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We remember and say thank you!

Cheikh Anta Diop once said,

»The denial of the history and intellectual achievements of the Black African people is the cultural and spiritual homicide that preceded and made possible the genocide in this world.«

With this publication we would like to commemorate the affected people who lost their lives in the anti-colonial struggle.

We would like to say thank you to all those affected by racism and discrimination, activists and civil society alliances who continue the anti-colonial struggle and have been demanding for decades the return of the stolen ancestors. The last few years have shown the importance of loud resistance to racist colonialism in order to change or initiate new social debates.

Our special thanks go to Mnyaka Sururu Mboro. For years, he has been fighting for the repatriation of human remains, which are illegally in the possession of German institutions. From the beginning, he assisted the Koordinierungsstelle in this undertaking and gave significant professional support to scientist Isabelle Reimann. *Haika Mmeku!*

We would like to thank Isabelle Reimann in particular for accepting the challenge and for creating this report with such passion, sensitivity and appreciation.

And, of course, our thanks also go to all the people, scientists and institutions who contributed to the preparation of the report. In particular, we would like to mention the critical guidance of Edward Halealoha Ayau, Santi Hitorangi, Evelin Huki, Christian Kopp and Paul Turnbull, some of whose comments and annotations are published. *Mahalo! Maururu & Thank you!*

Last but not least: Many thanks, Jeannine Kantara, for editing and translating the documents.
Why is the return of ancestral human remains so essential?

Isabelle Reimann
studied anthropology, psychology and sociology in Heidelberg and Leipzig. She is currently doing her doctorate at Humboldt-Universität Berlin and the Museum of Natural History Berlin. She is a white political educator and a mother.

»Because through this living relationships of care are given more priority than property and power relations, without which the debris of history continues to grow into infinity.«

Mnyaka Sururu Mboro
was born in Moshi at the foot of Mount Kilimanjaro in the then Mandate Territory of Tanganyika (now the United Republic of Tanzania). He has worked as a teacher in Tanzania as well as in Germany and has been advocating for the repatriation and burial of East African ancestors for decades. Mboro is co-founder and board member of Berlin Postkolonial and leads postcolonial walking tours.

»Currently, most live in trauma — because they have not yet buried their ancestors and believe that this results in climate disasters and diseases.«

Adetoun Küppers-Adebisi
is an author, publicist, curator, university lecturer and initiator of the Black Berlin Biennale for Contemporary Art and Decolonial Discourses. As president of AFROTAK TV cyberNomads- the Black German Culture, Education and Media Archive, she has received multiple national and international awards as a media and cultural activist for her contributions to a decolonial memory culture.

Michael Küppers-Adebisi
is a writer, visual artist and cultural activist. He works as a consultant for diversity and community building at the Berlin development policy center Berlin Global Village. He is on the board of Decolonize Berlin and is committed to the
realization of the Berlin matrix of decolonial approaches and concepts of memory politics. For his work on Black emancipation he received several awards.

»In the spirit of a renewed humanity, individual museums, state archives and private collections must reevaluate, at the latest now, in the 21st century, that Human Remains in their collections represent a morally and ethically questionable state of affairs if they originate from factual contexts of crimes against humanity murder, ethnic killings, enslavements, deportations and racist, political and religious persecutions. And whether they want to maintain the collective, colonial asymmetries of power as a neocolonial present. We owe this moral reevaluation to the cultures of origin and the diasporas living in Germany.«

Jeannine Kantara
grew up in East and West Germany as well as the Ivory Coast. She studied Social Sciences at the Open University in England, where she earned her BSc and Diploma in Gender Studies. She is co-founder of the Initiative Black People in Germany e.V. (ISD) and the magazine afro look. Jeannine Kantara works for the weekly newspaper Die Zeit, but also writes for other publications.

»The repatriation of human remains from people who were murdered and abducted during Germany’s colonial period cannot undo the crimes committed. However, they are an important step towards the historical reappraisal, acceptance of responsibility and reparations by today’s Federal Republic of Germany.«

Christian Kopp
was born in Neuruppin and studied history in Berlin and London. He has been a board member of Berlin Postkolonial e.V. since 2007. He works as a city guide and exhibition curator. Since 2020, he is sub-divisional project director in the collaborative project Dekoloniale Memory Culture in the City.

»To me, the presence of the ancestors abducted to Berlin during colonialism, is the most unbearable part of this city’s colonial racist heritage. The handling of the ancestors will be the real, definitive assessment of Berlin’s willingness to deal with its colonial past.«
Prof. Paul Turnbull
is professor emeritus of history at the University of Tasmania. Paul is internationally known for his research and writings over the past thirty years on colonial era theft and medico-scientific uses of the Ancestral Remains of Aboriginal Australian and Torres Strait Islander peoples. He assists Indigenous representative organizations, museums, and the Australian government in their efforts to repatriate ancestral remains. Paul was involved in the preparation of the report as a supervisor.

