the boys' return to the community - after their circumcision and initiation into various fighting techniques. [20]

According to Abega Martin, royal descendant and dignitary in the chieftom of Efulan village, in the past this ritual was "a duty for every young Beti man who wants to be considered a man in society." [21] Abega Martin, like most informants, believes that modernity and the colonial presence are the cause of the consecutive change seen in the lives of the young generation today.

The Ngumba in Southern Cameroon also believe that the missionaries have influenced the ancestor worship "Byeri" that was practised before the settlement of the missionaries. S.M. Nsiang Nzeh, who is both a leader of a Nguma group and a traditional doctor, explains: "Since the missionaries and the settlers came, we no longer have that here with us and these rites are no longer practised. The missionaries took everything with them." [22] Similarly, a patriarch of Bakweri village named Kinge Miller commented on the illustration of Bakweri society figures during an interview in Buea: "When I see this object it just reminds me of the shrine in the secret society where I adhered, but I cannot even use such a thing today because I am baptized." [23] As an ambiguous correlation between what [p.320] is there and what is not, absence is a cultural, physical and social phenomenon that has a powerful influence on how people conceive of themselves and the world in which they move. [24]

Among the Bakoko, [25] "amulets" [26] are remembered, which were often used by indigenous people as signs of protection. An example is a bracelet or other object that could be worn in everyday life, marking a "vital link between the ancestor and the living person, but these things have disappeared," as Eding Batta, king of Mbengue-Edea village, explained to me. [27] As cult objects, their absence means a cultural vacuum that inevitably affects the spiritual and cultural life of contemporary societies. As Felwine Sarr noted on the effects of translocation, "not only were the artworks removed from the cultural context in which they made sense, but they also failed to nourish the imaginations of generations and generations of African spectators." [28] There is every indication that, conversely, any even slight restoration of memory today will help some people to move closer to local traditions beyond their contemporary, modernity-driven lives.

The resilience of cultures: absence and presence

Another dimension of culture in societies that are "victims of dispossession" (Savoy) is resilience, which takes different forms. Based on Bille, Hastrup and Sørensen's concept of absent and present, it becomes clear that the absent is made present through the memory that remains of the missing thing. According to them, the absent is made present through language and texts, through thoughts and things. [29] Social relations are not only about what is there, but sometimes also about what is not there. Indeed, absence can have a significant presence in social relations and material culture. In Cameroon, the effects of the absence of cultural goods taken to Germany (and more generally to Europe) described above leave room for forms of contemporary re-appropriation by those who have been victims of cultural dispossession or by their descendants. The aforementioned authors state that "what is materially absent nevertheless influences people's experience of the material world." [30] The interviews I conducted show another side of the life system of societies that have adopted new ways of

self-representation through memory and other forms of resilience over time. Resilience is a psychological phenomenon that consists [p.321] in an individual affected by trauma processing the traumatic event in such a way that they do not or no longer live in adversity and rebuild themselves in a socially acceptable way. In our case, resilience takes place on several levels.

Linking resilience to objects: Safeguarding and manufacturing

Originally, resilience is a term from physics that defines the resistance of a body or material to shock or deformation. In psychology, resilience refers more to the set of processes by which an individual overcomes psychological trauma to rebuild. In our context, resilience refers to the forms of re-appropriation of cultural assets adapted by victims of dispossession as a substitute or to maintain a system or identity of their own. It is clear from my research that resilience in this context is an old phenomenon that has been evident since colonial times. The colonial context has not always left a visible absence, because systematic resilience can be observed in some local groupings since the colonial period. In Cameroon, there are numerous examples of this. A particularly impressive, little-known example is provided by the two life-size throne figures of the Laikom societies from the Northwest Cameroon region, which have been on display at the Humboldt Forum since autumn 2019. They are wooden figures attached to stools that King Yu (c. 1865-1912) left behind when German colonial troops led by officer Hans Caspar zu Putnitz (1879-1940) raided and looted the palace at Kom.[31] Yu, who probably created them himself, and his court artists carved replacement figures that are still used today for religious rituals and thus serve to perpetuate cultural traditions. Significantly, they sparked a controversy over originality: Western museums, including the Berlin Ethnological Museum, see the newly carved figures as copies; the Kom community, on the other hand, is convinced that the captured figures now on display cannot be original because they no longer serve any religious or spiritual function.

Another example of resilience is the memory politics work of members of the Mabea in southern Cameroon. Their work shows that the void left by the translocation of cultural goods has made room for new practices. For example, a group of Mabea citizens comprising traditional kings, dignitaries,[32] patriarchs,[33] traditional ritualists and priests have had new relic figures ('byeri') made by the custodians of tradition. They have also established the King Mayesse Foundation[34] in which forces and knowledge are pooled to promote Mabea culture through memory restoration, restitution claims, cultural upgrading and introductions to spirituality and tradition." [35]

[p.322] For those in charge, it is also about enhancing the cultural heritage of Southern Cameroon societies. They are to be given back their lost identities.[36] In this sense, after years of neglect and forgetting of religious cults, a certain consciousness-raising can be observed in cultural life, which wants to make people take an interest in the culture and traditions of their ancestors again. As Louis Perrois and Jean Paul Notué[37] have already demonstrated in their work on Fang statues, Byeri among the Fang are linked to ancestor worship and in particular to the reliquaries dedicated to them. Byeri refers to both the cult and the objects associated with it. The production of these figures is primarily dedicated to the cult. According to ritualist Nzambi J. Baptiste, "the Mabi do not practise art for art's sake, but the carving of the statuette was mainly for our traditional cult, our Nguilmalende cult." [38] If they practised woodcarving in the past, it was mainly for this statuette used in their tradition. So "there were sculptors, blacksmiths, they were willing to work the materials. There were people who had talent." [39] They used materials such as steel, bronze, gold, tree bark, padouk and ebony from which they made various forms of pieces. According to oral sources, the statuettes were made to represent a person the family considered important and who would be commemorated after their death. It thus becomes an influential ancestor whom the family reveres and always praises in order to fulfil certain needs. According to Nzambi J. Baptiste, "in a first stage, the statuette becomes a reproduction of a reality that is assumed. In a second stage, some statuettes in our house represent an ancestor." [40] Reconstructing, in a contemporary context, the mechanisms of making and sacralising these figures is currently the greatest challenge for these people.

Another form of resilience is the saving or preservation of cultural objects, as can be observed among the Vute communities in the village of Nguila. In the course of my research, I found that they still keep specimens of war tools up to 100 years old in the Chefferie, which can also be found in large numbers in museums in Germany, in this case in Munich.[41] The conversations with the Vute in the village of Nguila showed that they still have a strong attachment to these weapons. In their perception, the pieces in German public collections "were actually used by warriors to fight the Germans during the

Wars", [42] a point also made by Christine Seige in her work on the expeditions organised by the German colonial army led by Hans Dominik → Bio, 380 (1870-1910). [43] In conversation, it is striking how valuable these war implements, which are subsumed under the category "weapons" in German [p.323] museum inventories, are to them. One of the dignitaries of the Chefferie in Nguila discusses this as follows:

"All these items were used at the time of the war. There used to be riots here. It wasn't quiet like now, so everyone expected unrest, and at that time all these items were used. Arrows were a valuable material first for the hunter and then for war, and a valuable material has to be guarded by someone who has the power. For a dignitary in the village to get something like that, he has to go through the king because it is very valuable. The shield you have here as a photograph is our jewel today and we want it at any cost. It is very valuable." [44]

The Vute in Cameroon have a remarkable metallurgical tradition. [45] They used to make all the items from the natural resources they had mined themselves in the village. For this reason, Louna Mossi, a dignitary in the village leadership of Nguila, says: "At that time, we made the items in series because the soldiers always had to be equipped. We had all the material on site so that we could always be ready." [46] Today, these weapons are "an example of the strength of the Vute that we must preserve for the younger generations." [47] Within the village leadership, there are a variety of parts used for these purposes, but above all, there is a remarkable will to recover shields that went to Germany as war booty during the colonial period:

"We have the shield that is close to our hearts. The last one we had, someone stole it from us. When we have ceremonies we do a parade with it, we take it with us and show people how to do it, but unfortunately we lost it. That is what we care about, what we have lost. The last thing we have left. If you can bring back those who are in Germany, it will mean a lot to us." [48]

Resilience through the revival of cults

From one society to another, cultural assets do not have the same value today. However, it is noticeable that some communities, such as the Mabi, are trying to find ways to reintroduce ancestor worship, which is traditionally done through the conceptualisation of the statuette. For them, in fact, "This object is not just an object. What you call an object is in fact the most important symbol of the spirituality of our society." [49] They present this figure as the main subject of the "Byéri" cult. This is defined by Ndtoungou Godefrey, one of the dignitaries and project initiators, as

"Cult of connection with the ancestors. We believe that when a person dies among us, they disappear, they simply change their form and become a spiritual person, and through that we call on them when we have a problem." [50]

[p.324] According to a study of Fang statues conducted by Perrois, Byeri "were consulted before every important action: hunting, fishing, travelling, choosing a plantation or village plot, marriage, palaver, war, etc." [51] As His Majesty Nong Joseph, head of one of the Mabi groups in Southern Cameroon, explained in conversation, Byeri are "intangible elements of our culture that were used to perform rites and invocations to protect and guide society [...]. There are purification rites, development rites, blessing rites, etc." [52] However, the rites have disappeared from the daily life of families over the years, as it was last performed over 50 years ago, according to Nzambi J. Baptiste. But today, her greatest desire is to see their reintroduction through the making and initiation, through the sacralisation of these figures, which she believes are

"the expression of the deity Mabi, it is the representation of a known person who serves as an interface when one wants to address the Lord of the Universe "Nzambi", whom others would call God. [...] So it is not an object. It is a living reality that carries an energy that can be familial, personal or communal." [53]

Among the Vute societies, in connection with the translocated objects, there is no particular rite that shapes their lives today. [54] All the objects that can be found in museums and chefferies today are only used in commemorative ceremonies for parades, with the aim of "showing the younger generations what the Vute man used to be like". [55] The Vute people are not present in their lives today.

Under the impression of the conversations, it can be stated that "absence is as present in real life as presence." [56] One of the most important statements is that being absent in different places can have a great impact on the social world through different objects and practices. Even though it is sometimes a re-appropriation, the objects produced still have their place in the religious cults and practices of contemporary societies in Cameroon. The UNESCO Convention on Ritual Practices and Social and Festive Events already suggests the real importance of cultural practices for a society:

"Social practices, rituals and festive occasions are habitual activities that structure the lives of communities and groups and to which many of their members are attached and in which they participate. These elements are important because they affirm the identity of those who practise them as a group or society and, whether practised publicly or privately, are closely associated with important events. Social, ritual and festive practices can help mark the passing of the seasons, the times of the agricultural calendar or the periods of a human life. They are closely linked to a community's worldview and its perception of its history and memory." [57]

[p.325] Resilience through memory: The "little memory".

During my conversations with members of the societies that lost significant parts of their cultural heritage to Germany around 1900, I found that another form of emptiness and absence is that this history is simply unknown. I would call this a historiographical void. Indeed, often the first reactions to my questions suggested that the objects had never been taken from the places where they actually came from (according to museum inventories). Confronted with photographs I had brought with me, my interlocutors asked questions like: "Who gave you this object?"; "How did you get all these objects?"; "You claim that these objects have already been stored for 100 years by the whites"; "My daughter, it is you who informs me that these things exist, I did not live through the German period to know all these things." [58] Depending on the village and the object, it was quite difficult during the first encounters to find people who were able to identify them or even talk about their functions. Kum'a Ndumbe may have had similarly sobering experiences with his multidisciplinary team of researchers who pioneered oral history in Cameroon in 1981 under the name *Souvenirs de l'époque allemande au Cameroun*:

"Cross[ing] Cameroon from north to south, from east to west, to interview old Cameroonian contemporary witnesses who experienced the arrival of the first German settlers in their area. What did their place look like before the arrival of the Europeans, what was the shock of the encounter and how did the Germans manage to impose their system in administration, economy, education, trade, religion, health, in daily life in our area?" [59]

Although it is difficult to awaken memories of these distant, even painful experiences - they are not completely erased. I therefore speak of a "small memory" that needs to be preserved and captured. This applies equally to cultural assets, some of which are forgotten, others, as in the case of the Byeri and the Vute weapons, remembered and missed. "African countries face [...] a double challenge: the reconstruction of their memory and the reinvention of themselves through semantic recasting and resocialisation of the objects of their cultural heritage, thus establishing a new link between these objects and contemporary societies and their presences", as Bénédicte Savoy and Felwine Sarr wrote in 2018. [60] Memory as a form of resilience is evident in local societies through the way they talk about their objects or their past. It is not only a loss of memory that manifests itself in the statements of the interviewees, often at first contact. Rather, phrases such as "I remember", "I remember", "This reminds me of my grandfather" or "This object reminds me of many [p.326] things" also appear. In the present context, many Vute, Mabi, Ngumba, Beti, Maka, etc. objects are a priori a path to the past. Undoubtedly, "reverse provenance research" represents indispensable work in the process of recovering memory. According to the characteristics of cultural memory listed by Aleida Assmann, it

includes mythical history and events that took place in the absolute past, resulting in a time structure that corresponds to the absolute past, historical time or mythical primeval time. It is therefore a transgenerational structure.[61] Maurice Halbwachs also says: "If memories are images that are as real as the others, it is impossible to see how their temporal distance would constitute an obstacle to their return to consciousness." [62] Without memory, man or the living being would lose all his points of reference and all awareness of his identity. Despite the void, the amnesia, one realises the importance of this reconnection of museum objects with their actual owners in order to restore their memories. The absence of cultural objects in Cameroon and their presence in German public museums set the "impulse" to further question this absent presence. When I stand in the exhibitions in Germany, have the opportunity to visit the depots and study the rich collections, I find myself questioning the future of the communities from whom this heritage has been taken away. The context of the colonial period reinforces my need to ask about the origins of this cultural heritage in Cameroon, but also about the role it plays in the different spaces of origin today and in the future. This need grew with the realisation that the artefacts are more present in academic discourses than in the real lives of people in Cameroon. This motivates me all the more to interview the "resource" people who can still be found on the ground and, through conversation and exchange, to track down this heritage that no longer exists in Cameroon but does exist in German archives and museum catalogues on the ground in the different regions of Cameroon. Reverse provenance research" can lead to some communities being more interested than others in the issue of expropriation and the repossession of cultural goods. The absence of cultural property and remembrance is an obvious and worrying problem for the work of cultural memory. It is clear from the interviews that most of the local interlocutors are not aware of the massive presence of Cameroonian cultural heritage in colonial collections in Germany (more than in any other country in the world). Based on my research, one fact can be identified that really characterises the void: It is the present absence (présence-absence) of the cultural goods. The goods of the Vute, [p.327] Fang, Maka, Bakoko (and all the others mentioned above) are more present in the inventories of German museums than in their actual lives. When one tries to investigate the low presence of the cultural heritage of these societies, one finds an enormous loss, of which, however, they are in most cases unaware. Since most of the objects are kept in depots, they are not noticed even in Germany. In the end, one could say that there is a strong presence of colonial collections that Germans ignore and an overwhelming absence of collective cultural heritage, which in turn Cameroonians ignore. This implies a double task for provenance researchers: To inform by informing! The results I have presented here are a starting point to hope for a better structuring and development of work on the restitution of looted heritage in Cameroon.

Translated from the French into German by Andrea Meyer and Bénédicte Savoy

Embracing death so they may yet be space for life. Why we want restitution

FOGHA MC. CORNILIUS REFEM (WAN WO LAYIR)

Prolegomenon: *What if the page was never blank?*

As I sit here to write this, I dread only one thing: this paper's blankness. I stare into its void and it turns that look right at me, at the blankness of my own thoughts on the issue. I am fighting several deadlines, I have taken several walks in the cold thinking, and then drank several glasses of coffee hoping to find inspiration in the bottom, a practice in futility. But what if the page was never blank? There would just not be space for me to think. I invite you to read this text with an eraser and a pen of your own, to erase and rewrite what is at this moment unclear to me as we think through the blank spaces on this page and the *absence* of cultural heritage in Cameroon.

Impetus

One of the 60,000 plus subjects from the Cameroon [*River of Prawns*] is Ngonso. A subject to which I am intimately connected. Ngonso is the founder and the guiding spirit of the Nso people, an ethnic group in the North West region of Cameroon. They migrated from Rifem in Tikari (present-day Bankim, Adamawa Region of Cameroon), following a succession dispute after the death of Fon Tinki in 1387 under the leadership of Ngonso'. Nso got its name from Ngonso, and under her guidance, Nso formed alliances with other groups and became one of the biggest ethnic groups in the area. [1] After her *death* [around 1421] – considered by Nso people as the *disappearance* of her physical body – Ngonso became the guiding spirit of the Nso people and all aspects of Nso life (spiritual, political, and otherwise) were organized around her presence and ideas. Ngonso's life force was embodied in a sculpture covered with cowries, at this time, the official currency of exchange of the Nso people, to represent not only her value but also her pricelessness. Indeed, the Ngonso sculpture carried not only spiritual significance for the Nso people but ordered the Nso world politically and served as a bridge [p.332] between this world and the world of the ancestors. It is also worth noting that following colonial border impositions, a substantial population of Nso is also settled in what is now present-day Nigeria.

Ngonso disappeared twice

Ngonso, the person's death is considered by the Nso people as a disappearance, a transcendence into a different plane of being. As is the case with all rulers of Nso – descendants of Ngonso – they do not die but live forever. [2] The sculpting of Ngonso, therefore, was in fact a performance of absence, a rendering visible of the death this very action sought to dismiss. It also created a physical container for that death, allowing for the Fon, the successor of Ngonso to live forever and not die. As such, the sculpture of Ngonso by virtue of being a bounded physical object, one that is easily held together, contained death for the Nso dynasty and held together its society. What defined Ngonso as a person was her dynamism and leadership in moving Nso through several geographies and places, and what defines the sculpture is its physical form, to protect and define death while allowing that spirit and life to flourish for the Nso.

With all this in mind, I am going to pull on the threads that the following narrative has left hanging. Arguing for a practice of restitution that goes beyond just the replacement of absence with presence. I will first discuss what we are now calling vaguely *cultural heritage* (*objects of cultural creation*) as the performance and embodiment of absences. I will proceed to question to what extent the word absence could be used to talk about the *absent cultural heritage* of Cameroon in Germany. Then explore what exactly *restitution* might mean in light of this consideration.

The abundance of absence

In his seminal essay "Idea Of Culture", Bernard Fonlon argues that what drives culture is a *need* to satisfy human hunger. [3] He argues that human being just like their environment is also subject to the tillage that comes with the need to satisfy this hunger. Human's become both the tilled and the tiller and

engage with knowledge, labor, and skill purposefully for the creation of what he describes as an ideal human.[4] While I am not sure what he means by an ideal human or if I totally agree with that notion, given that the ideal itself is also subject to tillage and not predefined apriori, he, [p.333] nonetheless points to an important direction, the consideration of absence not as a pathology but as the space in which cultures may emerge. Ngugi wa Thiong'o also discusses the centrality of this necessity in the creation of cultures, arguing that poverty is not an end but a means to riches and that without the luxury of excess, the poor may yet be able to maximize the possibilities inherent in the minimum.[5] What I seek to achieve by standing on the shoulders of these giants that I have quoted is to show that the calls for restitution are not merely a response to absence. Given that the material we now call cultural heritage itself is created from absence, from nothing, from lack, and from poverty. If we consider that these subjects of cultural tillage are absence performed, textured, and materialized through relations and processes can we then reduce restitution to a mere response to absence?[6] The absence of Ngonnso from Nso and her presence in Germany for more than 120 years now have been performed in Nso in songs [7] and the Ngonnso cultural festival. It has also been embodied by a big statue of Ngonnso in the middle of the Nso palace courtyard, where its towering presence and the fact that it is more than 7 times bigger than the Ngonnso present here in Germany are a testament to the fact that the absence of the physical sculpture of Ngonnso is more than just that. If communities like Nso have found ways to represent this absence, and to occupy spaces where colonial displacement created voids and loss, why is restitution still a thing?

The absence of abundance

Yet, this is not the only case in which absence fails me. Perhaps the issue for communities is beyond the absence of cultural heritage, perhaps it is the presence of one, the presence of colonial heritage. It will be naive to think that the colonial mission only created absence or that the things that were altered by the colonial touch were simply those that were transported to museums and poisoned with toxic chemicals and reduced to lifeless objects on shelves to be gawked at by absent eyes. Perhaps we should return to Bernard Fonlon who argues that the colonial culture archives its goal of creating an ideal subject by using force on the body and soul of that person and then by using "education" to subordinate the colonized person.[8]

[p.334] Traces of destruction

Ngugi wa Thiongo argues that some of the poor also carry theory in their bodies.[9] Indeed, as he argues, pictures of kids in ghettos wearing worn-out T-shirts bearing logos of various corporations do not serve a commercial purpose but are a pointer to the connections between the extremes of poverty and corporate greed. This definitely holds true for communities like mine, Nso, where the white Jesus, hanging on church walls is a staple presence. One of them was carved and donated to a church by my grand uncle and I watched with great curiosity as he worked on the wood for months, bending it to his will and then struggled for weeks trying to mix the paint that was "Jesus's correct skin tone". Following the problematic decision to "return" Ngonnso by the SPK on the 27th of July 2022, some of the Christians in Nso proclaimed that Ngonnso's return would bring evil spirits to Nso. My reaction to this at first was to laugh at how absurd it was, and then I suddenly became consumed, but not surprised at how much colonization had altered the colonized. I remember how my grand uncle labored to make a sculpture of Jesus, his last major project before his death, and yet, through all this, any suggestion to create a replica of Ngonnso instead would have seen my body submitted to the strain of whip and the sprinkles of holy water and prayers to save my soul from the devil. So perhaps the pathology is not in the absence of cultural heritage but in the presence of colonial cultures for the Cameroonian people (or shall I say for the people of the river of prawns). Indeed, for Nso and Cameroon, traces of destruction are present.

Punitive exhibitions

Conversely, I argue that what we are witnessing in European museums is an abundance of absence. That what we now consider the presence of cultural heritage in Europe is indeed like running to a huge graveyard so as to witness the beauty of life. Just as one could say that this cultural heritage is absent in Cameroon, we can make the same case for Europe. Indeed what we witness are living cultures that have been killed, mutilated, rendered stagnant, classified, and mislabeled objects, serving no other use than to satisfy the most primitive demands of curiosity that do not go beyond seeing. [10] The ethnological museum is a mortuary for cultures, where the cultures have been taken

out of context and altered given the changes to the material by adding toxic chemicals for years and in a deeper sense by the fact that it loses its meaning and interaction with other cultures. They are indeed absent in their true form, but also absent from public discourse, as the greater mass of these subjects are still hidden and information on them is controlled and limited. The work and contribution of the present atlas greatly tend to a prolonged hunger in this regard.

What is also absent is the dynamism of cultures, and the ability to change. The mantra of western museums in their idea of cultural preservation (A bogus colonial paternalistic excuse they invented to justify theft) is '*Leave it in piece*' The manta for communities where this culture was the tillable result of tillage is '*Live it in peace*'.^[11] The absence of death perhaps is what is at stake in Europe, the absence of absence. I consider that as the 1953 film "*Les Statues Meurent Aussi*" posits in its title, these subjects indeed die too.^[12] What is absent here, therefore, is death, an absence that means the cultural space is saturated, and African cultures are reduced only to a few objects attributed to those who stole them, indeed a rejection of Africa's contemporaneity and its ability to exist in the future, it can only exist in the past which it does not have. This interruption in death is from socio-economic factors endogenous to [European] modernity.^[13]

The other absence perhaps is that of the human being who is the tiller of the cultural heritage. Those who see the subjects for what they are, whose relationship with them allows the complete existence of the subjects beyond the visual aesthetic field. Because they are perceived by ignorant eyes the existence of the subjects amounts to not. What we are facing therefore is multiple absences, in terms of an absence in the places of origin, in the place of holding where there is no information known about them, and an absence in time where they exist in the now but are not allowed to interact, hidden behind glass suffering a sentence of immortality, immutability, and stagnation overseen by several generations of jailers. An absence embodied and textured by the ethnological museums.

So we may bury our dead

Following the decision to restitute Ngonnso, the renowned Nso philosopher Godfrey Tangwa aka Rotcod Gobata wrote a commentary that caused a stir in many Nso WhatsApp groups pertaining to what should be done to Ngonnso upon return. He ^[p.336] wrote "My suggestion when Ngonnso finally gets to Kimbo is that a couple of replicas should immediately be made by our best sculptors. Thereafter, she should be ritually deeply buried in the [courtyard] of [the] Nso' [palace] and the spot marked with one of the replicas. This would solve the problem of crying about a befitting museum as well as the fear of further theft of the historic emblem. The idea of museums is one we are learning from our colonial masters and can take our time to domesticate and indigenize." Indeed, for him, if Ngonnso was eaten by termites and ants, that would be okay "as the ants and termites belonged to the same land and earth where Ngonnso' was buried and where she is ritually consulted through periodic rituals and sacrifices."^[14]

So what does restitution in the face of this colonially imposed *absence* mean for us then? Absence is not the reason for which we want restitution especially given that the subjects we want back are in themselves materializations of absence. The word absence might perhaps be misleading in this regard because it represents the state of being away from a people or place, and what concerns us here is not just that state but the conditions under which they were created. Indeed, the various subjects that constitute our (Cameroonian) cultural heritage have an agency and a life force greater than that of their original creators. That is why I have favored using subject over object because they are indeed in excess of themselves.

The conditions of the creation of this absence involved violence, death, pillage, and rape and carry structural and historical consequences for the peoples and places of Cameroon. The looting of Ngonnso for example in the context of German colonization was also at the time when the Nso palace was burnt, between 700-800 people were killed some of whose bodies were transported to Germany as human remains.

New eyes

What the nso are mourning is not a lack of cultural heritage, what they are lacking is an absence of cultural agency, to determine how to be represented. Absence is not bad in itself is not bad but the conditions under which it is created are the point of discussion here. Cultures are an adaptation to the absence both of past things and of future aspirations.

Restitution is therefore the process through which we as the people dispossessed of the remains of our ancestors and cultures are examining the process through which [p.337] that dispossession happened. Perhaps the added significance of these for us is the fact that they “remind us both of the way things were, and they attain the status of survivors, existing beyond the purpose of their original making”. [15] Restitution for us in this regard is not to go back to the way those things were, because there is no past to simply return to and it will also suggest ignoring the changes our communities have gone through till now. We are seeking to recuperate the leftovers of our cultural past because as leftovers, they are at once the material remains of something that occurred elsewhere, and prompts that call that something to mind. [16] It is exactly what this brings to mind that we are looking for, not just to simply reactivate those subjects in space, but to lay them to rest and create space for new possibilities and iterations in light [p.338] of what we consider –to return to Fonlon’s term – *ideal* for us at this time in our being. One of those things that will change for us for sure is that we are certain of the absence of rituals that specifically address the burial and return of unburied ancestors whose bodies were kept unburied for centuries. We lack words for these too, yet this absence does not scare us, we are certain this is a new cultural frontier for us too, in our evolution as a people in the hope that such injustice, once addressed never happens again, not to us, not to anyone else.

What is absent is our consent to see our cultures as simple museum pieces, in fact, the absence of museums which is usually an excuse against restitution is not for us a condemnation, if anything, it is a sign that our cultures are alive. If we did for one second consider that seriously, the question might be then, were the subjects taken from museums? If so what happened to them? If not, where were they taken from and what happened to those spaces? We know some of those spaces were burned and the caretakers killed. What is absent is the engagement in the moral responsibility this reality calls us all to carry. For us what is absent is therefore not simply the cultural subjects, but what we are fighting and dying for is also cultural agency. The right to determine how, where and under what circumstance our culture is represented, if at all. Indeed, I will stand on the shoulder of another giant here to say restitution allows us to look critically at the history and lasting effect of German colonialism and the looting of Nso and Cameroon and seeks beyond that to allow Nso and Cameroonian people to represent and speak for themselves and thus be allowed for an alternative narrative that does not immediately dismiss everything non-European as primitive. [17]

Benevolent attempt to clear up misunderstandings. A letter after 24 years of waiting

PRINCE KUM'A NDUMBE III

On the mausoleum of King Kum'a Mbape a Bele, alias Lock Priso Bell → [Bio, 397](#) in Bonabéri-Douala, a table of the wars waged throughout Cameroon by the German colonial power against native kings and rulers has been hanging since 2017. The visitor searches for a region and discovers who resisted, at what time, possibly even with how many native soldiers and for how long. But he misses the type and number of the missing royal instruments of power, the secret and sacred altars of African spirituality. Nowhere does he find information about the power of the women's covenants, the costume of the celebrations, the number and language of the invoking drums.

Demonised, destroyed, burnt, alienated, robbed, taken away to a distant foreign country where the new foreign ruler has prepared his strategy centre for world domination. In Cameroon and Africa all common, the colonial rulers were not only concerned with military victory and domination. The colonised had to be unsettled to their core, they had to deny themselves, demonise themselves, feel primitive and inferior and seek European salvation. The collective memory of his people had to be radically erased. The European missionary, dressed up as a sergeant, then went from house to house removing the remaining disempowered and demonised "objects", sending them to the Europe Strategy Centre, where they were then hidden in boxes for eternity in newly built detention centres called museums, or sometimes put on display.

The visitor to the Lock Priso Bell mausoleum then turns away disappointed, because no one can tell him what was destroyed, burned, looted and taken to faraway Europe or America from his region during the colonial period.

And even today, in 2022, there are museums in Europe and Germany that demand proof from Cameroonians if they dare to demand restitution. The dispute between me, Kum'a Ndumbe III, Prince of the Bele Bele, and the Munich Museum Fünf Kontinente has been played out publicly since 1998. A whopping 24 years, for a single looted piece, the "Tangué" → [Pictorial Booklet LIV](#) of my grandfather [p.342] Lock Priso Bell. How many years will it then take us to get the 40,000 (or more) "objects" from Cameroon restituted in public, private and missionary collections of German-speaking institutions? My letter of 28 November 2022 to the Munich Museum Fünf Kontinente, published for the first time in this "Atlas of Absence", is only representative of how the dialogue between Africa and Europe on restitution is being made more difficult. It cannot, it must not go on like this. New ways of living together on this planet Earth must urgently be found and implemented.

[p.343] Douala, 28.11.2022

Subject: Benevolent clarification of the Tangué issue

Dear Dr Uta Werlich,

After the meeting with Mr Hamado Dipama from Burkina Faso, from Decolonize Munich, accompanied by Mr Lawrence Oduro Sarpong, from Ghana, head of AfricAvenir Berlin e.V., I am sending you this letter, especially as the discussion about the Tangué has become even clearer. I enclose the documentation on my expertise accumulée sur les questions de restitution des objets de culte, de pouvoir et d'arts africains / camerounais / Collected expertise on the restitution of African cult, power and art objects.

On credibility and a benevolent attempt to clear up misunderstandings

I am very tired of this polemic about my grandfather's Tangué, which has been going on for 24 years in Germany, and I am benevolently trying to give explanations here in order to give the German side a deeper insight into this problem, if that is what you want.

I attended the Maria Theresia Gymnasium at Regerplatz in Munich from 1961 to 1967, with a Bavarian Abitur as my degree, at the University of Lyon II I got two doctorates, and at the Free University of Berlin I habilitated in political science and got the teaching qualification. My master's thesis, my doctorate and my habilitation were all on German history and politics at different times. I taught at the Université Lyon II, at the Catholic Université de Lyon, at the Free University of Berlin and at the Université de Yaoundé I. I was a member of the German University Association, the Association of German Writers VDS and President of the Writers' Association of Cameroon for ten years. I have been acting as Crown Prince of Bele Bele since 1981. My credibility has never been questioned.

But it is enough that a white German student, a white German professor who has never been to Africa or Cameroon, perhaps spent three weeks there, or that a Cameroonian living in Munich today without academic qualifications [p.344] questions my claim to my grandfather's Tangué, then this position becomes official German policy. This is really going too far, this attitude has lasted too long, we must finally deal with each other differently.

I am happy to take the trouble today to shed light on the darker sides of this Tangué issue.

On the family affiliation and public claim of the inheritance or tangué of Kum'a Mbape Bell/Lock Priso Bell

From 1916 to 2022, no one not belonging to the family of Lock Priso Bell (Bona Kum'a Mbape) has yet laid claim to the inheritance of this king.

Officially appointed by the present Cameroon government as "Chef Supérieur", Paul Milord Bwanga Mbape has never claimed to belong to Lock Priso's family.

Accordingly, he cannot be described as the "head of the family" of this family, as the Museum Five Continents repeatedly states.

The Museum Fünf Kontinente in Munich, represented by Dr Uta Werlich and Dr Eisenhofer, often claim through German media that Paul Milord Bwanga Mbape is the head of the Bele Bele family. However, there is no Bele Bele family.

Bele Bele was a kingdom that has now shrunk into 10 areas, and each area is made up of several families and immigrants. Paul Milord Bwanga Kum belongs to the Bona Mujongue family and is considered the head of the family there.

On 24 October 1912, there was a leadership dispute over the leadership of the Bele Bele Empire between two families, Bonakum and Bona Mujongue.[1] There was a public judicial hearing of the entire Bona Doo, led by King Rudolf Duala Manga Bell. Six envoys voted for the Bona Munjongue, i.e. Bwanga Mbape, great-grandfather of Paul Milord Bwanga Mbape, 19 voted for the Bonakum, i.e. Kum'a Mbape/Lock Priso, direct grandfather of Kum'a Ndumbe III, including Rudolf Duala Manga Bell. I think you can see here that we are talking about two different families.

Accordingly, Lock Priso stated:

"O mambo mese so din janea Kum a kusino na sango momene, na ekombo pe na bakala, a bi na le nde lambo lao, a si mapula bola mo to moto, buka momene o jalea mo ka lambo lao na bana bao". (dans l'ensemble, ce trône royal qu'il a reçu de son père lui-même, de tout le royaume et des Européens, il sait que c'est sa possession, il [p.345] ne voudrait la céder à personne, sauf à la gérer lui-même comme sa possession et celle de ses enfants)."

"On the whole, it can be said that this throne, which he has received from his father, from the whole kingdom and from the Europeans, is his property. He does not want to hand it over to anyone, but wants to keep it as his property and that of his children."

In today's situation, handing over the Tangué of Lock Priso Bell to the family of his adversary Bwanga Mbape/Bona Mujongue would be like a denial of his legitimacy in the 21st century by German outsiders.

On the legitimisation of Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III as successor to Lock Priso

Lock Priso Bell had 28 wives, 32 sons, 28 daughters. Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III's grandmother, a princess from Bimbia, was called Muni a Mbimbe. She came into marriage at the age of 17, stayed with King Lock Priso Bell for 40 years and lived in Bonabéri as a widow for 60 more years. Her son Ndumbe Kum III is the father of Kum'a Ndumbe III (Kum, son of Ndumbe III). Nowhere in the genealogical book is the name of Paul Milord Mbape to be found, still less that of his father, grandfather or ancestor. [2]

The claim in the Deutsche Welle documentary that Paul Bwanga Mbape is one of the successors of the 32 sons is simply false. [3] Nobody in Cameroon claims this, not even the person concerned himself.

The inauguration of Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III on the grave of Lock Priso Bell in 1981 as Crown Prince and successor to Lock Priso Bell was public, and the corresponding rituals are also abundantly documented. [4] The book *Restituez à l'Afrique ses objets de culte et d'art* has been officially handed over to the Five Continents Museum, and the relevant documents legitimising Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III as successor to Lock Priso Bell have also been published there. [5] Neither on television, radio, in the press nor in any official announcement has this book been questioned or its findings contradicted in Cameroon since its publication in 2019.

The royal throne of Kum'a Mbape Bell/Lock Priso was given to Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III, it is used by him and shown to the people at certain public events. There is enough broadcast of such ceremonies on the internet and YouTube. [6]

Not even the government of Cameroon disputes the legitimacy of Kum'a Ndumbe III as successor to Lock Priso. The [p.346] government refused to confirm him as King of the Bele Bele because he had supported the Social Democratic Front SDF in the presidential election with election observers before the traditional accession in 1992, [7] and had withdrawn from party politics after the accession in 1994 in order to be able to exercise his office impartially. Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III had also refused to join the ruling party RDPC despite massive pressure. But an heir to the throne who refuses to belong to the ruling party is simply not appointed as king by government decree. This too has been abundantly discussed and documented in the Cameroonian media time and again. [8] This is all documented and discussed in detail in the book *Restituez à l'Afrique ses objets de culte et d'art*, which was sent to the Museum Five Continents.

So this is not about "unmanageable mixtures", as Dr Eisenhofer claims in the Deutsche Welle documentary. Dr. Uta Wehrlich also claims that "it would not be sufficiently proven that Kum'a Ndumbe III, as successor to Lock Priso, would be legitimised to receive back the Tangué for the Bele family."

Max Buchner speaks of the Tangué of Lock Priso as his spoils of war, not of the Tangué of the Bele Bele. [9] International literature [10] speaks of the Tangué of Lock Priso, nowhere does it speak of the Tangué of the Bele Bele. Only in the most recent discussion with the Museum Five Continents does the term "Tangué of the Bele Bele" appear. Who wants to rewrite history?

The Museum Fünf Kontinente announced in the joint conversation of 13 May 2016 in Munich that it wanted to hold talks with the acting Chef Supérieur Paul Mbape in order "not to give back prematurely" (Eisenhofer). *Does the museum need more than six years to hold such talks? So it seems to be a tactic to delay the return of the Tangué as much as possible and not to hand it over to Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III, who has been demanding it back since 1998.*

The return of Tangué to Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III would strengthen him in the power struggle within the Bele Bele to the disadvantage of the incumbent Chef Supérieur Paul Mbape

This argument, also in the Deutsche Welle documentary and in other German media is strange.

Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III does not need the return of the Tangué to gain prestige. I exercise my function as **[p.347]** Crown Prince of Bele Bele daily, receiving ordinary citizens, kings, ambassadors, scholars, refugees. This is abundantly documented on the internet, in YouTube videos, on the homepage www.africavenir-international.org, www.africavenir.org, and through various national and international media. In the last four years, ambassadors from Germany, France, Senegal, Algeria, Israel as well as acting ministers of the Cameroon government have been received. As a habilitated university professor emeritus with 80 published books, more than 150 articles in various journals, a founded foundation AfricAvenir International in Douala with branches in Berlin, Paris and Vienna, I still need the stolen and soon returned Tangué of my grandfather to gain prestige? **[11]**

The family of Martin Luther King in Atlanta, USA, inducted me into the Inaugural Hall of Fame Honorees along with Martin Luther King's widow, Coretta Scott King, in April 2013. On 15 November 2014, she presented another award as the Living Legacy - Leadership Award. It was carved:

"Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III is a highly esteemed and engaged pan Africanist academic, a prolific writer and the legitimate successor to the throne of Lock Priso (Kum'a Mbape), an important traditional leader of the Duala people".

Here in Duala, on 29 December 2021, I received the award "Mbeatowe d'Or 2021 - Icon of the Sawa People" from the Sawa chiefs, in the presence of various Sawa kings.

The documentation Expertise accumulée sur les questions de restitution des objets de culte, de pouvoir et d'arts africains/camerounais, which has now been presented to the Museum Fünf Kontinente, clearly shows that my work around the restitution of African cult and art objects covers the entire African continent and is not reduced to the Tangué of Lock Priso Bell. Since 3 March 2016, I have also acted as Chair of the Comité International de Dialogue pour le Retour des Objets de Culte et d'Art, des Manuscrits et Documents Africains (Cameroun, Mali, Gambie)/Dialogue Committee for the Return of Cult and Art Objects, Manuscripts and African Documents.