“\[It is essential to return ancestral remains if we have true reconciliation with the colonial past. The way we live and share the earth with those who came before us is the essence of humanity.\]”

Santi Hitorangi
Honui o te Mata Hitorangi a Huariki o te Pito o te Henua.
(Regent for Mata Hitorangi a Huariki o Te Pito o te Henua Regency Council)
Māori Kohau Rongorongo.
(Rongorongo Language Scholar.)
Hatu Ivi Tupuna i te Kainga nei mo hoki.
(Rightholder and claimant to Human Remains in Deutschland pending repatriation.)

Evelin Huki
Honui o te Mata Huki a Tangaroa o te Pito o te Henua.
(Regent for Mata Huki a Tangaroa o Te Pito o te Henua Regency Council)
Ivi Atua Kohau Rongorongo.
(Rongorongo Language Regent and Scholar)
Hatu Ivi Tupuna i te Kainga nei mo hoki.
(Rightholder and claimant to Human Remains in Deutschland pending repatriation.)

“\[Muraki at place of origin with dignity*.\]” (Muraki: process by which the bones of a deceased ancestor are laid to rest in its bone chamber at its place of origin with dignity).

Edward Halealoha Ayau
is the former Executive Director of Hui Mālama I Nā Kūpuna O Hawai‘i Nei, a group that has repatriated and reinterred thousands of ancestral Native Hawaiian remains and funerary objects from the collections of museums and institutions worldwide.
The valuable lessons learnt over the past three decades by the impacts of repatriation is that it has allowed Hawaiians to restore our dignity, to restore our Hawaiian humanity.«

Jephta U. Nguherimo was born in the village of Okanjokomukona, Namibia, in 1963. He is a labor negotiator, author, activist and co-founder of the OvaHerero, Ovambanderu and Nama Genocide Institute. He resides in Kensington, Maryland, USA.

»It is imperative that the Europeans repatriate our ancestral remains in order for us to give them a dignified cultural and spiritual burial ceremonies. «
my story is not old
it is being told

oh, the arrogance of victors
to set the timeline
the arrogance of the killers
to set guidelines

my story is not history
it is about the burden of memory
it is about speaking up
i can’t keep my mouth shut

my story is about my identity
it is about my misery
it is about dispossession
it is about liberation

my story is righteous
it is timeless
it is extraordinary
it is revolutionary

my story is not old
oh, it is being told now
it is timeless
i can’t remain silent

From the poetry collection «unBuried-unMarked: The Untold Namibian Story of the Victims of German Genocide between 1904–1908»
In many parts of the world, respect for human dignity beyond death is of central importance. Here in Germany, too, we say goodbye to deceased people with a wide variety of rituals. We mourn, we remember, we commemorate. And we created the legal framework that governs the integrity of the body after death. And yet these framework conditions do not apply to all people, not all dead people in Germany have the same rights, especially those who died under colonialism.

The crimes of the colonial era and their consequences are visible everywhere in Europe, the Federal Republic and Berlin — especially in public institutions such as museums and universities. There are deceased people: without a grave, without commemoration. As relatives and ancestors, they have often been stolen from their descendants. They were already trapped in a dehumanizing context during their lifetime and remain so today, well over 100 years after their death.

The number of those whose human dignity was deliberately violated and whose peace in death was disturbed is alarmingly high, often not really known. When they were kidnapped by the colonial powers, they were degraded to »collectibles« and »human remains«. Keeping the human remains in today’s successor states of the former colonial powers is an expression of a continued brutal coloniality. It is proof of a dehumanizing colonial system logic and racist research that took place at the time, but also that racism as a power system is shaping our society, (global) relationships and (dead) people to this day. And it explains the different ways in which the deceased are treated: while people who were murdered under colonial rule were not granted the right to rest after death, nor were their relatives and descendants given the opportunity to commemorate them, the grave of colonial criminal Curt von Francois was restored by the family at the Berlin Invalidenfriedhof in 2018 in order to »re-establishing peace of the dead«.

Anti-colonial resistance has been stirring since the beginning of the violent robbery of the deceased. Communities of origin and descendants of the stolen people try to bring their dead back home and give them a dignified burial and final resting place.

But to this day, many former colonial powers refuse to take responsibility for their crimes. The Federal Republic of Germany,
too, does not adequately comply with the repatriation of the dead to their countries of origin. Descendants, activists and repatriation practitioners often fail to obtain information about the deceased in Germany (see article by Mnyaka Sururu Mboro and Christian Kopp). German institutions regard themselves as »owners of human remains« and not as custodians of unjustly acquired deceased ancestors, which is why they block access to information about the circumstances of their acquisition. Repatriation is understood here as an intergovernmental act and thus proceeded as a continuation of the dehumanizing and colonial system logic.

As coordination office, we have had many discussions and initiated an exchange on the question of: »How can an appropriate language be found in a dehumanizing colonial system that is still having an impact today?«. With this publication, we would like to show a way of talking about the dead with dignity, as an alternative to the formal language of administration and the objectifying rhetoric of scientific and cultural institutions. These bones are deceased people and that is how they should be treated and discussed!

Isabelle Reimann’s report is a first step in disclosing information about human remains from colonial contexts in the state of Berlin in order to enable those concerned to search for their ancestors in a targeted manner. Repatriation practitioners from the global South accompanied the preparation of Isabelle Reimann’s report. Some of the comments, for example by Edward Halealoha Ayau, as well as by Santi Hitorangi and Evelin Huki, are published here. They show the importance of rehumanization and provide insight into the perspective of those affected.

Some institutions either did not respond to the inquiries or responded negatively - others regarded them as an opportunity to take a fresh look at their own collection. But is nowhere near enough! Much more needs to happen socially and politically in order to restore human dignity and the peace in death of those people who became victims of the racist research and collection mania during German colonial rule. Descendants and communities have the right to bury and mourn their ancestors.

The authors recommend the creation of an advisory board of repatriation practitioners. This can be one way in which the successor states of the former colonial powers, together with those concerned, ensure that the dead are quickly returned to their countries of origin: with the descendants and ancestors at the centre of the process.
On November 14, 2021, the co-author of these lines, Mnyaka Sururu Mboro, submitted an official request to the federal Kontaktstelle für Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen Kontexten in Deutschland (Contact Point for Collections from Colonial Contexts in Germany). In preparation for a trip to Tanzania planned for spring 2022, Mboro delivered ten questions about members of his ancestral community, the East African Chagga, whose human remains were kidnapped in the course of colonization for racist research in German collections.

By its own account, the primary task of the Kontaktstelle, which was established at the Kulturstiftung der Länder in August 2020, is to give »information and advice« to inquirers from the ancestral communities, »forward requests in individual cases« and support the »networking of people and institutions«. However, the management immediately replied that, unfortunately, there was no nationwide overview of the Chagga and »so far they did not have the capacity to carry out a corresponding survey«. Although »first concrete planning steps« for a »broad-based query« about all ancestral remains from colonial contexts in German collections had been taken, this could only be regarded as »the start of this process, the implementation of which would also take a certain amount of time«.¹

It was only after Mnyaka Sururu Mboro had expressed in a second letter his astonishment about this partly dismissive, partly stalling response from the Kontaktstelle and demanded that his questions at least be forwarded to all German collection institutions, the Kulturstiftung der Länder gave in. They offered to send out their own nationwide inquiry about the Chagga ancestors in German collections. Once again, the Kontaktstelle dampened hopes of prompt processing and emphasized their expectation that »the results of the query would not be available for several months«.²

1 Website of Kontaktstelle für Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen Kontexten in Deutschland, www.cp3c.de/; Markus Hilgert, Generalsekretär der Kulturstiftung der Länder: Reply email to Mnyaka Sururu Mboro, November 14, 2021
2 Markus Hilgert, Secretary General of the Kulturstiftung der Länder: Reply email to Mnyaka Sururu Mboro, January 12, 2022
It remains to be seen what urgency the Kontaktstelle für Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen Kontexten on the one hand and the various German collections on the other hand will attach to the inquiry about the Chagga ancestors. However, the initial reaction to this specific request from a member of an ancestral community, the knee-jerk refusal and the reassurance that a large-scale research project was still in the planning stage, is keeping hopes for an energetic support from the Kulturstiftung der Länder limited.

It is all the more gratifying that the anthropologist Isabelle Reimann can already present a Scientific Report on the Existence of Human Remains from Colonial Contexts in Berlin on behalf of the civil society-based and Berlin Senate-funded Koordinierungsstelle für die Erstellung eines gesamtstädtischen Konzepts zur Aufarbeitung Berlins kolonialer Vergangenheit (Coordination Office for the creation of a city-wide concept for coming to terms with Berlin's colonial past). We have supported this important project from the start, recommended her as an expert and exchanged views with her on a regular basis.

Her carefully and expertly written investigation now offers much more than the inventory of ancestral remains from colonial contexts in Berlin that we had hoped for. The study provides a vivid introduction to the background of the transnational debates about treating the abducted ancestors with respect. Isabelle Reimann not only points out scientific gaps and ethical problem areas. From this, she develops well-founded recommendations for political action that must finally grant the descendants of the abductees the rights to their ancestors.

We want to highlight and comment on three of the many insights that can be gained from her impressive report:

1) Over the years, the Berlin Charité has developed a way of handling ancestral remains from colonial contexts that is exemplary in Germany. However, we should not forget that it took considerable time and pressure from critical civil and ancestral communities for the Charité to enter this path.

As the long-standing administrator of the largest collections of ancestral remains from colonial contexts in Berlin, the Charité already came under criticism from civil society actors in the early 2000s. In particular, Joachim Zeller, Martin Baer and Israel Kaunatjike published the first information about the origin, the sometimes shocking "acquisition circumstances" and the unbelievably large number of ancestors in Berlin collections. As early as 2004/05, civil society alliances with the significant participation
of Afro diasporic activists began demanding their repatriation. However, it was not until 2008 that the Charité felt compelled to act. An immediate trigger was Markus Frenzel’s investigative television programme FAKT, where the remains of victims of the OvaHerero and Nama genocide could be seen in the collections of Berlin and Freiburg. However, only the subsequent official requests for information and return from the Namibian and Australian embassies were the deciding factor for the Charité’s to become active. It is significant to note that it was the initial task of the Charité Human Remains Project (2010—2013), which started afterwards, in addition to the provenance of the ancestral remains, to clarify the legal or illegal context of their »acquisition« or appropriation. By contrast, for the Namibian embassy its illegality was never up for discussion.