In this capacity, I also received and mentored the experts Bénédicte Savoy and Felwine Sarr, sent by French President Emmanuel Macron, for three days in Douala from 16 to 18 July 2018, and accompanied them to Dschang and Baïoussam. They themselves describe this fruitful mentoring in their reports and books. **[12]**

[p.348] *The Tangué as a legally protected trademark in the European Union, Africa and worldwide*

Since 17 August 2015, in Alicante, the Tangué has been a protected trademark of AfricAvenir in the European Union and the certified copy of the registration certificate has been published and sent to the Museum Five Continents.

Furthermore, the Tangué was registered as a protected trademark of AfricAvenir by the Organisation Africaine de la Propriété Intellectuelle (OAPI) in Yaoundé on 29 September 2015.

I sent these documents to the Museum Five Continents by sending the book Restituez à l'Afrique ses objets de culte et d'art. **[13]**

Thanks to the Madrid Protocol for the Protection of Registered Trademarks**[14]**, this protection of the tangué applies worldwide.

What is there to discuss here?

From the bombing of the palace of Lock Priso Bell to the sacking of the palace and the whole area of Hickory Town to the construction of a modern building for the African Renaissance in Bonabéri.

When I asked for my grandfather's Tangué back on the TV programme Berliner Begegnungen[15] on 18 June 1998, some people called me a "nest-destroyer". They said I should be grateful for having attended the Maria Theresia Gymnasium in Munich and also grateful that I was later admitted to the Habilitation in Berlin. Few understood that I was concerned with overcoming this terrible clash in the colonial past, and with making a new start in the relations between Africa and Europe, or Cameroon and Germany. The fact that I was deeply familiar with the German world since 1961, but remained deeply rooted in Africa and understood this as an opportunity to build a new bridge of encounter between North and South in the 21st century, was not understood. I was insulted, treated and marginalised as an opponent, as an adversary of Germany, as a "Gernegrosser". This has been going on for 24 years. The discussion about the Tangué is only representative.

It is in 2022 that inventories of colonial objects in German museums have been completed. It has also become clear that there is not one but at least two Tangués from the bombing of Hickory Town in December 1884 in the Munich Museum. In the exhibition of the Berlin Humboldt [p.349] Forum and probably in other museums there are also tangués from this looting of Bonabéri in 1884.

A German special correspondent writes about the capture of Hickory Town/Bonabéri on 22 December 1884:

"The house of the fallen man, whose door was flung open with the butt, was richly furnished by the standards of the natives and contained a brightly painted, beautifully carved canoe attachment (Canoe Schnabel), [16] which we took with us as a trophy. There was no more serious work for us, and it was almost with envy that we heard the heavy firing, even from the guns and the revolver cannon, on the part of the Bismarck people." [17]

Lock Priso Bell's palace and skyscraper were burnt to the ground. [18] About 40,000 objects in German museums today come from Cameroon.

The extended family Bona Kum'a Mbape Bele decided in its meeting of 3 February 2019 in Bonabéri to organise a public hearing on the affiliation of the Tangué of Lock Priso Bell to put an end to the discussion in Germany. Government, governor, universities, royalty, Bele Bele families, national and international media, including the Süddeutsche Zeitung (Joerg Häntzschel), attended this meeting on 26 February 2019 and reported extensively. There were no claims other than that of Prince Kum'a Ndumbe II for the Kum'a Mbape family.[19]

Our response is the planned construction of an eight-storey African Renaissance House, a place of international encounter with a university, exhibition spaces, concert halls, meeting spaces for writers in residence, artists, inventors, innovators, furnished flats for tourists. An entire floor is dedicated to the circulation of returned cult and art objects, in dialogue with cult and art objects that have never left the African continent, and with other spaces for contemporary art and craft. This innovative project of the Fondation AfricAvenir international is carried out contractually in cooperation with the City of Douala, the Autonomous Port of Douala, the University of Douala and the University of Yaoundé I.[20] International partners are welcome.

Wouldn't it be a wonderful opportunity for today's German politics to set an example for coming to terms with the colonial past and for innovation in cooperation with the African continent?

Also this question: *Is the Museum Fünf Kontinente in Munich prepared to co-sponsor the project of the [p.350] African Renaissance House with the Fondation AfricAvenir International and also to settle some restituted cult and art objects there?* Our family would be pleased to receive an answer.

Through this debate, may we be able to build a lasting peaceful bridge in science, art and culture between Bavaria, Germany in general and Cameroon.

With kind regards

Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III,
Emeritus University Professor

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.353] [Appendix]

354 - Museums that hold Cameroonian cultural property in Germany

356 - Cameroonian objects in German inventories according to stakeholders

358 - Stakeholders

This list lists 259 persons who have procured Cameroonian cultural heritage for German museums and collections. It breaks down how many objects or inventory entries can be attributed to them in the individual institutions. The list not only includes the colonial-era "collectors" on site, but also offers a cross-section of the spectrum of people who were significantly involved in the process of translocation. The compilation is based on data sets collected from the collecting institutions as part of the DFG project "Reverse Collection History". [edited by Sebastian-Manès Sprute].

370 - Exemplary biographies

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.354 & p.355] Museums	Cameroon inventory (inventory entries)
Linden Museum, State Museum of Ethnology Stuttgart	8871
Museums in the Grassi, Museum of Ethnology Leipzig	5190
Ethnological Museum Berlin	5135
Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum, Cultures of the World Cologne	3164
Museum Five Continents Munich	3018
State Museum of Ethnology Dresden	2444
Overseas Museum Bremen	2250
World Cultures Museum Frankfurt	2154
Reiss Engelhorn Museums Mannheim	1789
Lower Saxony State Museum Hanover	1562
Museum am Rothenbaum, Cultures and Arts of the World Hamburg	1431
Braunschweig Municipal Museum	770
Ethnological Collection Lübeck	481
German Museum Munich	440
Georg-August University, Ethnological Collection Göttingen	341
Lippe State Museum Detmold	287
Roman and Pelice Museum Hildesheim	282
Johannes Gutenberg University, Ethnographic Study Collection Mainz	253
Museum Nature and Man Freiburg	163
Nuremberg Museum of Natural History	155
Ethnological Museum, Cultures of the World Wittenhausen	107
United Evangelical Mission on the Hardt Wuppertal	101
Eberhard Karls University, Ethnological Collection Tübingen	98
Philipps University, Marburg Ethnographic Collection	78
State Museum of Nature and Man Oldenburg	74

Upper Hesse Museum Giessen	51
Wilhelmshaven Coastal Museum	30
Museum Wiesbaden	26
Georg-August University, Göttingen Musical Instrument Collection	26
Ethnological Museum Herrnhut	25
Coburg Museum of Natural History	25
Philipps University, Religious Studies Collection Marburg	21
Museum in the Ritterhaus Offenburg	18
Museumslandschaft Hessen-Kassel Kassel (Bad Wildungen)	18
Wilnsdorf Museum	16
Daetz Centre Lichtenstein	15
Fehn- und Schifffahrtsmuseum Westrauderfehn Rhaderfehn	11
Bridge Museum Berlin	9
Hellweg Museum Unna	6
Georg-August University, Heinz Kirchhoff Collection Göttingen	3
Rostock Museum of Cultural History	3
Museum Eberswalde	3
Museum Uslar	3
Wusterhausen / Dosse Museum of Paths	2
Osnabrück Museum Quarter	1

Total 40,950

[p.356] Stakeholders	Objects delivered
Diehl, Adolf	4046
Schipper, Adolf W.	1610
Stein zu Lausnitz, Ludwig	1466
Konietzko, Julius	1261
Carnap-Quernheimb, Ernst	1109
Glauning, Hans F.L.H.W.	1092
Ankermann, Bernhard	1072
Dominik, Hans F.W.	1034
Strümpell, Kurt	857
Preuss, Martin	830
Paschen, Hans	824
Glock, Philipp	763
Thorbecke, Franz and Marie-Pauline	754
Dorbritz, Paul	699
Zintgraff, Eugen	631
Zenker, Georg A.	621
Frobenius, Leo	515
Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Adolf F.A.H.	502
Hösemann, Paul Alfred	475
Umlauff, J.F.G.	438
Kamptz, Oltwig von	428
Schultze, Arnold W.L.F.	404
Mansfeld, Alfred	369
Oertzen, Jasper M. O. von	367
Morning, Curt E.	350

Linden, Karl Count von	341
Tessmann, Günther	300
Haberer, Karl A.	275
Hirtler, Richard A.	271
Thorbecke, Franz	270
Esser, Max	268
Nolte, Hermann A.H.F.	262
Raben, Ernst K.I.C.F.A. von	255
Bertram, Hermann K.	239
Colin, Ludwig	231
Achenbach, Wilhelm E.F.	223
Putlitz, Hans C. G. E. Herr zu	220
Schran, F. A. (Lusy)	219
Stetten, Maximilian (Max)	204
[p.357] Zimmermann, Carl H.	203
Conradt, Leopold F.W.E.	201
Carpenter, Eugene	191
Fechtner, Artur F. E.W.F.	183
Lessel, Karl G.	176
Berké, Theodore	167
Client, Richard	167
Pahl, Gustav	156
Lequis, J.	152
Harttmann, Ludwig E.H.	150
Martin, Friedl	140

More than 200 other colonial-era stakeholders provided fewer than 140 objects each.

[p.358] Achenbach, Wilhelm Erich Ferdinand, * 22.03.1876 in Trier † 06.03.1908 in Lolodorf (Cameroon) - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [223], Stuttgart [221], Bremen [mention in provenance], Mainz [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 63, Briskorn 2000, p. 193

Adae, Friedrich (Fritz), * 03.03.1875 in Neuenstadt am Kocher † 12.02.1967 in Stuttgart - Bezirksamtmann - Inventareinträge gesamt [28]; Stuttgart [27], Mainz [1] - Lit.: Angerbauer 1996, p. 150

Adametz, Karl Moritz Ernst Gustav, * 28.03.1877 in Zembowitz O.S. † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [135]; Berlin [133], Göttingen [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 64, Eisleb 2001, p. 100

Ankermann, Bernhard, * 14.02.1859 in Tapiau (East Prussia) † 26.10.1943 in Berlin - museum director, explorer, ethnologist - inventory entries total [1,072]; Berlin [1062], Dresden [7], Göttingen [3] → [Bio p. 370](#)

Antelmann, Bruno, * ? † ? - Merchant, managing director of the "Deutsches Kolonialhaus", 'Ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [2]; Leipzig [mention in provenance], Berlin [2] - Lit.: Zeller 2002, pp. 84 - 92

Arning, Wilhelm, Dr., * 20.12.1865 in Hanover † ? - Medical officer of the "Schutztruppe für Deutsch-Ostafrika", explorer - inventory entries total [1]; Stuttgart [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920.01, p. 83

Arnim, Karl Gustav Ludwig Albrecht, von, * 28.03.1872 in Lichterfelde † 27.08.1899 in Hamburg - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [6]; Berlin [6] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 65

Bastian, Adolf, Dr., * 26.06.1826 in Bremen † 02.02.1905 in Port of Spain (today Trinidad and Tobago) - physician, ethnologist, founding director of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin - inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] - Lit.: Fiedermutz-Laun 1990, pp. 88 - 108, Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 141; Weidmann 1894, pp. 8 - 10

Bavaria, Therese, Princess of, * 12.11.1850 in Munich † 19.09.1925 in Lindau - explorer, botanist, zoologist - inventory entries total [132]; Munich [132] - Lit.: Beer 2007, pp. 23-28

Becker, Carl Heinrich, * ? † ? - Animal dealer, taxidermist, 'ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [2]; Bremen [2] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 196

Berké, Theodor, Dr., * 20.05.1870 in Kaiserslautern † 1949 in Baden-Baden - medical officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [167]; Munich [167] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 205

Bertram, Hermann Karl, * 25.06.1872 in Krummennaab (Upper Palatinate) † 27.09.1914 near Maricourt (France) - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [239]; Stuttgart [237], Mainz [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 69

Biedermann-Imhoof, Richard, Prof. Dr., * 06.05.1865 in Winterthur (Switzerland) † 06.07.1926 in Eutin - ornithologist, zoologist - inventory entries total [1]; Lübeck [1] - Lit.: Gebhardt 2006

Bornemann, ?, * ? † ? - Captain - inventory entries total [1], Bremen [1] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 203

Bornmüller, Alfred Julius, * 02.12.1868 in Hildburghausen † 13.07.1947 in Weimar - head of the German colony Neu-Württemberg in Rio Grande do Sul, explorer, botanist - inventory entries total [81]; Leipzig [81] - Lit.: Frahm/Eggers 2005

Broeckmann, Ludwig, * ? † ? - Managing director of the Bremer Tabakbau-Gesellschaft Bakossi mbH - inventory entries total [18], Bremen [18] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 205

Buchner, Max, Dr. von, * 25.04.1846 in Munich † 7.05.1921 in Munich - interim commissioner (14.07.1884 - 17.05.1885), explorer - inventory entries total [21]; Munich [21] → [Bio S. 375](#)

Bülow, Anton August Gottlieb Friedrich Siegfried, * 10.04.1871 in Schwerin † 27.04.1905 near Huams (German South-West Africa) - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [6]; Leipzig [3], Hanover [3] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 75; Schnee 1920, p. 254

Büsgen, Moritz, Prof. Dr., * 24.07.1858 in Weilburg a. Lahn † ? - Botanist - inventory entries total [8]; Göttingen [8] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 261

Bumiller, Theodor, Dr., * 22.06.1864 in Landshut (Rheinpfalz) † 26.11.1912 in San Stefano near Constantinople - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Deutsch-Ostafrika", explorer - inventory entries total [15]; Mannheim [15] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 254, Weidmann 1894, p. 24

Carnap-Quernheimb, Ernst, von, * 10.09.1863 in Oppeln † 02.12.1949 in Hirschberg (Riesengebirge) - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [1109]; Stuttgart [1102], Berlin [2], Mainz [5] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 76, Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 266, Weidmann 1894, p. 25

Chamier-Glisczinski, Leonhard Hermann Karl Otto (Uko) Johannes (Hans), von, * 27.09.1870 in Oeynhausen † 02.10.1952 in Potsdam - Officer of the "Protection Force for Cameroon". - Inventory entries total [10]; Berlin [10] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 77

Cleve, Hermann, * ? † 01.10.1914 in Suclawicz - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [2]; Lübeck [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 78

Colin, Friedrich, * ? † ? - Business, merchant - inventory entries total [1]; Stuttgart [1] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 26, Totzke 1885, p. 229ff.

Colin, Ludwig, * ? † ? - Director of the Württembergische Vereinsbank in Stuttgart - inventory entries total [231]; Munich [124], Dresden [107] - Lit.: Totzke 1885, p. 229ff.

Conradt, Leopold Fritz Wilhelm Edmund, * ? † ? - Station manager in Togo, explorer, entomologist - inventory entries total [201]; Berlin [201] - Lit.: Andratschke 2021, p. 124f; Weidmann 1894, p. 26

Conrau, Gustav, * 02.10.1865 in ?, † 12.1899 in Fontem (Cameroon) - merchant, representative of the firm Jantzen und Thormählen - inventory entries total [136]; Berlin [136] - Lit.: Schlothauer 2015, pp. 20 - 31

Danziger, Daniel Bernhard, * 30.06.1869 in Vegesack † ? - lawyer, husband of E.M.H. Danziger - inventory entries total [118]; Bremen [118] - Lit.: [p.359](#) Briskorn 2000, p. 208

Danziger, Ella Marie Helene, née Schipper, * ? † ? - sister of A. Schipper - inventory entries total [2]; Bremen [2] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 208

Dehls, Wilhelm Heinrich, * 20.07.1858 in Vegesack † 07.09.1930 in Philadelphia, (United States of America) - ? - Inventory entries total [2]; Bremen [2] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 209

Diehl, Adolf, * 1870 in Oppenheim † 1943 in Darmstadt - merchant - inventory entries total [4046]; Stuttgart [2344], Leipzig [1,605], Cologne [2], Dresden [10], Frankfurt [31], Mainz [54] → [Bio S. 378](#)

Dietert, W., * ? † ? - Corvette Captain - total inventory entries [3]; Bremen [3] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 212

Dominik, Hans Friedrich Wilhelm, * 07.05.1870 in Kulm † 16.12.1910 at sea - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [1034]; Stuttgart [802], Leipzig [4], Berlin [110], Munich [1], Dresden [1], Frankfurt [1], Hamburg [112], Göttingen [1], Mainz [2] → [Bio p. 380](#)

Dorbritz, Paul, * ? † ? - Colonial official (?) in Cameroon - inventory entries total [699]; Stuttgart [676], Munich [1], Mainz [22] - see archive of the Linden-Museum Stuttgart

Drechsel, Gottlieb Ferdinand, * ? † ? - Master plumber, 'Ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [1]; Munich [1] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 213

Eckhardt, Wilhelm Friedrich Karl Alexander, * 01.11.1875 in Calden † ? - Medical Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [3]; Cologne [3] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 210

End, Eugen Friedrich Karl, * 31.07.1858 in Wunsiedel † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Deutsch-Ostafrika" - inventory entries total [10]; Bremen [10] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 214

Engelhardt, ?, * ? † ? - Wife of P.A.L. Engelhardt - inventory entries total [6]; Herrnhut [6] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 563

Engelhardt, Philipp August Lorenz, * 10.06.1866 in Dresden † 1951 in Bayrischzell - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Deutsch-Ostafrika", colonial official (?) in Cameroon - inventory entries total [40]; Stuttgart [24], Berlin [16], Herrnhut [mention in provenance] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 563

Esser, Max, Dr., * 14.09.1866 in Cologne † 06.02.1943 in Baden-Baden - founder of the "Westafrikanische Pflanzungsgesellschaft Victoria", merchant, plantation owner - inventory entries total [268]; Stuttgart [261], Mainz [7] - Lit.: Chilver/Röschenthaler: 2001, pp. 3 - 28

Eylmann, Paul Erhard Andreas, Dr. Dr., * 03.09.1860 in Krautsand † 22.12.1926 in Farge - explorer, physician, geographer - inventory entries total [2], Bremen [2] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 217; Schröder 2004, pp. 43-51.

Fechtner, Artur Ferdinand Emil Wilhelm Fritz, * ? † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [183]; Leipzig [135], Berlin [47], Dresden [1] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 92

Flegel, Eduard Robert, * 13.10.1852 in Wilna † 11.09.1886 in Brass (Nigeria) - explorer - inventory entries total [124]; Berlin [104], Munich [15], Dresden [1], Göttingen [1], Hildesheim [3] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 640; Weidmann 1894, p. 41f.

Förster, Oscar, * 13.01.1871 in Breslau † 02.05.1910 in Nikolasee - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [108]; Stuttgart [40], Berlin [66], Mainz [2] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 650.

Forster, Johann Reinhold, * 22.10.1729 in Dirschau (Prussia) † 09.12.1798 in Halle a.d. Saale - explorer, natural scientist - inventory entries total [4]; Berlin [4] - Lit.: Drews et al. 2017

Frankenberg-Lüttwitz, Sigismund Heinrich Kaspar, von, * 11.12.1878 in Fürstenwalde a.d. Spree † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [61]; Berlin [61] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 95

Frese, Wilko, von, * 31.12.1882 in Wilperten † 27.02.1915 in Perthes - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [112]; Hanover [112] - Lit.: Hofmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 96

Frobenius, Leo, * 29.06.1873 in Berlin † 09.08.1938 in Biganzolo, Italy - ethnologist - inventory entries total [515]; Stuttgart [126], Leipzig [196], Berlin [41], Munich [69], Dresden [5], Frankfurt [34], Hamburg [42], Göttingen [2] - Lit.: Streck 2014

Gans Edler Herr zu Putlitz, Hans Caspar Frhr, * 30.06.1879 in Berlin † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [220]; Stuttgart [100], Leipzig [6], Berlin [110] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 97; Eisleb 2001, p. 127

Gellhorn, Hans Ernst Karl Richard, von, * 24.09.1873 in Cosel † 21.12.1946 in Berlin - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [5]; Stuttgart [3], Berlin [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 98

Germann, Paul, * 12.02.1884 in Sargstedt near Halberstadt † 1966 in Sargstedt near Halberstadt - art historian, anthropologist, National Socialist - inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] - see archive of the Ethnological Museum Berlin

Glauning, Hans Franz Ludwig Heinrich Wilhelm, * 29.01.1868 in Berlin † 05.03.1908 in Atscho (Cameroon) - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" - inventory entries total [1092]; Stuttgart [738], Leipzig [1], Berlin [338], Munich [1], Dresden [1], Frankfurt [1], Göttingen [3], Hildesheim [5], Mainz [4] → [Bio p. 386](#)

Gleim, Otto, Konsul Dr., * 22.04.1866 in Kassel † 17.08.1929 in Planegg - Governor (28.08.1910 - 29.01.1912), Undersecretary of State in the Imperial Colonial Office - inventory entries total [11]; Braunschweig [11] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 740.

Glock, Philipp, * 26.08.1881, Zuzenhausen † 06.09.1914, Nsanakang (Cameroon) - secretary of the governorate - inventory entries total [763]; Stuttgart [753], Frankfurt [1], Mainz [9] - see archive of the Linden-Museum Stuttgart

Glücksmann, Theodor, * ? † ? - Merchant, patron - inventory entries total [0], Berlin [mention in provenance] - Lit.: Eisleb 2001, p. 111f.

Godeffroy, Johann Cesar, * ? † ? - Founder of the colonial trading company of the same name - inventory entries total [6]; Mannheim [6] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 742.

Godknecht, Hans Joachim Friedrich Wilhelm, * 27.08.1875 in Teschow † 21.03.1951 [\[p.360\]](#) in Teschow - station manager - inventory entries total [16]; Lübeck [16] - see Archive of the Ethnological Collection Lübeck

Grubauer, Albert, Prof., * 1869 in ? † 1960 in ? - Research traveller, zoologist - inventory entries total [71]; Leipzig [5], Munich [66] - see archive of the Museum Fünf Kontinente Munich

Gruner, Hans, Dr. phil., * 10.03.1865 in Wahrenbrück † ? - Station manager, district official - inventory entries total [4]; Dresden [3], Witzhausen [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 768; Weidmann 1894, p. 48

Guse, Franz Karl, * 18.05.1864 in Königsberg † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [34]; Leipzig [3], Berlin [23], Göttingen [4], Hildesheim [2], Oldenburg [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 103; Andratschke 2021, p. 164f.

Haberer, Karl Albert, Prof., * 1864 in Bad Griesbach, Renchthal † 1941 in Freiburg im Breisgau - government physician, explorer - inventory entries total [275]; Stuttgart [183], Berlin [mention in provenance], Hamburg [90], Mainz [1], Freiburg [1] - see archive of the Linden-Museum Stuttgart

Hartmann, Karl Eduard Robert, * 08.10.1832 in Blankenburg, Harz † 20.04.1893 in Potsdam - explorer, ethnologist - inventory entries total [1]; Hannover [1] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 52, Ciz 1984

Hartmann, Ludwig Ernst Hermann, * 26.10.1885 in Stuttgart † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [150]; Stuttgart [148], Berlin [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 108

Hassert, Ernst Emil Kurt, Prof. Dr., * 15.03.1868 in Naumburg, Saale † 05.11.1947 in Leipzig - geographer, university teacher - inventory entries total [22]; Cologne [21], Dresden [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 44

Herbst, Emil, Dr., * ? † ? - Dentist, heirs - inventory entries total [4]; Bremen [4] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 234

Heigelin, Karl Theodor, * 06.04.1876 in Liebenzell 15.01.1930 in ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [30]; Stuttgart [30] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, Vol. 2, p. 109

Heldt, Johannes Christian Eiler, * 16.09.1858 in Apenrade, Denmark † 15.02.1925 in ? - Captain on the Woermann Line - inventory entries total [42]; Freiburg [42] - see archive of the Museum Natur und Mensch Freiburg

Hessler, Martin Karl Arnim, * 01.04.1874 in Philippsthal, Hesse-Nassau † ? - Medical Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [28]; Berlin [28] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 219

Hintz, Eugen, * 16.11.1868 in Danzig † 14.11.1932 in Berlin - explorer, entomologist - inventory entries total [102]; Leipzig [26], Berlin [1], Munich [31], Dresden [14], Bremen [13], Hannover [16], Hamburg [1] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 236

Hirtler, Richard Alfred, * 09.02.1872 in Lahr, Baden † 26.06.1916 in Duchcze - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" - Inventory entries total [271]; Stuttgart [141], Leipzig [117], Berlin [9], Mainz [4] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 112

Hösemann, Paul Alfred, Dr., * 18.02.1868 in Wurzen † 1922 in ? - medical officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (protection troop for Cameroon) - Total inventory entries [475]; Stuttgart [307], Leipzig [108], Berlin [35], Dresden [10], Frankfurt [2], Mainz [13] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 220; Eisleb 2001, p. 113

Hoppe, Carl, * ? † ? - Naturalienhändler, 'Ethnographica'-Handel - Inventareentr Einträge gesamt [96]; Hamburg [78], Lübeck [7], Hildesheim [10], Freiburg [1] - <https://d-nb.info/gnd/1208210114> [16.02.2023]

Hornbostel, Erich Moritz, von, * 25.02. 1877 in Vienna † 28.11.1935 in Cambridge, Great Britain - director of the Berlin Phonogramm-Archiv (1906-1933), Austrian ethnomusicologist - inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] - Lit.: Bose 1972, p. 633f.

Houben, Hans Heinrich Gerhard, * 08.11. 1871 in Viersen † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [119]; Stuttgart [104], Mainz [5], Freiburg [10] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 114

Hutter, Franz Karl, * 08.06.1865 in Kempten † 02.04.1924 in Burghausen - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [12]; Munich [12] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 85

Ipscher, Georg, Dr., * 30.11.1860 in Wusterhausen a.d. Dosse † 24.11.1935 in Wusterhausen a.d. Dosse - medical officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [107]; Stuttgart [103], Mainz [2], Wusterhausen/Dosse [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 221

Jacobs, Joh. , * ? † ? - Captain - inventory entries total [17]; Bremen [17] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 240

Jäger, Max, Dr. med., * 05.11.1877 in Grabow, Pomerania † ? - Medical officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [60]; Munich [40], Hamburg [20] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 221

Jantzen & Thormählen, Jantzen, Wilhelm, * 10.11.1839 in Hamburg † 28.05.1917 in Hamburg | Thormählen, Johannes, * 31.01.1842 in Glücksstadt † ? - Merchants, founder of the colonial trading company of the same name - inventory entries total [26]; Hamburg [25], Göttingen [1] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 174, Loose 1974, p. 349f.

Joest, Wilhelm, Prof., * 15.03.1852 in Cologne † 25.11.1897 on the Santa Cruz Islands - explorer, patron - inventory entries total [4]; Stuttgart [4]; Cologne [mention in provenance] - Lit.: Eisleb 2001, p. 115f.; Weidmann 1894, p. 62.

Junkelmann, Erich, Dr., * 06.01.1890 in Leipzig † 1964 in ? - Merchant, composer, art historian, 'ethnographica' dealer - inventory entries total [6]; Bremen [6] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 241

Kämena, Nikolaus, * ? † ? - Freight forwarder, 'Ethnographica'-trade - inventory entries total [5]; Bremen [5] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 244

Kamptz, Oltwig, von, * 21.04.1857 in Torgau † 17.03.1921 in Breslau - Commander of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (18.10.1897 - 17.04.1901) - Inventory entries total [428]; Leipzig [7], Berlin [49], Bremen [370], Hildesheim [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 116; Briskorn 2000, [p.361] p. 244; Andratschke 2021, p. 171; Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 222.

Karutz, Richard, Prof. Dr., * 02.11.1867 in Stralsund † 10.02.1945 in Dresden - museum director, doctor, National Socialist - inventory entries total [6]; Lübeck [6] - Lit.: Templin 2010

Kegel, Lore, née Lessing, née Gessner, née Lore. Gessner, née. Konietzko, * 09.10.1901 in Düsseldorf † 20.10.1980 in ? - Art dealer, painter, 'ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [4]; Stuttgart [1], Cologne [1], Bremen [2] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 251ff.

Kegel-Konietzko, Boris, * 08.02.1925 in Hamburg † 03.10.2020 in Hamburg - art dealer, explorer, biologist, 'ethnographica' dealer - inventory entries total [20]; Bremen [1], Hamburg [5], Freiburg [1], Göttingen Musikinstrumentensammlung [3], Marburg Religionskundliche Sammlung [1], Berlin Brücke Museum [9] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, pp. 251ff.

Keller, Jakob, * 04.04.1862 in Bofsheim † 12.03.1947 in Schriesheim - missionary (Basel Mission) - inventory entries total [92]; Berlin [1], Bremen [70], Nuremberg [21] → [Bio p. 394](#)

Kersting, Hermann, * 11.02.1863 in Riga † 26.08.1937 in ? - Vice-Governor of the Caroline Islands, Mariana Islands and Marshall Islands (1910 - 1914), station chief in Togo, physician - inventory entries total [2]; Berlin [2] - Lit.: Eisleb 2001, p. 116f.

Kirchhoff, August Ferdinand Wilhelm, * 07.12.1874 in Hohenhausen † ? - Bezirksamtmann - inventory entries total [94]; Detmold [94] - Lit.: Lilla 2004, p. 190

Knobloch, Richard Alexander Edwin Hermann, * 04.02.1868 in Nordheim, Prussia † 06.09.1924 in Nordhausen - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [6]; Frankfurt [2], Mainz [4] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 120

Köhler, August Walter (Heirs of), * 30.September 1858 in Eltville † 19.01.1902 in Togo - Deputy Governor of Cameroon (1899), Imperial Commissioner and Governor of Togo (1895-1898), Governor of Togo [1898-1902] - inventory entries total [67]; Bremen [67] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 248; Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 315f.

Konietzko, Julius August, * 06.08.1886 in Insterburg † 27.04.1952 in ? - Merchant, explorer, 'ethnographica' dealer - inventory entries total [1261]; Leipzig [238], Berlin [24], Cologne [2], Munich [5], Dresden [56], Bremen [205], Frankfurt [18], Hanover [137], Hamburg [573], Göttingen [1], Marburg [1], Osnabrück [1] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, pp. 251ff.

Krämer, Augustin, Prof. Dr., * 27.08.1865 in Los Angeles, Chile † 11.11.1941 in Stuttgart - museum director, anthropologist, ethnologist - inventory entries total [0]; Stuttgart [mention in provenance] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 371

Krause, Gottlob Adolf, * 05.01.1850 in Ockrilla near Meissen † 19.02.1938 in Zürich - explorer - inventory entries total [2]; Dresden [2] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 71; Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 374; Sebald 1972

Kreyher, Martin, * 12.09.1872 in Groß-Läsowitz, district of Liegnitz † 1930 in Görlitz - medical officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [1]; Hermann [1] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 227

Krickeberg, Walter, * 27.06.1885 in Schwiebus, Neumark † 15.07.1962 in Berlin - museum director, ethnologist, National Socialist - inventory entries total [4]; Berlin [4] - Lit.: Zeller 1982, p. 35f.

Krogh, Christian Ludwig August von, * 22.03.1863 in Peine † 11.09.1924 in Büsum - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [1]; Leipzig [1] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 122

Küas, Herbert, * 05.07.1900 in Leipzig † 21.03.1983 in Leipzig - archaeologist, art historian - inventory entries total [1]; Leipzig [1] - Lit.: Unger 2003, p. 7-42

Küas, Richard, * 1861 in ? † 1943 in ? - Colonial official (?), writer - inventory entries total [7]; Leipzig [7] - Lit.: Küas, Richard, index entry: Deutsche Biographie, www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd119552981.html [14.02.2023].

Kück, Gerhard, * ? † ? - 'Ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [1]; Bremen [1] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 257

Külz, Friedrich Otto Ludwig, * 18.02.1875 in Borna † 1938 in Erdmannshain - government physician, tropical medicine specialist, explorer - inventory entries total [4]; Leipzig [4] - Lit.: Baumann/Klein/Apitzsch 2002, p. 212

Küppers-Loosen, Johann Georg Hubert, * 1860 in ? † 18.05.1911 in ? - Research traveller, merchant, board member of the 'Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde zur Förderung des Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museums der Stadt Köln' - inventory entries total [27]; Cologne [27] - see archive of the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum Cologne

Kund, Richard, * 1852 in Zielenzi, Neumark † 31.07.1904 in Sellin, Rügen - officer, explorer - inventory entries total [167]; Leipzig [16], Berlin [124], Dresden [13], Oldenburg [14] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 392; Weidmann 1894, p. 74f.

Laasch, Gustav Adolf Wilhelm, * 16.04.

1873 in Buslar, Prussia †? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [10]; Berlin [9], Hildesheim [1] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 124; Andratschke 2021, pp. 166 -170

Langheld, Wassy, * 1865 in ? † 1913 in ? - Merchant - inventory entries total [7]; Berlin [5], Hildesheim [2] - Lit.: Andratschke 2021, p. 188ff.

Langheld, Friedrich Wilhelm Gerhard, * 25.05.1867 in Berlin † 09.07.1917 in the field hospital Kutczany, Galicia - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [23]; Leipzig [1], Berlin [20], Oldenburg [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 125; Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 440; Weidmann 1894, p. 75

Larsonneur, Alfred Marie Joseph, * 18.01.1875 in Nantes † 14.12.1945 in Paris, - French colonial official - inventory entries total [2]; Berlin [2] - see Archive of the Ethnological Museum Berlin

Leimenstoll, Johannes Immanuel, * ? - Missionary, missionary merchant - inventory entries total [3]; Stuttgart [3] - see archive of the Museum der Kulturen Basel

Leist, Karl Theodor Heinrich, * 01.05.1859 in Meitzendorf † 12.03.1910 in Chicago - court assessor, deputy chancellor (June 1893-February 1894) - inventory entries total [16]; Leipzig [16] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 449

Lenz, Oskar, * 13.04.1848 in Leipzig [p.362] † 02.03.1925 in Sooß - German-Austrian explorer, mineralogist, geologist - inventory entries total [5]; Berlin [4], Dresden [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 451.; Weidmann 1894, p. 76

Lequis, Joseph (Heirs), * ? †? - Father of Ernst Lequis, a station manager - inventory entries total [152]; Cologne [152] - Lit.: on Ernst Lequis: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 128f.

Lessel, Karl Georg, * 8.05.1883 in Bucharest † 15.03.1931 in Berlin - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [176]; Dresden [176] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 129

Lessner, Paul Franz Adolf, * 14.08.1870 in Schubin, Prussia †? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [102]; Stuttgart [100], Mainz [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 129

Lieder, Philipp, * ? † ? - explorer, geologist - inventory entries total [1]; Stuttgart [1] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 77f.

Lier, (Charles) Carel, van, * 05.09.1897 in Den Haag † 15.03.1945 in Hannover-Mühlenberg - Dutch art dealer, 'ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [1]; Frankfurt [1] - Lit.: Lier 2003

Linden, Karl, Graf von, * 28.05.1838 in Ulm † 15.01.1910 in Stuttgart - museum director - inventory entries total [341]; Stuttgart [341] - Lit.: Kußmaul 1985, p. 590f.

Lips, Julius Ernst, Dr. | pseudonym: Palan Káraní, *08.09.1895 in Saarbrücken † 21.01.1950 in Leipzig - museum director, ethnologist, sociologist - inventory entries total [0]; Cologne [mention in provenance] - Lit.: Kreide-Damani 2010

Maass (Maaß), Alfred, * 08.02.1863 in ? † 17.12.1946 in ? - Research traveller, anthropologist - inventory entries total [3]; Berlin [mention in provenance], Frankfurt [3] - Lit.: Eisleb 2001, p. 120

Mansfeld, Alfred, * 14.03.1870 in Tetschen, Austria † 1932 in ? - Government physician, district official - inventory entries total [369]; Stuttgart [108], Leipzig [2], Berlin [84], Dresden [173], Mainz [2] - Lit.: Eisleb 2001, p. 120f.; Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 501

Marquardsen, Hugo, Dr. , * 02.02.1869 in Porto Allegre, Brazil † 17.05.1920 in ? - Geographer - inventory entries total [42]; Stuttgart [42] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 513.

Martin, Friedl , Dr., * ? † ? - Research traveller, Royal Bavarian Councillor - inventory entries total [140]; Stuttgart [133], Frankfurt [3], Mainz [4] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 83.

Massow, Valentin Albrecht Ludwig August Hubertus, von, * 03.11.1864 in Steinhöfel † 23.07.1899 in Kirikiri (today: Adjéidè Togo) - station chief in Togo, commander of the "police force" in Togo (1896-1899) - inventory entries total [1]; Leipzig [1] - Lit.: Sebald 2014, pp. 7-18

Max, Gabriel Cornelius, Ritter von, * 03.08.1840 in Prague † 24.11.1915 in Munich - painter, university teacher, 'Ethnographica'-trade - inventory entries total [31]; Mannheim [31] - Lit.: Ehling 2016, pp. 109-111

Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Adolf Friedrich Albrecht Heinrich, Duke zu, 10.10.1873 in Schwerin † 05.08.1969 in Eutin - Governor of Togo (1912-1914), explorer - inventory entries total [502]; Leipzig [1], Berlin [1], Dresden [1], Frankfurt [477], Hamburg [20], Hildesheim [2] - Lit.: Andratschke 2021, p. 199ff.; Schnee 1920, vol. 1, p. 16

Meerwarth, Hermann, * 09.10.1870 in Karlsruhe † 09.04.1943 in Braunschweig - museum director, zoologist, animal photographer - inventory entries total [1]; Braunschweig [1] - Lit.: Gebhardt 2006, p. 235

Menzel, Ernst Gustav, * 21.04.1872 in Wittgensdorf † 15.12.1931 in Hansfelde - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [55]; Berlin [54], Göttingen [1] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 37

Merensky, Alexander, * 08.06.1837 at Panten near Liegnitz † ? - Missionary (Berlin Missionary Society), colonial propagandist - inventory entries total [1]; Leipzig [1] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 84f.

Merzbacher, Gottfried, * 09.12.1843 in Baiersdorf † 14.04.1926 in Munich - explorer, geographer - inventory entries total [4]; Munich [4] - Lit.: Sauer 2007, p. 63ff.

Meyer, Hans, Dr., * 22.03.1858 in Hildburghausen, Duchy of Saxony-Meinigen † 05.07.1928 in Leipzig - colonial politician, explorer, geographer - inventory entries total [11]; Stuttgart [6], Leipzig [3], Bremen [2] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 267; Eisleb 2001, pp. 122-124; Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 554; Weidmann 1894, p. 85

Möllendorf, Paul Georg, von, * 17.02.1847 in Zehdenick, province Brandenburg † 20.04.1901 in Ningbo, China - diplomat, linguist - inventory entries total [0]; Dresden [mention in provenance] - Lit.: Lee 2008

Mohn, Paul Felix, * 15.07.1879 in Oschatz † 17.10.1914 near Mahiwa, D.O.A. - Medical Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [201]; Leipzig [201] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 233

Morgen, Curt Ernst, von, * 01.11.1858 in Neisse, Silesia † 15.02.1928 in Lübeck - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [350]; Leipzig [38], Berlin [281], Dresden [23], Oldenburg [8] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 141; Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 590; Weidmann 1894, p. 128

Müller (-Lepenau), Franz Ludwig Wilhelm, * 07.09.1850 in Friedrichsthal † 12.02.1921 in Paderborn - commander of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (06.04.1903 - 02.1908) - inventory entries total [33]; Stuttgart [16], Leipzig [17] → [Bio p. 408](#)

Nachtigal, Gustav, * 23.02.1834 in Eichstedt, Altmark † 20.04.1885 in Las Palmas, Liberia - Imperial Commissioner for West Africa, explorer - inventory entries total [133]; Berlin [132], Hannover [1] - Lit.: Horstmann 2013, pp. 89-94; Schnee 1920, vol. 2, p. 612; Weidmann 1894, pp. 131f.