The research of the Charité project became the cornerstone for several follow-up projects of a similar nature. Since 2011, the Charité has repatriated 227 individuals from Namibia, Australia, New Zealand/Aotearoa and Paraguay in nine transfers and acknowledged its historical responsibility. It is now proactively researching the provenance and returning the ancestral remains from colonial contexts in its care.

2) As a federal foundation, the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz (SPK) for years has been hiding an anthropological collection of ancestral remains from colonial contexts in its Ethnologisches Museum (EM). Despite the pressure from a critical public, no results of provenance research have been published since the takeover of its second anthropological collection, which was transferred from the Charité to the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte (MVF) in 2011. So far, not a single repatriation of ancestral remains from the MFV collection has taken place.

In retrospect, one of the most astonishing findings of Isabelle Reimann’s report is the now officially confirmed fact that, in addition to numerous ancestral remains from colonial contexts that are processed or integrated into cultural objects, the SPK at the EM also has its own anthropological collection, which includes i. a. 38 human skulls - as for years, the President of the SPK Hermann Parzinger had repeatedly assured that »the Ethnological Museum (EM) [...] has no anthropological collection and does not keep any anthropological materials«. The Foreign Office also officially announced in 2014: »None of the institutions of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin is in possession of an anthropological collection«.

---

4 According to its own statements, the Charité Human Remains Project was designed to be »open-ended« with regard to a possible legal or injustice context. See: Holger Stoecker and Barbara Teßmann: »Namibische Gebeine in Berlin – Methoden und Rechercheweges der Provenienzforschung«, in: Holger Stoecker, Thomas Schnalke, Andreas Winkelmann (Hg.): Sammeln, Erforschen, Zurückgeben? Menschliche Gebeine in aus der Kolonialzeit in akademischen und musealen Sammlungen, pp. 199 and 220 and: portal.wissenschaftliche-sammlungen.de/CollectionActivity/301
5 For the Charité see in particular Chapter 3.3.3. of this report (S. 64–68)
The Federal Government and the SPK were hardly more transparent with regard to the anthropological collections transferred to the MVF in 2011. For years, they denied any historical or political responsibility for them. As recently as March 2014, the German government responded to a written inquiry by a member of the German parliament about ancestral remains from Tanzania: »Since the holdings, as explained, are only temporarily in the museum's care, the MVF did not carry out any research into their origin«.8

Although we, together with allied non-governmental organizations, protested against the planned »deportation« of the collection to an anthropological institution and as early as December 2014 publicly presented concrete evidence of numerous ancestral remains from all former German colonies in Africa that had been deported to Berlin, it took another FAKT broadcast (November 2016) for the SPK to finally start researching the provenance of the East African ancestors at the end of 2017 and of those from West Africa in 2021. To date, the research results have only been handed over to the Embassy of Rwanda and - under our pressure – to the Embassy of Tanzania. A publication on the project is still pending. For more than a decade, Germany's largest collection of ancestral remains from colonial contexts has been in the care of the federal SPK. So far, not a single victim of colonial-racist research has been returned to their relatives.9

3) The Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory - BGAEU) refuses to provide politicians, scientists and civil society with information about the extensive »Rudolf Virchow Collection« in its possession. The collection contains numerous human remains from colonial contexts of injustice. Nevertheless, the BGAEU still offers the collection for ethically highly problematic research.

It is a most unbearable idea that thousands of ancestral remains from colonial contexts of injustice are still in the »property« of a scientific Berlin society that seems completely unmoved by the worldwide critical discussions on the repatriation of ancestors. For example, for years, the BGAEU has been offering »its« human remains on the Internet and invites scientists from all over the world to research them. By contrast, in October 2015 the Society tried to prevent OvaHerero and Nama activists who came to Berlin from visiting their ancestors. In his cynical justification the then President Wolfram Schier of the BGAEU stated that he »could not see any scientific purpose in
viewing or examining the human remains«.\textsuperscript{10}

The \textit{BGAEU} now even entirely refuses to comply with a scientific inventory mandated by the state of Berlin and does not provide any further information on the colonial contexts of “its” collection which underlines the need for institutional pressure, legal challenges and legislative action. As the owner of the offices and collection rooms of the society, the \textit{SPK} should influence the \textit{BGAEU} in such a way that it no longer refuses to treat human remains from colonial contexts with respect. From a legal point of view, the \textit{BGAEU} could be required to provide transparency of the collection holdings as well as calling into question its »private ownership« of the kidnapped dead. Finally, politicians should also agree on a ban on any research on abducted ancestors from colonial contexts that does not serve the purpose of repatriating them.\textsuperscript{11}
Scientific report on the presence of human remains from colonial contexts in Berlin
By Isabelle Reimann
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1. Introduction

1.1. Ontological challenges

»The soul within«

The skeletal remains, hair and even soft tissue structures of people from all over the world are stored in German scientific collections, institutes and museums. For the descendants of these people, the continued preservation of the remains of their ancestors as scientific specimens without the consent of the deceased or their descendants, past and present, is a major ethical problem. Many people in affected communities regarded themselves as having a deep responsibility to provide their ancestors with a respectful and dignified burial. This responsibility is not only felt by those with a genealogical connection to the dead, but also those who have cultural and spiritual affiliations and ties currently unrecognized in German law. In many instances, the importance of dignified treatment of the dead also needs to be seen in the context of violent colonial histories. The dead in Western scientific institutions are seen by Indigenous peoples across the globe as attesting to the colonial era’s causation of immense losses of relatives, land, resources and sovereignty.

The resistance of communities to the theft of the remains of their ancestors has been well documented since the beginning of this outrage. In the case of German colonialism, there were not only demands for the return of remains, but also actual returns even during the period of German colonialism when this was deemed politically expedient. For example, in what was then the colony of German South-West Africa, the grave robber Karl Eugen Waldemar Belck had to return the skull of one Jacobus Hendrick’s skull to his daughter. It was also political pressure that forced the return of the bones of people from Samoa, which had been added to the Felix von Luschans collection in Berlin. Von Luschan was the holder of the chair for anthropology and ethnography at the Berlin University and head of the Africa and Oceania department of the Königliches Museum für Völkerkunde.

The demand for the return of the head of Mkwawa from today’s Tanzania was deemed so important a political means of Britain securing their own colonial rule at the end of World War One that its return was demanded under the Versailles Peace Treaty. For descendant communities, the remains of their ancestors are not objects, but spiritually living entities,
often possessing agency (see chapter 2.2.2). In this respect, the
title picture »The soul within« by the Djugan und Yawaru artist
Michael Jalaru Torres from his 2019 »collect« series, which was
created as part of the return of human remains to the Yawuru and
Karajarri of Broome (Western Australia) from the Staatliche
Kunstsammlungen Dresden, is symbolic. As an opening statement,
this picture illustrates vividly that human remains are
ancestors of very real people and the obligation to recognize
their dignity as human beings – regardless of one’s own view of
the collections.

Taking seriously the existences of different ontological
and epistemic traditions in respect of the dead opens up the
possibility of recognizing andcountering power imbalances and
domination born of past colonial practices of appropriation
and exclusion that persist even today. In a joint assessment of
the guidelines on the treatment of human remains by the
Deutschen Museumsbundes (German Museum Association) published
in 2013, Honor Keeler (Cherokee national and long-standing
involved in NAGPRA and international repatriation of Indigenous
ancestors–together with the respected long-time repatriation
practitioner Edward Halealoha Ayau from Hawai’i–observed, »They
[our Ancestral Relatives] are treated as property and reside in
a perpetual state of posthumous slavery.«

Keeler’s point is that to this day, the formal and legal
status of historical human remains in museum and scientific
collections in Germany is that of »cultural property«. As
such, the legal protection and the social acceptance of
private or state property prevents the fulfilment of responsibilities
that result from obligations of customary law and cultural
traditions in respect of the Ancestral dead.

Assigning universal values to the European sciences,
prioritizing their interests and separating them from the
mostly unethical appropriation practices in this case leads to
their mystification. Regarding of the skulls, for example, as a
»scientific resource« and the interest in using scientific
methods to generate knowledge about the history of mankind,
about eating habits and diseases from human remains, is also to
be seen as a specific and historically and culturally situated
perspective. While collectors and researchers use the bones for
publications and to further their careers, a number of
elements show that their results were used against the relatives
concerned. As will become clear below, anthropological
scientific collection and research were inseparable from
colonial expansion and development—and structures of colonial
exploitation (see section 2.4.2).
Through provenance research illuminating the circumstances in which the remains of individuals were acquired, the entanglement of the scientific collecting and uses of human remains in colonial ambitions becomes visible. The second side of the story so far has been excluded from the colonial archive. In cooperative provenance research and collaboration with descendants on repatriation, it can now be included. This makes the further and current meaning of the abstract category of »colonial contexts« understandable in individual cases. (see section 2.4.4).

Consequently, this report aims to go beyond presenting a factual inventory. It aims to contribute to the ontological and epistemic rethinking in respect of museum and other scientific collections triggered by repatriation movements.

1.2. The aim of the inventory

For years, post-colonial, black and migrant civil society initiatives have been demanding that museums and universities produce detailed, publicly accessible inventories of their holdings of human remains from colonial contexts, not only to inform the countries of origin, but also the often well-known ancestral communities.

However, it was not until 2019, that federal state ministers as well as the culture ministers of the federal states and municipal umbrella organizations adopted the »Erste Eckpunkte zum Umgang mit Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen Kontexten« (First key points for dealing with collections from colonial contexts). This initiative expressed the political intention to prioritize research on the provenance of human remains from colonial contexts and to implement processes for their repatriation.

In order to implement this announcement as well as the own recommendations of the newly published »Leitfaden des Museumsbundes zum Umgang mit menschlichen Überresten« (Guidelines of the museum association for dealing with human remains) »a Germany-wide overview of corresponding collections from colonial contexts would be [helpful]. It would form an important basis for the appropriate handling of this collection, enable the urgently needed networking and coordination between the houses and, above all, promote transparency towards the ancestral communities.«

Inventory details and the clearest possible information
on the circumstances in which remains were originally acquired is an essential prerequisite for relatives or descendant communities to make informed decisions about the processes involved in repatriation. An overview of the cross-institute holdings, remains and their documentation is also the basis for the reconstruction of the identity or origin of human remains or the background to their acquisition, i.e. cooperative and interdisciplinary provenance research. The publication of the acquisition books of the Berlin State Museums in August 2021 is an important first step. So far there is no publicly accessible consolidated national inventory.