Nolte, Hermann August Heinrich Friedrich, * 25.06.1869 in Lüneburg † 01.02.1902 in Banyo, Cameroon - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [262]; Stuttgart [262] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 146

Oertzen, Jasper Martin Otto von, * 24.09.1880 in Windhausen near Kassel † 08.01.1948 in Passau - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries **[p.363]** total [367]; Stuttgart [261], Dresden [102], Mainz [4] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 147

Oldenburg, Helene Maria Anna, née Aichinger, * 25.05.1868 in Mank † 20.06.1922 in Vienna - photographer, wife of R.T.P. Oldenburg - inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] - Lit.: Wernhart 1978, p. 226

Oldenburg, Rudolf Theodor Paul, * 24.02.1879 in Vienna † 23.01.1932 in Vienna - Austrian merchant, explorer, photographer - inventory entries total [39]; Hannover [39] - Lit.: Wernhart 1978, p. 226

Oldman, William Ockelford, * 24.08.1879 in Grantham, Great Britain † 30.06.1949 in London, Great Britain - art dealer, 'ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [19]; Cologne [19] - see archive of the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum Cologne

Oppenheim, Max, Freiherr von, * 15.07.1860 in Cologne † 15.11.1946 in Landshut - Orientalist, archaeologist - inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 133f.

Othegraven, Hugo Eugen Friedrich Marie, von, * 1873 in ? † 1942 in ? - explorer, painter - inventory entries total [4]; Berlin [4] - Lit.: Hueck 1999, p. 90f.

Pahl, Gustav, * ? in Aalen † 1934 in Berlin - customs administrator in Cameroon, director of a sugar confectionery factory in Aalen, Imperial Financial Councillor - inventory entries total [156]; Stuttgart [156] - see archive of the Linden Museum Stuttgart

Pantänius, Karl Johann, * 1855 in Lübeck † 18.12.1884 in Fostown, Cameroon - merchant - inventory entries total [2]; Lübeck [2] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 135

Paschen, Hans, ? - Jäger, representative of a Hamburg department stores' in Yaunde - inventory entries total [824]; Leipzig [551], Dresden [262], Frankfurt [9], Rostock [2] - Lit.: Lange 2005, pp. 183-210

Passarge, Otto Karl Siegfried, Prof. Dr., * 28.11.1866 in Königsberg, Prussia † 26.07.1958 in Bremen - geographer, geologist, palaeontologist - inventory entries total [7]; Berlin [3], Hamburg [3], Göttingen [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 2, 25

Passavant, Carl, * 14.05.1854 in Basel † 22.September 1887 in Honolulu, Hawaii - Swiss physician - inventory entries total [10]; Berlin [10] - Lit.: Schneider 2005; Weidmann 1894, p. 135

Pavel, Hans Karl Georg Kurt von, * 19.05.1851 in Tscheschen, Wohlau District † 17.01.1933 in Berlin - Commander of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (18.05.1901 - 31.01.1903) - inventory entries total [11]; Berlin [11] → [Bio p. 420](#)

Pechuel-Loesche, Eduard, pseudonym: M. E. Plankenau, * 26.07.1840 in Zöschen near Merseburg † 29.05.1913 in Munich - explorer, geographer - inventory entries total [22]; Leipzig [2], Munich [20] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 29; Weidmann 1894, p. 136

Pelizaeus, Gustav Caspar Clarus, * 1859 in ? † 1944 in ? - Merchant, brother of Wilhelm Pelizaeus - inventory entries total [96]; Bremen [7], Hildesheim [89] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 281ff.

Pelzer, Adam, * ? in ? † 04.02.1918 in ? - Merchant, office furnishings - inventory entries total [1]; Bremen [1] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 283

Pfaff-Giesberg, Robert, Dr., * 25.11.1899 in Offenburg † 11.05.1984 in Bad Bellingen - museum director, ethnologist - inventory entries total [2]; Stuttgart [1], Freiburg [1] - Lit.: Schultz 2015, p. 135-155

Planitz, Hans Wilhelm Gustav Adolf Edler von der, * 15.01.1883 in Koblenz † 03.09.1917 in Hamburg - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [14]; Leipzig [7], Berlin [7] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 151

Plehn, Albert, Dr., * 14.04.1861 in Lubochin, Kreis Schwetz, West Prussia † 17.05.1935 in Berlin - tropical physician - inventory entries total [2]; Lübeck [2] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 67

Plehn, Friedrich, * 15.04.1862 in Lubochin, Kreis Schwetz, West Prussia † 29.04.1904 in Schotteck near Bremen - tropical physician, government physician - inventory entries total [16]; 3, [16] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 67f.

Plehn, Rudolf, * 23.02.1868 in Lubochin, Kreis Schwetz, West Prussia † 24.11.1899 in Dumebezi, Cameroon - station manager, forest scientist - inventory entries total [16]; Berlin, [16] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 68

Poppe, Albrecht, * ? † ? - Private scholar, 'Ethnographica'-trade - inventory entries total [1]; Bremen [1] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 284

Poppen, Johann Janssen, * 26.08.1856 † 07.07.1908 - factor manager for Jantzen and Thormählen in Klein Batanga, Eloby and Campo - inventory entries total [11]; Rhaderfehn [11] - see archive of the Fehn-und Schifffahrtsmuseum Westrhaderfehn

Preil, Wilhelm, * 22.03.1872 in Chemnitz † 07.07.1906 in Duala, Cameroon - station chief in Togo, explorer - inventory entries total [2]; Stuttgart [1], Berlin [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 95.

Preuss, Martin, Dr., * ? † ? - Station manager, botanist - inventory entries total [830]; Stuttgart [811], Mainz [19] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 142

Preuss, Paul Rudolph, * 12.11.1861 in Thorn, West Prussia † 19.12.1926 in ? - Head of the botanical garden in Victoria, Director of the New Guinea Company - inventory entries total [3]; Leipzig [1], Berlin [2] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 101

Prussia, Friedrich Carl Alexander, Prince of, * 29.06.1801 in Charlottenburg Palace near Berlin † 21.01.1883 in Berlin - General, third son of King Frederick William III and Queen Luise - inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1]

Prittwitz and Gaffron, Georg von, * 17.06.1861 in Breslau † ? - Officer, explorer - inventory entries total [1]; Göttingen [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 102

Prosper Müllendorff, Jean-Pierre, * 26.06.1854 in Luxembourg, Luxembourg † 28.06.1922 in Cologne - journalist, historian, translator - inventory entries total [37]; Cologne [37] - Lit.: Mannes, Gast: Prosper Müllendorff. At: www.autorenlexikon.lu, [14.02.2023].

Pückler-Limpurg, Kurt, Count von (Baron von Groditz), * ? in Munich † 22.01.1904 in Basha, Cameroon - station manager, employee of the "Northwest Cameroon Society". - Inventory entries total [116]; Stuttgart [115], Berlin [1] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 1, pp. 183-193

Puttkamer, Jesco Eugen Bernhard Wilhelm von, * 26.08.1876 in Berlin † 25.03.1959 in Wiesbaden - officer of the **[p.364]** "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [87]; Stuttgart [87] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 154

Puttkamer, Jesko von, * 02.07.1855 in Berlin † 24.01.1917 in Berlin - Governor (13.08.1895-09.05.1907) - inventory entries total [23]; Berlin [19], Frankfurt [1], Mainz [3] → [Bio S. 422](#)

Raben, Ernst Klaus Iwan Christian Friedrich Alfred von, * 22.09.1877 in Gmünd † 07.06.1924 in Gütersloh - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [255]; Stuttgart [255] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, Vol. 2, p. 156

Raben, Mary, * ?, -, relative of E. v. Raben (heirs) - inventory entries total [97]; Stuttgart [97] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 156

Ramsay, Hans Gustav Ferdinand, von, * 18.05.1862 in Tinwalde, West Prussia † 14.01.1938 in Tanga, East Africa - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun", merchant of the "Gesellschaft Nordwest-Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [106]; Stuttgart [21], Leipzig [46], Berlin [39] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 159; Eisleb 2001, p. 127f.; Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 125.; Weidmann 1894, p. 143f.

Range, Max, Dr., * 05.09.1880 in Lübeck † ? - Medical Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [28]; Lübeck [28] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 237

Rausch, Emil, * 08.10.1877 in Giessen † 06.09.1914 in Nssanakang, Cameroon - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun"- inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] → [Bio p. 424](#)

Rautenstrauch, Julius, * † ? - merchant, vice-consul of the North German Confederation in Antwerp, 'Ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [106]; Cologne [106] - see archive of the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum Cologne

Reck, Hans (Erben von); Prof. Dr. Dr., * 04.02.1886 in Würzburg † 04.08.1937 in Lourenco Marques (today: Maputo, Mozambique) - geologist - inventory entries total [1]; Bremen [1] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 286

Reichenow, Anton T., Dr., * 1.08.1847 in Charlottenburg † 6.07.1941 in Hamburg - ornithologist - inventory entries total [7]; Berlin [7] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 146; Weidmann 1894: 146f.

Rigler, Friedrich Johann Alexander, Dr., * 14.07.1864 in Dunajiwzi † 13.03.1930 in Altona-Hochkamp - station manager, merchant, Germanist - inventory entries total [114]; Stuttgart [106], Berlin [2], Mainz [6] - see archive of the Linden-Museum Stuttgart

Ritter, Karl, Dr., * 05.06.1883 in Dörflas † 31.07.1968 in Murnau am Staffelsee - diplomat, government official, National Socialist - inventory entries total [4]; Bremen [4] - Lit.: Keipert 2008, p. 684f.

Rolle, Franz Hermann, * 17.09.1864 in Freiburg im Breisgau † 12.05.1929 in Berlin-Schöneberg - museum director, director of the Naturhistorisches Institut Hamburg, 'Ethnographica'-trade - inventory

entries total [57]; Stuttgart [1], Leipzig [2], Berlin [13], Cologne [1], Munich [12], Dresden [10], Bremen [18] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 290

Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, Alfred Alexander William Ernest Albert, Duke of, * 15.10.1874 in London, Great Britain † 06.02.1899 in Merano - hereditary prince, heir to the throne, patron of the arts, 'ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [2]; Leipzig [2] - Lit.: Sandner 2001, pp. 153-158

Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, Carl Alexander August Johann, Grand Duke of, * 24.06.1818 in Weimar † 05.01.1901 in Weimar - patron - inventory entries total [0]; Leipzig [mention in provenance] - Lit.: Facius 1977, p. 264f.

Samuelson, Hermann, * ? † ? - Corvette Captain, Economy - total inventory entries [4]; Bremen [4] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 291

Sapper, Karl Theodor, Prof. Dr., * 06.02.1866 in Wittislingen † 29.03.1945 in Garmisch-Partenkirchen - geographer, geologist, linguist - inventory entries total [20]; Tübingen [20] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 254

Scheunemann, Peter Paul Friedrich, * 07.01.1870 in Hamburg † 27.05.1937 in Bad Nauheim - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [77]; Berlin [1], Cologne [76] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 168

Schimmelpfennig, gen. V. der Oye, Hans Adolf Rudolf Carl, * 13.08.1863 in Hirschberg, Silesia † 14.07.1901 in Douala, Cameroon - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [5]; Hamburg [5] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, Vol. 2, p. 168

Schipper, Adolf Wilhelm, * 12.11.1873 in Bremerhaven † 04.11.1915 in Banyo, Cameroon - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [1610]; Stuttgart [1022], Berlin [33], Bremen [555] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 169; Briskorn 2000, p. 297ff.

Schmidt, Joseph Adolf Oskar, * 06.01.1872 in Bruchsal † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [13]; Stuttgart [9], Freiburg [4] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 172

Schömig, Gustav, * 05.03.1883 in Rimpf † 02.09.1979 in ? - Medical Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [9]; Berlin [9] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, Vol. 2, p. 240

Schran, F. A. (Lusy), * ? † ? - Imperial building inspector - inventory entries total [219]; Leipzig [69], Munich [146], Dresden [3], Oldenburg [1] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 160f.

Schrenck-Notzing, Albert, Freiherr von, * 18.05.1862 in Osternburg, Grand Duchy of Oldenburg † 12.02.1929 in Munich - doctor, psychotherapist - inventory entries total [11]; Leipzig [11] - Lit.: Bauer 2007, p. 544f.

Schultze, Arnold Wilhelm Louis Ferdinand, Dr., * 24.03.1875 in Cologne † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [404]; Stuttgart [7], Leipzig [38], Frankfurt [359] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 176; Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 310

Schwarz, Berhard, Dr., * 12.08.1944 in Reinsdorf near Greiz † 08.01.1901 in Wiesbaden - explorer, theologian - inventory entries total [20]; Berlin [20] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 163

Schwartz, Wolfgang, * ? in Russia † 14.10.1914 in Königsberg - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [18]; Berlin [18] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 177

Seitz, Theodor, * 12.09.1863 in ? † 28.03.1949 in ? - Governor (09.05.1907 - 27.08.1910) - inventory entries total [7]; Berlin [p.365] [7] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 338

Seligmann, Siegfried, Dr., * 12.06.1870 in Wandsbek † 10.11.1926 in Hamburg - physician - inventory entries total [2]; Hamburg [2] - Lit.: Hauschild 1978, p. 151-159

Seyfried, Egon, * ? † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Deutsch-Ostafrika" - inventory entries total [6]; Stuttgart [1], Bremen [5] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 306

Soden, Baroness von, * ? Wife of Julius v. Soden (* 05.02.1846 in Ludwigsburg † 03.02.1921 in Tübingen) - Governor's wife (26.05.1885-14.02.1891) wife (26.05.1885-14.02.1891) - inventory entries total [9]; Tübingen [9] - lit.: on the husband: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 369; Ernst/Volk 2022, pp. 40-42

Solf, Wilhelm, * 05.10.1862 in Berlin † 06.02.1936 in Berlin - State Secretary in the Reichskolonialamt - inventory entries total [2]; Berlin [2] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 370

Sommerfeld, Bernhard Max Viktor Wilhelm von, * 15.01.1879 in Göhren, Lausitz † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 179

Soyaux, Herman, * 04.01.1852 in Breslau † 1928 in Brazil - explorer, botanist - inventory entries total [39]; Leipzig [39] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 169

Speyer, Arthur Johannes Otto Jansen, (Speyer III), * 23.07.1922 in ? † 2007 in ? - Merchant, 'Ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [40]; Leipzig [19], Cologne [5], Bremen [12], Hanover [1], Hamburg [2], Lübeck [1] - Lit.: Schultz 2016, p. 5-8

Speyer, Arthur Max Heinrich, (Speyer II), * 16.07.1894 in ? † 11.02.1958 in ? - Merchant, 'Ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [22]; Berlin [6], Dresden [7], Frankfurt [2], Göttingen [1], Freiburg [6] - Lit.: Schultz 2016, pp. 5-8

Speyer, Arthur Karl Hans Friedrich August, (Speyer I), * 03.01.1858 in Kassel † 23.11.1923 in ? - Merchant, zoologist, 'ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [1]; Freiburg [1] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 306; Schultz 2016, pp. 5-8

Spieß, Carl, * 1867 in Bremen † 1936 in Bremen - missionary (North German Missionary Society), missionary inspector - inventory entries total [3]; Berlin [1], Bremen [2] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 308

Spring, Albert, * ? † ? - Captain, explorer - inventory entries total [9]; Stuttgart [6], Mainz [3] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 170

Staudinger, Paul, * 19.05.1859 in Dresden † 26.08.1933 in ? - Research traveller - inventory entries total [0]; Berlin [mention in provenance] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 402; Weidmann 1894, p. 170f.

Stefenelli, Max von, * ? † ? - Factorist (German Westafrican Trading Co.) - inventory entries total [14]; Berlin [7], Munich [7] - see archive of the Ethnological Museum Berlin

Steinäcker, Franz, Freiherr von, * ? † ? - explorer - inventory entries total [74]; Berlin [65], Hannover [9] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 171

Steiner, Paul, * 1849 in Silesia † ? - missionary (Basel Mission) - inventory entries total [7]; Leipzig [7] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 171

Stein zu Lausnitz, Ludwig, Baron von, * 03.03.1868 in Darmstadt † 07.10.1934 in Hamburg - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [1466]; Stuttgart [995], Leipzig [135], Berlin [323], Mainz [13] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 180ff.

Stephani, Franz von, * 12.06.1876 in Bielefeld † 24.04.1939 in Berlin - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [10]; Leipzig [1], Hamburg [9] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, pp. 182-183

Stetten, Maximilian (Max) von, * 26.05. 1860 in Nuremberg † 24.02.1925 in Munich - Commander of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (8.07.1894-6.08.1896) - inventory entries total [204]; Munich [204] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 183; Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 408; Weidmann 1894, p. 171f.

Stollé, Arthur (Heirs of), * 19.11.1872 in Mühlheim a.d. Ruhr † 1934 in Koblenz - mining assessor, geologist - inventory entries total [7]; Cologne [7] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 411

Struck, Bernhard, * 28.08.1888 in Heidelberg † 08.10.1971 in Jena - anthropologist, ethnologist - inventory entries total [8]; Leipzig [mention in provenance], Dresden [8] - Lit.: Pittelkow/Hoßfeld 2016, pp. 65-82.

Strümpell, Kurt, * 16.07.1872 in Schöningen † 28.10.1948 in ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [857]; Stuttgart [23], Leipzig [1], Berlin [134], Cologne [1], Dresden [1], Brunswick [695], Göttingen [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 186; Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 430

Sydow, Eckhard Chlodwig Heinrich Albrecht, von, * 05.09.1885 in Dobberphul, Kreis Königsberg † 01.07.1942 in Berlin - art historian, ethnologist - inventory entries total [6]; Berlin [1], Cologne [5] - Lit.: Sydow, Eckart von, Index entry in: German Biography, www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd117387010.html [13.02.2023]

Tappenbeck, Hans, * 14.01.1861 in Wolsier, Westhavelland † 26.07.1889 in Douala, Cameroon - officer, explorer- inventory entries total [13]; Leipzig [2], Berlin [9], Dresden [1], Oldenburg [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 459; Weidmann 1894, p. 173f.

Tessmann, Günther, Dr., * 02.04.1884 in Lübeck † 15.11.1969 in Curibita - explorer, botanist, ethnologist - inventory entries total [300]; Berlin [100], Munich [84], Frankfurt [6], Hamburg [5], Lübeck [17], Munich Deutsches Museum [87], Göttingen [1] - Lit.: Klockmann 1988

Thiel, Wilhelm Heinrich Bruno, * 01.01. 1881 in Schwartau † 03.04.1915 in Garwa - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Total inventory entries [6]; Lübeck [6] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 191

Thilenius, Georg Christian, Prof. Dr., * 04.10.1868 in Soden am Taunus † 28.12.1937 in Hamburg - museum director, physician, ethnologist - inventory entries total [1]; Hamburg [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 479

Thorbecke, Franz, Dr., * 08.11.1875 in Heidelberg † 12.08.1945 in Winterstein near Tabarz - explorer, geographer - inventory entries total [270]; Leipzig [152], Berlin [116], Frankfurt [2] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 479

Thorbecke, Franz and Marie-Pauline, [p.366] Marie P., (* 12.08.1882 in Aurich † 05.02.1971 in Freiburg an der Niederelbe) - explorer, painter - inventory entries total [754]; Mannheim [754] → [bio p. 429](#)

Uechtritz-Steinkirch, Edgar von, * 05.04.1866 auf Burg Tzschocha † 28.11.1938 in Gebhardsdorf - explorer, landowner - inventory entries total [3]; Berlin [3] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 564; Weidmann 1894, p. 175f.

Umber, Heinrich Max, * 11.07.1876 in Laubenheim, Hesse † ? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [84]; Göttingen [84] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, Vol. 2, p. 193

Umlauff, Heinrich Christian, * 17.11.1868 in Hamburg † 22.12.1925 in Hamburg - merchant, ethnographic dealer, 'ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [4]; Leipzig [3], Hamburg [1] - Lit.: Thode-Arora 1992, p. 143-158

Umlauff, J.F.G., * 1833 in ? † 1889 in ? - Merchant, taxidermist, 'Ethnographica' trade - total inventory entries [438]; Stuttgart [8], Leipzig [mention in provenance], Berlin [6], Cologne [10], Munich [7], Dresden [39], Bremen [234], Frankfurt [11], Mannheim [mention in provenance], Hamburg [100], Lübeck [7], Munich Deutsches Museum [1], Göttingen [3], Herrnhut [mention in provenance], Coburg [1], Marburg Religionskundliche Sammlung [2] → [Bio pp. 432](#)

Unruh, Walter Willy Eugen Hermann, * 03.05.1875 in Klein Münche near Birnberg, Posen Province (today: Mniszki/Międzychód, Poland) † 04.08.1945 Berlin - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [37]; Stuttgart [36], Leipzig [1] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 193

Velten, Carl, Prof. Dr., * 04.09.1862 in Fluterschen, county Altenkirchen † 01.04.1935 in Woking, county Surrey, Great Britain - linguist - inventory entries total [1]; Stuttgart [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 602

Vietor, Johann Karl, * ? † ? - Plantation owner, owner of the company J.K. Vietor with branches in Togo and Dahomey - inventory entries total [2]; Bremen [2] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 326

Virchow, Hans, * 10.09.1852 in Würzburg † 07.04.1940 in Berlin - physician, university teacher - inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] - Lit.: Muschong 2013

Virchow, Rudolf, * 13.10.1821 in Schivelbein, Pomerania † 05.09.1902 in Berlin - physician, anthropologist - inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 176

Voss, Johannes Friedrich Daniel, * 16.10.1832 in Lübeck † 20.09.1893 in Lübeck - captain - inventory entries total [1]; Lübeck [1] - Lit.: Weidmann 1894, p. 177.

Vosseler, Julius, Prof. Dr., * 16.12.1861 in Freudenthal, Württemberg † ? - Director of the Hamburg Zoological Garden - inventory entries total [1]; Stuttgart [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 638

Wätjen, Heinrich, * ? - Merchant - inventory entries total [1]; Bremen [1] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 328

Waldow, Hans Friedrich Karl Franz, * 30.10.1870 in Barth, Reg-Bez-Stralsund † ? in Berlin - Medical Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 245

Wegelin, Caesar, * 05.04.1875 in Augsburg † 27.08.1914 near Ménil - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [85]; Berlin [4], Munich [81] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 196

Wenckstern, Karl Waldemar August, von, * 31.08.1878 in Münster † 1968 - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun". - Inventory entries total [9]; Berlin [9] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 197

Westendarp, Max, * 11.09.1870 in ? † 16.02.1952 - owner of the large Hamburg ivory trading company "Heinrich Meyer" - inventory entries total [9]; Stuttgart [9] - see archive of the Linden Museum Stuttgart

Weule, Karl, * 29.02.1864 at Alt-Wallmoden, district of Goslar † 19.04.1926 in ? - Museum director, geographer, ethnologist - inventory entries total [3]; Berlin [3] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 706f.

Widenmann, August, * 04.02.1865 in Biberach † 08.05.1949 in Bornstedt - medical officer of the "Schutztruppe für Deutsch-Ostafrika", doctor - inventory entries total [6]; Berlin [6] - see archive of the Ethnological Museum Berlin

Widmaier, Rudolf, * 20.06.1880 in Höfingen near Leonberg † 22.04.1957 in Geisenheim - missionary (Basel Mission) - inventory entries total [113]; Stuttgart [110], Mainz [3] - see archive of the Linden-Museum Stuttgart

Wiese und Kaiserswaldau, Walter von, * 12.02.1879 in Habelschwerdt, Glatz † ? - explorer, officer - inventory entries total [25]; Frankfurt [10], Hamburg [15] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 709

Wilhelm II, * 27.01.1859 in ? † 04.06.1941 in ? - German Emperor - inventory entries total [3]; Berlin [3] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 710

Winkler, Erwin Gotthold, * ? † 22.05.1923 in Dresden - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [55]; Dresden [55] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 199

Wissmann, Hermann Wilhelm Leopold Ludwig, von, * 04.09.1853 in Frankfurt/Oder † 15.06.1905 in Weißenbach near Lenzen - Reichskommissar, Governor of German East Africa (1895/1896) - inventory entries total [4]; Berlin [3], Hannover [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3: 721; Weidmann 1894, pp. 180-188

Woermann, Adolf, * 10.12.1847 in Hamburg † 04.05.1911 in Tritttau - merchant, shipowner, colonial politician - inventory entries total [6]; Berlin [6]; Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p.724; Weidmann 1894, p.186

Woermann, Carl, * 11.03.1813 in Bielefeld † 25.06.1880 in Hamburg - merchant, shipowner - inventory entries total [42]; Hamburg [42] - see archive of MARKK Hamburg

Wolf, Heinrich Ludwig, Dr. * 29.01.1850 in Hagen am Teutoburger Wald † 26.06.1889 near Ndali, Dahomey - physician, anthropologist - inventory entries total [1]; Dresden [1] - Lit.: Hantzsch 1910, p.112-115

Württemberg (Carlsruhe), Hermine, Duchess of (née von Schaumburg-Lippe), * 05.10.1845 in Brückeberg † 23.12.1930 in Regensburg - patron, wife of Wilhelm Ferdinand Maximilian Karl Duke of Württemberg (* 3.09.1828 in Trugenhofen † 29.07.1888 in Regensburg), 'Ethnographica' trade - inventory entries total [2]; Stuttgart [2] - Lit.: [p.367] Esbach 1906, p. 180

Wulff, August Engelbert, * 03.11.1878 in Bremen † 25.11.1952 in Bremen - tropical farmer, merchant - inventory entries total [4]; Bremen [4] - Lit.: Briskorn 2000, p. 333

Wuthenow, Bernard Wilhelm Eduard, * 28.05.1863 in Krossen an der Oder † 07.05.1905 in Weißer Hirsch near Dresden - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [120]; Leipzig [112], Brunswick [8] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 171

Zech auf Neuhofen, Julius, Count von, * 23.04.1868 in Straubing † 29.10.1914 near Gheluvelt, Flanders - District Officer, Governor of Togo (1905-1910) - inventory entries total [1]; Berlin [1] - Lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 739

Zenker, Georg August, * 11.06.1855 in Leipzig † 06.02.1922 in Bipindi, Cameroon - plantation owner, botanist - inventory entries total [621]; Leipzig [174], Berlin [447] → [bio p. 437](#)

Zickwolff, Hermann Wilhelm Bartholomäus, * 20.04.1877 in Bayreuth †? - Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" - inventory entries total [3]; Stuttgart [3] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 200

Ziemann, Johannes (Hans), Dr., * 05.07.

1865 in Berlin † 03.12.1939 in Berlin - Medical Officer of the "Protection Force for Cameroon". - Inventory entries total [28]; Stuttgart [26], Frankfurt [1], Mainz [1] → [Bio p. 439](#)

Zimmerer, Eugen, * 24.11.1842 in Gernersheim †? - Governor (15.04.1891 - 13.08.1895) - inventory entries total [191]; Munich [179], Nuremberg [12] - lit.: Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 749

Zimmermann, Carl Heinrich, * 07.09.

1864 in Louisendorf, Hessen-Nassau, Kreis Frankenberg † 13.01.1949 in Hanau - Commander of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (13.04.1914- 02.1916) - inventory entries total [203]; Frankfurt [202], Göttingen [1] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 201; Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 750

Zintgraff, Eugen, Dr., * 16. 01.1858 in Düsseldorf † 04. 12.1897 on Tenerife Reichskommissar, jurist - inventory entries total [631]; Leipzig [70], Berlin [491], Dresden [7], Frankfurt [20], Brunswick [mention in provenance], Lübeck [2], Göttingen [3], Hildesheim [30], Oldenburg [8] - Lit.: Andratschke 2021, p. 174; Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 753f.; Weidmann 1894, p. 190

Zintgraff, Justin, * ? † ? - Judicial councillor, father of Eugen Zintgraff - inventory entries total [47]; Stuttgart [36], Leipzig [24], Berlin [mention in provenance], Brunswick [11], Lübeck [1], Hildesheim [mention in provenance] - Lit.: Andratschke 2021, p. 174; Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 753f.; Weidmann 1894, p. 190

Zipse, Hugo Paul, * 20.04.1878 in Huchenfeld, Bavaria † 08.10.1914 in field hospital Nesle near St. Quentin - officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [17]; Berlin [17] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 203

Zupitza, Maximilian, Dr., * 13.03.1868 in Bauerwitz, Leobschütz District, Upper Silesia † 1938 in ? - Medical Officer of the "Schutztruppe für Kamerun" (Protection Force for Cameroon) - Inventory entries total [124]; Stuttgart [122], Mainz [2] - Lit.: Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, p. 253, Schnee 1920, vol. 3, p. 771f.

[p.370] ANKERMANN, Bernhard

*14 February 1859, Tapiau, East Prussia

†26 October 1943, Berlin

Profession: Ethnologist

Other activities: Museum curator

Places of work: Germany, Cameroon

1896: Employee of the Royal Museum of Ethnology in Berlin
1901: Doctorate on African musical instruments in Leipzig.

1902: Appointed assistant director at the African-Oceanic department of the Berlin Museum of Ethnology and joined the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory (BGAEU)

1907-1909: Research trips in the colony of Cameroon (grassland area)

1909: Appointed curator at the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin

1911: Head of the African Department

1921-1924: Head of the African-Oceanic Department

1923-1928: Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the BGAEU

1925: Retired

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

The ethnologist Bernhard Ankermann undertook a so-called research and collecting trip to the grassland region of the colony of Cameroon between 1907 and 1909 on behalf of Felix von Luschan. He returned with about 1500 ethnographica (Krieger 1973, 117), of which only about 1050 can be found in the inventory of the Berlin Ethnological Museum today (cf. DB extract EM Berlin 27.5.2021). Ankermann's example illustrates both the competition between German stakeholders for cultural objects of the colonised populations and the intertwining of science and the military. Adolf Diehl → [Bio, 378](#) (1870-1943), a dealer who worked for the Grassi Museum in Leipzig, among others, openly questioned Ankermann's competence in a letter to its director Karl Weule (1864-1926): he collected in a hurry, paid colossal prices and had no sense of quality. In Bamenda, he had acquired "almost only things delivered to order (chairs, masks)" (Leipzig MVL Archive, Diehl 1910/3). In an effort to put himself in a good light, Diehl omitted that Ankermann had travelled to different grassland kingdoms, giving the impression that all the objects he executed came from a single place. Their high number, on the other hand, suggests that Ankermann was certainly driven by the idea of maximum accumulation, which was widespread at the time. His approach also raises questions of provenance. For although Diehl seems to reduce Ankermann's collecting practice to "order[s]", the scholar's dealings with members of the German military should by no means be lost sight of. Thus Ankermann acknowledged the "willing and energetic support" (Ankermann 1910, 292) of the Bamenda military station. Moreover, he thanked colonial officers such as Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#) (1868-1908), Hans Edler von der Planitz (1883-1917), Ernst Gustav Menzel (1872-1931), Emil Rausch → [Bio, 424](#) (1877-1914), Ernst von Raben (1877-1924), etc. 'for all conceivable help', which had contributed 'not a little to the success of the expedition' (Ankermann 1910, 292). Ankermann's journey, accompanied by his wife Luise (1878-1906), took place primarily during a period when the kingdoms of the Grasslands were forced into numerous wars of subjugation. These favoured looting of cultural goods, some of which came into Ankermann's possession through purchase or as gifts: "Captain Menzel also added to and completed my own collections in a very desirable way through a fine ethnographic collection he brought from Wum and Berabe" (Ankermann 1910, 292). Ernst Gustav Menzel (1872-1931) had been involved in so-called punitive expeditions in the Mbo Plain and later in Bafum since 1906/09 and sent 297 objects **[p.371]** "all from Wum, landscape Bafum" to the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde (Berlin Zentralarchiv, Ankermann 1909). Beyond ethnographica, Ankermann was interested in the intangible cultural

heritage in the highlands of Cameroon: he made sound recordings and is also known for his numerous photographs in the Bamum Kingdom, among other places (see Njapndunke → [Bio](#), 414). At least 100 of these are now in the collections of the Ethnological Museum in Berlin.

Following Luschán's instructions, Ankermann wrote a second version of the Instructions for Ethnological Observation and Collecting after his return in 1914. Ultimately, the work served to systematise looting.

- Image commentary: This portrait photograph of an elderly scholar with glasses, high forehead, white collar, tie, dark suit and facsimile signature, typical of the 1930s, appeared in 1938. At that time, Ankermann's stay in Cameroon had been over 30 years and the end of the German colonial period in Africa over 20 years in the past. Ankermann himself had already been retired for 13 years. The introduction to the Festschrift in which it appeared referred to him as the "old master of African ethnology". (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

1072 Total identified

1062 Berlin, Ethnological Museum7 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology

3 Göttingen, Ethnological Collection of the Georg-August University

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[P.372] ASUNGANYI (FONTEM ASUNGANYI)

*about 1865, Lebang/Fontem
†1951, Lebang/Fontem

Position: Fon (King) of the Bangwa

other activities: Resistance fighter

Place of activity: Lebang (Fontemdorf, Fontem)

1898: First encounter with a German in Fontem (Gustav Conrau), who recruits workers for plantations.

1899: Resistance to further labour recruitment by Conrau

1900: Resistance to the war campaign led by Captain Bernhard von Besser

1901: Establishment of a defence system against the German colonial troops

November 1901: Unsuccessful resistance against the German colonial troops led by Kurt Pavel

21.11.1901-December 1901: Fight against the column of Lieutenant Ernst von Gellhorn

1903: Deposition, suspension of a bounty

May 1911: arrest and banishment

1915: Return to power

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

Fon (King) Asunganyi ruled over the Bangwa, a population group of nine chiefdoms in the hilly transition zone between the forest and grasslands of Cameroon (Atem 2000). He was the namesake of the then main town of Fontem, also known as Lebang. His first encounter with a German agent dates back to 1898, when Gustav Conrau (1865-1899), a trader, labour recruiter and contract collector, arrived in the area to recruit labourers for the colonial plantations on the coast, and in the process to take cultural goods (Lintig 2017, 101). This supposedly peaceful encounter soon turned into a conflict, at the end of which Conrau died during an escape attempt in 1899.

The colonial government in Cameroon used Conrau's death as a pretext to take action against Fon Asunganyi as an allegedly 'insubordinate' ruler (Puttkamer 1912, 241). Jesko von Puttkamer → [Bio, 422](#) (1855-1917) recorded that Conrau was probably 'shot by the savages' (ibid., 207). After initial sanctions against the Bangwa, a so-called punitive expedition was launched at the end of 1901 with the largest military force ever sent into the interior (ibid., 240f.). The king, on the other hand, deployed more than 300 fighters and erected an elaborate defence system of rocks and tree trunks, complete with pitfalls, in the hilly landscape, which impressed the commander of the so-called Schutztruppe Kurt Pavel → [Bio, 420](#) (1851-1933) (Pavel 1902, 90f.). Nevertheless, 21 Bangwas lost their lives when Fontem was stormed, and Fon Asunganyi had to flee.

Since the Bangwa ruler seemed "useful" to the colonial government, they promised to spare him if he came to Tinto Station and asked for peace (ibid., 91). He did not comply with this demand. As can be read in an account of his later arrest in the *Deutsches Kolonialblatt*, he on the contrary "harassed" a column of Lieutenant Ernst von Gellhorn (1873-1946), "which was to collect the peace payments, so hard [...] that the column only managed to escape from Bangwa Land with the help of friendly auxiliary warriors" (Anonymous 1911, 582). In 1902, the Fon was declared deposed by Captain Wilhelm Langheld (1867-1917), replaced by his son Ajongake and a price put on his head (Langheld 1909, 327).

Fon Asunganyi, according to oral culture, hid in a place in his kingdom from where he continued to lead the resistance. It was not until 1911 that he was betrayed (Anonymous 1911, 582) and on 28 May 1911 arrested **[p.373]** by the station chief in Dschang, Lieutenant Emil Rausch → [Bio, 424](#) (1877-1914), and exiled to Garua (ibid., 583). He returned to Bangwaland in 1915 and also to power shortly afterwards (Michels 2017). He died in 1951.

During the colonial period, the Bangwa lost numerous royal and sacred cultural objects such as the world-famous "Bangwa Queen" to German colonial stakeholders like Conrau (Lintig 2017). Nearly 190

Bangwa sculptures can be traced in the inventories of various German museums, including those captured or extorted from officers. In three cases, research has established a direct link to Fon Asunganyi: The Stadtmuseum in Braunschweig owns two of his ceremonial staffs (Boszda 2021); the Ethnologisches Museum in Berlin probably his pipe (Lintig 2017, 108f.). In many other cases, the chain of provenance has remained fragmentary, as usual, and thus Fon Asunganyi's name cannot be recorded. Instead, the names of Kurt Pavel, Kurt Strümpell (1872-1947), Ernst von Gellhorn, Emil Rausch, Gustav Conrau or Hans Houben (1871-1942) appear in German museum inventories in connection with Bangwa cultural objects in Cologne, Braunschweig, Stuttgart or Berlin, which are now the subject of restitution claims. In addition, human remains were captured in his region, such as 13 skulls sent by the staff physician Theodor Berké (1870-1949) to the anatomical institute in the then German city of Strasbourg after the 1901 punitive expedition (Strasbourg, Inventare des Institut d'Anatomie Normale de la Faculté de Médecine, Ochs 1997).

- Image commentary: This detail of a photograph, which was probably originally taken for a different purpose, shows Asunganyi in the 1940s as an older man. His posture, the attributes of power, the splendid clothes and the young woman in the background indicate a ceremonial occasion. Since the 1970s, this accidental portrait has been one of the standard illustrations in every American or European publication on the "art of the Bangwa", especially on the so-called Bangwa Queen. It was first published by Robert Brain and Adam Pollock in *Bangwa Funerary Sculpture* (1971), at the time without any indication of photographer, context or location. These remained unmentioned in later publications as well. Only recently has a new sensitivity for the (image) rights of former colonised people led to more precise information. For example, the caption in an essay by Evelien Campfens published in 2019 in the *International Journal of Cultural Property* reads: "Fon Asunganyi, reigning Chief of Fontem in the 1890s (deceased 1951). Image taken in the 1940s, courtesy royal family through Chief C. Taku". (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects from the Bangwa

188 Total identified
 61 Brunswick, Municipal Museum
 48 Stuttgart, Linden-Museum: State Museum of Ethnology
 39 Berlin, Ethnological Museum
 14 Leipzig, Museums in the Grassi/Museum of Ethnology
 8 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums
 3 Hamburg, Museum am Rothenbaum - Cultures and Arts of the World
 3 Munich, Museum Five Continents
 2 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology
 2 Lübeck, Ethnological Collection
 2 Witzhausen, Ethnological Museum - Cultures of the World
 1 Bremen, Overseas Museum
 1 Göttingen, Ethnological Collection of the Georg-August University
 1 Hanover, Lower Saxony State Museum
 1 Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Cultures of the World
 1 Mainz, Ethnographic Study Collection of the Johannes Gutenberg University
 1 Wilnsdorf Museum

[p.375] BUCHNER, Max

***25 April 1846, Munich**

†7 May 1921, Munich

Occupation: Doctor

Other activities: Research traveller, ethnographer, colonial administrator, museum curator

Places of work: Germany, Cameroon (Douala)

1864: Abitur at the Wilhelmsgymnasium Munich

from 1865: Training as a doctor

until 1875: Ship's doctor in the service of the shipping company Norddeutsche Lloyd

from 1875: Journey to New Zealand and the South Seas

1878: Journey to equatorial West Africa and Congo

1881: Visit to the Congo

1884: "Journey" with Gustav Nachtigal to the west coast of Africa to establish colonies

1884/85: interim Reich Commissioner in "Cameroon

1887-1907: museum curator in Munich

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

Max Buchner, originally a ship's doctor in English service, was one of the first official representatives of German colonial policy. With the Imperial Consul General Gustav Nachtigal (1834-1885), appointed in April 1884, he went to West Africa to acquire so-called protectorates for German trade and the Reich, or, as Buchner put it himself, "to hoist the flag for the first time [!]" (Buchner 1914, III). Nachtigal appointed him as "interim representative of Sr. Maj. the Kaiser" in Douala between July 1884 and May 1885, before Governor Freiherr Julius von Soden (1846-1912) replaced him (Hausen 1970, 306). During his tenure, Buchner expanded the sphere of influence of the colonial empire through enforced or negotiated treaties with other neighbouring Duala and Bimbia communities.

Buchner's writings, which he published immediately after his return to Germany and in 1914, prove that he not only actively promoted the land grab as the government's envoy, but also carried out his duties with full conviction. His formulations point to the idea of a master race of Europeans or Germans that was common at the time. The Duala, whom he considered to be the "most lazy" people, should be "clamped down on" because they allegedly did not produce anything themselves but lived off the labour of others (Buchner 1887, 166). The intermediate trade, on which the Duala had a lucrative monopoly, should be broken by all means through a "trade block"; only then could these people be formed into "useful" people through "education for work" (ibid., 184). Buchner even wanted to transform slavery into compulsory labour, so that the paid work would be perceived as a "benefit" by the colonised (ibid., 182). To him, the equality of all people was "senseless folly"; thus he advocated the civilisation of blacks only to the extent that it benefited the colonial masters (ibid., 183). Even shortly before the end of Germany's formal colonial rule in Cameroon, he evoked in *Aurora colonialis* the rich heritage it would leave to future generations (Buchner 1914, III).

Buchner's ethnographic interest led him to take cultural goods from the local population, even by force. On 22 December 1884, on the occasion of a military action against the ruler of Bonabéri and resistance fighter against German colonialism, Kum'a Mbape alias Lock Priso → [Bio, 397](#) (c. 1846-1916), he stole his magnificent work, the Tangué - in Buchner's words "feudal barge ornament" and his "main prey" (Buchner 1914, 194). Buchner sent the captured carved ship's bill → [illustrated booklet LIV](#) to Munich, [\[p.376\]](#) where it is still part of the holdings of the Museum Fünf Kontinente. As the letter from Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III → [Chapter Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III, 341 ff.](#) makes clear, the ruler's mark has been reclaimed by the Bele Bele community of origin in Douala since the 1990s.

After forfeiting his position as representative of the German colonial government in the colony, Buchner switched to museum administration and headed the Museum of Ethnology in Munich (today

Museum Fünf Kontinente) for 20 years. From 1888 to 1890, Buchner, who received the Knight's Cross of the Order of Merit of St. Michael on 11 December 1885 for procuring Cameroonian cultural artefacts, carried out so-called collecting trips in East Asia, Australia, Southeast Asia and Oceania or Papua New Guinea (Dreesbach/Kamp 2007, 68-74).

- Image commentary: From its beginnings, photography with oval bust images was oriented towards a European portrait tradition. It goes back to the more or less oval cameos and cameos of Roman antiquity with their images of rulers and gods, which were widely disseminated from the Renaissance onwards in scholarly and increasingly popular illustrated books. In the collective European pictorial consciousness, this heroicising form of representation gradually established itself as a standard format: scholars, poets, musicians and natural scientists in ovals adorn countless publications from the 17th to the 19th century as frontispieces. The tradition continued in Europe until the middle of the 20th century. The specific occasion for the razor-sharp portrait of the elder Buchner depicted here is unknown. The photograph probably dates from his time as director of the Munich Ethnological Museum, now the Museum Fünf Kontinente. (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

21 Munich, Museum Five Continents

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.378] DIEHL, Adolf

*1870, Oppenheim
†1943, Darmstadt

Position: Representative of the colonial economy

Other activities: Plenipotentiary of the North West Cameroon Society.

Places of assignment: Togo, Cameroon

approx. 1896-1899: Togo

from approx. 1899/1900 to approx. 1913: Cameroon

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

Adolf Diehl was in the service of colonial trading and planting companies on the west coast of Africa for more than ten years, but at the same time did business with artefacts on his own. Already in Togo, where Diehl worked for the company Wölber und Zimmermann in the 1890s, he was active as a commissioned collector - according to Paul Matschie (1861-1926), the head of the mammal department at the Zoological Museum in Berlin, but rather "occasionally" and out of "hobby" (Berlin, SMB-ZA, Matschie 1900). During his employment at the Northwest Cameroon Society, Diehl's career as a dealer and agent visibly took off. Correspondence with the director of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Leipzig, Karl Weule (1864-1926), shows with what zeal he seized every opportunity "to collect" for the Leipzig house or acted in an advisory capacity (Leipzig, Archiv MVL, Diehl 1910/3). For example, Diehl declared himself willing to draw Weule's attention to important cultural objects and to supply him with them. For the removal of larger objects, he recommended sawing them up, a technique that the colonial officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#) (1868-1908) had also used. He is said to have commissioned a large part of his acquisitions from local artisans in order to resell them to German museums (Brandstetter 2021).

Diehl's statements, however, reveal that he by no means only had artefacts made, but also appropriated them on so-called punitive expeditions. In order to win the increasingly fierce race for cultural goods, he relied on trusted men who acted as intermediaries with non-commissioned officers: "[T]he majority of the officers collect privately. I bought my things from a Schutztruppe NCO through the mediation of one of our gentlemen in Bamum. It is very difficult to get anything from them, as expressly all the loot is designated as war booty and reserved for Berlin. Nevertheless, I will already see to it that you do not come up short." (Leipzig, Archive MVL, Diehl 1906/51).

As much as the German military incursions favoured Diehl's hunt for Cameroonian cultural heritage, they also contributed to its destruction, which did not escape Diehl's notice. Thus the landscape of Basho, Assam and Ebessi, where a punitive expedition under Major Harry Puder (1862-1933) had taken place, resembled "a great heap of rubble" from whose "ashes" a new primeval forest was to emerge, but "there is nothing left to be had there in the way of good, old pieces" (Leipzig, Archiv MVL, Diehl 1910/3).

[p.379] Diehl's example can be used to demonstrate the massive extraction of cultural assets by a single person: On 10 March 1906 alone, he sent 26 loads to Mamfe across the Cross River; he left 21 behind because almost all the carriers had been "requisitioned" because of the war (Leipzig, Archiv MVL, Diehl 1906/51). According to the inventories, his name is associated with 4046 numbers in six different museums in Germany, which puts him at the top of the list of German object donors. The medals that German museum people held out to him may have been a motivation for the dealer's, from today's perspective, unscrupulous activity. (Archive MVL, Diehl 1906/51).

- Image commentary: Portrait photographs of Adolf Diehl certainly exist. So far, however, none is known to researchers.

Museums supplied with objects

4046 Total identified

2344 Stuttgart, Linden-Museum: State Museum of Ethnology

1605 Leipzig, Grassi Museum of Ethnology

54 Mainz, Ethnological Collection of the Johannes Gutenberg University

31 Frankfurt a.M., World Cultures Museum

10 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology

2 Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Cultures of the World

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.380] DOMINIK, Friedrich Wilhelm Hans

*7 May 1870, Kulm

†16 December 1910, at sea

Position: Military

Other activities: Head of the military station in Yaoundé

Places of assignment: Cameroon

1889: Beginning of military career as a Fahnenjunker in Frankfurt an der Oder **1894:** Adjutant in the newly formed Cameroon "Schutztruppe" (protection force)

1894-1898: Head of the military station in Yaoundé

1897: Formal entry into the Schutztruppe as an officer

1894-1910: Head of several so-called punitive expeditions, including the Vute-Adamaua campaign in 1898/99

1901: Special representative of the governorate in Cameroon

1903-1910: again head of the station in Yaoundé

1910: Death at the age of 40 on a ship voyage to Europe

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

While the statue of Hans Dominik formerly erected in Kribi and the monument to the colonial officer planned for Yaoundé but never inaugurated there finally left the former German colony in 1930, the so-called Dominik Wall in Yaoundé, where he had torture and executions carried out, keeps the memory of his atrocities alive to this day (Ikelle-Matiba 1966; Philombe 1981).

Arriving in Cameroon in April 1894, Dominik remained there intermittently until his death in 1910. From 1894 he was in charge of the German station in Yaoundé, which he took over again in 1903. In order to secure the empire a place "in the tropics", he took land during his reign of terror, promoted colonial trade as well as colonial plantations and was responsible for so-called punitive expeditions. Dominik demanded "ruthless obedience" from the native soldiers. This had to be "instilled in the black soldier under all circumstances, instinctively he must follow his masters" (Dominik 1901, 117). Convinced of the racist ideology of white master humanity, he justified his cruel methods by an alleged anthropological difference between blacks and "us", (Dominik 1901, 9). The fact that he had about 50 children and old people plunged into the abyss in the Mvelle and Batschenga area in order to force the surrender of local opponents even caused a scandal in the Reichstag (Bommarius 2015, 43).

Dominik was one of the colonial officers who unabashedly reported on the captured cultural goods and documented them photographically (Dominik 1901, 277; Awono 2021). He offered his loot to museum people such as the Berlin curator Felix von Luschan (1854-1924), including the war shirt of the field marshal Gimene (d. 1898), who served under Vute ruler Neyon → [Bio, 439](#) (c. 1865-1899). 1898), which he said he had taken from the enemy he had shot (Berlin Zentralarchiv, Dominik 1898: 34v) → [Bildheft XXIII](#). However, human skulls were also captured; some he received from rulers who were forced to deal with him diplomatically. Thus, on 27 February 1902, he received the head and armoured shirt of Lamidos Rey (d. 1902), who had been slain by the German-appointed Lamido of Bubanjidda, Buba (Dominik 1908, 125f.). The Maka in the eastern part of the colony also fell victim to him when, in 1910, he had ten recalcitrant Maka and Omvang rulers → [Bio, 402](#) executed and tortured prisoners with the so-called slave fork, an instrument of torture that restricted mobility. To motivate the auxiliary warriors he recruited, he held out the prospect of raping Maka women (Dominik 1910, → [Chapter LeGall, 113 ff.](#)). Dominik sent numerous Maka skulls to the eugenicist Eugen Fischer (1874-1967), who had made a dubious name for himself through his racist research experiments on the so-called Rehobot bastards in the colony of German Southwest Africa (today Namibia). Under National Socialism, he contributed to the forced sterilisation of so-called Rhineland children from unions between Black soldiers and German women after the First World War (Wigger 2007). Fischer thanked the officer in his obituary: "Major Dominik made an extremely precious donation, he sent the skeletons

of two magnificent adult gorillas and a chimpanzee and a number of skulls and preparations of Maka-N* and many other objects - the beautiful gifts and the giver will not be forgotten." (Fischer 1911, 1). Dominik's name is associated with 1034 inventory entries relating to cultural objects from Cameroon. Some of these are now considered to have been destroyed. In addition, there are living animals such as dog monkeys, young lions and an elephant from Cameroon, which he had delivered to the Berlin Zoo in 1899 (Dominik 1901, 314; → [chapter Breuer, 185 ff.](#)).

- Image commentary: This life-size sculpture by Hans Dominik was captured in the Cameroonian coastal town of Kribi in 1917 by the French military photographer Frédéric Gadmer. The work by the Berlin sculptor Karl Möbius had been donated by the "planters and merchants of Hamburg" shortly after Dominik's death and erected in Kribi in September 1912. After the loss of its colonies, Germany tried to persuade the new colonial power, France, to hand over the monument. But it was not until 1930 that the sculpture was taken from Cameroon via Le Havre and Hamburg to Frankfurt an der Oder, Dominik's former garrison town. In the photo archive of the French army, the photo bears the original title: "Statue of Major Dominique [sic], the former terror of Cameroon". In the Federal Archives in Berlin, an entire file documents the painstaking Franco-German restitution process known as "repatriation" (BArch R 1001/6919). (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

1034 Total identified

802 Stuttgart, Linden-Museum: State Museum of Ethnology

112 Hamburg, Museum am Rothenbaum - Cultures and Arts of the World

110 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

4 Leipzig, Museums im Grassi/Museum für Völkerkunde

2 Mainz, Ethnographic Study Collection of the Johannes Gutenberg University

1 Munich, Museum Five Continents

1 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology

1 Frankfurt a.M., World Cultures Museum

1 Göttingen, Ethnological Collection of the Georg-August University

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.12-19>

[P.383] GALEGA I

*about 1840

†24 May 1901, Bali-Nyonga

Position: Fon (King) of Bali

Place of work: Bali, North-East region in the district of Mezam

Late 1850s: Beginning of his rule as Fon of Bali.

16.1.1899: First meeting of Galega with a German (Eugen Zintgraff)

26.8.1891: vassal of German colonial rule in the course of the so-called protection treaty with Zintgraff

Critical biographical note

(Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

When Galega, often misleadingly called Garega in German, received Eugen Zintgraff (1858-1897) on 16 January 1889 as the first German in the Bali dominion, he immediately recognised the possibilities of an alliance with the newcomers for his own political goals (O'Neil 1996, 82-85). According to Zintgraff, Galega wanted above all to benefit from "the intellectual superiority and insight of the European" (Zintgraff 1895, 341). The latter, in turn, was concerned with extending colonial rule to the so-called hinterland of the colony and building up a colonial infrastructure (Michels 2004, 118). The corresponding interests led to a pact between Galega and Zintgraff, supplemented in 1891 by a so-called protection treaty approved by the colonial government, in which Galega transferred to Zintgraff the "exercise of all power over the Bali lands [...], namely the right over life and limb of the Balis, as well as the exclusive decision on war and peace" (Berlin, BArch, Vertrag 1891, 1). In return, Galega was recognised as the "supreme chief" of the population in his domain (ibid., 2). Subsequently, Galega and Zintgraff took joint military action against neighbouring populations. The Baliburg station near the village of Bali was established as a base, and the officer Franz Hutter (1865-1924) formed the so-called Bali force of tactically trained native soldiers armed with modern rifles (O'Neil 1996; 88, Michels 2004: 126-129).

However, in addition to providing soldiers for military enterprises, Galega used the newly acquired military strength primarily to extract the contractually agreed tribute from the population under his command. This led to problems when Galega became more intensively involved in the colonial regime's labour procurement and in 1896 committed to transferring several hundred workers annually to the West African Victorian Plantation Company (O'Neil 1996, 89). German weapons and military tactics were now used by Galega to recruit labour for the colonial economy in veritable manhunts, among others among the Moghamo and Meta' (ibid., 89).

While the advantages of the military alliance outweighed the disadvantages for the German side at the beginning, it soon became obvious from a colonial perspective that Galega, who was regarded as cunning, was not a man who could be easily led by a European (Chilver 2010, 129). On the other hand, from a German perspective, he seemed to benefit far more from the agreement than colonial rule would have liked (Ramsay 1901, 237).

[p.384] German contacts in the region were virtually limited to him until Galega's death (O'Neil 1996, 90). Even the neighbouring great Bamum kingdom was not encountered by the Germans until 13 years after Zintgraff's arrival in Bali, mainly because of Galega's politics (Hutter 1907, 1f.).

The role of Galega as a vassal and Bali as one of the first colonised territories in the hinterland, corresponds to the comparatively high number of objects from Bali in German collections, among them, however, only one object that can undoubtedly be traced back to Galega I. The object is listed in the Bremen inventory under the name "Galega I". The "stool with beads (animal figure) (called Garega chair) Cameroon" (Briskorn 2000, 237) listed in the Bremen inventory under the number B 13806 originally entered the holdings of the Linden Museum via the officer Richard Hirtler (1872-1916) (DB extract of 17.3.2021, inv. no. 036747). He reports about the "object made by the old Garega". The chair undoubtedly comes from Bali, as I have seen it in use by the present chief, Fo-Njongge. [...] Fo-

Njong is very attached to the heirlooms handed down from Garega." (Hirtler 1904, 3f.) Hirtler does not mention how the seat cherished by Fon Nyonga II (alias Tita Gwengang) nevertheless came into his possession, although he himself must have attached great importance to it. This is indicated by the note "property rights reserved", which is peculiar in this context, in the entry list of the object (Linden 1904, 9). Hirtler's wife Dora reclaimed the piece after her husband's death in 1916 and gave it to the Übersee-Museum Bremen (Briskorn 2000: 237).

Image commentary: A handsome man in a wide robe with a simple headdress, breast emblem and necklace looks into the camera of an unknown photographer. The picture has unreal features. Is this due to the rough retouching on the right and left behind the sitter, the moderate quality of the print on yellowish paper, the lack of shadows or the all too smooth facial features of the sitter? The caption alone asserts the sitter's identity and rank, alongside references to the Berlin-based reproduction company. In a group picture with Eugen Zintgraff published by Victor Julius Ngoh in 2010, the Bali ruler looks different from here (Ngoh 2010). In any case, the publisher used the cropped face for the cover of Zintgraff's 1895 travelogue North Cameroon, a colonial-exoticising collage complete with weapons, palm trees and huts. The photograph also made a career for itself in Cameroon: it served as the model for a life-size statue of Galega in what is now the Royal Palace of Bali (Michels 2021, 137). (Bénédicte Savoy)

Bali-related objects in museums and collections

3122 Total identified
956 Stuttgart, Linden Museum
725 Berlin, Ethnological Museum
487 Leipzig, Grassi Museum
159 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology
149 Hamburg, Museum am Rothenbaum - Cultures and Arts of the World
146 Hanover, Lower Saxony State Museum
132 Frankfurt a.M., World Cultures Museum
122 Bremen, Overseas Museum
55 Munich, Museum Five Continents
53 Lübeck, Ethnological Collection
43 Braunschweig, Municipal Museum
36 Hildesheim, Roemer-und Pelizaeus Museum
15 Tübingen, Eberhard Karls University - Ethnological Collection
11 Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Cultures of the World
10 Mainz, Johannes Gutenberg University - Ethnographic Studies Collection
7 Freiburg i.Br., Museum Nature and Man
6 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums
5 Göttingen, Georg-August University, Ethnological Collection
3 Coburg, Natural History Museum
2 Detmold, Lippe State Museum

[p.386] GLAUNING, Hans

***29 January 1868, Berlin**

†5 March 1908, Atscho

Position: Officer of the so-called Schutztruppe

Other activities: Cartographer

Places of deployment: German East Africa Colony (Tanzania, Burundi, Rwanda), Cameroon

1887-1894: Training as first lieutenant in Dresden.

1893: Attends the Seminar for Oriental Languages at the Friedrich Wilhelm University in Berlin. Hausa class

1894 -1899: Service in the Schutztruppe for German East Africa

1900-1908: Service in the Schutztruppe for Cameroon

1901: Company commander of the Groß-Schnellen expeditions (12.1.1901-26.2.1902) Command of the military stations Nssakpe and Abokum

1901/02: Company commander of the Bangwa expedition (20.10.1901-01. 1902) and the expedition to Lake Chad (8.1.1902-14.8.1902)

1902: Head of the Bamenda military station

1903/04: Head of the German-English border survey Yola-Lake Chad (January 1903-June 1904)

1905: Head of the military station Bamenda

1905: Head of the expedition against Bameta and in the Bamenda district (14.6.1905-27.7.1905) as well as in the northern district Bamendas (25.8.1905-30.10.1905)

1906: Leader of the expedition against the Nso (15.04.1906-20.6.1906)

1907/08: Company commander of the Alkasom and Djumpe expeditions, death as company commander of the Munchi expedition (28.10.1907-6.6.1908, led by Major Puder)

Critical biographical note

(Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

There are not many representatives of the German colonial state in Cameroon who shaped the military occupation and administration of the colony to the extent that Hans Glauning did.

When Glauning, who spent a total of 13 years in colonial service, was transferred from Deutsch Ost Afrika (D.O.A.) to Cameroon in 1900, he had already earned the reputation of an "outstanding leader[s]" of the so-called Schutztruppe. As in D.O.A., he subsequently participated intensively in the mapping of the local colonial territories during his almost eight years of service in Cameroon and was also soon perceived as an "important expert on ethnography and regional studies" (Hoffmann 2007, 100). In this respect, he was not only considered one of the "most capable and proven officers", but also one of the "most striving [and] zealous promoters" of the "colonial sciences", to which, according to his superior Harry Puder (1862-1933), his "careful many [cartographic] route surveys" and, last but not least, "his diligent collections" bore particular witness. His importance among his soldierly comrades was so great that his death was described in an obituary as the "heroic death" of a "knight[s] of many orders of the sword" (Puder 1908, 463).

Glauning's central importance for the representatives of the colonial state in Cameroon is reflected not least in the enormous amount of so-called ethnographica, but also of natural history artefacts, which he supplied to German collections. At the same time, Glauning is a prime example of the violent and colonial state-sponsored expropriation of Cameroonian cultural heritage. For him, acts of war, in contrast to the options available to him in peacetime, represented the far better opportunity to appropriate the property of the indigenous population. As he once expressed himself to the Stuttgart museum director, Karl Graf von Linden (1838-1910): "As far as obtaining a large drum is concerned, it will be difficult to procure one now, since the areas in question are pacificirt [sic!], but the natives do not like to give up their drums voluntarily." (Archive Linden-Museum, letter Glauning 1908)

The officer, who was extremely active in military matters, had plenty of opportunities to do so, as he was involved in numerous military operations against the local population, which in retrospect

resembled wars of extermination, but which, in his view, led to the "complete subjugation" of the native "human material". (Berlin, BArch, Bericht 1907, Bl. 135136). Glauning's work was marked by the most serious war crimes throughout his entire period of service, including numerous murders, abuses, hostage-taking, forced recruitments and expropriations committed under his responsibility, entire villages set on fire or arbitrary punitive measures, including death sentences (cf. Stelzig 2006, 165f.). The fact that a large part of the objects he procured were war booty is also documented in his correspondence with representatives of the German museum scene of the time, such as Felix von Luschan (1854-1924) in Berlin and Karl von Linden in Stuttgart (see archival records below). Almost 1100 Cameroonian cultural objects in German museums can be traced back to Glauning, including outstanding regnal regalia such as King Njoya's throne → [Pictorial Booklet XLVIII](#) (c. 1876-1933) by Bamum.

- Image commentary: Portrait of Captain Hans Glauning, posing with hat, uniform and medals. His gaze directed visionarily into the distance, his hands folded solemnly over his sword, Glauning embodies in this production an image of man, rank and institution typical of the time. Visible insignia of this (colonial) claim to power: the weapon in his hand and a row of medals on his lapel. Glauning received one of his awards in 1902 for his participation in campaigns of conquest in Cameroon, and another was awarded to him in 1903 on the initiative of the director of the Stuttgart Museum, Karl von Linden. This painting from the collection of the descendant of Glauning's siblings not only stages a (toxic) military masculinity, it also exemplifies how colonial officers were decorated both for the violent subjugation of African societies and for the plundering of their cultural heritage. (Yann LeGall/Mareike Vennen)

Museums supplied with objects

1092 Total identified
738 Stuttgart, Linden Museum
337 Berlin, Ethnological Museum
5 Hildesheim, Roemer-und Pelizaeus Museum
4 Mainz, Ethnographic Study Collection of the JG-University
3 Göttingen, Ethnographic Collection of the GA-University
2 Wilhelmshaven, Coastal Museum
1 Leipzig, Grassi Museum
1 Munich, Museum Five Continents
1 Frankfurt a.M., Weltkulturen Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German Colonial
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.11119>

[p.387] GONG NAR (Ngrté III) aka Ngute/Ngutte

Life data unknown

Position: Ngrté (King) of the Vute ruling centre of Linte.

Location: Cameroon, Région Centre, Département Mbam-et-Kim

ca. 1880-1899: Ngrté over the Vute centre of rule Linte.

1898: Defeat in the fight against German colonial rule in the course of the so-called Wute-Adamaua expedition

1899-1906: Retreat to isolated mountain ranges on the left bank of the Mbam in the guerrilla struggle against German colonial rule

6.4.1906: capture and subsequent internment

Critical biographical note

(Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

Gong Nar (Mvoutsî Karang 1991, 112) is considered a heroic resistance fighter in Cameroon, a "célèbre résistant vouté" (Ndongo/Nnomo/Omgba 2002, 156; Seige 2003, 149). The alternative German designation "Ngute/Ngutte" results from the colonial protagonists' lack of knowledge of the language. It is a linguistically deformed version of the title for the regent of Linte's centre of rule, i.e. Ngrté. The latter was confused with the ruler's personal name, analogous to the title for the regent of the better-known Vute ruling centre Ndumba: "As is often known from the sources, the chiefs of Ndumba called themselves Ngila (Ngilla, Ngran, Ngirang) and those of Linte Ngutte (Ngute, Ngrte, Ngourtei). [...] This explains when designations such as Ngirammetumbe, Ngilla men Dumbe or Ngutte men Linte appear in colonial-era travel accounts. This is to be understood as Ngila (Ngran), ruler (mvên) of Ndumba and Ngutte (Ngrté), ruler of Linte, respectively. The respective chiefs had their personal names next to them". (Seige 1991, 166)

Furthermore, the linguistic deformation Ngute/Ngutte, again corresponding to the treatment of Ngila/Ngilla, served at the same time as a designation for the capital Linte as well as for the ruling domain itself (Seige 1991, 165, fn. 17). "Ngourtei" in this context can be translated *mutatis mutandis*: "He finds the enemy in any hole or cave, wherever he may hide (ngour - hole, cave, tui - finds)." (ibid., 166). Gong Nar was already the third ruler of Linte to use the title Ngrté (ibid.).

The ruling centres of the Vute were political entities which, on the one hand, were in "tributary dependency" of the Fulbe emirate of Tibati, but on the other hand also had numerous other "subaltern ruling centres" themselves (Hoffmann 2007, vol. 1, 242f.). Under the influence of the "powerful Islamic neighbour", the Vute had also modelled themselves on the political and social organisation of the Fulbe (ibid., 242) and initiated a "state-building process" that was already on the threshold of an "early state" at the beginning of the German colonial era (Seige 1991, 163). Warfare played an "extraordinary role in the individual and social life of the Vute in the centres of power" in this phase marked by territorial expansion (Seige 2003, 131). The main objective of warfare was to "carry out raids to obtain slaves" (Seige 1991, 92), which were the most important "article of trade" [p.390] in the local economy of the time. The Vute, as vassals of the Fulbe and because of the "continuous demands of the Lamido for slaves [...] felt compelled to carry out regular raids against other ethnic groups" (Seige 2003, 129).

In the course of German efforts to occupy the Cameroonian colonial territory entirely and to curb the influence of the Fulbe rulers, the Vute were warred against during the so-called Wute-Adamaua expedition from December 1898 to May 1899 and were crushingly defeated in a decisive battle for the capital Ndumba (Herterich 2001, 10). Gong Nar was able to evade the German grip during the battle and the subsequent occupation of the Vute settlement territory for the time being by retreating into the "impregnable rocky regions of the Yassem Mountains" (Seige 2003, 142). For a few years, his bastion developed into a refuge and a "kind of resistance centre" against German colonial rule (ibid., 281).

Despite the military weakening of the Vute after 1898/99, the colonial government was relieved when the "Ngute question, which had been pending for years" came to an end with the unconditional "submission" of the "feared and powerful chief" on 6 April 1906 (Anonymous 1906, 464f.). Significantly,

Gong Nar's capture only succeeded as a result of a "breach of trust" by the officer Hans Dominik (1870-1910), who lured him into a trap (Seige 2003, 299). After his internment in Yaoundé (ibid.), he was allowed to return to the Vute in Ndumba around 1910 (Thorbecke 1914, 154). Nothing is known about his further fate.

Large parts of the Vute's former property ended up in German collections as a result of the war of 1898, so-called punitive expeditions and other occasions, in which Gong Nar's name itself did not find its way into.

- Image commentary: Photographs of prisoners, especially of resistance fighters in chains, are a recurring motif in colonial travel literature, intended to express submission to colonial rule. Today, these images can be read differently, namely as evidence of the often brutal oppression, of injustice and to illustrate the ignorance with which the colonialists falsified the titles of the rulers (Ngrté/Ngutte) or confused them with proper names. Of course, the image is not of a broken ruler, but of two men who look directly at their counterparts with their heads held high. (Yann LeGall/Mareike Vennen)

Objects associated with Gong Nar in museums

Under the geographical indication of origin "Ngute", which refers to Gong Nar's work, some objects from the Vute can be found for example in the collections of the

→Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde Leipzig, (DB extract GMV Leipzig, 10.12.2021)
Linden Museum in Stuttgart (DB extract LM Stuttgart, 17.3.2021)

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.392] HAMMAN (MOHAMMAN) Lamou

*1870, Tibati †ca
. 1899, Douala Coast

Position: Sultan of Tibati

ca. 1884: Hamman Lamou becomes Lamido of Tibati at the age of 14.

November-December 1890: first encounter of Hamman Lamou - Amulamu - with a German (Captain Curt Morgen).

11-13 March 1899: defence of Tibati against the campaign of Captain Oltwig von Kamptz

April 1899: futile defence of the war camp in Sanserni, which is destroyed.

July 1899: renewed resistance by the Sultan, capture, deportation and imprisonment in Douala until his death.

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

The Sultanate of Tibati belonged to the northern Fullah Sultanates (Mohammadou 1965), whose subjugation was to secure German control over this region. Like Ngilla town (today: Nguila), it was on the way to the Lake Chad region, where Captain Curt Morgen (1858-1928, from 1904: von Morgen) undertook a reconnaissance trip via Tibati in 1890. According to his own account, he was then warmly received by the young, cultured Hamman (also Mohamman) Lamou, who read and wrote Arabic and was under the Sultan of Jola (Morgen 1893, 269-274).

With his description of the sultan, Morgen admittedly served colonial ideological patterns of thought about the local populations: He affirmed the supposed cultural difference between Europeans and Africans and, moreover, emphasised the contrast between so-called "Waldlandn*", who were said to be physically and spiritually backward, and "Sudann*", who were thought to be physically and culturally developed. On this basis, a religious hierarchy had been established, with Christianity at the top "with high moral standards", "Mohammedanism" in the middle and paganism at the lowest level. Styling religion as a sign of cultural and intellectual ability, Hans Dominik → [Bio, 380](#) (1870-1910), for example, claimed that the black person, as a result of his spiritual weakness, tended more towards 'Mohammedanism' than towards Christianity (Dominik 1908, 95).

The attacks of the colonial troops under Oltwig von Kamptz (1857-1921) on Tibati in 1899 gave rise to a massacre and one of the largest lootings during German colonial rule in Cameroon. According to Kamptz, the battle claimed "300 lives" among the attacked population (Kamptz 1899, 846). On the ground, the colonial troops are said to have captured 38 large ivory teeth, among other things (BArch R1001/3346, 157), the transport of which required 120 porters, some of whom came from the ranks of the captured hostages. With the proceeds from the sale of the ivory, Kamptz had the German station Joko expanded (BArch R1001/3346, 155-156). In addition, he demanded hundreds more ivory teeth and cattle as war compensation or peace conditions (Kamptz 1899, 846). The defeated sultan was captured and abducted to the coast, where he died in prison. The case of Tibati is not only representative of colonial violence against rulers who did not want to submit, but also of the massive taking away of dynastic and sacred objects as well as objects of power (Temgoua 1994). Through Kamptz alone, more than 150 captured Tibati cultural objects came to the Übersee-Museum in Bremen (Briskorn 2000, 134).

[p.393] Today, the Tibati Sultanate is demanding both the return of the cultural goods and far-reaching reparations → [chapter Assilkinga, 157 et seq.](#) The still untraceable bones of the Sultan remain a major concern for the community. In October 2022, His Majesty El Hadj Hamidou Mohaman Bello (†), as the then current Lamido of Tibati, visited the goods from Tibati in Bremen, which had been abducted around 1900, for the first time.

- Image commentary: The account of a reception at the court of Hamman Lamou in the travelogue of Curt Morgen, an officer active in the so-called Schutztruppe for Cameroon since 1889, is written in

such a way that one is tempted to interpret it as a description of the illustration printed here - but not of the real event. Text and image make use of exoticising stereotypes. While the reporter remains invisible in the text, he plays the decisive role in the picture. The illustrator Rudolf Hellgrewe (1860-1926) shows him only in a back view, but the eyes of all the dignitaries gathered in the tent are directed at him. Only the ruler and himself are seated on furniture: the German officer in an elaborate chair with armrests, the Sultan of Tibati on his traditional throne bed, now in Bremen (Inv. No. B13897 → [illustrated booklet XXXVI](#)). Behind the façade of a friendly welcome, the picture refers to a struggle for power and sovereignty. (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects from Tibati

316 total

156 Bremen, Overseas Museum

97 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

32 Munich, Museum Five Continents

25 Dresden, Museum of Ethnology

4 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums

1 Göttingen, Ethnological Collection of the Georg-August University

1 Stuttgart, Linden Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.394] KELLER, Jakob

*4 April 1862, Bofsheim

†12 March 1947, Schriesheim

Position: Missionary **Other activities:** Keller used his medical knowledge as a hospital assistant to establish medical care in the mission stations under his command.

Places of assignment: Cameroon

Before 1882: Apprenticeship as a baker

1882/83: Military service

1885: joins the Basel Mission

1890: Ordinariate

1890-1900: Missionary service at mission stations Mangamba, Bonaberi and Victoria, Cameroon

1902: Exploratory trip to the Cameroon grasslands

1902-1907: **Missionary** service at Bombe and Bali Mission Stations, Cameroon

1907-1909: Home leave

1909-1914: **Missionary** service at Bali Mission Station and leadership of regional missionary efforts

1914: Return to Germany

Critical biographical note

(Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

Jakob Keller spent almost the entire German-Cameroonian colonial era in the colony from 1890 to 1914 and was instrumental in building up the Basel mission there. Among the missionaries, Keller acquired a comparatively large number of cultural assets that can be found today in various German-language collections. He operated entirely in the sense of the contemporary notion of a "missionary war[s]" (Briskorn 2000, 131), in which the mission was seen as a "war without weapons" and religious objects in particular could take on the character of war trophies for the missionaries (Briskorn 2000: 132). For example, in the archives of the Basel Mission there is a photograph of Keller with the following comment on the back: "Victory spoils of the Abo Mission - Cameroon of 10 Dec. 1897" (Briskorn 2000, 132). And in a report published by Keller on this same "Abo Mission" he writes: "'And break into Satan's kingdom with power.' As a cavalry division falls upon the enemy in a storm, so we [...] fell upon the idols [...] and made them prisoners." (Keller 1898, 6). In their will to religious purification, characterised by a Protestant work ethic, the missionaries ultimately resembled the officers of the so-called Imperial Schutztruppe, who were characterised by Prussian soldierly discipline and who destroyed entire native communities with comparable imperious and rigorous arrogance. For himself, Keller primarily preferred prestige objects of the local elites (cf. Bozsa 2019, 42f.). Trophies from his religious war against the pagan customs of Cameroon, on the other hand, were not found in his private possessions, parts of which he sold to the Übersee-Museum Bremen for 1000 Reichsmark only in 1935 (Briskorn 2000, 246).

Keller was responsible for one of the most extensive missionary raids in German-Cameroonian colonial history, evidence of which can still be found today. In the course of what the merchant Gustav Conrau (1865-1899) described as an "iconoclasm" initiated by Keller (Conrau 1899 cited in Schlothauer 2015, 269), Keller was able to steal numerous ritual objects from the local spiritual "Losango" communities from ten smaller and larger villages in the Abo region over three days in 1897 with the help of Christianised parts of the population. Convinced that the "Losango" significantly embodied paganism, Keller made "prisoners" [p.395] in four villages on the first day alone: "24 human-like idols, three buffalo masks, an elephant mask, a leopard mask, two Ekongolo bast suits, a tambimbe suit, several drums, sticks etc." (Keller 1898, 6). In doing so, he and his Christianised helpers did not proceed squeamishly and hastened: "to get ahead of the people so that they do not hide their masks etc.!" Supported by the people of the town, they [the Christianised helpers] pushed in a hut door here and there and brought out: caps of feathers, suits of raffia, human-like abominable idols, drums, buffaloes, elephant and leopard masks together with many other, partly abominable things (Keller 1898, 4).

In addition to what was confiscated by the missionaries on this and the next two days and the following period, there was also the burning and destruction of a large but unquantifiable amount of Cameroonian cultural heritage. The missionaries were partly responsible for this, but numerous objects were also destroyed by raids by parts of the more or less Christianised indigenous population itself. "There was no more resisting", as Keller put it (Keller 1898, 7).

Keller does not mention that all this was only possible as a result of the establishment of colonial tyranny and a missionary process lasting many years, as well as a loss of authority of the traditional leadership elites coupled with this. In the end, however, it was not the mission and its mandate that were the decisive moment for the surrender of cultural goods, but rather the fear of reprisals by the German colonial government, which supported the missionaries. It is not least Keller himself who, in his narrative, has a native sum up that his power was absolute and equal to that of the governor: "The Europeans, the governor has come and [...] [we natives] have [...] nothing more to say. Every white man is a governor. If now the European present [...] says: 'The Losango are abolished', then it is so, and the matter is settled!" (Keller 1898, 4). Given the atrocities that German colonial rule had already perpetrated against other local populations, it is not surprising that great deference was shown to the missionaries who cooperated closely with the colonial administration. Further major deliveries of expropriated ritual objects by Keller to the Museum der Kulturen Basel were made from the Mangamba region in 1898 and again from the Abo region in 1911 (DB extract MKB Basel, 20.6.2022).

- Image commentary: The photograph, presumably taken shortly before 1935, shows Jakob Keller about 20 years after his return from Cameroon. The wallpaper and coffered door suggest a German interior. Keller is wearing a robe and a pointed cap, as reserved for dignitaries of the Bali-Nyonga dominion in Cameroon. He holds a pipe in his left hand and a leopard skin is draped over his right arm. Together with about 70 other objects, the missionary sold the two items to the Völkerkundemuseum in Bremen [p.396] (today the Übersee-Museum) in 1935. From 1937 onwards, the robe and cap dressed a life-size black mannequin with grim facial features in a glass case; between his feet, a museum sign gave the absurd information "Chief of the Bali". The photograph of the clad cellar as well as the display case was published by Bettina von Briskorn (Briskorn 2000, cover and 4). The provenance researcher Isabelle Bozsa suspects that Keller had the robe tailored for himself in Cameroon as a souvenir (Bozsa unv. Mss.: 2). (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

92 Total identified

70 Bremen, Übersee-Museum

53 Basel, Museum of Cultures

21 Nuremberg, Museum of Natural History

1 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

[p.397] KUM'A MBAPE BELE ba DOOH, aka LOCK PRISO

*approx. 1846, place unknown
†1916, Bonabéri near Douala

Position: Ruler in Hickory Town (now Bonabéri) **Other activities:** Resistance fighter

Place of activity: Bonabéri, Douala

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

"Pull that flag down... no man buy we... german trouble us plenty and want to give us plenty dash we tell them no... leave us free and not make us plenty trouble. Gez. Lock Priso Bell" (Lock Priso, quoted from Buchner 1914, 121f.). On 28 August 1884, Kum'a Mbape and twelve other dignitaries from Hickory Town (now Bonabéri) protested in writing against the fact that the Consul General for West Africa, Gustav Nachtigal (1834-1885), had hoisted the German flag on Duala territory on the right bank of the Wuri River to mark the acquisition of a colony there on behalf of the Reich. The nickname "Lock" (English: "luck") is said to derive from the fact that his enemies could not eliminate Kum'a Mbape (Koum 2022).