The present report is therefore expression of the long-articulated political will and ongoing work of migrant, diasporic, post-colonial civil society initiatives to promote understanding and redress of the colonial past. This is evident in the order placed by the Berlin Senate’s coordination office, located at the Decolonize Berlin organization, for a city-wide concept for coming to terms with Berlin’s colonial past.

The homemade problem of the lack of consent from relatives from all over the world when creating the collections leads to major challenges to this day. Recognizing the authority of relatives and ancestral communities in deciding how to deal with the remains of their ancestors also requires access to and use of information regarding the remains and publication of information that informs the narrative of ancestral memory. However, there is no general guideline for handling specific information. For example, photographs of Aboriginal Australian Ancestral Remains are considered highly sensitive and are protected from publication with access restrictions. While in other cases, transparency is of great importance as a prerequisite for processing and recognizing colonial history. This led to the publication of the Case Reports on human remains of the Nam a and OvaHerero on the website of the OvaHerero/ Mbanderu and Nama Genocides Institute (ONGI) which is committed to the appropriate remembrance of the victims of the genocide by the Germans.

This report has been written mindful of these and other related ethical considerations in respect of who should have access to information about human remains acquired in colonial contexts, and the need to be aware of the sensitivities involved in conveying such information. Subject to these considerations, it aims – as far as has been possible – to provide a structured, comprehensive source of information about colonial era collections of human remains in Berlin on the basis of which political options for action and
framework conditions can be identified. The objective is therefore:

- Classification of the subject matter of the collections in the historical and current contexts and contexts of meaning
- Processing of information about human remains from colonial contexts in Berlin
- Creation of an overview for the evaluation and recommendation of the next steps and measures

It presents an overview of these collections as a first step towards the creation of a cross-institutional inventory. The »Leitfaden« (guideline) of the Deutscher Museumsbund (German Museum Federation) was used as the basis for the definition of »human remains« (see section 2.1.1). The assignment to the colonial context is also based on a guideline of the Museumsbund (see chapter 2.4.1). The report focuses exclusively on institutions. No research was undertaken to identify human remains from colonial contexts in the private possession of individuals. And as previously mentioned, the focus on Berlin reflects the desire of the Berlin Senate to develop a city-wide concept for dealing with the city’s colonial past and its remembrance. The presence of human remains in the geographical area of Berlin was investigated, but not the administrative ties between the institutions and the city of Berlin.

The Bund-Länder-AG is planning a nationwide survey in 2022, for which the Kontaktstelle für Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen Kontexten (Contact point for collections from colonial contexts), and the Deutsches Zentrum Kulturgutverluste (German Center for the Loss of Cultural Property) have been commissioned.

1.3. Short Summary of the results and recommendations

Order situation:
The present report was commissioned by the Koordinierungsstelle für ein gesamtstädtisches Konzept zur Aufarbeitung Berlins kolonialer Vergangenheit. The establishment of the »coordination office« was decided by the Abgeordnetenhaus Berlin (Berlin House of Representatives) in August 2019 and is part of the organization Decolonize Berlin, a network of various civil
society actors who have been campaigning for years to come to terms with German and European colonialism. The goal is to work with representatives from politics, administration and civil society to develop measures that initiate decolonization processes and stimulate a social discussion on how to deal with German colonialism and its aftermath.

Overview:
The report is divided into four sections. After the introduction, the second chapter forms the historical and ethical framework in which the collections of human remains from colonial contexts are embedded. This is followed by the results of the inventory in the state of Berlin. The fourth part discusses the results and recommendations in more detail, which are summarized—in short—as follows:

Inventory:
The survey of the museum and scientific institutions in the geographic area of Berlin showed that the collections of 12 institutions contain at least 5,958 remains of people whose appropriation is assumed to be in a colonial context. A tabular overview can be found under 3.2.

The information on the holdings of the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte (MVF), the Ethnologisches Museum (EM) and the Charité are given separately in the appendix. While the EM considered all human remains relevant for the expert opinion based on the history of the collection, the MVF only provided the numbers of human remains from the context of German colonialism. The Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (BGAEU) did not provide any information.

Hence there are around 13,500 human remains if all human remains from the »racial anthropological« Luschan and Rudolf Virchow collections (see section 3.1) are included and those remains in other collections for which a colonial context cannot be excluded. Adding the 16,000 bone fragments from human bones of at least 54, possibly more than 100 people of various ages, which were recovered from the excavations on the site of the Kaiser Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik (KWI-A) and for which a colonial context cannot be ruled out either.

Research status:
Human remains, for which a colonial context cannot be excluded, are used in Berlin for research, exhibitions and teaching.
purposes. Individual institutions have switched to authorizing use only for provenance research and after consultation with the societies of origin.

So far, none of the institutions have exhausted all possibilities in order to process the origins or even the identity of the people whose body parts were made into scientific preparations in their collections. Provenance research is still pending for the majority of human remains from colonial contexts.