Bonabéri is the place of origin of the great Bell family, Bele ba DooH, who ruled the Joss Plateau on the left bank of the Wuri River. One of DooH's sons, Bebe Bell (1839-1897), ruled there as King Bell, while his brother, Mbape Bell, remained as ruler in Bonabéri and became father to Kum'a Mbape alias Lock Priso. Kum'a Mbape's decisive role as a resistance fighter of the first hour against German colonial rule has not only been the subject of historical research (Eckert 1991; Zeller 2007), but over the past decades has gained almost legendary status in various media, not least with the participation of his descendants (Ndumbe 1970; Oyono 2001; Meyomesse 2019; Bekolo 2017). His outstanding position among the local dignitaries had already been memorialised by Max Buchner (1846-1921), Nachtigal's companion and provisional commissioner of Kaiser Wilhelm I in Cameroon, in his memoirs: "Lock Priso von Hickorytaun, King Bell's rebellious headman, in his time our main enemy and from the beginning the main opponent of our seizure of possession [...]" (Buchner 1887, 51)

Kum'a Mbape's resistance was by no means exhausted in the written protest quoted at the beginning, which Manga Ndumbe Bell (1851-1908), King Akwa, Mpundo Akwa, Rudolf Duala Manga Bell (1873-1914) and others were to continue. Rather, he had exposed early on as bribery the "gifts" that German traders had distributed at the suggestion of Adolf Woermann (1847-1911) to induce the Duala rulers to sign a so-called protection treaty. When it became clear that his protest note was ineffective, he initiated the phase of armed resistance from December 1884. This led to the first German colonial war on 22 December (Eckert 1991, 121-125).

[p.398] It was Buchner who ordered gunboats from the German navy led by Admiral Eduard von Knorr (1840-1920) to fight Lock Priso and his allies. However, the Germans found support from King Bell, among others, who actively participated in looting and subsequently setting fire to Kum'a Mbape's estate (Eisenhofer 2017, 201). The extent to which Buchner was intent on capturing cultural assets as undamaged as possible can be seen in the diary entries of 22 December 1884, which are disturbing from today's perspective: "The house of Lock Priso is pulled down, a moving picturesque image. We set fire to it. But I have asked to be allowed to look through the individual houses for ethnographic oddities beforehand." (Buchner 1914, 194) Among the stolen objects, as is well known, was Kum'a Mbape's insignia of power, the tangué (Munich, Museum Fünf Kontinente, Inv.-Nr. 7087 → [Bildheft LIV](#)), which has been reclaimed since the 1990s (→ [Chapter Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III, 341 ff.](#) ; Splettstößer 2019, 189-234). In the museum's entry book, which otherwise contains only scarce entries, the piece received a longer note: "Boat beak. Large colourful painted carving carved from a piece which formerly adorned the ship's beak of a canou of the N*chief Lock Priso and was captured by the German navy in battle" (cited in Splettstößer 2019, 196). Like other colourful, elaborately carved ship's beaks with which the Duala equipped their stately canoes for certain ceremonies, the Tangué is one of the approximately 700 inventory numbers that have been stored in German museums for more than a century with the indication of origin "Duala".

- Image commentary: Depictions of Lock Priso are rare; this seems to be the only one that has survived to the present day. It is a photographed image of an oval photo portrait (→ see picture commentary Buchner p. 375) and shows the already elderly ruler, who had been in contact with European trade on the Cameroon coast for decades, in a European suit with white collar and bow tie. Under the medallion, which was originally created for representational purposes, a later hand has recorded in blue ink as a memorial: Kum Mbape. This print is now in the possession of one of Lock Priso's grandsons, Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III in Bonabéri/Douala. (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects from the Duala

700 Total identified

- 111 Stuttgart, Linden Museum: State Museum of Ethnology
- 96 Leipzig, Museums in the Grassi/Museum of Ethnology
- 84 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology
- 82 Berlin, Ethnological Museum
- 71 Munich, Museum Five Continents
- 40 Freiburg i.Br., Museum Nature and Man
- 36 Hamburg, Museum am Rothenbaum - Cultures and Arts of the World
- 34 Bremen, Overseas Museum
- 30 Hanover, Lower Saxony State Museum
- 19 Frankfurt a.M., World Cultures Museum
- 18 Göttingen, Ethnological Collection of the Georg-August University
- 15 Lübeck, Ethnological Collection
- 12 Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Cultures of the World
- 6 Hildesheim, Roman and Pelician Museum
- 6 Kassel, Museum Landscape Hesse-Kassel
- 6 Mainz, Ethnographic Study Collection of the Johannes Gutenberg University
- 6 Tübingen, Ethnographic Collection of the Eberhard Karls University
- 5 Detmold, Lippe State Museum
- 4 Offenburg, Museum in the Ritterhaus
- 3 Heidelberg, Ethnological Museum of the J. u. E. von Portheim Foundation
- 3 Wilhelmshafen, Coastal Museum
- 3 Witzhausen, Ethnological Museum - Cultures of the World
- 2 Brunswick, Municipal Museum
- 2 Göttingen, Ethnological Collection of the Georg-August University
- 2 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums
- 2 Uslar, Museum Uslar
- 1 Berlin, Brücke Museum
- 1 Munich, German Museum
- 1 Munich, Museum Five Continents

[P.400] KUVA LIKENYE

*between 1805 and 1815, Buea
†1895, Buea

Position: King of the Bakweri **Other activities:** Resistance fighter

Place of action: Buea on Mount Cameroon

1891: Resistance to the first attack by the colonial troops under Captain Karl Freiherr von Gravenreuth.

1894: Resistance against another military attack under Captain Max von Stetten

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

Kuva Likenye, the king of the Bakweri, has for some years been regarded as an icon of resistance, especially in Buea and the surrounding area, as he had repeatedly resisted the advance of German colonial troops and their military attacks in the 1890s (Tande 2009). Recent documentary and feature films, literature and painting have contributed significantly to his current hero status (Ngwane 2008). "Dschatga", the mighty one, as he was called by his followers, already met Jesko von Puttkamer → [Bio, 422](#) (1855-1917), who had been appointed chancellor in the colony, at the end of 1886, when he undertook a so-called expedition to Buea and Mount Cameroon (Ardener 1996, 67-69), and shortly afterwards, in January 1887, Eugen Zintgraff (1858-1897), who spent a few days with the Bakweri on his way from Victoria to Kumba. He was well aware that Puttkamer had met one of the most respected men in the area (ibid., 67). And Zintgraff also remembered Kuva Likenye's appearance - he wore his beard "conspicuously braided in three plaits" - in the later notes of his attempt to penetrate further into the north of the region on behalf of the German Foreign Office (Zintgraff 1895, 33).

The German colonisers' desire to gain power over a larger territory and thus increase profits quickly changed their attitude towards local rulers like Kuva Likenye. Any pretext to take action against supposed "rebels" and "enemies" like him was used to further advance land grabbing and thus control over plantation economy and trade, as Puttkamer's memoirs from 1912 show: "The Buea people are in revolt against the governorate, no European can enter the mountain unchallenged, trade and commerce are consequently at a standstill; and all this after ten years of German rule immediately at the gates of the governorate" (Puttkamer 1912, 22). The first attack in November 1891 under Captain Karl von Gravenreuth (1858-1891) and Lieutenant Max von Stetten (1860-1925) was successfully opposed by Kuva Likenye with a following of 400 men, so that the capture of Buea was thwarted.

Three years later, towards the end of 1894, a force equipped with heavier weapons under Stetten and Hans Dominik (1870-1910) undertook another campaign against the Bakweri and their ruler, who was by then considered weakened in his own ranks, and was put to flight (Ardener 1996, 107-114).

Betrayed by a captured compatriot, he finally fell victim to "the strain of wandering" (Dominik 1901, 107). [Thus Kuva Likenye had not been killed by German weapons. His body was brought back to Buea by followers, where he was buried as a hero (Ardener 1996, 113).

The colonial troops' military attacks on the Bakweri had not only led to land and cattle theft and forced labour (Dominik 1901, 107-110). Moreover, the Bakweri lost numerous cultural goods for the benefit of German museums. Although these goods did not originate from the period of the punitive expeditions and thus no direct connection to ruler Kuva Likenye can be proven, the subjugation of the Bakweri opened the way for the further deprivation of cultural goods in a situation of unequal power relations.

- Image commentary: According to current knowledge, images of Kuva Likenye have not survived. Dibussi Tande, who acted as a consultant for the documentary Kuva Likenye in 2008, writes about the film's iconography: "Although purists will fault the absence of archival footage from the Bakweri-German wars or images of Kuva Likenye (such images do not exist), this is largely made up for [in the film] by the use of animation and archival images from the German colonial period" (Tande 2008). (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums **supplied with objects from the Bakweri**

249 Total identified

63 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology

61 Stuttgart, Linden-Museum: State Museum of Ethnology

51 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

24 Munich, Museum Five Continents

10 Leipzig, Museums in the Grassi/Museum of Ethnology

10 Lübeck, Ethnological Collection

4 Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Cultures of the World

3 Mainz, Ethnographic Study Collection of the Johannes Gutenberg University

1 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.402] MAKA- and OMVANG-HERRSCHER (Group Biography)

Position: Kings in the region of Doumé

other activities: Resistance fighter

Place of activity: Central Cameroon

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

In 1910, the German colonial power sentenced ten rulers in the south-east of the colony to death and executed them in the town of Doumé, convinced that they were members of the Maka communities, which were considered rebellious and had already been fought against for some time. According to a report in the *Deutsche Kolonialzeitung*, they were called Aulemakong, Ekongamgamba, Ngelemenduka, Okang, Bobela, Ngom, Nangabitun, Sef, Gule-Ngamba and Kongo, who was described as the "chief's policeman" (Anonymous 1910, 927). Several of the names were translated into German in deviation from the local designations, meaning Aulemaku, Bobele, Ngoen, Bonanga and Nkal Mentsouga, among others. The latter was not a representative of the Maka, but ruler of the Omvang, who were in a permanent state of war with some Maka peoples (Koufan Menkéné/Mbeng Dang 2011, 323-336).

The pretext for the executions was the murder of the Dresden merchant Arno Bretschneider of the Liverpool firm John Holt (BArch R 175-I/92, fol. 45-48). According to official announcements in the colonial press, which were based on a report by Hans Dominik → [Bio, 380](#) (1870-1910), the investigations revealed that Bretschneider 'was not guilty of any assaults against the natives'. Nevertheless, he had been strongly warned against entering the territory of the North Maka (Anonymous 1910, 927). After Dominik had initially assumed an "act of violence of local significance", it became clear that the murder had been part of an "uprising prepared long in advance". It could not be ruled out that mistakes made by the district administration in developing the new area were responsible for the attempt to expel the Europeans (ibid.). The uprising and murder were taken as an opportunity to devastate the region with a war of subjugation or revanchism and to quickly kill many people, including the aforementioned rulers.

After analysing files in the National Archives in Yaoundé, however, the case was different: no revolt had been the cause of Bretschneider's murder in the village of Salé, which was headed by one of Nkal Mentsouga's sons. Rather, he had cheated in trade (Koufan Menkéné/Mbeng Dang 2011, 334). Moreover, Bretschneider had probably posed a threat from the Maka's perspective. Like so many other European colonists, he had been in search of workers who were urgently needed for plantations and for road and railway construction. The recruitment of labour and the poor working conditions were associated with hostage-taking, **[p.403]** forced labour, torture, death and exile. Recruited workers often never returned home. Defensive reactions therefore occurred not only among the Maka, but also, for example, among the Bangwa in Fontem, where Gustav Conrau died in 1899 (Schlothauer 2015, 22f.), or in the Yaoundé region, where a planter named Voß had died during a recruitment for the Bimbia plantation in 1907 (Anonymous 1907a, 624). On the occasion of such cases, the colonial power did not hesitate to summarily declare the rulers to be cruel cannibals (Koufan Menkéné/Mbeng Dang 2011, 332). Such clichés became an integral part of colonial rhetoric, used to justify retaliatory measures such as summary executions, the burning of villages or the destruction of farms.

At the same time, the German colonial power used the warlike actions as an opportunity to appropriate human remains and cultural assets. In 1910, Dominik sent Maka skulls to the Institute of Anatomy in Freiburg i.Br. (Dominik 1908). At least one skull of the Maka executed in 1910, which the Übersee-Museum Bremen gave the inventory number 4877, had been sold by the Hamburg ethnographica dealer Julius Konietzko (1886-1952) on 21 September 1936 for RM 70 (Fründt 2011, 63f.). The Maka communities also lost quite a few cultural assets; in Stuttgart's Linden Museum alone there are about 620 relevant entries. The Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde in Leipzig and the Übersee-Museum Bremen also have a high concentration of Maka cultural heritage.

Museums supplied with Maka objects

1203 Total identified

620 Stuttgart, Linden-Museum: State Museum of Ethnology

266 Leipzig, Grassi Museum of Ethnology

193 Bremen, Übersee Museum

34 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

31 Munich, Museum Five Continents

16 Hamburg, Museum am Rothenbaum - Cultures and Arts of the World

12 Lübeck, Ethnological Collection

9 Mainz, Ethnographic Study Collection of the Johannes Gutenberg University

5 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology

4 Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Cultures of the World

3 Coburg, Museum of Natural History

3 Frankfurt a.M., World Cultures Museum

2 Tübingen, Eberhard Karls University - Ethnological Collection

1 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums

1 Hanover, Lower Saxony State Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.404] MAYESSE (King), BIANG Bwô Mbumbô

*1833, Bôdua/Mbeka'a am Lobe †7
May 1893, Grand-Batanga

Position: Army commander of the Mabi

other activities: Resistance fighter

Place of action: Southern Cameroon, Département de l'Océan

1891-1893: Armed resistance against German colonial rule.

1893: Crushing defeat against the Mabea expedition led by the so-called Polizeitruppe under the direction of the court ace Alwin K. Wehlan (15-31.3.1893)

April 1893: Death by hanging

Critical biographical note

(Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

Biang Bwô Mbumbô alias King Mayesse is considered a national idol in the oral tradition of the Mabi of Southern Cameroon, together with Biwée Nagya alias King Massili and Nagyang Kwamba alias King Benga. As head of the Mabi, he led one of the first local resistance struggles against German colonial rule (Mboum 2022, 94).

Mbumbô, who according to tradition was not of royal descent, was regarded as a free spirit and warrior of powerful stature who, in the face of German occupation, rose to become the leader of the armed resistance of the local population (cf. Mboum 2022, 94; Hoffmann 2007, vol. 1, 77f.). Although the archives only recall King Benga (BArch, Bericht 1893, 21), Mbumbô's existence and the leading role he played in the Mabi resistance have always been undisputed for the Mabi themselves.

Mbumbô's activities were primarily directed against the early German efforts to penetrate the so-called hinterland of Southern Cameroon and to impose a colonial economic trade monopoly that deprived the indigenous population of their livelihoods (Mboum 2022, 91-99). The armed resistance of Mbumbô and his comrades-in-arms, which began in 1891, came to an end in March 1893 with the so-called Mabea expedition led by the then deputy governor and chancellor of the colony Karl Theodor Heinrich Leist (1859-1910) and his deputy, Vice-Chancellor Alwin Karl Wehlan (1860-?) (Herterich 2001, 6; Hoffmann 2007, vol. 11, 77f.).

Knowledge of the extremely brutal warfare that the newly established police force was waging at the time against the Mabi, but also against other local population groups such as the Malimba and Bakoko (see Mbome → Bio, 406), reached the German public at the time and led to one of the first German colonial scandals. With regard to the so-called punitive expeditions carried out at the time, there were reports of "cruel excesses of violence", which ranged "from bloody flogging and arbitrary killing to bestial desecration of corpses". Even children, women and the elderly were not exempt (Bösch 2009, 267).

The Germans were unable to capture Mbumbô himself during the two-week campaign against the Mabi. Following the fighting, however, according to Wehlan, the Mabi "handed over their former ruler King Benga after several days", whereupon he was "delivered to death by hanging" (BArch, Bericht Wehlan 1893, 26). According to tradition, Mbumbô was executed by the Germans together with his two comrades-in-arms, King Massili and King Benga (Mboum 2022, 94).

[In the terms of surrender dictated by the victor, Wehlan put the following words into the mouths of the Mabi: "The war with the Imperial Government has cost the Mabea population immense loss of life and has plunged us into such unspeakable misery by destroying all our property that, in order not to perish in the utmost distress, we prefer to submit to the Imperial Government in mercy and in disgrace." (BArch, Gouvernement 1893, 27f.)

A few undestroyed parts of the Mabi's property ended up in the holdings of the Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde Leipzig via Leist and Valentin Lewonig (b. 1863), the military drill sergeant of the police force that was being established at the time.

- **Image commentary:** No photographs are known of Biang Bwô Mbumbô.

Museums supplied with objects from Mabi

473 Total identified:

247 Leipzig, Grassi Museum

80 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology

68 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

27 Stuttgart, Linden Museum

25 Hanover, Lower Saxony State Museum

11 Frankfurt a.M., World Cultures Museum

8 Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Cultures of the World

4 Hamburg, Museum am Rothenbaum - Cultures and Arts of the World

2 Tübingen, Eberhard Karls University - Ethnological Collection

1 Mainz, Johannes Gutenberg University - Ethnographic Study Collection

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[P.406] MBOME A PEP

***Year of birth unknown, Edea †27 June 1895, in the Cameroon River.**

Position: King of the Bakoko

Other activities: Ivory trader, resistance fighter

Place of activity: Southern Cameroon (Edea)

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

Mbome a Pep - usually referred to as "King Bome" or "Roi" or "Chef Bome" in German colonial and French mission history sources - was a chief of the Bakoko, a population group around Edea that calls itself Adiè. In 1892, the *Deutsche Kolonialblatt* reported that his village was large, "kept very clean" and had "50 to 60 huts". Mbome was "almost exclusively engaged in the ivory trade", which helped him to achieve "great wealth". At the time, the paper estimated that the "Edea people, as good-natured, cheerful people, without warlike senses, but very eager to trade, would probably always remain good friends of the [German] station" (Volckamer von Kirchensittenbach 1892, 238f.). But barely three years later the mood had changed: In the summer of 1895, the so-called *Schutztruppe* in Cameroon led a "successful war campaign" against "stubborn resistance" against the Bakoko, which, according to their own statements, "had never been conducted more seriously in Cameroon and rarely elsewhere" (BArch R1001/3357, 21f.). The consequences were devastating: according to German military reports, "at least 100 villages" went up in flames, several hundred Bakoko died, "in addition, 28 prisoners, over 100 rifles and a significant amount of livestock" fell into the hands of the *Schutztruppe* (ibid., 10-12). One of the prisoners was Mbome a Pep, who was accused of treason. He died on 27 June 1895, a few days after his arrest.

The National Archives in Yaoundé keep a file containing important documents about this event. It is entitled "Investigation against Chief Bome of Edea for treason and his death by drowning and escape during transport to Douala" (FA 1/102, 71-83). This describes in detail how the king, after his capture, had to board a ship that was to take him under police and military supervision to Douala, which was not yet called Douala at the time. After a few hours, the otherwise "calm" Mbome a Pep, who for once was "not tied up", seized an opportunity to jump overboard and swim away from his tormentors. A military statement said: "He suddenly disappeared without a cry [...]. Despite a quarter-hour search, no trace of him could be discovered" (ibid., 81-83).

Even today, the event is remembered among the Bakoko population. The circumstances of Mbome a Pep's death, however, are considered unexplained here. Present-day Bakoko rulers, Their Majesties Ngwanza Jean of Mbondandick, Nguele of Nzock-Nkong, Miyila Placide of Metounga and Eding Batta Merveille of Mbengue-Edea, also [p.407] recall that women, men and children were assigned to forced labour and beaten under German colonial rule (Conversation Edea 2022). To escape forced labour, some of their ancestors injured themselves or even committed suicide.

Even today, Bakoko communities are moved by the fact that the circumstances of Mbome a Pep's disappearance are uncertain. In the colonisation process, however, the Germans not only tortured and killed, but also destroyed, stole, confiscated, bought or exchanged the Bakoko's material culture. In addition to the repatriation of the bones of their former ruler, they demand in particular the return of the sacred cultural objects that were used in local religious rites. This applies, for example, to "objects" of the ritual dances bisoa'a, lemba and baye or the sacred "objects" by means of which the secret society ndjé ensured the establishment of a connection between this world and the hereafter. The ndjee also served the community as a judicial body (Laburthe-Tolra 1985: 351, 354). A total of 483 inventory numbers are associated with the Bakoko in German museums today. For about 100 of them, Yann LeGall, Elias Aguigah and Jeanne-Ange Wagne → Map, 126 were able to establish that they were captured during the Bakoko expedition of 1895, in which Mbome a Pep lost his life.

- Image commentary: No photographs of Mbome a Pep are known.

Museums supplied with baccoco objects

484 Total identified

198 Stuttgart, Linden-Museum: State Museum of Ethnology

146 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

48 Leipzig, Museums in the Grassi/Museum of Ethnology

25 Munich, Museum Fünf Kontinente

19 Frankfurt a.M., World Cultures Museum

18 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology

12 Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Cultures of the World

4 Bremen, Overseas Museum

4 Mainz, Ethnographic Study Collection of the Johannes Gutenberg University

3 Göttingen, Ethnographic Collection of the Georg-August University

3 Hanover, Lower Saxony State Museum

3 Lübeck, Ethnological Collection

1 Tübingen, Ethnological Collection of the Eberhard Karls University

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.408] MÜLLER, Wilhelm

***7 September 1850, Friedrichsthal**
†12 February 1921, Paderborn

Position: Commander of the so-called Schutztruppe

Other activities: deputy governor, chairman of Kolonialkriegerdank e.V.

Places of deployment: Namibia (former colony of German South-West Africa), Cameroon

1868-1894: Military training as a major in the army

1870/71: Deployment in the Franco-Prussian War

1895-1902: Commander of the Schutztruppe for German South-West Africa

1902/03: Service with the German Army

1903-1908: Commander of the Schutztruppe for Cameroon

1904: Head of the Bakoko Expedition (22.1.1904-Mid Feb. 1904) Head of the Anyang Campaign (5.2.1904-22.8.1904)

1905: Head of the Manenguba Expedition (7.1.1905-26.4.1905)

1906: Deputy Governor

1907: Head of the Jetsang expedition (18.2.-22.3.1907)

since 1908: Chairman of the Supervisory Board of Kolonialkriegerdank e.V.

1914-1918: Deployment in the First World War

Critical biographical note

(Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

Franz Ludwig Wilhelm Müller had already had a long career with the so-called Schutztruppe and, as commander in the then colony of German Southwest Africa, had to answer for numerous war crimes before he was appointed commander-in-chief of the Schutztruppe for Cameroon in 1903.

During his term of service, which lasted until 1908, a number of military operations and wars against indigenous population groups also took place under his responsibility in Cameroon. As commander, however, Müller was not himself involved in most of the military actions for which he was responsible in the colony, which is why his personal leadership is only evident in the context of larger expeditions (Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2, 8), such as the wars against the Anyang, Bakoko or Maka → Bio, 402. In 1906, when he was confronted by missionaries with structural abuses and excesses by soldiers of the Schutztruppe, a "soldier robbery and rape system" (BArch, Spellenberg 1905, 13), he "unreservedly admitted the possibility of such incidents", but blamed the "non-commissioned officers" and "lieutenants" under his command for such conditions: "These young, inexperienced gentlemen usually drive into it in ignorance, without really knowing the conditions. - This is also readily admitted by Colonel Müller", as reported by the missionary Lutz (BArch, Lutz 1906, 31f).

Müller was also deeply involved in the acquisition of so-called ethnographic collection items and represented an important node in the procurement network of the museum director Karl Graf von Linden (1838-1910) in Stuttgart (BArch, Müller 14.6.1904, 1f). As a commander-in-chief stationed mostly at the headquarters of the governorate, Müller, as he lamented in a letter to von Linden, was not able to procure objects as well as the officers under his command who regularly patrolled the colony's territory (BArch, Müller 18.7.1904, 2). His primarily stationary activity, however, suited his work as a multiplier of the desires of the Stuttgart collection manager, as he was in contact with all military and administrative instances of the colony in the bureaucratic flow of information. Müller's conspicuous obsequiousness towards Karl von Linden seems inappropriate in view of his rank as commander, for example when, in response to the museum director's requests for collection items, he assures him: "As far as it is in my power, I will do everything to accommodate your wishes." (BArch, Müller 14.6.1904: 1f.)

[Müller's activity as an official representative of the colonial state and as a private agent of von Lindens' procurement wishes cannot be separated. For him, the military occupation went hand in hand with the forcible appropriation of foreign cultural property, as can be seen from one of his letters to the director

of the Stuttgart Museum, in which he reports on the potential object yield of the so-called Manenguba expedition (Herterich 2001, 20): "I am currently working in a completely virgin area, namely in the white spot northeast of the Manenguba Mountains. It is not surprising that the natives do not easily have the right understanding for my task, and so it does not work without shooting here either". (BArch, Müller 24.1.1905, 2).

He also did not shy away from sending human skulls to the Stuttgart Museum (Archiv Linden-Museum, Linden 1905, 1).

Müller was first and foremost a guarantor that his subordinates were able to expropriate enormous amounts of Cameroonian cultural heritage between 1903 and 1908, a heyday of military subjugation and administrative development of the colony's so-called hinterland. He himself delivered 16 objects to the Stuttgart museum, including many pieces from population groups he had fought during the war against the Anyang in 1904. For the military merits he had acquired in Cameroon from the German point of view, he received the Red Eagle Order 3rd Class with ribbon, swords and crown (Kirch 1906, 62).

- Image commentary: Müller is depicted in the uniform of a major general and as a bearer of the Order of the Red Eagle, 3rd class, with ribbon, swords and crown. Studio portraits of officers in the grey home uniform of the so-called Kaiserliche Schutztruppe in Africa, with hat (here in hand), pronounced moustache and advantageously illuminated order buckle on the chest are found in abundance in German archives. The men portrayed, mostly around 50, look confusingly similar - sovereign-looking representatives of a state-borne militarism, more type than individual. Müller's medals line up the names of battles of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870/71 with Cameroon and "Southwest Africa". They were offered for sale in 2002 by Jan K. Kube, a special auction house for historical weapons, militaria, orders and contemporary historical objects in Bavaria (Kube 2002). (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

16 Total identified

16 Stuttgart, Linden Museum

[p.411] NGRAN II (Gomtsé) & NGRAN III (Neyon)

NGRAN II

*Life data unknown

† ca. 1891

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

Among the Cameroonian rulers, the Vute rulers of Ndumba, who were always struggling to expand their power and territory, attracted special attention and suspicion from the Germans in the first years of colonisation. In the 1880s and 1890s, it was not the founder of the dynasty, Vouktok or Voukto (Ngran I), who had to deal with the colonisers, but above all his sons Gomtsé (Ngran II) and Neyon (Ngran III). The influence of these Vute leaders, who bore the title Ngila or Ngran, but were usually called Ngilla in German colonial literature, extended over wide regions of the Sanaga Plain northwest of Yaoundé. According to the German stakeholders, the aim here was to draw the border between areas of the colony in the north that had already been developed and those that were yet to be conquered. The rulers' involvement in the slave trade, which was conducted beyond the Vute empire in Yoko and Tibati to Lake Chad or Bagirmi and from there towards Sudan or the Maghreb, was decisively met with disapproval (Seige 2003, 92). The Vute were therefore classified as greedy "slave robbers" and hunters of "black ivory" (Zimmermann 1909, 78). Last but not least, they represented an obstacle to German expansionist efforts, as Neyon (Ngran III) did not want to clear the path leading through his sphere of influence into the Adamaua lands.

The colonial power therefore made the subjugation of Neyon (Ngran III) its primary task. A campaign led by Hans Dominik → [Bio, 380](#) (1870-1910) in January 1897, which cost many Vute their lives and brought the attackers rich booty (Künkler 2022, 50-56), was followed by the decisive blow in 1898/99 in the course of the so-called Wute-Adamaua expedition (Herterich 2001, 10; Seige 2003, 142, 198f.; Temgoua 2014, 56-61). It was contested by four companies of about 80 men each, a carrier column of 325 persons and other staff members under the leadership of Captain Oltwig von Kamptz (1857-1921) (Anonymous 1899; Kamptz 1899). Dominik, who was in charge of the Yaoundé station during these years, spoke of the "day of revenge", "because Ngilla had to know that it was now a question of being or not being for him, that he could no longer count on pardon after his insolent brigandage" (Dominik 1901, 257). Dominik's rhetoric equated the colonial policy of conquest with the liberation of the local population from an obstinate and cruel slave trader.

[p.412] The Vute lost not only hundreds of people but also large quantities of cultural goods in the numerous wars of subjugation. Jesko von Puttkamer → [Bio, 422](#) (1855-1917) enthusiastically reported 'rich booty' (Puttkamer 1912, 92). At the end of December 1898, Dominik offered the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde a war shirt of "Ngilla's" field marshal Gimene (d. 1898), which he had taken from the man he had murdered (Berlin, SMB-ZA, Dominik 1898). Such a shirt, attributed to Ngilla, is now in the possession of the Linden Museum in Stuttgart (Inv.-Nr. 017144 → [Bildheft XXIII](#)). After the battle against the Vute in 1899, Dominik proudly listed his spoils of war: 'twelve ivory teeth, weapons of all kinds, including four rifles M. 71, ammunition M. 71, tent poles, probably from Volckamer's tent, a great deal of powder, 15 horses and over 700 small cattle' (Dominik 1901, 264). Cultural objects captured by the Vute can today be found in at least 17 German museums, for example in Berlin, Leipzig or Stuttgart, if they did not fall victim to the world wars. Since 2021, Adamou Gomtsé Ndah has ruled as Ngran XI in Nguila → [Matchinda chapter, 315 ff.](#)

- **Image commentary:** According to experts, this is the only known, perhaps even the only existing depiction of Gomtsé (Ngran II) (Seige 2003, 113). The drawing was made at the end of May 1898, when Hans Tappenbeck enjoyed the hospitality of the still youthful ruler for about a week. The portrait appears to be sketched at close range; two drawn feet peek out from under the striped burnoose of the man sitting on a low bed. With its pictorial language, the portrait does not locate Gomtsé on the African continent south of the Sahara but in an undefined Orient. In the text, which it serves as an

illustration, Gomtsé is also de- Africanised: "The chief, whose appearance strongly resembles the type of a Spanish Jew, did not make an unpleasant impression on the traveller". Three years after its first publication, the portrait served once again as a model for an illustration by Rudolf Hellgrewe in the memoirs of the officer Curt von Morgen. (Bénédicte Savoy)

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[P.414] NGRAN III

***about 1865, Ndumba**

†1899, Ndumba

Position: Ngran (king) in the Vute ruling centre of Ndumba.

Other activities: Warlord, resistance fighter

Places of activity: Ndumba (Eng. Ngilla town), in the Sanaga Plain, Central Cameroon

ca. 1880-ca. 1891: Rule of Gomtsé (Ngran II).

May 1889: Peaceful reception of Hans Tappenbeck and his troop, which is however prevented by Gomtsé from marching on to the north-west.

December 1889-October 1890: Peaceful reception of officer Curt Morgen. Morgen stays in Ndumba for several months and the Germans establish a research station and a trading post. Joint war campaign by Gomtsé and Morgen against the neighbouring ruler Ngaundere I.

Approx. 1891: Death of Gomtsé (Ngran II).

ca. 1891 to 1899: assumption of rule by Gomtsé's brother Neyon (Ngran III)

August 1894-August/September 1895: Neyon's encounters with Hans Dominik in Ndumba (now: Nguila).

January 1897: resistance struggle with heavy losses against a war campaign led by Dominik, destruction of Ndumba.

Early January (?) 1899: death of Neyon

January-October 1899: "Wute-Adamaua Expedition", in the course of which the Vute of the Sanaga Plain are placed under German colonial administration

Vute objects in German museums

1369 Total identified

630 Stuttgart, Linden Museum

169 Leipzig, Grassi Museums

122 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

116 Munich, Museum Fünf Kontinente

103 Bremen, Übersee-Museum

60 Detmold, Lippisches Landesmuseum

58 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology

25 Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Cultures of the World

21 Hamburg, Museum am Rothenbaum

21 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums

18 Frankfurt a.M., World Cultures Museum

10 Lübeck, Ethnological Collection

7 Göttingen, Ethnological Collection of the Georg-August University

5 Oldenburg, State Museum of Nature and Man

2 Tübingen, Ethnological Collection of the Eberhard Karls University

1 Herrnhut, Ethnological Museum

1 Munich, German Museum

NJAPNDUNKE (Njapdunké)

*about 1850

†2 July 1913, Foumban

Position: Regent in Foumban, Queen Mother

Place of work: Foumban in western Cameroon

ca. 1860-1886: Ruler at the side of King Nsa'ngu.

ca. 1876: birth of her first and only son Ibrahim Njoya

ca. 1886-1894: Queen Regent

ca. 1894-1913: Queen Mother

Critical biographical note

(Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

Njapndunke, also referred to by the Bamum as 'nafon' (queen mother) or 'na' or 'ne' and 'neh' (mother) (Geary 1988, 81), was the mother of Njoya → [Bio, 417](#) of Bamum. She is known as the defender of her son's claim to the throne, who after the death of her husband, King Nsa'ngu (1863-1889), transitionally ascended the throne herself and eliminated numerous rivals for the crown. However, her political influence, which actually went far beyond this role, also caused irritation on the part of colonial protagonists (Geary 1988, 16, 81; Wild 2002, 109). In the mythically transfigured image of the Bamum Kingdom (Geary 1987, 299-315), Njapndunke was stylised as a conservative antagonist of German modernisation efforts (Wild 2002, 109).

The sources, however, paint a far more differentiated picture of a self-confident and self-determined personality: "If she wants something, one cannot discourage her" (Geary 1988, 83). Njapndunke, whose name is read in the Bamum language as "njap = set", "ndun = over", "nke = water" (Geary/Njoya 1985, 94), honoured the Bamum traditions and at the same time repeatedly defied them. Be it as a transitional regent in her own right, who had personal domains of rule, estates and thousands of subordinates, with regard to her religious status or the fact that she also did not shy away from going to war with and having rivals killed (Njoya 1952, 75, cited in Geary/Njoya 1985, 90).

In the history of the Bamum written by her son, there is the following characterisation of Njapndunke: "In war, ne Nzapndunke scolded like a man. She spoke so loudly that a man listening to her forgot himself and felt like a woman in front of a man. She was big-hearted and generous. She liked to talk to little ones and big ones. She laughed a lot. She never stayed in her house. From morning till night she talked to people [...] Nzapndunke had many clothes and other things. She liked all kinds of parties and never spent a day without giving presents. Everyone, even strangers, praised her more than the king. She had five times the number of persons as the king; her benefactions were numerous." (Njoya 1952, 77 quoted in Geary/Njoya 1985, 90f.).

Numerous royal objects of Njapndunke and her son reached Germany (Oberhofer 2009 and 2010). Among the former 929 Bamum objects that existed in the Ethnological Museum in Berlin before the Second World War according to the main catalogue - today only 572 pieces remain, 40% are considered missing - at least one object is explicitly associated with Njoya's mother: a handbag made of woven bast, which Njapndunke gave to Hans Glauning [\[p.415\]](#) → [Bio, 386](#) according to museum documentation and was sold to the museum in 1910 as part of Glauning's estate (inv. no. III C 23748) (Oberhofer 2009). The research expedition of Franz (1875-1945) and Marie-Pauline Thorbecke → [Bio, 429](#) (1882-1971) from 1911 to 1913 also brought objects of Njapndunke to the Reiss-Engelhorn Museums in Mannheim. However, Martin Schultz was still able to state in 2014 that the "process of inventorying" had "not been fully completed" to date. Among the "1341 numbers recorded in the handover list (some of which consist of several individual objects, others of related components of one object)" were "about 400 numbers" from Bamum (Schultz 2014, 14). Further information about the collection had not been published, and even the records transmitted in the context of this project do not contain all the existing information of the cited transitional inventory (DB extract REM Mannheim, 8.12.2021). Similarly, as already stated by Schultz, "existing information [...] was only taken over in

parts [...] into the municipal inventory books. A drinking horn from the possession of Njoya's mother, partly studded with bronze sheet and decorated with spider web patterns, was listed in the inventory of the collection as "Drinking horn of buffalo horn, from the possession of 'Na'. Bamum, old, with bronze rim", which is only abbreviated in the inventory book as "drinking horn with bronze Bamum" (Schultz 2021, 14f.).

Schultz (2021, 11) was able to identify eleven numbers that were originally marked with the indication of origin "Na", including a "chair" (IV Af 4834), two "tobacco pipe[s]" (IV Af 5075, IV Af 5524), a "wooden chair" (Af 6260), two "calabash bottles" (IV Af 6269, IV Af 6270) as well as four "calabash bottle stoppers" (IV Af 6531, IV Af 7503-05) and a "drinking horn" (IV Af 7397). However, according to the available record, only eight of these are currently listed in the collection holdings (DB extract REM Mannheim, 8.12.2021), at best because the process of inventorying them has still not been completed. The holdings of the Museum der Kulturen Basel also include a "cap" (inv. no. III 26292) by Njapndunke, which arrived there in 1907 via the missionary Martin Göhring (1871-1959) (Bosza 2019, 46).

- Image commentary: This impressive photograph shows Njapndunke in the last decade of her life. As in other photographs, the queen mother sits broad-legged and facing the camera, her hands clenched into fists (the left as if holding a sceptre). Well-laced European-style leather shoes and tight trousers protrude from under her loose dress; she wears a cap and shows no hair. She does not smile. The bamboo-framed door and the high threshold in the background are part of the royal architecture in Foumban. In renouncing the usual attributes of women in a royal context, Njapndunke shows herself entirely as a ruler who knows about her power and obviously also about that of images. The portrait was painted around 1908/09 when the [p.416] Berlin museum curator Bernhard Ankermann was in Foumban for collecting and research purposes. It forms a series with other portraits of Njapndunke published by Christraud Geary in the mid-1980s. The apparent difficulty for European viewers in classifying Njoya's mother as a man or a woman has led to misnomers in some places; for example, the unrecognised queen is referred to as "head" in the Grassi Museum in Leipzig (SKD, PhMAf 2084). Once such errors have been corrected, it will certainly be possible to identify more portraits of the strong woman in photographic museum collections in the future. (Bénédicte Savoy)

Objects in museums associated with Njapndunke

13 Total identified

11 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums

1 Basel, Museum of Cultures

1 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

[p.417] NJOYA (NZUEYA), Ibrahim Mboumbouo

*about 1876

†1933, Yaoundé

Position: Fon, Sultan

Other activities: Cartographer, inventor, reformer

Place of activity: Foumban in western Cameroon

1888: Njoya's father, Fon Nsa'ngu, is killed in a war campaign against the Nso, who retain his head.

ca. 1888-1892: Young Njoya's mother, Njapndunke, takes over the regency.

ca. 1892-1896: War of succession. Njoya becomes Fon with the support of the neighbouring Muslim ruling house of Banyo. In gratitude, he accepts the authority of the Sokoto Caliphate and converts to Islam

1906: Njoya supports the German colonial troops in the war against the Nso.

1913: Bamum becomes an independent "Residentur" administratively

1915: Bamum conquered by British troops

1916: France takes control of German Cameroon, Njoya is deposed, but continues to reside in the capital Foumban.

1931: Exile in Yaoundé

Critical biographical note

(Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

Sultan Ibrahim Njoya of Bamum is one of the best-known Cameroonian personalities of the German colonial period, who was known far into the German public sphere (Geary 1987, 299-315).