There are no examples yet of equal, cooperative provenance research with direct relatives and members of the indigenous peoples concerned, or formerly colonized population groups whose ancestors (or body parts of ancestors) are in the collection facilities in the Berlin area. Exchange and cooperation with international scientists, government authorities and institutions such as the Te popa Museum in New Zealand/Aotearoa with official repatriation programs are taking place.

Furthermore, the desire as well as the need for cross-institute cooperation was mentioned by a large number of the contact persons from the facilities. There is also a need for exchange regarding the handling of human remains, the origin of which is unclear and probably cannot be further clarified.

**Recommendation Advisory Board:**

The establishment of an Advisory Board or a commission is recommended to accompany the further provenance research and repatriation work, including the handling of the inventory information. The Advisory Board or commission should be made up of experienced repatriation practitioners as well as representatives of communities and indigenous organizations whose ancestors are likely to be in the collections.

This recommendation is based on the findings that the definitions, access and type of information in the context of an "inventory of human remains from colonial contexts" cannot be separated from provenance research that has already been initiated and already presuppose fundamental decisions that—based on the principle of *Free Prior and Informed Consent* (FPIC)—should be made in consultation with indigenous peoples (UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples, cf. in particular Articles 11 and 12).

**Recommendation for cross-institutional processing project(s):**

One or more cross-institutional, interdisciplinary and transnationally oriented research projects/repatriation projects with the participation of the advisory board are recommended for inventory determination, clarification of the origin and reconstruction of the appropriation contexts of the human remains from colonial contexts stored in the state of Berlin.

The recommendation is based on the one hand on the lack of information and data in the institutions themselves and on the other hand an immense research desideratum with regard to provenance research of the human remains located in Berlin.

Information that is as complete and reliable as possible
is needed so that members and representatives of indigenous organizations can make informed decisions about how to deal with the remains of their ancestors. This requires cooperation between institutions in order to bring together different information and sources, for example on human remains from the same appropriation contexts that are stored in different institutions and archives, or on the same consignors. The need for cross-institute collaboration was often expressed by almost all those responsible for the collections and was seen as a necessity for reappraisal, particularly in smaller and non-specialist institutions. The dialogical exchange with the advisory boards during the inventory phase leads to mutual information, the possibility of finding individual solutions and the determination of needs for an interdisciplinary and transnational research project.

In addition to the desideratum of provenance research on individual holdings, there is also a lack of projects to process the colonial history of collections in relation to human remains from the various institutions as a basis for systematic provenance research. This was recognized in particular by the Museum für Naturkunde as a necessary next step and also considered urgent in view of the interdependence of museums and university collections in Berlin and throughout Germany.

The prioritization to clarify the background of human remains from colonial contexts as announced in the above-mentioned »Eckpunktepapier« (key points paper) of 2019 should be expressed through innovative and appropriate research structures, especially with regard to collaborative provenance research with communities of origin and relatives.

Recommendation: Incorporation into the concept of historical reappraisal and remembrance of Berlin’s colonial past:

Dealing with the collections of human remains, their appropriation from colonial contexts, the role of anthropological research and their social reception and significance is an immanent part of coming to terms with Berlin’s colonial past. The incorporation of the topic into Berlin’s city-wide processing and remembrance concept under the leadership of Black, migrant and diasporic organizations and individuals should also be understood by politicians and the institutions preserving the collection as a necessary part of the processing in order to ensure sensitive and racism-critical handling and overall social coping including the perspective of those negatively affected by racism.

Recommendations to politics:

The German state should create the constitutional conditions to recognize the dignity of human beings also in relation to their mortal remains and to enable relatives to care for their ancestors and deceased members of the ancestral communities in an appropriate manner and to be able to fulfill their family and cultural responsibilities. The recognition and observance of indigenous rights must be guaranteed when dealing with human remains from colonial contexts.
### 2. Definitions and Background

#### 2.1. Background: human remains in collection institutions

##### 2.1.1. About the term »human remains«

Human remains are given different names according to different perspectives. In the critical debates of the past 10 years, the term »material« or »object« was also increasingly discussed in scientific circles and has been partially replaced by the term »human remains«. Following the demand of relatives for the repatriation of their ancestors and to stop the practice of dehumanization (see chapter 2.2.2), the German word »Über-Reste« (»leftovers«) does not seem dignified and therefore does not serve the purpose of rehumanization. In the absence of a better term and due to its establishment in topic-related guidelines and key issue papers, the term »menschliche Überreste« is nevertheless used in the German version of the present report. The English term »Human Remains« is also used. The term »Ancestral Remains«, i.e. »remains of ancestors« or »ancestors«, which in itself underlines the concern of rehumanization, is used in the present report whenever these are addressed as ancestors by certain people or groups of people.