Njoya's rule began in the 1890s after several years of civil war over his father's succession to the throne, when German colonial rule had already begun with the military occupation of neighbouring populations, but the Bamum were considered "undiscovered" (Hutter 1907, 1f.). Since Njoya had become heir to the throne while still a child, his mother Njapndunke → [Bio, 414](#) advised him throughout his life in government affairs (Geary 1985, 14).

When the first representatives of German colonial rule reached the capital of the Sultanate of Foumban (Fumban) in July 1902, Njoya sought to secure his rule by expressing, as the German expedition leader Hans Ramsay (1862-1938) recorded, 'his willing submission to German rule' (Ramsay 1902, 43). He received a so-called letter of protection, the Chefferie was administratively subordinated to the Bamenda military administration station and the German flag was hoisted over Foumban. From then on, Njoya was a vassal of the emperor and had given up his sovereignty as an independent ruler, but could thus continue to act largely autonomously as head of the Bamum (Altena 2003, 344). In 1906, he supported the German military in the war against the Nso. Since, according to indigenous law, Njoya only gained his full sovereignty as ruler through possession of his father's head, the Germans made the return of the skull part of the peace terms with the Nso at his request.

Njoya also used the confrontation with colonial rule to reform parts of Bamum society. He introduced equipment for processing agricultural products and worked with the colonial administration and the mission to establish a school system in Bamum. His innovative spirit was considered outstanding, often going beyond the mere adaptation of new achievements and filling them "with new meaning in his mind" (Altena 2003, 350), including the Schümon or Bamum script (Schmitt 1963).

His "dazzling, ingenious and fascinating" (Heller 1985, 10) personality quickly made Njoya an icon in imperial Germany. Objects from Bamum, and especially those associated with Njoya himself, already developed into valuable "curiosity[s] of the first rank" in this epoch (Puttkamer 1904, 80).

[p.418] Striking in this respect is the hunt by German museum directors for insignia and prestigious objects from Njoya's royal house, such as the Mandu Yenu → [Pictorial Booklet XLVIII](#), his pearl-covered throne chair (Geary/Njoya 1985), handed over to the governor as a tribute on the occasion of the German emperor's birthday in 1908, or his large drum (Sprute 2018). Even though Njoya himself is not usually listed as the donor of the objects in the museum documentation, a number of objects can

be identified on the basis of the records submitted that probably originated from Njoya's possession. The largest collection with eleven numbers is in the Ethnological Museum Berlin, including a "stool" (III C 19141) two "hand drawings" (III C 22405, III C 22406), a "blow horn" (III C 25930), a "standard" (III C 25932), a "palm wine bottle" (III C 25933), Mandu Yenu (III C 33341 a,b → [Pictorial Booklet XLVIII](#)), a "sword" with "sword scabbard" (III C 33342 a,b → [Pictorial Booklet I](#)), a "king's bonnet" (III C 33343) and a "tobacco pipe stem" (III NIs 1880). In addition, four numbers are found in the Reiss-Engelhorn Museums Mannheim, including a "large tobacco pipe" (IV Af 4887) and three bells (IV Af 5001, 5003, 6257), as well as two letters in Schümon in the Linden Museum Stuttgart (Inv. Nos. F 54452 and F 54453). However, Njoya's cooperative attitude also corresponds beyond the domain of royal objects with a large number of Bamum objects in German collections.

- Image commentary: No sultan with a stern look, no king on the throne, no statesman in uniform - this photograph, probably taken in Foumban in 1915, shows Njoya as a private citizen, a 40-year-old grandfather with his newborn grandchild on his lap. The child's mother, Njoya's daughter Nji Mongu Ngutane, is not visible in the frame. Around 1900, photographs of men with newborns were rare, not only in the African context. All the more impressive is this picture, which - like many other photographs from Foumban - was taken during the German colonial period by the missionary Anna Wuhrmann → [Bio, 434](#). Today, they can be found as a compilation in the digital archive of the Basel Mission; in it, the photo shown here has the original title: "Njoya as a happy grandfather". (Bénédicte Savoy)

Objects associated with Njoya in museums

17 Total identified

11 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

4 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums

2 Stuttgart, Linden Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German colonial archive.
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.12-19>

[p.420] PAVEL, Kurt (von)

***19 May 1851, Tscheschen near Wołów in present-day Poland**

†17 January 1933, Berlin

Position: Military

Other activities: Commander of the so-called Protection Force for Cameroon

Places of deployment: Cameroon

1868-1900: Pavel promoted through several ranks from ensign to lieutenant-colonel.

1901-1903: Commander of the Schutztruppe for Cameroon

13-25.11.1901: campaign against the Bangwa with two companies of 150 men each

30.11.1901-29.12.1902: Campaign against the Bangwa, Bafut and Mankon

January to April 1902: March to Lake Chad and back to the coast with originally five officers, 150 soldiers and 600 porters. Numerous combat operations.

15.1.1902: Contact with Sehm II Fon of the Nso.

1903-1910: continuation of military career in Berlin, promotion to lieutenant general

1913: Elevation to the Prussian peerage

1914-1916: Service in the First World War on the Western Front

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

As commander of the so-called Schutztruppe for Cameroon, Kurt Pavel succeeded Captain Oltwig von Kamptz (1857-1921). A few months after his arrival in the colony in July 1901, he was to fight and subjugate the Bangwa, Bafut and Mankon. This was because the Bangwa were blamed for the death of Gustav Conrau (1865-1899), a contract collector, company agent and labour recruiter, while the Bafut and Bandeng or Mankon were, according to the colonial governorate, "in open outrage" (Puttkamer 1912, 241). In retrospect, the former governor Jesko von Puttkamer → [Bio, 422](#) (1855-1917) reported on the troops brought into position that they had formed the 'strongest force' he had ever 'been able to send into the interior' (ibid., 240).

Pavel's actions against the local populations in Cameroon were extremely brutal, as evidenced by his oft-quoted report from 1902, printed over several issues in the *Deutsches Kolonialblatt*: "Arriving outside Bafut at 12 noon [10. December 1901] and liaising with the 3rd Company, I developed for action, had the village shelled with the mountain gun and machine guns, and then stormed Bafut with the first two companies from the southwest, and with the 3rd Company from the west." (Pavel 1902, 92) His campaign cost the Bangwa 56 dead, the Bafut over a thousand and the Bandeng over 200, in addition to the destruction of farms and the burning of houses (BArch R1001/3350). He had hundreds of women, men and children taken hostage in order to use them as leverage in negotiations; he also demanded forced labourers and ivory for this purpose (Pavel 1902, 162f.). The fact that he took cultural goods and other loot on a large scale in the course of the military attacks and secured some of them for himself and accompanying officers instead of transferring them to the Berlin museums, as stipulated in the Federal Council resolution issued in 1889 and expanded several times since then, was known in military circles and even censured, for example by von Puttkamer on the occasion of Pavel's Lake Chad expedition (BArch R1001/3350; Puttkamer 1902; Rippe 2022, 117). The symbolic figure of the Nso, Ngonnso (EM Berlin, III C 15017 → [Bildheft III](#)), which had been reclaimed for decades and came to Berlin via Pavel in 1902 (Spletstößer 2019, 288f.), was presumably stolen by his adjutant Hans Houben (1871-1942) (BArch R 175-I/112). In June 1902, the latter attacked the Nso, looted the palace and burned it down while Pavel was in the Lake Chad region.

In the museum inventories, Pavel's name can ultimately only be verifiably linked to eleven cultural objects from Cameroon. It is possible [\[p.421\]](#) that some of the objects he captured remained in the family or were sold on the art market.

- Image commentary: This blurred reproduction of a black-and-white photograph of Pavel as a general appeared seven years after the end of the German colonial period in Africa, together with the medallion portraits of six other commanders of the so-called Schutztruppe for Cameroon, in one of the many colonial nostalgic publications from the time of the Weimar Republic. Below the portraits, in green Art Nouveau lettering, are the names of the officers and their period of service in Cameroon. The publisher was the Association of Officers of the Former Imperial Protection Force for Cameroon. The publication was dedicated to "the dead of the Schutztruppe", German military officers listed by name, as well as a blanket "1703 coloured soldiers and many war helpers and porters!" Pavel survived the publication of the book by seven years. (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

11 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.422] PUTTKAMER, Jesko (von)

***2 July 1855, Berlin**

†24 January 1917, Berlin-Charlottenburg

Position: Governor

Locations: USA, Cameroon, Togo, Nigeria

further activities: Law studies in Strasbourg, Leipzig, Freiburg i.Br., Breslau and Königsberg

1881: Trainee lawyer

1883: Assignment to the Imperial Consulate in Chicago

1884: Further training at the Foreign Office

May 1886: Chancellor in Cameroon

July 1887: Interim Commissioner for Togo

August 1888: Consul in Lagos

1889: Imperial Commissioner for Togo Commissioner for Togo

1895: Imperial Commissioner for Togo Commissioner of Cameroon

1907: Retired

1917: Suicide

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

In literary works or history books of independent Cameroon, Jesko von Puttkamer is sometimes portrayed as a conscientious civil servant who travelled the colony to solve the problems of the population and contribute to its sustainable "development" (Ikelle-Matiba 1963, 86; Owona 1996, 62). However, Jean Ikelle-Matiba's (1936-1984) and Adalbert Owona's downright euphoric descriptions overshadow the brutal conquest and exploitation of local societies for the benefit of the empire, which disenfranchised the "natives" and reduced them to mere labour material (Michels 2021, 391f.).

Von Puttkamer advocated the racist ideology of Herrenmenschentum. In his eyes, the supposedly inferior races had no other right to exist than to be in the service of the white masters. In view of the outbreak of the First World War, he claimed that it was "quite undoubted that through the equalisation [...] of the races the prestige of the European race, so necessary for the colonies, must be lost and that thereby the European colonial economy [...] suffers incurable damage" (Puttkamer 1915, 19).

The governor advocated a colonial policy whose foundation was the military force of the colonial troops (Puttkamer 1912, 68f.) in order to break the resistance of local rulers and to capture resources and not least cultural assets. In 1898, for example, he welcomed looted cattle brought to Douala by the then commander of the so-called Kaiserliche Schutztruppe, Captain Oltwig von Kamptz (1857-1921), as "a welcome enrichment of our meat supplies" (ibid., 102). He spoke with similar euphoria of 'a large buffalo shield captured at Ngilla' after Hans Dominik → [Bio, 380](#) (1870-1910) had fought Ngran Nyon → [Bio, 411](#) (†1899) in 1897 (ibid., 94). He also supplied museums himself with cultural objects, which he sometimes described as 'tribute', such as a large pipe and a beaded stool which he received from Sultan Ibrahim Njoya → [Bio, 417](#) (c. 1876-1933) from Foumban in 1903 and sent to the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin (III C 19141 Stool, Bamum; III C 20826 a, b Tobacco pipe, Bamum). In doing so, he did not only send cultural objects to the director of the Africa and Oceania departments Felix von Luschan (1854-1924) in return for payment. In 1906, Puttkamer supplied him with a skull from Cameroon and demanded a gift in return, whereupon Luschan sent him the skull of an executed man who had been publicly hanged in Vienna (Berlin Zentralarchiv, Briefwechsel Puttkamer u. Luschan 1906).

[In 1906 von Puttkamer left the colony. A petition addressed to the Reichstag, in which representatives of the Akwa complained about his arbitrary and violent official orders, made him politically unacceptable. A private scandal affair served as a pretext for his early retirement (Michels 2021, 390f.; Schneider 2007, 195-200).

- Image commentary: Wearing a parade uniform with pimple cap and plume of feathers, Puttkamer leans casually against a prop balustrade and gazes into the far distance of the photo studio with a lordly look. His hand rests on a rapier, medals and cords adorn his chest. With the flowing fall of white feathers on his head, with rapier, portépée and acorn between his legs, he represents an epitome of sexualised power in the Empire. If the Berlin publisher Georg Silke had not placed the officer's name and function directly below the illustration, one might have mistaken Puttkamer for Kaiser Wilhelm II, who circulated his likeness with the same attributes and poses in countless reproductions. As governor, Puttkamer not only represented the monarch in Cameroon, he was identical with him, an emperor of the colony. This photograph, published five years after his deposition, bears witness to that. (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

28 Total identified

24 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

3 Mainz, Johannes-Gutenberg University - Ethnographic Study Collection

1 Frankfurt a.M., Weltkulturen Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.424] RAUSCH, Emil

***8 October 1877, Giessen**

†6 September 1914, Nssanakang, Cross River Cameroon

Position: Military

Other activities: Station manager, administrator

Places of operation: Cameroon

1895-1902: Promotion from ensign to lieutenant, retirement from the army.

7.1.1902: employment with the so-called Schutztruppe for Cameroon

1902: Adjutant of the colonial garrison of Fontemdorf (today Fontem); station chief in Tinto

1905: Participation in the Manenguba expedition under Commander Müller

1905/06: Adjutant to Captain Christian von Krogh in the Mbo Expedition

1906: Promotion to First Lieutenant

1908-1914: Administrator of the Fontemdorf station transferred to Dschang

14.10.1909-15.2.1910: Head of the Nkam-Nun expedition

1912: Promotion to captain

1914: Death in battle against the British in the Cross River area

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

Emil Rausch was the head of Tinto Station, founded in 1892 and reopened in 1902, which was moved to Dschang in what is now the West Region of Cameroon from 1908. In Djutitsa, not far from Dschang, he had an agricultural school and a cattle station founded, which earned him a reputation in colonial circles as a development agent (Vollbehr 1912, 44f.; Michels 2004, 125f., 160f.). Beyond purely administrative functions, Rausch was responsible as station chief for the armed forces that were to permanently subdue the resisting population (Pavel 1902, 92). On the occasion of Kurt Pavel's punitive expedition → [Bio, 420](#) (1851-1933) against the Bangwa, Bafut and Mankon in 1901/02, for example, Rausch stationed a unit of just under 100 soldiers under the overall command of Hans Houben (1871-1942) in Fontemdorf (Langheld 1909, 327; Pavel 1902, 162).

Rausch took part in numerous war campaigns with serious consequences, such as the Mbo expedition in the course of which, apart from "heavy losses" of human life, almost 450 men were captured as hostages or forced labourers and sent to the coast (Anonymous 1906, 774), or the expedition against Babadju in 1904/05 (Anonymous: 1905, 557). The Nkam Nun expedition he led in 1909/10 was intended to "pacify" (Rausch 1910, 690) or "open up" the densely settled population there because of their "restless attitude". This meant nothing other than "cleansing" them of those who did not want to submit to the German colonisers by "brisk patrolling" and "roaming the country for weeks on end" (ibid., 692). This area of more than 2000 square kilometres was of particular interest to Rausch because it could supply workers for the Northern Railway or for European factories on the Mbo Plain (ibid., 693). The long, stage-rich route of the expedition - Dschang-Bamugu-Fotuni-Banka-Bangang-Manjewo/Mandjibo-Bare-Mamele-Bangwe-Belu-Mboebu/Mboebo-Kem/Kekem-Njun/Yong-Mbue/Mboué-Manjewo-Babontscha-Banka-Fonjanti-Mbang-Balu-Bana-Batscha/Batcha-Balambo-Nun-Fluss/Rivière Noun-Bangang-Fokam-Bangangte-Bana-Dschang - testifies to the relentlessness of the head of administration.

Despite Rausch's long stay in Cameroon, he only appears by name in the information on the provenance of an ivory blow horn from Fotabong I in the Berlin Ethnological Museum (Inv. III C 20218). However, he supported object takers on their trips to Cameroon, e.g. the ethnologist Bernhard Ankermann → [Bio, 370](#) (1859-1943) or the couple Franz (1875-1945) and Marie Pauline Thorbecke → [Bio, 429](#) (1882-1971) (Ankermann 1910, 292; Thorbecke 1914, 16f., 28). He gave the painter friend Ernst Vollbehr (1876-1960) valuable cultural objects, which presumably [\[p.425\]](#) also came from military expeditions (Vollbehr 1912, 112). In the summer of 1905, the native of Giessen wanted to send a dozen cultural objects from the grasslands to his native Hesse. In view of the Federal Council

Decree, passed in 1889 and extended several times since, which obliged colonial officials and officers to deliver their collections gathered in the colonies to the museums of the imperial capital, Rausch asked Felix von Luschan (1854-1924), director of the Africa and Oceania Department of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde, to approve the shipment to Darmstadt (Berlin SMB-ZA, Rausch 1905). Luschan reluctantly agreed: "Although I consider it highly deplorable when scientifically important collection pieces are taken away from the large Central Museum and remain hidden in a small collection unnoticed, I cannot ignore the reasons you have given and will therefore exceptionally agree to your collection being sent to Darmstadt" (Berlin Central Archive, Luschan 1905). Today, Rausch's consignment can be traced neither in the museum inventories in Berlin nor in Darmstadt. The whereabouts of the part of Emil Rausch's estate offered for sale in 2011 by the Munich auction house Hermann Historica, "approx. 490 individual photos mounted on cardboard from the German protectorates in Africa [...], 38 photo negatives. In addition, approx. 40 carbon copy notebooks with all the correspondence that Rausch conducted between 1905 and 1909 [...]. Notebook with recorded routes 1903 [...]. Large route map of the area between Okahandja and Epukiro" - a collection that is certainly informative for the history of Cameroon.

- Image commentary: The photograph was part of a bundle from Rausch's estate that was offered by the Hermann Historica auction house in Munich in 2011. It was shown alongside other photos and documents in the auction catalogue. Information about the persons depicted was missing. Presumably, one of the two seated men in uniform is Rausch. Both are to be found in a similar pose, i.e. sitting on chairs with a black man at their feet - a common constellation in colonial-era photographs - in at least one other picture in the bundle (Bénédicte Savoy).

Museums supplied with objects

1 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

[p.427] SIMEKO'O aka Angoula Angoula

*Year of birth unknown

†1904, Ka'a

Position: Head of Yesum/Esum

Other activities: Resistance fighter

Place of activity: Central Cameroon

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

The Yesum - or Esum - form a population group in the central region of Cameroon. They consist of the Yemendam, Yembias, Yezo'o and Yetsela and are mainly settled in the present-day area around Nkoteng and Nanga-Eboko north of Yaoundé. With the Yekaba, the Yebekolo and the Yebekanga, they form the largest population groups there (Pierre 1965). Lembe-Yezoum is considered the capital of the Yesum. Angoula Angoula, son of Abat Angoula/Angoula, was their most influential overlord. According to his 76-year-old grandson Fabien Mendjana, Simeko'o - also, Schimekoa, Simekoa, Semikore/Semicore or Sin-Meko Angoula - was his nickname (conversation in Obo, 23.8.2022). He sent four sons to reinforce his domain on the borders of his kingdom. Thus the eponymous Yesum localities of Nguinda, Zoua Yesum, Simbane and Obo were created (conversation with Onguene Jules, 22.8.2022).

Fearing the loss of his autonomy, Simeko'o rejected the attempt by the German colonial rulers to open trade routes from Yaoundé station through his territory further east and north to rulers of other populations (Hoffmann 2007, 114). Since then, military representatives such as the former head of the 1901 South Cameroon Frontier Expedition, Captain Philipp Engelhardt (1866-1951), regarded him as "unruly" (Engelhardt 1904, 6) or "insubordinate", as stated in diary notes by staff physician Paul Hösemann (1868-1922), who was a member of this expedition and of the campaign directed against Simeko'o in the same year (Berlin Zentralarchiv, Hösemann 1901).

In addition to his contacts with the Maka, Simeko'o maintained trade relations with Mebenga m'Ebono (c. 1875-1914), also called Martin Paul Zampa or Samba, a former sergeant of the Schutztruppe (Hoffmann 2007, 114f.), who came from the Yesum population group and had settled at Nanga-Eboko as an agent of the Randad & Stein trading firm (Dominik 1901, 258f.; Mbono Samba 1976). Under the pretext that Simeko'o was cruel and cannibalistic like the Maka kings, the colonial government sought help in the fight against him from his relative Zampa/Samba (Berlin Zentralarchiv, Hösemann 1901; Zimmermann 1909, 134f.). Under Captain Hans Adolf von Schimmelpfennig (1863- 1901), Lembe was burnt to the ground on 5 March 1901 and a military post was subsequently established with 30 soldiers "in order to force the recalcitrant ruler to obey now" (Engelhardt 1904, 6).

Despite the capture of Lembe, the situation remained tense for two more years due to Simeko'o's particular war tactics, during which the German companies fought the Yesum (Dominik 1908, 38f; Engelhardt 1904, 6). According to oral tradition, they wanted to eliminate the ruler without bloodshed [p.428] and therefore initially made him "chief". But when he then showed himself in Yaoundé, he was offered a poisoned bottle of wine as a travel supply, which led to his death in the village of Ka'a (Mbono Samba 1976; conversation with Mendjana, 23.8.2022). He was succeeded by his second son, Zumbu/Soumbou, who was devoted to the colonial administration (Hoffmann 2007, 115).

The example of the colonial violence directed against the Yesum under Simeko'o illustrates the problematic nature of museal knowledge orders, because no information can be found in the inventory about the circumstances under which twelve cultural objects reached the Berlin Ethnological Museum via Hösemann. In addition, the confusion of the place names Lembe and Limbé (then Victoria in the Southwest Region) (III C 13117; III C 13118, both identified as Xylophon, Esum, Cameroon, Lembe/Limbe) leads to erroneous attributions that do not result in the enrichment but, on the contrary, in the loss of knowledge.

- Image commentary: The retouched portrait is one of the large-format illustrations with which the magazine *Globus* endeavoured to "stimulate and keep alive the interest of the educated public in Germany in the study of countries and peoples" (Preface to the first issue, 1862, III). The article published in connection with Simeko'o's picture, however, suggests that it was created only after the sitter had surrendered to the German troops (Engelhardt 1904, 6). Behind the pretext of ethnological curiosity, colonial photography reproduces the powerlessness of the conquered. (Bénédicte Savoy)

Objects related to the Yesum in museums
12 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.429] THORBECKE, Marie Pauline, née Berthold

***12 August 1882, Aurich**

†5 February 1971, Freiburg an der Niederelbe

Position: Painter

Other activities: Photographer, expedition participant, ethnographer and cartographer

Places of work: Germany, Cameroon (Douala, Dschang, Foumban, Tikar, Joko and Tibati)

ca. 1900-1909: trained as a painter and photographer with the founder of the Worpswede painters' colony, Fritz Mackensen

1911-1912: Research trip to Cameroon with her husband Franz Thorbecke

Critical biographical note

(Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

Marie Pauline Thorbecke accompanied her husband Franz Thorbecke (1875-1945) as the only woman in the team on his research trip to Cameroon. She is one of the few European women who demonstrably participated in the acquisition of collection items, even if this is often not appropriately acknowledged in the collection documentation.

Regardless of the patriarchal gender order that prevailed around 1900, Thorbecke took on a key role during her husband's expedition in the organisation of research and travel as well as in the context of procuring illustrative material for museums and collections. She not only acted as the expedition's official photographer, but also provided all the other pictorial evidence, drawings, watercolours and even some of the cartographic sketches for the research publications that were later published (Engelhard/Wolf 1991, 12). During the journey, she had to perform managerial functions several times due to the illness of the other fellow travellers (Kraus 1971, 305f.), but depending on the situation, she ultimately "also took over all other activities that arose" (Bechhaus-Gerst 2009, 51).

In the process, Thorbecke participated intensively in the negotiations for the procurement of "ethnological artefacts" (ibid.) and also conducted "ethnological surveys" on her own, as she writes in an article from 1935: "On the march or in hours of rest in the camp, when my husband was recording and drawing the map of the country, I had the natives, who had become familiar with me, tell me their fairy tales, I learned their number words and recorded speech samples of the languages and dialects that changed so frequently, I also asked carefully about legal views, religious ideas and customs" (quoted in Schultz 2014, 7).

The scientific yield of the research trip, which led over 2500 kilometres through the highlands of Central Cameroon, was considerable (Engelhard/Wolf 1991, 12) and, according to Franz Thorbecke, in addition to "data on climate, topography, vegetation, fauna and economic conditions", contained "1300 rocks and soil samples, 800 botanical numbers, including a collection of woods, 300 zoological numbers, 6 human skulls, 2 of them with whole skeletons, and skeletal parts, 50 phonograms of music and speech samples, 1300 ethnographies, 800 photographs, all developed en route, 80-90 watercolours, [p.430] oil paintings and colour sketches, and many pencil drawings" (quoted in Schultz 2014, 7.).

Thorbecke ultimately worked as an unpaid assistant for her husband for 30 years, but rarely made a public appearance herself (Bechhaus-Gerst 2009, 53).

- Image commentary: In images like this, which in contrast to portraits of officers or explicit scenes of violence seem less explosive, we nevertheless encounter a number of motifs, attributes and modes of representation that exoticise, stage colonial clichés, construct foreignness and reflect colonial power relations. What is depicted here are colonial racist hierarchies: While Thorbecke sits on a tamed and fenced Lakka, a Cameroonian pony, her Black companion stands barefoot beside it, holding the reins. The author of the book in which this photo was published was not interested in his name. From Thorbecke's diary, however, we know the names of three Black "Boys", Djimbe, Isono and Drytime. Is he one of them? What also remains invisible is that in the so-called Thorbecke expedition, Black

soldiers and porters had to walk hundreds of kilometres while the white woman, her husband Franz Thorbecke and Leo Waibel, another white companion, rode on horses. (Yann LeGall/Mareike Vennen)

Museums supplied with objects

1026 Total identified

757 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums

152 Leipzig, Grassi Museum

116 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

1 Frankfurt a.M., Weltkulturen Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.432] UMLAUFF, Johann Friedrich Gustav

*1833

†1889

Occupation: Trader

Places of work: Cameroon, Germany

1869: Foundation of the company J.F.G. Umlauff in Hamburg for trading in naturalia and ethnographica.

1889: Takeover of the company by the sons Johannes and Heinrich Umlauff

1974: Dissolution of the company

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

From the middle of the 19th century, Johann Friedrich Gustav Umlauff began to trade in so-called curiosities at Spielbudenplatz in Hamburg, which he received rather by chance from incoming ships. Previously, he himself had worked on ships of the trading house Joh. Ces. Godeffroy & Sohn, which specialised in trade and plantation construction in the Pacific and Oceania. Umlauff's company, founded in 1869, profited from his contacts and experience and developed into a large company for ethnographica, naturalia and anthropologica. According to the advertisement for the "Ethnological Institute and Museum", beyond individual ethnographic objects or collections, "model figures and groups, racial skulls, mummies and skeletons" were part of the repertoire of the house, which also took over the arrangement of exhibitions (Hücking/Launer 2000, 95). Umlauff's marriage to Caroline Hagenbeck, the sister of the animal trader and later initiator of ethnological shows in Germany, Carl Hagenbeck (1844-1913) (ibid., 94), also brought the two men closer together in business terms (Thode-Arora 1989).

In addition to ship captains and sailors, military men such as Hans Dominik → [Bio, 380](#) (1870-1910), Jasper Martin Otto von Oertzen (1880-1948), Richard Hans Otto Schröder (1875-1906), among others, supplied the company. In addition, their agents seized and abducted cultural goods in ritual healing sites in the Cameroon grasslands, such as in Bangu, and bribed guards in Foumban (Berlin Zentralarchiv, Umlauff 1914, o.p.). In order to increase the appeal of its offer, the house specifically emphasised in a "Kurze[n] Erklärung zu den Katalogen [...] der Kamerun Sammlung" (Short statement on the catalogues [...] of the Cameroon collection) of May 1914 how "difficult and immensely costly" it was to procure and transport "large pieces such as the hut poles, ancestor figures, drums, etc." (ibid.). In this context, the explanations provide an emphatic picture of the local population's resistance to the unlawful, forced deprivation of their cultural goods and thus of their agency in matters of preservation. Umlauff's clientele included scholars such as Leo Frobenius (1873-1938) or institutions such as the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin (Ivanov 2000, 24; Berlin Zentralarchiv, Umlauff 1898) and the Deutsches Museum in Munich, which in 1907 acquired, among other things, a canoe model of the Duala from Umlauff that was over two metres long and made for export (Wörrle 2020). In total, almost 700 cultural objects and human skulls from Cameroon in the inventories of German museums can be traced back to transactions with the Umlauff company, the circumstances of which are anything but clear.

[p.433] - Image commentary: Six men, three skeletons, four monkeys, some birds and the halved head of an elephant share the space of the Umlauff workshop on the Reeperbahn in Hamburg, which is crammed with stools, tables and pedestals. The photo, staged as a snapshot, shows the men at work: transforming animals into objects. The abbreviations of Johannes Umlauff (left) and his brother Heinrich (centre) written in ink directly on the photo are by an unknown hand. The picture was kept by the Hamburg painter and graphic artist Gisela Bührmann, a great-granddaughter of J.F.G. Umlauff, who gave it, together with other photographs, newspaper clippings and documents, to a former client of Umlauff in 1999: the Museum am Rothenbaum in Hamburg (MARKK). (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

694 Total identified

242 Leipzig, Grassi Museum

243 Bremen, Übersee Museum

100 Hamburg, Museum am Rothenbaum

39 Dresden, State Museum of Ethnology

13 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

11 Frankfurt a.M., World Cultures Museum

10 Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Cultures of the World

8 Stuttgart, Linden-Museum: State Museum of Ethnology

7 Munich, Museum Five Continents

7 Lübeck, Ethnological Collection

6 Herrnhut, Ethnological Museum

3 Göttingen, Ethnological Collection of the Georg-August University

2 Marburg, Religious Studies Collection of the Philipps University

1 Coburg, Natural History Museum

1 Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums

1 Munich, Deutsches Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.434] WUHRMANN, Anna (from 1923: Rein-Wuhrmann)

*28 November 1881, Marseille

†20 April 1971, Basel

Position: Missionary

Other activities: Teacher, photographer

Places of work: Cameroon

Until 1902: Training as a teacher

1902-1905: Work in social institutions (orphanage, so-called deaf-mute institution)

1905-1910: Work as a teacher in the Lyceum Club Basel

1910: Joins the Basel Mission

1911: Early completion of missionary training and ordination

1911-1914: Missionary service at the mission station Foumban (Fumban) in Cameroon

1914: Short-term British prisoner of war and expulsion to Switzerland

1920-1922: Missionary service for the Paris Société des Missions Evangéliques in Cameroon

1923: Marriage to school counsellor Dr. B. Rein

1943: Death of husband and return to Switzerland

Critical biographical note

(Sebastian-Manès Sprute)

When Anna Wuhrmann was sent as a missionary to the colony of Cameroon in 1911, she was one of the few European women who were actively involved in the colonial project. This had previously been a male affair on the European side, to which women were only granted access after a minimum of colonial state order and European life culture could be established (Knibiehler/Goutalier 1985, 17). Thus, the military doctor Hans Ziemann → [Bio, 439](#) (1865-1939), who was also active in Cameroon, had still doubted in 1907 that German women could live in the colonies (Wildenthal 2003, 209). Nevertheless, according to the annual report, some 97 women over the age of 15 were already counted in the local European colonial society, including 67 married women, 36 of them with missionaries (Kolonialzentralverwaltung 1907, 9). In contrast to these so-called "mission brides", Wuhrmann was one of the few single "mission workers" in the colony (cf. Bozsa o.J., 1).

In accordance with contemporary gender logic, it was incumbent on women to emotionally win over the colonised natives, especially their female gender counterparts, and to exert a general positive moral influence on the colonial situation (Ha 2009, xxiii). In the missionary context, this also involved conquering the souls of the colonised, as well as the fact that the missionary was primarily responsible for establishing contact with the native women (Wuhrmann 1925, 5). During Wuhrmann's period of activity, the Basel mission was primarily concerned with the fight against polygamy, whereby the missionaries were to impart an awareness of sin to the women (Bozsa o.J., 1).

At the mission station Foumban (Fumban), Wuhrmann developed a close relationship with the Bamum royal house and the local population. She produced numerous publications about her four years on site. She also left behind documentary photographs that not only bear witness to the missionary work, but also allow unique insights into parts of contemporary Bamum society (see Njoya → [Bio, 417](#)).

While Wuhrmann did not succeed in completely escaping the colonial gaze regime, her photographs resulted in a comparatively undisguised and dignified portrait of Foumban and its inhabitants: "Through her choice of perspective (somewhat from below), she developed a distinctive style that is unusual **[p.435] for the** colonial perception in photography at the time: the subjects appear graceful, proud and with strong personal expression." (ibid., 2)

Among the few objects in the collection that came to the Museum der Kulturen Basel through Wuhrmann are two palm wine vessels decorated with glass beads, which are royal prestige objects and, according to her own account, had been given to her by the Bamum royal house as a sign of friendship (ibid., 3).

- Image commentary: The missionary teacher Anna Wuhrmann sits at a desk as an independent-looking young woman and allows herself to be photographed from outside through the open window. She writes with concentration, paper documents on the shelf indicate intellectual work. The ambience is that of a bourgeois interior around 1900 in Europe: from a photo frame on the left of the table, her parents are probably looking at the writer, other framed pictures adorn the wall, and in the background, a potted plant and oil lamp provide a cosy atmosphere. If the Foumban expert Christraud Geary had not published this photo in 1988 with the remark that it showed Wuhrmann "at her desk in the Fumban mission station" and if the information from the Basel mission archives did not confirm this, one would never have suspected this room to be in the heart of the kingdom of Bamum. The Europeans not only came to Africa with their languages, religions, weapons and styles of dress, they apparently also brought entire home furnishings with them. (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

7 Total identified

7 Basel, Museum der Kulturen

(These seven inventory numbers conceal the individual parts of actually only three objects: a plate and two bottle containers).

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.437] ZENKER, Georg August

*11 June 1855, Leipzig

†6 February 1922, Bipindi, Cameroon

Position: Botanist, zoologist

other activities: Station manager, plantation owner

Place of work: Cameroon

1875-1878: Military service in Chemnitz

ca. 1879-1886: Gardener and inspector of the botanical garden in Naples

1886/87: accompanies the explorer Giacomo Bove in the Congo

1887-1889: Worked for the C. Woermann company in Gabon, then for the Hamburg plantation company Reiche Jr.

1889: Arrival at Yaoundé Station (today Yaoundé), replacement of Karl Hörhold as Station Chief

1889-1894: Head of Yaoundé Station

1894/95: "Exploratory trip" with Hans Dominik at Ngilla on the Sanaga shore, handover of station management to Dominik

1895/96: Settlement at Bipindi as cocoa, coffee and rubber planter

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

The gardener and botanist Georg August Zenker, one of the best-known German colonists, lived in Cameroon beyond the end of official colonial rule. From 1889 to 1895, he headed the German station in Yaoundé (Dominik 1911, 64), from where he penetrated areas barely controlled by the Germans in order to promote the cultivation of rubber and coffee as well as the trade in ivory and thus ultimately the exploitation of natural resources (Anonymous 1894, 189). At the end of 1895, he retreated to Bipindi on the Lokundje River with his locally established family and planted cocoa, coffee, rubber and bananas. After leaving the colonial service, he continued to work with the colonial apparatus locally and in the metropolis.

Zenker was a major stakeholder in the colonial extraction of natural and cultural assets, which he sent to a wide variety of institutions in Germany (Kaiser 2018, 16). About 450 inventory numbers are listed under his name in the Ethnological Museum in Berlin, including human skulls, and more than 170 numbers in the Grassi Museum für Völkerkunde in Leipzig. He sent almost 1900 natural history objects to the Museum für Naturkunde Berlin. According to a report by the governor Jesko von Puttkamer (1855-1917) in 1897, Zenker's house in Bipindi near Kribi, which still exists, looked like a "perfect museum", "full of ethnographic curiosities, photographs, oil and watercolour sketches, herbaria, animal skins and skulls, weapons, fetishes, bird skins, etc." (Puttkamer 1912, 77).

Entries in his directories or in the entry book of the Berlin Ethnological Museum indicate the unlawful confiscation of parts of his natural history and ethnological "collections", for example when they speak of "loot from battlefields" - meaning the Wute-Adamaua campaign of 1899 - or of a "skull. Voghe Belinghe [Mvog-Belingha, T.F.], fallen in action March 1893" (BArch Zenker 1894). In addition, his letters and drawings attest to the tragic fate of the porters, who "must be captured" (Berlin Zentralarchiv, Zenker 1901) or, having died en route, still became a motif for Zenker in a landscape sketch as a decomposing corpse. (→ Fig. 3, p. 101).

However, Zenker was not successful in his business. He received loans from the custodian Felix von Luschan (1854-1924) in Berlin for his personal needs or to pay his debts, for example to the forwarding company W. Homann & Co. in Hamburg (Berlin Zentralarchiv, Zenker 1899). He justified this credit system by saying that in the southern part of the so-called protectorate it was difficult "to obtain anything, since the Baquca (Bakjielle), Mabea, Bakuko, Ngumba and Bouley were on the lowest cultural level" (Berlin Zentralarchiv, Zenker 1899). In view of his disorderly finances, the conclusion is

obvious that the workers on his plantations were poorly paid or toiled under duress, as was usual anyway on plantations run by colonists.

- Image commentary: The heavily retouched portrait photograph appeared three years after Zenker's death in the travelogue of a former lieutenant of the so-called Schutztruppe, Hans von Chamier-Glisczinski. It shows a bearded man in a white shirt and trousers, looking sharply into the camera from under the peak of his cap. In the background, a fence and palm tree indicate his status as a plantation owner. He sits casually leaning back, and even his fine hands do not give the impression of hard work. Chamier-Glisczinski wrote about Zenker's death a few years after the First World War: "With him, our oldest colonial pioneer closed his eyes". (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

621 Total identified

447 Berlin, Ethnological Museum

174 Leipzig, Grassi Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.439] ZIEMANN, Hans

***5 July 1865, Berlin**

†3 December 1939, Berlin

Position: Senior medical officer

Other activities: Tropical physician, head of the medical administration in the colony of Cameroon

Places of deployment: Cameroon, Italy, Germany

22.10.1885-15.2.1890: studies medicine at the Kaiser Wilhelms Academy in Berlin

29.1.1890: junior doctor in the infantry regiment Herzog Friedrich Wilhelm von Braunschweig

1.4.1890: transfer to the medical officer corps of the navy

1891-1897: promotion from assistant naval surgeon to naval staff physician

1897-1899: Institute of Hygiene in Berlin

1899: Transfer to Cameroon

1.4.1904: Naval Surgeon Major

1.8.1908: Chief Surgeon of the Imperial Protection Force for Cameroon

20.12.1912: **resignation** with permission to wear the former uniform

1923: Associate Professor of Tropical Pathology and Haematology, Friedrich Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin, co-founder of the Institute for Tropical Medicine there.

Critical biographical note

(Richard Tsogang Fossi)

"I have already reported to the Imperial Government in several reports since 1900 that in the interest of a quick and relatively radical rehabilitation of Douala, the natives must be moved from the vicinity of the Europeans by 1 km according to the flight distance of the malaria mosquitoes that mostly live in native huts" (Ziemann 1910, 3306). With these words, Hans Ziemann introduced an expert report that was presented to the Reichstag in May 1910. According to plans of the colonial government in Douala, represented by the district official Hermann Röhm, the coastal town was to become a central trading and transport hub on the coast of West Africa. To this end, thousands of Duala families were to be evicted from their land on the riverbank of the Joss Plateau without compensation, or at best for little compensation - in favour of about 400 Europeans (Eckert 1991, 165-167). Ziemann's medical report, which recommended segregation of the black and white population, legitimised the land grab. The chief medical officer stated that 72% of the black inhabitants were infected with malaria and that a spatial separation from the white colonists was unavoidable. The colonial economic interests were justified by supposedly sanitary arguments, which were in fact an expression of the widespread racial hygiene ideology of the time. Ziemann's case shows that medicine, specifically the fight against malaria, not only served colonial policy, but was also instrumentalised to further one's own career, in this case in competition with Robert Koch (1843-1910) for the best prophylaxis (Eckart 1988, 368-378; Eckart 1997, 223). While the blacks were classified as carriers of disease, the white colonisers saw themselves as carriers of culture and yet violated all the agreements they themselves had laid down in the German-Duala treaties barely 30 years earlier (Essiben 2005, 15-23).

During his tenure in Cameroon, Ziemann deprived cultural goods and even hairstyles of living people → [chapter Tsogang Fossi, 173 et seq.](#) At the instigation of Karl von Linden (1838-1910), who disapproved of the Berlin museums' prerogative to send ethnographica and naturalia from the colonies, which had existed since 1889 through a resolution of the Bundesrat that had been extended several times, Ziemann donated his Cameroonian "collection" to the King of Baden-Württemberg (Archiv Linden-Museum, Ziemann). Meanwhile, the imperial capital benefited from a bundle of more than 248 so-called zoologica that Ziemann left to the Museum für Naturkunde (Anonymous 1904, 357).

[p.440] - Image commentary: The portrait belongs to the holdings of the Wellcome Collection in London. Ziemann dedicated it "in friendly memory" to Lieutenant Colonel Sydney Price James (1870-1946). It is uncertain when and where the tropical doctors met. Both are representatives of a

generation of well-connected natural scientists who perfected their research - here: the fight against malaria - in the colonies and on battlefields, the Briton mainly in India and during the Boxer Rebellion in China, the German in Cameroon. For many scientists, the First World War marked the end of European cooperation, but Ziemann and James apparently continued to stay in touch. Ziemann sent the photo to James around 1920, the same year the Briton quoted his Berlin colleague in his much-received publication *Malaria at Home and Abroad*. (Bénédicte Savoy)

Museums supplied with objects

28 Total identified

26 Stuttgart, Linden-Museum: State Museum of Ethnology

1 Mainz, Ethnographic Study Collection of the Johannes Gutenberg University

1 Frankfurt a.M., Weltkulturen Museum

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.441] [Picture booklet]

Selection of objects from Cameroon in German public museums

Coordination: Dieu Ly Hoang

Provenance research: Sebastian-Manès Sprute

Selection:

Bénédicte Savoy
Richard Tsogang Fossi
Yrine Matchinda
Mikaél Assilkinga
Albert Gouaffo

Concept and artistic realisation: Mirjam Kroker & Dorothee Billard

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[S.I]

Size 25 cm

Provenance: This sword was given by Sultan Njoya of Bamum → [Bio, 417](#) to the governor Theodor Seitz in 1908 as a tribute to the German Emperor (cf. Anonymous 1908: 140). It has been part of the holdings of the Ethnological Museum Berlin since 1908.

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], sword with scabbard, 1908, iron, vegetable fibre, wood, glass, textile, cotton, brass, approx. 69 × 11 × 6 cm (sword), approx. 64 × 45 × 11 cm (belt laid out circularly and scabbard in the middle), 2.7 kg, [no concrete indication of location], grassland, Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 33342 a, b.

[P.II]

Size ?

Provenance: This pearl bonnet of a Dzem ruler was claimed by the officer Hermann Bertram as war booty in the course of the Southern Expedition/Ebolobingon (29.7.1905-26.9.1905). The bonnet was transferred to the Linden Museum in Stuttgart by Bertram in 1908 in a bundle of a total of 237 pieces of booty that he had acquired "with much effort during 2 ½ years of warlike activity" (Bertram 1908 cited in Grimme 2018: 38).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], beaded bonnet of Chief Mabilia, [no dating], glass (bead), [no measurements], [no weight indication], Mabilia's village, [no indication of a region], [no indication of a country]. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 056017.

[P.III]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: Ngonnso, the Nso mother deity, came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin as war booty obtained by the officer Hans Houben as a result of the expedition against Nso (3.6.1902-17.6.1902), through his superior officer Kurt von Pavel → [Bio, 420](#) 1903 (cf. Splettstößer 2019: 283-288, Houben 1902: 34f. → [chapter Cornelius Refem, 331 ff.](#)).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], Ngonnso', human sculpture; Kava' (throne); Ngiv' melu' (palm wine ladle), 19th century, wood, lime, cowrie shell, tin foil, brass, glass beads, 92 × 36.5 × 41 cm, 11.2 kg, [no specific location given], grassland, Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 15017.

[P.IV]

Size 100 cm

Provenance: This drum from Bansa came to the Ethnological Museum in Berlin as war booty. → [Bio, 386](#) in the course of an undocumented military operation in December 1905, came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1906. (Cf. Glauning 1905: 66, 1906: 72, → [chapter Sprute, 95 ff.](#))

Object description: [No indication of an originator], slit drum, 2nd half of the 19th century, wood, 357 × 68 × 63 cm, approx. 195 kg, Banssa, [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 21107.

[S.V]

Size ?

Provenance: This beaded chair from Bagam came to the Linden Museum Stuttgart in 1908 through the officer Hans Putlitz. The appropriation of the chair is in the context of Putlitz's participation in the patrol against Babadjou (September-November 1904), the so-called punitive expedition against Kom (4.12.1904-11.1.1905) and the punitive campaign against Bameta (14.6.1905-27.7.1905 cf. Ebermaier 1904: 66-79; Knobloch 1904: 180-183).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], beaded chair, [no dating], wood, textile, glass (bead), [no measurements], [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 057678.

[P.VI]

Size?

Provenance: This dagger with Nso scabbard came to the Linden Museum in Stuttgart in 1903 as war booty collected by the officer Hans Houben in the course of the expedition against the Nso (03.6.1902-17.6.1902). Under Houben's account, "thefts, maltreatment, rape of women, etc. were the order of the day. [...] were the order of the day" and led in a short time to the depopulation of "entire villages" (Jäger 1904: 173, → [Chapter Cornilius Refem, 331 ff.](#))

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], dagger (a) in scabbard (b) with bead trimming, [no dating], wood, glass (bead), iron, leather, [no measurements], [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 033494.

[P.VII]

Size?

Provenance: This Banyang feather cap came to the Städtisches Museum Braunschweig in 1902 through the officer Kurt Strümpell. Its appropriation is related to the so-called punitive expedition led by Strümpell against the Bangwa (13.9.1900 - Dec. 1900), which pursued the goal of collecting "war indemnity[s]" (Puttkamer 1900: 134).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], feather cap, before 1902, wood, fur, feathers, raffia, [no indication of dimensions], [no indication of weight], [no specific location], Southwest region, Cameroon. Brunswick, Brunswick Municipal Museum, inv. no. 1709-0235-00.

[P.VIII]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This mask, which according to the inventory comes from Bafusam (today Bafoussam), comes from the "Dsungle" or Ndsungle (1913: 120) according to officer Karl Adametz, and arrived at the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1913 together with, among others, "8 human skulls" (ibid.: 123). Adametz, head of the Bamenda district from 1908 to 1913, remarked with regard to his activities there, "that collecting occasionally in a warlike action yields more complete and original results than purchasing." (Ibid. 1908: 80)

Object description: [No indication of an originator], elephant, mask, 19th/20th century (beginning), cotton, bast, glass beads, 100 × 55 × 5 cm (unpadded), 100 × 55 × 20 cm (padded), [no indication of weight], Bamenda, [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 29794.

[P.IX]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This mask from Bali came to the Lower Saxony State Museum in Hanover in 1915 through a brother of the officer Wilko von Frese. Even if Frese was involved in a so-called punitive expedition (cf. Hoffmann 2007, vol. 2: 96), in this case, due to the vassal status of the Bali, it is more likely to be an acquisition in which Frese profited from the asymmetrical power relations and the extortionate conditions of the colonial economy (see Hausen 1970: 181-198).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], dance bonnet, before 1910, cotton, glass, 98 cm, [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Hanover, Landesmuseum Hanover, inv. no. ET 7255.

[P.X]

Size 5 cm

Provenance: This Bangwa fly-whisk came to the Städtisches Museum Braunschweig in 1902 through the officer Kurt Strümpell. Strümpell's appropriation of the fly-wing is to be seen in the context of his leading participation in two so-called punitive expeditions against the Bangwa (13.9.1900- Dec. 1900 and 20.10.1901-30.11.1902, cf. Strümpell 1900: 136-149; Pavel 1901: 47-50).

Object description: [No indication of an originator or creator], flywhisk, before 1902, wood, hair (animal), length 27 cm, [no indication of weight], [no specific location], Southwest Cameroon, Cameroon. Brunswick, Brunswick Municipal Museum, inv. no. 1709-0177-00.

[P.XI]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This Bakundu sculpture came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1899 through the colonial official Leopoldt Conradt. Conradt, who worked as a station chief in Togo, is documented in 1892 and 1895 as a travelling entomologist in Lolodorf (Cameroon) (cf. Andratschke 2021: 124f.). The context of appropriation could not be further narrowed down so far.

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], male sculpture, 19th century, wood, 171 × 36 × 34 cm (storage measure), [no indication of weight], Bonge, [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 10026.

[P.XII]

Size?

Provenance: The chair of the Nso ruler came to the Linden Museum in Stuttgart in 1903 as war booty, which the officer Hans Houben had taken away in the course of the expedition against the Nso (3.6.1902-17.6.1902). Houben's actions were characterised by mistreatment, destruction and looting and resulted in a state of war in the region that lasted for years (cf. Michels 2004: 261-271, → [chapter Cornilius Refem, 331 ff.](#)).

Object description: [No indication of an author], chair of the chief of Banzo, [no dating], wood, tin (sheet metal), [no measurement n], [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 33564.

[P.XIII]

Size 100 cm

Provenance: The Queen Mother (Nafoyn) Naya of Kom and her companion came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1906 through the officer Hans Putlitz. Their acquisition falls within the context of the so-called punitive expedition led by Putlitz against Kom (4.12.1904-11.1.1905, cf. Knobloch 1904: 180-183). Putlitz encountered "the most serious resistance", which led to correspondingly heavy fighting and, on the Kom side, to at least "80" deaths (1904a: 186).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], male sculpture with stool [left], Queen Mother (nafoyn) Naya, female sculpture with stool [right], 19th century, wood, copper, textile, 194 × 48 × 50 cm [left sculpture], 183 × 42 × 54 cm [right sculpture], 39 kg [each sculpture], [no specific location given], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 20681 & III C 20682.

[P.XIV]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This stool from Baham came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1906 as war booty collected by the officer Hans [Glauning → Bio, 386](#) during the battles for Baham (14.6.1905-27.7.1905) (cf. Glauning 1905: 46).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], stool, 18th/19th century, wood, earth patina, 48.5 × 58 × 58 cm, 14.2 kg, Baham, [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 20341.

[P.XV]

Size?

Provenance: These posts from the bed of Sultan Omaru of Banyo were obtained by the officer Hans [Glauning → Bio, 386](#) in the course of the expedition to Lake Chad (26.3.1902-7.6.1902). The appropriation of the bed in the town of Banyo, described by Glauning as "deserted" (Glauning 1902: 2), refers to looting or the practice of so-called silent purchase, a type of theft in which a minor self-selected compensation is left behind.

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], figure, bedpost of the bed of Sultan Omaru [left], bedpost [right], [no dating], wood, [no measurements], [no indication of weight], Banyo [both], Bachum [right], [no indication of a region], [no indication of the country]. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 027041 & 027815.

[P.XVI]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This mother-and-child figure of the Bangwa was acquired by the merchant Gustav Conrau during his second stay in the Bangwa settlement area between February and September 1899, in the course of complex and list-rich barter transactions, and has been in the Ethnological Museum Berlin ever since (cf. Lintig 2016: 32f.).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], Mother with child, female sculpture, 19th century (middle), wood, setting, 81 × 22 × 20 cm, 4 kg, [no concrete indication of location], grassland, Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 10531.

[P.XVII]

Size 25 cm

Provenance: Three of these relief pieces came to the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde as a result of a research visit to Northwest Cameroon in 1909 by Bernhard Ankermann, assistant director of the Africa department → [Bio, 370](#). Ankermann 'found' and photographed (1910: 291f.) the rare relief in the floor of 'a hut of the chief's homestead' of the Nso in Kumbo (Krieger 1969: 41). His appropriation illustrates the approach suggested in his collecting instructions of ruthlessly "rummaging through the huts of the natives" (Ankermann 1914: 9).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], floor relief, [no date], clay (fired), 14 × 42 × 46 cm, [no indication of weight], Kumbo, grassland, Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 24830.

[P.XVIII]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This drum from Banssa came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1906 as war booty, which the officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#) had taken away in the course of an undocumented military enterprise in December 1905 (cf. Glauning 1905: 66, 1906: 72, → [chapter Sprute, 265 ff.](#)).

Object description: [No indication of an author], part of a slit drum, [no dating], wood (carved), approx. 100 × 310 × 120 cm (total, without buffalo head), approx. 95 × 215 × 120 cm (body), both body halves together 346.5 kg without head, with stainless steel connecting fittings, [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 21170.

[P.XIX]

Size?

Provenance: This robe, which according to the inventory belonged to Sultan Mohamed of Tibati, was acquired by the officer Hermann Nolte in the course of the so-called punitive expedition against Tibati (13.3.1899-25.8.1899, Wute-Adamaua campaign) as spoils of war. Or, as the Stuttgart museum director Linden noted in 1901 on the occasion of the volume of around 80 inventory entries sent to him by Nolte: "All objects without exception were always captured or acquired on the spot" (Linden 1901: 4, emphasis in the original, → [chapter LeGall, 113 ff.](#), fn. 23 and 26).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], robe, Mohammedan, formerly owned by Sultan Mohamed, [no dating], cotton, [no measurements], [no weight], Tibati, [no indication of a region], [no indication of a country]. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 015995.

[P.XX]

Size ?

Provenance: This throne stool from Bamum or Bali came to the Linden Museum Stuttgart in 1911 through the merchant Adolf Diehl → [Bio, 378](#). Although no specific context of appropriation has yet

been identified here, Diehl, who as a commissioned collector purchased the majority of the cultural objects he conveyed to German museums, profited from the asymmetrical power relations and extortionate conditions of the colonial economy (see Hausen 1970: 181-198).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], chair, [no dating], [no indication of material & technique], [no measurements], [no indication of weight], Bamum, [no indication of a region], [no indication of a country]. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 075775.

[P.XXI]

Size 100 cm

Provenance: this commemorative figure of a king from Bamenom (now Bama) was transferred to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1906 as war booty obtained by the officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#) in the context of looting during the so-called punitive campaign against Bama (14.6.1905-27.7.1905) (cf. Glauning 1905: 46).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], sculpture, 2nd half of the 19th century, wood, glass, cowrie shell, tin foil, textile, 195 × 50 × 45 cm, 48.8 kg, Bamenom, grassland, Northwest Region, Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 21040.

Size 100 cm

[P.XXII]

Provenance: This royal architectural element of the Bangwa came to the Museum Fünf Kontinente München in 1905 through the medical officer Theodor Berké. Its appropriation is in the context of Berké's participation in the expedition against Bangwa (15.11.1902-16.2.1902, cf. Langheld/Rausch 1902: 267f.).

Object description: Ateu Atsa, veranda post of a palace, 2nd half of the 19th century, wood, height 300 cm, [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Munich, Museum Fünf Kontinente, inv. no. 05-242.

[P.XXIII]

Size?

Provenance: This Vute war shirt came to the Linden Museum Stuttgart in 1901 through the officer Hans Dominik → [Bio, 380](#). However, the shirt described by Dominik as belonging to the ruler "Ngilla" of the Vute was attributed by Elias Aguigah to his "brother, Gimene", whom Dominik "shot in battle". Dominik reported this incident in connection with an identical appearing war shirt that he had previously offered in vain to the Ethnological Museum Berlin (Dominik 1898, 35).

Object description: [No indication of an author], war shirt sewn with leather amulets, [no dating], cotton, horn, leather, [no measurements], [no weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 017144.

[P.XXIV]

Size?

Provenance: This Ngbe attachment mask of the Ekoi came to the Linden Museum in Stuttgart in 1905 as war booty procured by the officer Wilhelm Müller → [Bio, 408](#) in the course of the so-called punishment of Manenguba (7.1.1905-26.4.1905). Müller reported that he had "tried in vain to induce the chiefs [...] to procure ethnographic objects" (Müller 1905, 3), but added that "there is no way around it without shooting" (ibid., 2). (ibid., 2).

Object description: [no indication of an author], Ngbe attachment mask, [no dating], wood, plant fibre, antelope skin, bone, textile, pewter, [no measurements], [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 045455.

[P.XXV]

Size?

Provenance: This instrument, described in the inventory as a "palavertrum" of the Nso from Kumbo, came to the Linden Museum Stuttgart in 1903 as war booty collected by the officer Hans Houben in the course of the expedition against the Nso (03.6.1902-17.6.1902). In this regard, Houben reports how at least 50 Nso were killed and how he "burnt down [the place]" (Houben 1902: 35f, → [chapter Cornilius Refem, 331 ff.](#)).

Object description: [No indication of an originator], palaver drum, [no dating], wood, skin, [no measurements], [no indication of weight], Kumbo, [no indication of a region], [no indication of a country]. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 033562.

[P.XXVI]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This headdress from Batscham came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1910 through the officer Karl Adametz. Adametz, head of the Bamenda district from 1908 to 1913, remarked with regard to his activities there, "that collecting occasionally in a warlike action produces more complete and original results than purchasing" (Adametz 1908: 80).

Object description: [No indication of an author], head crest, [no date], textile, glass, 96 × 20 × 67 cm (height incl. hanging tail), 1.9 kg (incl. cardboard stand), Batsham, grassland, Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 26406.

[P.XXVII]

Size 25 cm

Provenance: This head mask from Bamenom (today: Bamena) was appropriated as war booty by the officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#) during the so-called punitive campaign against Bamena (14.6.1905-27.7.1905) (cf. Glauning 1905: 46). It has been in the collection of the Ethnological Museum Berlin since 1906.

Object description: [No indication of an originator], head mask, [no dating], wood, raffia, cowries (*Cypraea moneta*), 50 × 39 × 26 cm, [no indication of weight], Bamenom, [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 20353.

Size 100 cm

[P.XXVIII]

Provenance: This door post from Bamenom (today: Bamena) came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1906 as war booty, which the officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#) had taken away in the context of the so-called punitive campaign against Bamena (14.6.1905-27.7.1905) (cf. Glauning 1905: 46).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], door post, 19th century, wood, 240 × 52 × 28 cm, 40.5 kg, Bamenom, Bamende district (North West Province), Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 23696 b.

[P.XXIX]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: After several failed attempts at persuasion (cf. Zenker 1896: 55), the plantation owner Georg Zenker → [Bio, 437](#) was able to purchase this Byeri (ancestral reliquary) of the Ngumba from a local ruler for "95 M[ark]" (ibid. 1897: 122). It has been part of the holdings of the Ethnological Museum Berlin since 1897.

Object description: [No indication of an originator], reliquary figure (byeri), 19th century, wood, feathers (giant turaco, helmeted guinea fowl, crowned eagle, screaming hornbill, grey parrot, domestic fowl), iron, brass, glass, 112 × 41 × 37 cm, 2.2 kg, [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 6689 a-c.

[P.XXX]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This Vute shield came to the Museum Fünf Kontinente München in 1895 through the officer Max von Stetten. The appropriation of the shield took place in the context of the so-called punitive campaign led by von Stetten against the Vute rule of Dandugu (12.7.1895-25.7.1895), during which not only "some [200]" Vute were killed, but also their wives were taken hostage and the villages of "Mango and Nkurre were partially burnt down" (Stetten 1895: 8 and 10).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], shield, Ebemm, 2nd half of the 19th century, skin, horsehair, cotton, iron, wood, plant fibre, 140.5 × 88.5 × 28.5 cm, [no indication of weight], [no exact location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Munich, Museum Fünf Kontinente, inv. no. 95-480.

[P.XXXI]

Size 25 cm

Provenance: This Kotoko wickerwork plate came to the Städtisches Museum Braunschweig in 1902 through the officer Kurt Strümpell. The plate was acquired in the context of Strümpell's participation in the expedition to Lake Chad (26.3.1902-7.6.1905). The leader of the expedition, Kurt von Pavel → [Bio, 420](#), had decreed that "all [...] ivory and other booty" would be "declared the private property of the members of the expedition and distributed among them". (Puttkamer 1902: 282)

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], wicker plate, before 1905, plant fibre (undetermined), thickness 31 cm, [no indication of weight], Logone-Birni, Extrême-Nord region, Cameroon. Braunschweig, Städtisches Museum Braunschweig, inv. no. 1709-0275-00.

[P.XXXII]

Size?

Provenance: This mask came to the Wilnsdorf Museum in 1991 from an unspecified art trade institution. It is presumably a so-called Batcham mask, but the provenance has not yet been conclusively clarified.

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], attachment mask Bacham, [no dating], wood, [no measurements], [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Wilnsdorf, Museum Wilnsdorf, inv. no. 700-029.

[P.XXXIII]

Size 25 cm

Provenance: This Bamum neck ring came to the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde as a result of several research trips by Bernhard Ankermann → [Bio, 370](#) in north-west Cameroon between 1907 and 1909. Ankermann profited from the favourable acquisition conditions due to Bamum's vassal status. Ruthlessly, he recommended in his later published collecting instructions "to rummage through the

huts of the natives"
(Ankermann 1914: 9).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], neck ring, c. 1900, brass, 5 × 31.5 × 28 cm (measurement on object), 887 g, [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 25123.

[P.XXXIV]

Size 100 cm

Provenance: According to the inventory, this architectural element from Bati near Bali (near present-day Bali) was originally part of the "Hptl. homestead" (Adametz 1913: 119). It came into the possession of the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1913. Adametz, head of the Bamenda district from 1908 to 1913, remarked with regard to his activities there, "that collecting occasionally in a warlike action yields more complete and original results than purchasing." (Ibid. 1908: 80)

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], door frame, a) c. 1900, b) & c) 19th/20th century (beginning), wood, iron, a) 247.5 × 50 × 30 cm, b) 252 × 60 × 25 cm, c) 24 × 210 × 34 cm, a) 31 kg, b) 30.2 kg, c) 30 kg, Bati, Bali, Northwest Region, Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 29716 a-c.

[P.XXXV]

Size?

Provenance: This double mask of the Ekoi came to the Linden Museum Stuttgart in 1903 as war booty, which the officer Hans Houben was able to acquire in the course of his work as station chief of Ossidinge and the burning of Mamfe (in 1902). Houben's regime in the region, described as a "reign of terror" (Michels 2004: 261), was accompanied by the burning down of other villages such as Badje (cf. Jäger 1904: 173, → [chapter Cornilius Refem, 331 ff.](#)).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], double mask, [no dating], wood, skin, goat hair, nail (iron), iron, copper (sheet metal), [no measurements], [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon, Nigeria. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 033497.

[P.XXXVI]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This Fulbe throne bed from Tibati came to the Übersee-Museum Bremen in 1902 as war booty collected by the officer Oltwig von Kamptz in the course of the so-called punitive expedition against Tibati (Wute-Adamaua campaign, 13.3.1899-25.8.1899) (cf. Briskorn 2000: 134).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], bed, [no date], cane, leather, 76 × 24 × 169.5 cm, [no indication of weight], Tibati, [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Bremen, Übersee-Museum Bremen, inv. no. B13897.

[P.XXXVII]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This Haussa horse saddle girth came to the Übersee-Museum Bremen in 1902 as war booty looted by the officer Oltwig von Kamptz in the course of the so-called punitive expedition against Ngila (Wute-Adamaua campaign, 14.11.1898-1.1899) (cf. Briskorn 2000: 134).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], horse saddle girth, [no date], leather, fabric, cotton, metal, 19 × 1 × 111 cm, [no indication of weight], Tibati, [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Bremen, Übersee-Museum Bremen, inv. no. B10649.

[P.XXXVIII]

Size 25 cm

Provenance: This mask from Bafum comes from the estate of the officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#), in which he had mainly accumulated "spoils of war" (Luschan 1908: 173). Bafum was fought by Glauning during the so-called punitive expeditions against Djumpperri (26.12.1907-31.1.1908) and Muntschi (01.2.1908-15.3.1908). The mask came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1910 through the mediation of his brother Fritz Glauning.

Object description: [No indication of an artist], mask, 19th century, wood, plant fibre, 35 × 25.5 × 17.5 cm, 1.8 kg, Fungom, Northwest Region, Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 24255.

[P.XXXIX]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This figure from Bakoven came to the Lower Saxony State Museum in Hanover in 1910 through the officer Wilko von Frese. The appropriation of the figure falls within the context of Frese's participation in the so-called punishment of Nkam-Nün (14.10.1909-end Feb. 1910, cf. Rausch 1910: 277-282).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], portrait figure, before 1910, wood, 114 × 49 × 48 cm, [no indication of weight], Bakoven, [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Hanover, Landesmuseum, inv. no. ET 5541.

[P.XL]

Size?

Provenance: This Nso ceremonial bell came to the Linden Museum in Stuttgart in 1903 as war booty obtained by the officer Hans Houben in the course of the expedition against the Nso (3.6.1902-17.6.1902). Houben's period of service on the ground, characterised as a "reign of terror" (Michels 2004: 261), was accompanied by looting, rape and the burning of entire villages (cf. *ibid.* 261-271, → [chapter Cornelius Refem, 331 ff.](#)).

Object description: [No indication of an originator], ceremonial bell with mallet, [no dating], cotton (fabric), glass (bead), brass, [no measurements], [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 033513.

[P.XLI]

Size 100 cm

Provenance: Sultan Njoya of Bamum had this commemorative figure made in 1908 on the occasion of the death of Officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#) and presented to his family members as a gift. (Geary 1994: ix) It entered the holdings of the National Museum of African Art in Washington in 1985 via numerous intermediate stations. Glauning played an important role for Njoya throughout his life because he helped him to recover the lost head of his father, Nsangou (cf. *ibid.*: 23-25).

Object description: [from English]: Bamum artist, male figure, late 19th century, wood, brass, cloth, glass beads, cowrie shells, 160 × 39.4 × 36.8 cm, [no weight given], Fumban, Grasslands, Cameroon. Washington D.C., Smithsonian National Museum of African Art, inv. no. 85-8-1.

[P.XLII]

Size?

Provenance: This double-faced Ngbe inverted mask of the Ekoi came to the Linden Museum Stuttgart in 1909 through the merchant Adolf Diehl → [Bio, 378](#). Although no specific context of appropriation has yet been identified here, Diehl, who as a commissioned collector purchased the majority of the cultural objects he conveyed to German museums, profited from the asymmetrical power relations and extortionate conditions of the colonial economy (see Hausen 1970: 181-198).

Object description: [no indication of an author], double-faced Ngbe inverted mask, [no dating], wood, antelope skin, tin, feather, rotang, textile, cowrie snail, [no measurements], [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 059328.

[P.XLIII]

Size?

Provenance: This bowl with female sculptures from Bafut came to the Linden Museum in Stuttgart in 1903 as war booty stolen by the medical officer Maximilian Zupitza in the course of the so-called punitive expedition against Bandeng-Bafut (30.11.1901-5.2.1902). Although Zupitza complained that he had come off "rather short" in comparison with other officers, he nevertheless boasted that he had brought "a not inconsiderable collection to fruition" (Zupitza 1903: 2).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], caryatid bowl for redwood powder, [no dating], wood, earth colour white, [no measurements], [no weight indication], Bafut, [no indication of a region], [no indication of a country]. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 032943.

[P.XLIV]

25 cm

Provenance: This stool, the emblem of a Bangwa ruler, came to the Städtisches Museum Braunschweig in 1902 through the officer Kurt Strümpell. Its acquisition is to be seen in the context of two so-called punitive expeditions against the Bangwa (13.9.1900-Dec.1900 and 20.10.1901-30.11.1902), in which Strümpell participated in a leading capacity (cf. Strümpell 1900: 136-149; Pavel 1901: 47-50).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], stool, before 1902, wood, height 57 cm, diameter 32 cm, [no indication of weight], [no specific location], Southwest Cameroon, Cameroon. Braunschweig, Städtisches Museum Braunschweig, inv. no. 1709-0024-00.

[P.XLV]

Size 100 cm

Provenance: This door from the assembly hall of the ruler of Baham came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1906 as war booty, which the officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#) had taken away in the course of the battles around Baham (14.6.1905-27.7.1905) (cf. Glauning 1905: 46).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], gate, 19th century, wood, a) 269 × 21 × 38 cm (pillar left), b) 269 × 27 × 40 cm (pillar right), c) 42 × 199 × 27 cm (middle joint), a) 28.1 kg, b) 30.7 kg, c) 26.8 kg, Baham, [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 21052 a-c.

[P.XLVI]

Size?

Provenance: This Nso cap from Kumbo came to the Linden Museum in Stuttgart in 1903 as war booty collected by the officer Hans Houben in the course of the expedition against the Nso (3.6.1902-17.6.1902). Since "carrying it along was impossible", Houben had "[t]he ivory stored in the chief's homestead" furthermore "buried" for later recovery (Houben 1902: 35, → [chapter Cornelius Refem, 331 ff.](#)).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], cap, [no dating], raffia fibre, cotton (fabric), glass (bead), [no measurements], [no weight indication], Kumbo, [no indication of a region], [no indication of a country]. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 033548.

[P.XLVII]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This mask from Batabi came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1907 through the officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#). The appropriation of the mask falls within the context of the so-called punitive expedition against Bali-Batibe (23.2.1906-15.4.1906), which provided an opportunity for Glauning to claim local cultural assets (cf. Glauning 1908:4).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], buffalo head, mask, 19th century, wood, textile, plant fibre, glass beads, 23 × 70 × 30 cm, 8.3 kg, Batabi (near Bali), Northwest Region, Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 21154.

Size 100 cm

[P.XLVIII]

Provenance: Mandu Yenu, his father's beaded throne, was given by Sultan Njoya of Bamum → [Bio, 417](#) in 1908, as the then head of the Africa Department of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde put it, as a 'tribute' (Luschan 1908: 137) for the German Kaiser to the officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#). It has been part of the holdings of the Ethnological Museum Berlin since 1908 (cf. Geary/ Njoya 1985: 181).

Object description: [No indication of an originator], Ngwuo "Mandu Yenu", throne chair with step, 19th century, wood, glass, textile, lime (cowrie shell), 174 × 126 × 155 cm, 110.5 kg (throne chair), 42 kg (throne step), [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 33341 a, b.

[P.XLIX]

Size?

Provenance: This pipe bowl from Bali came to the Linden-Museum Stuttgart in 1911 through the colonial official Paul Dorbritz. Its appropriation is in the context of Dorbritz's activities in the Bamenda district in 1910. Even though he did not shy away from having "loot procured" (Dorbritz 1910: 5), it can be assumed, due to the vassal status of the Bali, that he limited himself to "buying" the pipe bowl on the "orders" of the Stuttgart museum director (ibid.: 4).

Object description: [No indication of an author], pipe bowl, [no dating], clay, [no measurements], [no weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 066449.

[S.L]

Size?

Provenance: This Nso bracelet came to the Linden Museum in Stuttgart in 1903 as war booty obtained by the officer Hans Houben in the course of the expedition against Nso (3.6.1902-17.6.1902). Houben generally left a trail of destruction in his wake, and there were numerous outrages "partly tolerated, partly even committed by himself" in the areas "badly maltreated" by him and his troops (cf. Jäger 1904: 172, → [chapter Cornilius Refem, 331 ff.](#)).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], bracelet with bead trimming, [no dating], leopard skin, textile, glass (bead), [no measurements], [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 033521.

[P.LI]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This Bangwa bell came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1910 through the medical officer Martin Heßler. It was sent together with cultural objects that Heßler acquired through his participation in the expedition to North Cameroon (18.11.1904-25.1.1905), but according to his information it comes from "the old Bangwa chief Fontem" named Asunganyi (Heßler 1909: 102).

Object description: [No indication of an originator], double bell, 20th century (beginning), iron & plant fibre, 99 × 53 × 21 cm, 11.4 kg, [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 23979.

[P.LII]

Size 50 cm

Provenance: This mask from Bangang came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1906 through the officer Hans Glauning → [Bio, 386](#). The mask was appropriated in the context of the battle for Baham (14.6.1905-27.7.1905), which Glauning exploited as an opportunity for the unlawful dispossession of the local population (cf. Glauning 1908:4).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], mask, 19th century, wood, 94 × 66 × 58 cm, 16.6 kg, Bangang, [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 20349.

[P.LIII]

Size?

Provenance: This essay mask of the Ngbe secret society from the Cross River region came to the Linden Museum Stuttgart in 1909 through the merchant Adolf Diehl → [Bio, 378](#). Even though no specific context of appropriation has yet been identified, Diehl, who as a commissioned collector purchased some of the cultural objects he brokered, profited from the asymmetrical power relations and extortionate conditions of the colonial economy (see Hausen 1970: 181-198).

Object description: [No indication of an author or originator], Ngbe attachment mask, [no dating], wood, antelope skin, rotang, pewter, bone, horn, tar, [no measurement], [no weight], Creek town, Calabar, [no indication of a region], [no indication of the country]. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 059327.

[P.LIV]

50 cm

Provenance: This tangué (ship's bill) of the Duala ruler Kum'a Mbap'a Bele ba Dooh alias Lock Priso → [Bio, 397](#) came to the Museum Fünf Kontinente München in 1885 as war booty claimed by the government official Max Buchner → [Bio, 375](#) during the suppression of the resistance movement of part of the Duala population in 1884. (Cf. Splettstößer 2019: 189-195, Buchner 1914: 194).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], ship's beak, Tangué, 1880s, wood, paints, metal nails, 145 × 70 × approx. 64 cm, [no indication of weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Munich, Museum Fünf Kontinente, inv. no. 7087.

[S.LV]

Size?

Provenance: This royal breast ribbon of the Nso from Kumbo came to the Linden Museum Stuttgart in 1903 as war booty claimed by the officer Hans Houben in the course of the expedition against Nso (3.6.1902-17.6.1902). As a result of the enterprise, not only was Kumbo burnt down, but other villages in the surrounding area were also covered with war (Houben 1902: 35f., → [chapter Cornilius Refem, 331 ff.](#)).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], breast band of a royal musician, [no dating], plant fibre, glass (bead), [no measurements], [no weight indication], Kumbo, [no indication of a region], [no indication of a country]. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 033547.

[P.LVI]

Size 25 cm

Provenance: This tobacco pipe of the Bangwa ruler Asunganyi came to the Ethnological Museum Berlin in 1899 via Gustav Conrau. Conrau received it as a guest gift during his first visit to the Bangwa ruler's court (cf. Lintig 2017: 102).

Object description: [No indication of an author or creator], tobacco pipe, [no date], brass, wood, glass, leather, plant fibres, 77 × 36 × 5 cm, [no indication of weight], [no specific location], grassland, Cameroon. Berlin, Ethnological Museum, National Museums in Berlin, inv. no. III C 9814 a, b.

[P.LVII]

Size?

Provenance: This Njem drum was obtained as war booty by the officer Hermann Bertram in the course of the Southern Expedition/Ebolobingon (29.7.1905-26.9.1905). The drum was transferred to the Linden Museum in Stuttgart by Bertram in 1908 in a bundle of a total of 237 pieces of booty, which he had acquired "with much effort during 2 ½ years of warlike activity" (Bertram 1908 cited by Grimme 2018: 38).

Object description: [No indication of an author], dance drum, [no date], wood, skin, cane, [no measurements], [no weight], [no specific location], [no indication of a region], Cameroon. Stuttgart, Linden Museum, inv. no. 055784.

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.505] [Appendix]

510 Thanks

512 authors

515 Name index

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.510] Thanks

Atok:

SM Bertrand Efoudou III

Baham, Musée Royal de Baham:

Albert Fomekong

Bangoua:

SM Yannick Djampou Tchatchouang

Basel, Basel Mission Archives / Mission 21:

Dr Patrick Moser

Basel, Museum der Kulturen:

Ursula Regehr

Dr. Anna Schmid

Batoufam:

SM Innocent Nayang Toukam

Félix Nigue

Celestin Tchouanguep

Berlin:

Gesa Grimme

Berlin, Bard College:

Prof. Dr. Aya Soika

Berlin, Embassy of the Republic of Cameroon:

Hamadou Tobi Bachirou

H.E. Victor Ndocki

Dr Maryse Nsangou Njikam

Berlin, bpk picture agency:

Cornelia Reichert

Berlin, Brücke Museum:

Daniela Bystron

Lisa Marei Schmidt

Berlin, Museum für Naturkunde - Leibniz Institute for Research on Evolution and Biodiversity:

Christiane Funk

Dr Ina Heumann

Dr Catarina Madruga

Fiona Möhrle

Dr Gesine Steiner

Berlin, National Museums in Berlin - Prussian Cultural Heritage, EM:

Prof. Dr Lars Christian Koch

Prof. Dr Alexis von Poser

Dr Verena Rodatus

Berlin, National Museums in Berlin - Prussian Cultural Heritage, MVF:

Marius Kowalak

Berlin, National Museums in Berlin - Prussian Cultural Heritage, ZA:

Dr. Christine Howald

Michaela Hussein-Wiedemann

Berlin, Berlin University of Technology:

Elsa Goulko

Silvia von Keitz

Dr Stefan Schlelein

Steffi Terp

Dr Mareike Vennen

Berlin, Zoological Garden Berlin:

Dr. Clemens Maier-Wolthausen

Braunschweig, Städtisches Museum Braunschweig:

Isabella Bozsa

Dr. Rainer Hatoum

Bremen, Übersee-Museum Bremen:

Prof. Dr Wiebke Ahrndt

Dr Bettina von Briskorn

Silke Seybold

Bünde, German Tobacco and Cigar Museum:

Michael Strauß

Cambridge, University of Cambridge:

Dr Bernhard Fulda

Coburg, Natural History Museum Coburg:

Dr Eckhard Mönnig

Dr Carsten Ritzau

Detmold, Lippisches Landesmuseum:

Dr Amir Theilhaber

Dr Michael Zelle

Douala:

Marilyn Douala Manga Bell

SM Jean-Yves Eboumbou

SM Milord Mbape

Dresden, Dresden State Art Collections, Archive:

Vera Wobad

Dresden, Dresden State Art Collections, Kupferstich-Kabinett:

Denise Görlich

Susann Krüger

Dresden, Dresden State Art Collections, SES:

Dr Friedrich von Bose

Graduate Ethnologist Silvia Dolz

Graduate Ethnologist Petra Martin

Dr Léontine Meijer-van Mensch

Sylvia Pereira

Julia Pfau

Dschang, Université de Dschang:

Prof. Dr Émile Kenmogne

Yannick Stéphane Nguimba Dissake

Prof. Dr Roger Tsafack Nanfosso

Düsseldorf, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf:

Prof. Dr Stefanie Michels

Eberswalde, Museum Eberswalde:

Birgit Klitzke

Edéa:

SM Merveille Eding Batta

SM Placide Miyila

SM Nguele SM

Jean Ngwanza

Foumban:

Nji Oumarou Nschare

Frankfurt a. M., Weltkulturen Museum Frankfurt:

Julia Friedel

Freiburg, Museum Natur und Mensch:

Nicole Landmann-Burghardt

Dr. Silke Stoll

Fürth, ARTOTHEK:

Ulf Buschmann

Geneva, Université de Genève:

Bansoa Sigam

Prof. Dr Jean François Staszak

Giessen, Oberhessisches Museum:

Manuela Rochholl

Dr. Katharina Weick-Joch

Göttingen, Georg-August-Universität - Ethnological Collection:

Dr. Michael Kraus

Göttingen, Georg-August-Universität - Musical Instrument Collection:

Dr. Klaus-Peter Brenner

Göttingen, Georg-August-Universität - Heinz Kirchhoff Collection:

Dr. Anita Schmidt-Jochheim

Halle (Saale), Federal Cultural Foundation:

Dr. Lutz Nitsche

Hamburg, Museum am Rothenbaum. Cultures and Arts of the World:

Dr Malika Kraamer

Prof. Dr Barbara Plankensteiner

Catharina Winzer

Dr Heidelies Wittig

Hanover, Lower Saxony State Museum Hanover:
Dr Claudia Andratschke

Hildesheim, Roemer and Pelizaeus Museum:
Dr Sabine Lang

Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen-Kassel:
Dr Martina Lüdicke

[p.511] Cologne, Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum - Kulturen der Welt:
Dr Clara Himmelheber
Yağmur Karakis
Dr Nanette Snoep

Kribi:
Hartmann Dimale
Ndtoungou Godefrey
Jude Sylvain Mboum
Lucie Mpagou
SM Paul Fritz Ndjondje
SM Joseph Nong
Jean Baptiste Nzambi (†)
Jean Nzie

Lichtenstein, Daetz-Centrum Lichtenstein:
Anne-Sophie Berner

Limburg, Mission Museum of the Pallottine Fathers:
Fr Markus Hau

Lolo Village:
SM Siang Nzié

London, British Museum:
Prof. Dr Hartwig Fischer
Julie Hudson
Dr Sam Nixon

Lübeck, Ethnological Collection:
Dr Lars Frühsorge

Magdeburg, German Centre for the Loss of Cultural Property:
Prof. Dr. Larissa Förster

Mainz, Johannes-Gutenberg University - Ethnographic Studies Collection:
Dr Anna-Maria Brandstetter

Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn Museums:
Dr Corinna Erckenbrecht

Marburg, Philipps-Universität - Ethnographic Collection:
Dr. Dagmar Schweitzer de Palacios

Marburg, Philipps-Universität - Religious Studies Collection:
Dr Susanne Rodemeier

Mbandjock:

SM Jean Paul Bawa Dina
Simon Pierre Vougen Mvée

Munich, Deutsches Museum:

Dr Bernhard Wörrle

Munich, Museum Fünf Kontinente:

Dr Stefan Eisenhofer Dr
Karin Guggeis
Dr Anka Krämer de Huerta
Dr Uta Werlich

Neukirchen, Seebüll Foundation Ada and Emil Nolde:

Dr. Astrid Becker

Nguila:

Donatien Djoung
SM Ndah Gomtsé
Louna Mossi
Titse Mvouroe
Nango Naah

Nkoteng

Samuel Angoula
Lazarre Dang Biyo'o
Esther Evelyne Essaneme
Jules Onguene

Nuremberg, Natural History Museum:

Werner Feist

Obo at Lembé Yesum:

Fabien Mendjana

Offenbach, German Leather Museum:

Dr. Inez Florschütz

Offenburg, Museum im Ritterhaus:

Susanne Leiendecker-Piegsda

Oldenburg, State Museum of Nature and Man:

Jennifer Tadge

Osnabrück, Museumsquartier:

Dr. Thorsten Heese

Oxford, Pitt Rivers Museum:

Prof. Dr Dan Hicks

Paris, Sorbonne Université:

Dr Felicity Bodenstein

Rhauderfehn, Fehn- u. Schiffahrtsmuseum Westrhauderfehn:

Marcus Neumann

Rostock, Museum of Cultural History:

Annelen Karge

Stuttgart, Linden Museum:

Prof. Dr. Ines de Castro

Iris Müller

Dr. Christoph Rippe

Katja Scharff

Dr. Fiona Siegenthaler

Tervuren, Royal Museum of Central Africa:

Dr Guido Gryseels

Tibati:

SM El Hadj Hamidou Mohaman Bello (†)

Hamidou Nouhou Sarki Yaaki Nouhou Barrywa

Mohamadou Abdala

Tübingen, Eberhard Karls University - Ethnological Collection:

Prof. Dr. Gabriele Alex

Unna, Hellweg Museum:

Dr Beate Olmer

Uslar, Museum Uslar:

Dr. Christian Riemenschneider

Wiesbaden, Museum Wiesbaden:

Dr Andreas Henning

Dr Andy Reymann

Wilhelmshaven, German Naval Museum:

Dr Stefan Huck

Wilhelmshaven, Coastal Museum:

Dr. Sven-Hinrich Siemers

Wilnsdorf, Wilnsdorf Museum:

Dr. Corinna Nauck

Wittenberg, Julius Riemer Collection:

Dr Andreas Wurda

Witzenhausen, Ethnological Museum - Cultures of the World:

Ute Dietrich

Wuppertal, United Evangelical Mission on the Hardt:

Christoph Schwab

Yaoundé:

Martin Pierre Abega

Yaoundé, National Museum:

Prof. Dr Raymond Neba'ane Asombang

Yaoundé, University of Yaoundé I:
Prof. Dr David Simo

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>

[p.512] Authors

Mikaél Assilkinga is a doctoral student at the TU Berlin/Université de Dschang and a member of the research project "Reversed Collection History". He researches power objects from Cameroon in German museums with a focus on the consequential effect of their translocation in the Cameroonian societies of origin and in Germany. He also deals with the provenance of Cameroonian so-called human remains from the colonial context.

Lindiwe Breuer is a student of the philosophy and history of science at the TU Berlin. She previously studied philosophy and cultural studies in Leipzig. She has worked in various cultural projects and institutions, including art education at the Gropius Baus in Berlin. She is a student assistant in the research project "Reverse Collection History".

Fogha Mc. Cornilius Refem (a.k.a. Wan wo Layir) is an artist and PhD student in the Minor Cosmopolitanisms Research Training Group at the University of Potsdam. Previously, he studied Social Work at the Alice Salomon Hochschule Berlin. He was Humanity In Action Senior Fellow in 2021. His research interests include decolonial thinking, subaltern studies, black empowerment and critical museum studies.

Albert Gouafo is Professor of German Literature and Cultural Studies and Intercultural Communication at the Université de Dschang. His research interests include transfer research, German literature of the colonial period in Africa and the African diaspora, memory studies and provenance research on cultural objects stolen during German colonisation. With Bénédicte Savoy, he leads the research project "Reversed Collection History". He is a member of numerous committees in Germany, including the advisory board "Colonial Contexts" at the German Centre for the Loss of Cultural Property.

Dieu Ly Hoang is a student in the Master's programme in Art History at TU Berlin and a student assistant in the Department of Modern Art History. Her areas of specialisation include 19th century painting, transnational collection history and art and cultural transfer.

Yann LeGall is a research fellow in the DFG/AHRC-funded research project "The Restitution of Knowledge", which is being carried out jointly by the TU Berlin, the University of Oxford and the Pitt-Rivers Museum. He is investigating the history of colonial looting and war booty from so-called punitive expeditions. In his dissertation (2019), he dealt with the restitution of human remains from the colonial era and transnational cultures of memory.

Yrine Matchinda is a doctoral candidate in German studies with a focus on cultural studies at the Université de Dschang and a member of the research project "Reversed History of Collections". Her dissertation deals with Cameroonian ritual objects in German colonial collections and the social consequences of their relocation.

Andrea Meyer is a research associate in the Department of Modern Art History at the TU Berlin and the research project "Reverse Collection History". Her research fields include museum history and the visual arts of modernism. She is a member of the research network "Museums & Society. Mapping the Social" and the network "Making museum professionals, 1850 - the present".

Prince Kum'a Ndumbe III is a historian, writer, poet and founder of the AfricAvenir cultural centre in Bonabéri/Douala. He is committed to the critical reappraisal of the history of African cultures and their rehabilitation. He wrote his habilitation thesis on the FRG's Africa policy at the Free University of Berlin and taught there, in Lyon and Yaoundé. In 2019, his book *Restituez à l'Afrique ses objets de culte et d'art!*

Philippe Rekacewicz is a geographer, cartographer and information designer. Using the tools of critical cartography, he focuses on population movements and is interested in the relationships between cartography, art, science and politics. From 1988-2014 he worked for Le Monde

diplomatie, and from 1996-2008 he headed the cartographic department of GRID-Arendal, a local office of the United Nations Environment Programme. With Philippe Rivière he runs the website visionscarto.net.

[Bénédicte Savoy] teaches art history at the TU Berlin. Her research interests are art and cultural transfer in Europe, museum history, and art theft and looted art. In 2018, she co-authored a report with Felwine Sarr commissioned by Emmanuel Macron on the restitution of African cultural property to Africa. Her book *Africa's Struggle for Its Art. History of a Postcolonial Defeat* (2021) has been translated into English and French. With Albert Gouaffo, she leads the research project "Reversed History of Collections".

Sebastian-Manès Sprute studied ethnology in Göttingen and completed his doctorate in African studies at the Humboldt University in Berlin. He works as a postdoctoral researcher for the research project "Reverse Collection History". His research focuses on colonial history, provenance research and cultural studies theory of time.

Richard Tsogang Fossi is a German scholar and post-doctoral researcher in the project "Reverse Collection History". He researches German colonial history, German-Cameroonian colonial memory and the provenance of Cameroonian cultural heritage in Germany and the circumstances of its relocation. In recent years, he has been involved in various projects between Cameroon and Germany, including the much-discussed exhibition "Hey Hamburg, do you know Duala Manga Bell?" at the Hamburg MARKK.

Eyke Vonderau has been Research Coordinator at the Department of Modern Art History at TU Berlin since 2015. He studied history at Humboldt University in Berlin and worked as coordinator of the International Research Training Group Berlin - New York - Toronto "The World in the City" and as a research assistant at the Center for Metropolitan Studies at TU Berlin.

Book design:

Dorothee Billard is an artist and graphic designer. The focus of her artistic work is on drawing and in the conception of books. Since 2016 she has been teaching at the Dresden University of Fine Arts in the field of artistic publishing. She lives in Berlin and Dresden. www.dorobillard.de

Mirjam Kroker is an artist/researcher and publicist. Seminomadic. Transdisciplinary background in fine arts (Dresden/Madrid), cultural and social anthropology (Tübingen/Vienna). Latest research: Planetary Contemplation/Intuition & hearing times (working grant Stiftung Kunstfond, 2022), THE UNIVERSE AS YOUR LIBRARY and the World as Studio or voneilchendes codes der welt (Sächsisches Landesstipendium, 2019/21). www.mirjamkroker.org

[p.515] Name Index

Page numbers in bold refer to the biographies from p. 370 onwards.

Roman numerals preceded by B refer to the picture booklet starting on p. 441

Abat Angula (Angoula) 427

Abdala, Mohamadou 168, 511

Achenbach, Wilhelm Erich Ferdinand 356, 358

Adae, Friedrich (Fritz) 358

Adametz, Karl Moritz Ernst Gustav
77, 79, 86, 124f., 128, 130, 186, 358, B VIII, B XXVI, B XXXIV

Aguigah, Elias 113f., 407, B XXIII

Akwa (King), see Ngando Mpondo

Aly, Götz 116, 119, 133, 136

Aman, Jean 319

Amiet, Cuno 238

André (Father) 319

Angenot, Marc 300, 310, 312

Angoula Angoula, see Simeko'o

Ankermann, Bernhard 48, 67, 79, 85, 147, 154, 203f., 209, 232, 235, 251, 279, 356, 358, 370f., 416, 424, B XVII, B XXXIII

Ankermann, Luise 370

Antelmann, Bruno 358

Arndt, Suzan 303

Arnim, Karl Gustav Ludwig Albrecht von (Lieutenant) 120f., 127, 189, 358

Arning, Wilhelm 358

Assmann, Aleida 318, 326

Asunganyi (Fontem Asunganyi)
127, 372f., B LI, B LVI

Atsa, Ateu B XXII

Bakhtine, Mikhaïl 300

Bakoko ruler 406f.

-Etangambele 114, 127, 135

-Etute gases 114, 127, 135

-Madimanjob 114, 127, 135

-Musinga 114, 135

-Nduniebayang 114, 127, 135

-Nsonge 114, 135

Bamum (Bamun), Njoya of (also Nzueya, Njoia, Nschoja)
49, 71-73, 201-203, 205f., 208f., 219, 237, 308, 414f., 417f., 422, 434, B I, B XLI, B XLVIII

Barrois, Beatrice 267

Barth, Fredrik Thomas Weybye 285

Barth, Heinrich 85

Bastian, Adolf 48, 81, 86f., 146f., 149, 209, 230-232, 358

Baumann, Herrmann 244, 287

Bavaria, Therese (Princess of) 358

Beaujean-Baltzer, Gaëlle 166

Bebe Bell 397

Becker, Carl Heinrich 358

Bell, Kum'a Mbape, see Kum'a Mbap'a Bele ba Dooh

Bell (King), see Ndumb'a Lobe

Bello, El Hadj Hamidou Mohaman
163, 168, 393, 511

Belting, Hans 201

Berké, Theodor 84, 128, 357f., 373, B XXII, B LVII

Bernbeck, Reinhard 159f.

Bertram, Hermann Karl 108, 128, 356, 358, B II

Besser, Bernhard von 38, 105, 122f., 127, 372

Biedermann-Imhoff, Richard 358

Bille, Mikkel 151, 317, 320, 324

Biwèe Nagya (alias King Massili)
321, 404

Bleyl, Fritz 214

Bode, Wilhelm von 209

Bome (King Bome, roi Bome), see Mbome

Bornemann 358

Bornmüller, Alfred Julius 358

Boulaga, F. Eboussi 144

Brauchitsch, Eduard von 77

Bretschneider, Arno 402

Briskorn, Bettina von 396, 510

Broeckmann, Ludwig 358

Buchner, Max von 30, 34f., 75f., 127, 173, 178, 346, 358, 375-377, 397f., B LIV

Buba (Lamido of Bubanjidd) 380

Bubnova, Varvara 237, 239f.

Bülow, Anton August Gottlieb Friedrich Siegfried 127, 358

Bührmann, Gisela 433

Büsgen, Moritz 358

Bumiller, Theodor 358

Carnap-Quernheimb, Ernst von 63, 127, 356, 358, 390, 393, 413

Chamier-Glisczinski, Leonhard Hermann Karl Otto (Uko) Johannes (Hans) von 186, 358, 438

Christaller, Theodor 39, 81

Clark, John 143

Cleve, Hermann 128, 358

Colin, Frederick 358

Colin, Ludwig 356, 358

Conradt, Leopold Fritz Wilhelm Edmund 79, 88, 357f., B XI

Conrau, Gustav 80, 105, 254f., 358, 372f., 394, 403, 420, B XVI, B LVI

Dandugu (Vute ruler) 127, B XXX

Danziger, Daniel Bernhard 358

Danziger, Ella Marie Helene, née Schipper 359

Darwin, Charles 35

Dehls, Wilhelm Heinrich 359

Deliss, Clémentine 133, 270

Dernburg, Bernhard 67

Dido (King), see Ekwalla

Diehl, Adolf 67, 73, 79, 106, 144-146, 148f., 151, 276, 356, 359, 370, 378f., B XX, B XLII, B LIII

Dietert, W. 359

Dipama, Hamado 343

Djache Nzefa, Sylvain 207

Djimbe 430

Dominik, Hans Friedrich Wilhelm 75, 77-79, 102f., 107, 114, 117, 127f., 130, 132, 135, 158, 179, 185-191, 193, 304, 322, 356, 359, 380-383, 390, 392, 400-403, 411f., 422, 432, 437, B XXIII

Dorbritz, Paul 77, 356, 359, B XLIX

Drechsel, Gottlieb Ferdinand 359

Dücker, A. (Captain) 87

[p.516] Drytime 430

Eckhardt, Wilhelm Friedrich Karl Alexander 128, 359

Eding Batta, Merveille 320, 406, 510

End, Eugen Friedrich Karl 359

Einstein, Carl 215, 237-240, 309

Eisenhofer, Stefan 344, 346, 511

Ekwalla, Jim (Ikwala/Ikwalla, aka King Dido) 29, 34, 127

End, Hermann 203

Engelhardt, Philipp August Lorenz
38, 179, 359, 427

Engelhardt (wife of P.A.L. Engelhardt) 359

Esch 84

Espagne, Michel 310

Esser, Max 80, 356, 359

Eylmann, Paul Erhard Andreas 359

Fabri, Ernst Friedrich 30f.

Fagg, William 251

Fechtner, Artur Ferdinand Emil Wilhelm Fritz 128, 357, 359

Fischer, Eugen 381

Flegel, Eduard Robert 85, 359

Fonlon, Bernard 332f., 337

Förster, Oscar 233, 359

Forster, Johann Reinhold 359

Franke, Arno 68

Frankenberg-Lüttwitz, Sigismund Heinrich Kaspar von 68, 128, 359

Frankenstein, Michael 88

Frese, Wilko von 78, 128, 359, B IX, B XXXIX

Frederick William III, King of Prussia 363

Frobenius, Leo 85, 270, 356, 359, 432

Fuller, Joseph Jackson 143

Galega I 34, 383-385

Geary, Christraud M. 206, 259, 416, 435

Gebauer, Paul 250

Geertz, Clifford 300, 303f.

Gellhorn, Hans Ernst Karl Richard von 127, 359, 372f.

Georgi, Milda Frieda (alias Sidi Riha)
200

Germann, Paul 359

Gimene 127, 380, 412, B XXIII

Glauning, Fritz B XXXVIII

Glauning, Hans Franz Ludwig Heinrich Wilhelm 38, 49, 71, 78-80, 94-97, 117, 119f., 127f., 131, 158, 162, 204-207, 209f., 233, 308, 356, 359, 370, 378, 386-388, 414f., B IV, B XIV, B XV, B XVIII, B XXI, B XXVII, B XXVIII, B XXXVIII, B XLI, B XLV, B XLVII, B XLVIII, B LII

Gleim, Otto 359

Glock, Philipp 77, 356, 359

Glücksmann, Theodor 233, 359

Godeffroy, Johann Cesar 359, 432

Godknecht, Hans Joachim Friedrich Wilhelm 359

Göhring, Martin 147, 415

Gomtsé (Ngran II) 411-413

Gong Nar (Ngrté III, Ngute/Ngutte)
127, 389-391

Gravenreuth, Karl von 400

Grubauer, Albert 359f.

Grünwedel, Albert 120

Gruner, Hans 360

Guse, Franz Karl 121, 127, 360

Gütschow, Ernst 84

Haberer, Karl Albert 356, 360

Habich 71

Haeckel, Ernst 208

Hagenbeck, Carl 88, 189, 191, 432

Hagenbeck, Caroline 432

Halbwachs, Maurice 326

Halleur, Hermann Gustav Carl 62

Hamm-Brücher, Hildegard 252

Hamman (Mohamman) Lamou (Laami o, Sultan of Tibati)
71, 127, 163, 392f.

Harter, Pierre 256, 259

Hartmann, Karl Eduard Robert 360

Harttmann, Ludwig Ernst Hermann
357, 360

Hassert, Ernst Emil Kurt 85, 360

Hastrup, Frida 317, 320

Heck, Ludwig 185-189, 191, 193

Heckel, Erich 200, 214

Heigelin, Karl Theodor 128, 360

Heinicke, Horst 107, 128

Heldt, Johannes Christian Eiler 360

Hellgrewe, Rudolf 393, 412

Hempel, Rose 215

Autumn, Emil 360

Hessler, Martin Karl Arnim 360

Heusch, Luc de 159

Heydrich, Martin 238f.

Heydt, Eduard von der 244

Hicks, Dan 124, 511

Hintz, Eugen 360

Hirschberg, Walter 287

Hirtler, Richard Alfred 356, 360, 384

Hirtler, Dora 384

Hitler, Adolf 15, 85

Honecker, Erich 220

Hörhold, Karl 174, 437

Hösemann, Paul Alfred 84, 127, 179, 356, 360, 427f.

Hoppe, Carl 360

Hornbostel, Erich Moritz von 360

Houben, Hans Heinrich Gerhard 78f., 128, 360, 373, 420f., 424, B III, B VI, B XII, B XXV, B XXXV, B XL, B XLVI, B L, B LV

Hübe-Schleiden, Wilhelm 31

Hutter, Franz Karl 273, 288, 360, 383

Ikellé-Matiba, Jean 422

Ikwala (also Ikwalla), see Ekwalla

Imbert, Jean 289

Ipscher, Georg 360

Isono 430

Ittmann, Johannes 149

Jacob, Oswald 106

Jacobs, Joh. 360

Hunter, Max 175, 276, 360

James, Sydney Price 440

Jantzen, Wilhelm 31, 34, 80, 360

Jantzen & Thormählen, Company 34, 80, 358, 360, 363

Joest, Wilhelm 360

Joseph, Nong 324, 511

Junkelmann, Erich 360

Kämena, Nicholas 360

[p.517] Kamptz, Oltwig von 71, 78, 120f., 127, 158, 185f., 356, 360, 392, 411, 420, 422, B XXXVI, B XXXVII

Kandinsky, Wassily 199, 204, 309

Karakis, Yağmur 113f., 158, 511

Karutz, Richard 360

Kegel, Lore, née Lessing, née Gessner, née Lore. Gessner, née Konietzko 361

Kegel-Konietzko, Boris 361

Keller, Jakob 79f., 148, 175, 361, 394-396

Kersting, Hermann 132, 361

King, Coretta Scott 347

King, Martin Luther 347

Kirchhoff, August Ferdinand Wilhelm 361

Kirchner, Ernst Ludwig 199f., 202, 212-214, 218f.

Knobloch, Richard Alexander Edwin Hermann 77, 128, 361, B V, B XIII

Knutzen, A. 87

Knorr, Eduard von 127, 398

Köhler, August Walter 361

Colossus, Hans-Joachim 258

Konietzko, Julius August 79, 88, 124, 130, 356, 361, 403

Kouang, Shoun 318

Krämer, Augustin 361

Krause, Gottlob Adolf 361

Krause (Lieutenant) 114

Kreyher, Martin 361

Krickberg, Walter 361

Krieger, Kurt 62, 79, 219, 249-253

Krogh, Christian Ludwig August von
124f., 130, 361, 424

Küas, Herbert 361

Küas, Richard 361

Kück, Gerhard 361

Külz, Friedrich Otto Ludwig 74f., 361

Kum'a Mbap'a Bele ba Dooh (also Kum'a Mbape, alias Lock Priso,)
29, 34, 75, 78, 127, 201, 277, 341f., 344-349, 375, 397-399, B LIV

Kum'a Ndumbe III, Alexandre 277, 317, 325, 341-351, 376, 398, 513

Kund, Richard 62, 78, 357, 361

Künkler, Eva 124

Küppers-Loosen, Johann Georg Hubert 361

Kussmaul, Friedrich 251

Küsters 273

Coachman, Gerdt 250

Kuva Likenye 127, 400f.

Laasch, Gustav Adolf Wilhelm 77, 361

Laclavère, Georges 290

Lamprecht, Karl 208

Langhans, Paul 288

Langheld, Wassy 361

Langheld, Friedrich Wilhelm Gerhard
66, 128, 234, 361, B XXII

Lapaire, Claude 274f.

Larsonneur, Alfred Marie Joseph 361

Lecoq, Raymond 250

Leimenstoll, Johannes Immanuel 361

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.12-19>

Leiris, Michel 10

Leist, Karl Theodor Heinrich 68, 361, 404f.

Lenz, Oscar 361

Lequis, Joseph 357, 361f.

Lessel, Karl Georg 66, 304, 357, 362

Lessner, Paul Franz Adolf 121f., 127, 362

Lewerentz, Annette 87

Songs, Philipp 362

Lier, Carel (Charles) van 362

Linden, Karl (Count of) 118-120, 356, 362, 386f., 408, B XIX

Lintig, Bettina von 259

Lippmann, Walter 301, 310

Lips, Julius Ernst (alias Palan Kárani)
362

Lloyd, Jill 211

Lock Priso, see Kum'a Mbap'a Bele ba Doon

Luise, Queen of Prussia 363

Luschan, Felix von 48f., 71, 74, 76f., 81, 86, 88, 94-97, 116, 119-123, 132, 134, 141, 145, 147-149, 151, 174, 203-205, 207-209, 231-235, 241, 308, 370f., 380, 387, 422, 425, 437, B XXXVIII, B XLVIII

Lutz (missionary) 408

Maass (Measure), Alfred 362

Mabia B II

Macke, August 199f.

Macron, Emmanuel 9, 347, 514

Mahama 75, 187

Maka ruler 71, 402f.

-Aulemaku (Aulemakong) 71, 128, 402

-Bobebe (Bobela) 71, 402

-Bonanga 71, 128, 402

-(Gule-Ngamba) 402

-(Congo) 402

-(Nangabitun) 402

-(Ngelemenduka) 402

-Ngoen (Ngom) 71, 402

-(Okang) 128, 402

-(Sef) 128, 402

Manga Bell, Rudolf Duala 36, 344, 397

Mansfeld, Alfred 77, 84

Marc, Franz 199f., 203, 309

Marinetti, Filippo Tommaso 204

Marquardsen, Hugo 362

Martin, Abega 319, 511

Martin, Friedl 357, 362

Massili (King), see Biwèe Nagya

Massow, Valentin Albrecht Ludwig August Hubertus von 362

Matschie, Paul 185, 191-193, 378

Matvejs, Voldemārs 237, 239f.

Mauss, Marcel 230f.

Max, Gabriel Cornelius (Knight of)
362

Mayesse, Biang Bwô Mbumbô (King)
127, 321, 404f.

Mbape, Paul Milord Bwanga 344-346

Mbembe, Achille 123

Mbimbe, Muni a 345

Mbome A Pep (also Bome, King Bome, roi Bome) 127. 404, 406f.

Mebenga m'Ebono (also Martin Paul Zampa/Samba) 427

Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Adolf Friedrich Albrecht Heinrich (Duke of)
356, 362

Meerwarth, Hermann 362

Mendjana, Fabien 427, 511

Menzel, Ernst Gustav 67, 362, 370f.

[p.518] Merensky, Alexander 362

Merrick, Joseph 143

Merzbacher, Gottfried 362

Meyer, Adolf Bernhard 215, 230

Meyer, Hans 362

Miller, Kinge

Miyila, Placide 406

Möbius, Karl 381

Modest, Wayne 133

Poppy, Paul Felix 362

Moisel, Max 36, 315

Möllendorf, Paul Georg von 362

Morgen, Curt Ernst von 78, 127, 164f., 180, 186, 356, 362, 392f., 411f.

Mossi, Louna 322f., 511

Müller, Johannes 159f.,

Müller(-Lepenau), Franz Ludwig Wilhelm 80f., 104, 128, 141, 145f., 149, 362, 408-410, 424, B XXIV

Müller, Wilhelm (missionary) 80f., 141, 145f., 149

Murdock, George P. 32, 36, 285-287

Nachtigal, Gustav 32, 34, 75, 362, 375, 397

Nagyang Kwamba (aka King Benga)
321, 404

Ndah, Adamou Gomtsé (aka.
Ngranj XI) 412, 511

Ndtoungou, Godefrey 323, 511

Ndumb'a Lobe (King Bell) 29, 34f., 81, 397f.

Neyon (Ngranj III) 71, 127, 380, 411-413, 422

Ngando Mpondo (King Akwa) 29, 32, 34, 397

Ngoso Din, Adolf 36

Ngranj I, see Vouktok

Ngranj II, see Gomtsé

Ngranj III, see Neyon

Ngranj XI, see Ndah

Ngrté III, see Gong Nar

Nguele 406, 510

Ngute (Ngutte), see Gong Nar

Ngwanza, Jean 406

Njapndunke (also Njapdounké, Nzapndunke) 371, 414-416, 417

Nji Mongu Ngutane 418

Njoya (also Nzueya, Njoia, Nschoja), see Bamum (Bamun), Njoya of

Nkal Mentsouga (Omvang ruler)
128, 402f.

Nolde, Emil 201-204, 208, 210-212, 216, 218f.

Nolte, Hermann August Heinrich Friedrich 117, 121, 127, 158, 356, 362, B XIX

Northern, Tamara 251, 253, 256, 259

Notué, Jean Paul 70, 259, 322

Nsa'ngu (also Nsangou) 201, 205f., 414, 417, B XLI

Nschare, Ndji Oumarou 71

Nw'embeli, Nakeli 121, 127

Nyonga II (aka Tita Gwenjang) 384

Nzambi JeanBaptiste 316, 322, 324, 511

Nzeh, S.M. Nsiang 319

Nzouango, Rogatia 317

Oberhofer, Michaela 258

Oertzen, Jasper Martin Otto von
132, 356, 362, 432

Oldenburg, Helene Maria Anna, née Aichinger 362

Oldenburg, Rudolf Theodor Paul 363

Oldman, William Ockelford 363

Omaru (Sultan of Banyo) B XV

Oppenheim, Max (Baron von) 363

Othegraven, Hugo Eugen Friedrich Marie von 363

Ovonramwen 120

Owona, Adalbert 422

Pahl, Gustav 357, 363

Pantänius, Karl Johann 363

Paschen, Hans 356, 363

Passarge, Otto Karl Siegfried 85, 288, 363

Passavant, Carl 85, 363

Paul, Carl 144

Pavel, Hans Karl Georg Kurt von 79, 118f., 127, 234, 307, 363, 372f., 420f., 424, B III, B XXXI

Pechstein, Max 200, 212, 214,

Pechuel-Loesche, Eduard (Pseudo. M. E. Plankenau) 363

Pelizaeus, Gustav Caspar Clarus 363

Pelzer, Adam 363

Penny, H. Glenn 116

Perrois, Louis 322, 324

Pfaff-Giesberg, Robert 363

Picasso, Pablo 241, 309

Picht, Heinrich 81

Planitz, Hans Wilhelm Gustav Adolf Edler von der 363, 370

Plehn, Albert 127, 363

Plehn, Friedrich 363

Plehn, Rudolf 363

Poppe, Albrecht 363

Poppen, Johann Janssen 363

Poukam I 71

Preil, Wilhelm 363

Preuss, Martin 356, 363

Preuss, Paul Rudolph 363

Prussia, Friedrich Carl Alexander,
Prince of 363

Prittwitz and Graffron, Georg von 363

Prosper Müllendorf, Jean-Pierre 363

Puchegger, Anton 190

Pückler-Limpurg, Kurt, Count von (Baron von Groditz) 84, 128, 363

Powder, Harry 130, 378, 386,

Putlitz, Hans Caspar, Noble Baron zu
67, 88f., 128, 233, 321, 356, 363, B V, B XIII

Puttkamer, Jesco Eugen Bernhard Wilhelm von 363

Puttkamer, Jesco von 39, 76, 81, 87, 97, 118, 127, 364, 372, 400, 412, 420, 422f., 437

Raben, Ernst Klaus Iwan Christian Friedrich Alfred von 127, 356, 364, 370

Ravens, Mary 364

Ramsay, Hans Gustav Ferdinand von
38, 71, 77, 205f., 364, 417

Range, Max 128, 364

Ratzel, Friedrich 290

Rausch, Emil 78, 86, 128, 364, 370, 372f., 424f.

Rautenstrauch, Julius 364

Ray, Man 257

[p.519] Reck, Hans 364

Reichenow, Anton T. 364

Rein-Wuhrmann, Anna, see Wuhrmann

Rey (Lamido) 380

Richardson, Harris 146

Rigler, Friedrich Johann Alexander
132, 364

Knight, Karl 364

Röhm, Hermann 439

Rolle, Franz Hermann 364

Rollhäuser, Lorenz 120f.

Rothberg, Michael 134

Rubinstein, Helena 254, 257

Rüger, Adolf 102

Ruthenberg, Vera 218

Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, Alfred Alexander William Ernest Albert (Duke of) 364

Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, Carl Alexander August Johann
(Grand Duke of) 364

Saker, Alfred 143

Samb, Issa 133

Samuelson, Hermann 364

Sandrock, Martin Philipp Ludwig
71, 128

Sarpong, Lawrence Oduro 343

Sarr, Felwine 116, 121, 320, 325, 347

Sauerlandt, Max 212

Schachtzabel, Alfred 209, 243, 257

Schäfer, Hans 84

Scheunemann, Peter Paul Friedrich
66, 78, 100, 107, 128, 364

Scheve, Eduard 74

Shields, Willy 162

Schillings, Carl Georg 189

Schimmelpfennig von der Oye, Hans Adolf Rudolf Carl 127, 364, 427

Schipper, Adolf Wilhelm 77, 128, 356, 359, 364

Schlosser, Franz Martin Julius Werner 127f.

Schlothauer, Andreas 259

Schmidt, Joseph Adolf Oskar 364

Schmidt, Werner 218f.

Schmidt-Rottluff, Karl 200, 202, 212-214, 216, 219f., 241

Schomburgk, Hans 189

Schömig, Gustav 364

Schran, F.A. (Lusy) 276, 356, 364

Schrenck-Notzing, Albert (Baron von)
364

Schröder, Richard Hans Otto 432

Cupping 81

Schultz, Joachim 303

Schultz, Martin 415

Schultze, Arnold Wilhelm Louis Ferdinand 356, 364

Schulze (Consul) 35

Schürle, Georg 79, 150

Black, Bernhard 364

Schwartz, Wolfgang 364

Seitz, Theodor 103, 121, 206, 364, B I

Seligmann, Siegfried 365

Senghor, Léopold Sédar 315

Seyfried, Egon 365

Silke, Georg 423

Simeko'o (alias Angoula Angoula; also Schimekoa, Simekoa, Semikore/Semicore, Sin-Meko Angoula) 127, 427f.

Skolaster, Hermann 174

Soden (Baroness of) 365

Soden, Julius von 30, 35, 81, 365, 375

Solf, Wilhelm 105, 365

Sommerfeld, Bernhard Max Viktor Wilhelm von 365

Sørensen, Tim Flohr 317, 320

Soyaux, Herman 365

Speyer, Arthur Johannes Otto Jansen (Speyer III) 257, 365

Speyer, Arthur Max Heinrich (Speyer II)
254, 256-258, 365

Speyer, Arthur Karl Hans Friedrich August (Speyer I) 365

Spiess, Carl 365

Spring, Albert 87, 365

Staudinger, Paul 365

Steane, Carl (Nacho) 74

Stefenelli, Max von 365

Stein zu Lausnitz, Ludwig (Baron von)
66, 78, 102, 108, 114, 127f., 135, 356, 365

Steinäcker, Franz von 232, 365

Steiner, Paul 143, 365

Stelzig, Christine 167, 205, 231, 235f.

Stephani, Franz von 68, 365

Stetten, Maximilian (Max) von 114, 127, 135, 199, 356, 365, 400, B XXX

Stoessel, Walter 68

Stoler, Ann Laura 132

Stollé, Arthur 365

Strübel (Colonial Secretary) 87

Struck, Bernhard 68, 365,

Strümpell, Kurt 77, 117, 127, 269, 356, 365, 373, B VII, B X, B XXXI, B XLIV

Sydow, Eckart von 237f., 240-245, 250f., 259, 365

Tande, Dibussi 401

Tangwa, Godfrey (aka Rotcod Gobata) 335

Tappenbeck, Hans 62, 78, 365, 411f.

Tessmann, Günter 174, 356, 365

Tetang 125

Thiel, Wilhelm Heinrich Bruno 365

Thilenius, Georg Christian 125, 365

Thiong'o, Ngugi wa 333f.

Thorbecke, Franz 73-75, 85, 234, 356, 365, 415, 424, 429f.

Thorbecke, Marie Pauline, née Berthold 73-75, 85, 234, 356, 365, 415, 424, 429f.

Thormählen, Johannes 31, 80, 360

Tiesler, Frank 220

Tinki 331

Toffa, Ohiniko Mawussé 113

Trachsler, Walter 274f.

Triaca, Bianca 159

Uechtritz-Steinkirch, Edgar von 366

Ugiomoh, Frank 201

Umber, Heinrich Max 127, 366

Umlauff, Johann Friedrich Gustav
79, 130, 132, 240, 356, 366, 432f.

Umlauff, J.F.G., Company 72, 88, 150, 432f.

Umlauff, Heinrich Christian 366

[p.520] Unruh, Walter Willy Eugen Hermann
127, 366

Velten, Carl 366

Vieters, Heinrich (Father) 143

Vietinghoff, Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig, Baron von 128

Vietor, Johann Karl 366

Virchow, Hans 366

Virchow, Rudolf 86, 366

Vollbehr, Ernst 72-74, 79, 85f., 424

Voss, Johannes Friedrich Daniel 366

Vosseler, Julius 366

Vouktok (Voukto, Ngran I) 411

Wagne, Jeanne-Ange 121, 407

Waibel, Leo 430

Waldow, Hans Friedrich Karl Franz 366

Wätjen, Heinrich 366

Weber, Ernst von 31

Wegelin, Caesar 66, 366

Weheliye, Alexander 134

Wehlan, Ernst 114, 127

Wehlan, Alwin Karl 404

Weissenborn, Bernhard 85

Wenckstern, Karl Waldemar August von 128, 205, 366

Werlich, Uta 343f.

Westendarp, Max 366

Weule, Karl 73, 149, 366, 370, 378

Wichmann (captain) 87

Widenmann, August 366

Widmaier, Rudolf 80, 366

Wiese and Kaiserswaldau, Walter von 366

Wilhelm I, King of Prussia and German Emperor 397

Wilhelm II, King of Prussia and German Emperor 71, 206, 253, 308, 366, 423

Wilhelm, Paul 202, 217-220

Winkler, Erwin Gotthold 366

Winkler, Fritz 202, 216-220

Wissmann, Hermann Wilhelm Leopold Ludwig von 366

Woermann, Adolf 30-32, 35, 366, 397

Woermann, Carl 366

Woermann (company) 32, 80, 87, 97, 118, 185, 360, 437

Wolf, Heinrich Ludwig 366

Wuhrmann, Anna (also Rein- Wuhrmann) 81, 418, 434f.

Worm, Paul 150

Württemberg (Carlsruhe), Hermine (Duchess of) 366

Wulff, August Engelbert 367

Wuthenow, Bernard Wilhelm Eduard, -Schmidmann, gen. v. Wuthenow 367

Yu (King) 128, 321

Zech auf Neuhofen, Julius (Count of)
367

Zeitz, Lisa 238

Zenker, Georg August 79, 81, 84, 100f., 186, 190, 356, 367, 437f., B XXIX

Zheverzheev, Levkiy 240

Zickwolff, Hermann Wilhelm Batholomäus 367

Ziegler, Julius 80

Ziemann, Grete 177-180

Ziemann, Johannes (Hans) 36, 84, 100, 175, 177-180, 434, 439f.

Carpenter, Eugen 76, 357, 367

Zimmerman, Andrew 116, 119

Zimmermann, Carl Heinrich 127f., 357, 367

Zimmermann (Wölber and Zimmermann Company) 378

Zintgraff, Eugen 30, 35, 62, 68, 78, 80f., 86, 105, 127, 148, 232, 356, 367, 383f., 400

Zintgraff, Justin 367

Zipplius (Trader) 175

Zipse, Hugo Paul 367

Zollenkopf, Georg Thomas 128

Zumbu (also Soumbou) 428

Zupitza, Maximilian 79, 127, 367, B XLIII

[END]

More than 40,000 objects from Cameroon are now kept in public museums in the Federal Republic of Germany - more than in any other country in the world, including Cameroon. Between 1884 and 1919, German protagonists had brought even a far greater number of weapons, musical instruments, statues, everyday objects, manuscripts, jewellery and much more from the "colony of Cameroon" to the German Reich. In the turmoil of the Second World War, however, many of the pieces were destroyed.

In the Atlas of Absence, this ruthless and systematically organised theft of West African cultural assets is documented by numerous maps and essays. In a joint effort, African and European researchers bring together for the first time military-historical, museological, ethnological, cartographic and biographical perspectives. The unheard-of history of this multiple loss thus becomes directly vivid.

www.reimer-verlag.de

This document should not be read on its own. It supplements the German original:
<https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1219>