The definition of »human remains« in the Leitfaden zum Umgang mit menschlichen Überresten in Museen und Sammlungen des Deutschen Museumsbundes (2021) also serves as a basis for this report: The term includes all unprocessed, processed or preserved forms of preservation of human bodies as well as parts thereof, also those consciously incorporated into (ritual) objects. It should be noted that this definition and the present inventory do not include impressions, image and audio material and funeral objects, even if they are also culturally sensitive items in the collection: »It can have the same meaning in the societies of origin and for descendants as human remains«. The distinction between human remains, natural history and cultural objects goes hand in hand with the continuation of Eurocentric and colonial systems of classification and relationships, which is why further differentiations and re-evaluations must be kept open, at least in specific cases.
2.1.2. Human remains in German research and educational institutions

Human remains served, and are still serving, as »working material« for various branches of research:

»For medicine (with anatomy, pathology and forensic medicine), biological anthropology or biology in general, as well as the various archaeological and prehistoric disciplines, working with human remains is a central aspect of their everyday occupation and their professional self-image. Without the examination of the living or dead human body, these disciplines are hardly conceivable.«

Some of the research questions have changed and further options for analysis such as new imaging methods (CT, MRI) and biochemical analyzes (isotopes, DNA) have been added. In addition, work is being carried out on future ways of gaining knowledge. Human remains are also used in scientific teaching and training of the above-mentioned disciplines.

Until the middle of the 20th century, European or Western ethics had no major reservations about objectification in a scientific context. Historical collections of human remains, including those in depots of the state offices for archeology, which were mainly excavated in German territory and are at least 100 years old, continue to be used by scientists as research material for human life in the past without major ethical concerns.

The use of body parts of people who have recently died is now subject to modern bioethical principles of informed consent, as is the case with body donations for teaching and research purposes, which include the wishes of the deceased and respect for them. Today the use and display of human remains for artistic or commercial purposes are only legally permissible in Germany if the scientific-didactic purposes prevail.

As a rule, scientific institutions only use Human Remains with the consent and after provenance checks. For example, when asked about the existence of human remains for the present report, the Berlin Rathgen Forschungslabor stated that, since February 2005, prior to accepting a research assignment, information on the provenance and legal export of the »objects«
from the country of origin are requested, documented and, if necessary, the assignment will be rejected.

Indigenous interests and scientific research are not necessarily exclusive, as indigenous representatives emphasize again and again. With the recognition of historical injustice and the guarantee of “Free Prior and Informed Consent”, fruitful research partnerships for mutual benefit have even emerged. Exemplary initiatives and related research-ethical questions are discussed in the volume Working with and for Ancestors. Collaboration in the Care and Study of Ancestral Remains. However, the process of coming to terms with colonial injustice in Germany is still in its infancy. Also, the recognition of indigenous rights and thus principles such as »Free Prior and Informed Consent« have only been binding since Germany signed the ILO Convention in 2021. Therefore, the priority should initially be on the processing and responsible handling of the collections and thus the prerequisite for cooperative collaboration.

2.1.3. Objects of racial anthropological research

The emergence of physical anthropology since the late 18th century forms the background against which larger systematic collections, especially of skulls, but also other human remains from all over the world, were created in Germany. From the second half of the 19th century, there was an institutional consolidation of physical or biological anthropology in Germany as an independent specialist discipline, in connection with which the Göttinger Anthropologentreffen of 1861 is considered a decisive event.

Characteristic for the description and documentation of human remains in »race research« is the assignment to a »race«/»culture«/»ethnicity« as a central feature—in addition to location, age and gender. These assignments contain foreign names as well as Eurocentric generalizations and do not reflect the differentiated, often permeable, ethnic, social and political identity and group assignments of the time. The human remains were supposed to represent a type of person and the documentation contained hardly any information on individual identity or biographical data. In the administrative and classificatory systems of museums and research institutions, the bodies of indigenous people in particular have become scientific objects, »objects of race«. With the division of mankind into different varieties or »races« Questions

\[\text{see i.e. Ayau}
\]
\[\text{Kakaliouras 2021, 282}
\]
\[\text{see Hoßfeld 2016, 96}
\]
\[\text{see i.e. Duuren 2007 ; Winkelmann 2020, 45}
\]
\[\text{This fact means that the determination of a community, society or country of origin can be problematic when their identification is made without consultation with probable descendants with relevant linguistic, cultural and historical expertise. Regional or local expertise is particularly important for these questions (see Nankela Silvester 2021: 144).}
\]
\[\text{Rasool 2015, 669}
\]
about the origin and development of mankind were at the center of the debates.

The long-term effectiveness of the »race« construct lies in the interweaving and juxtaposition of popular scientific, sociological and biological narratives. The legacy of »scientific racism«, is grounded in the »idea that races could actually be properly distinguished based on quantitative morphological investigations« suggested by »race research«, but also the links between sociocultural and biological ones Characteristics in »chains of equivalence« (such as white = civilized, Black = primitive).

According to the media scientist Christine Hanke, the natural scientific style and the use of metric-statistical procedures, the results of which were then compared and arranged with lists, tables, diagrams and statistical calculations, went and still go hand in hand with an enormous amount of evidence: »The effectiveness of the physical anthropology consists in producing the evidence and self-evidence of 'racist' and 'sexual' differences«.

Beyond the acceptance and construction of human »races«, their temporal arrangement in a linear line of civilization was fundamental. Colonized populations with their respective histories, cultures and political, economic and social forms of organization and culture were discursively relocated to the past of a European stage of development. The exclusion of contemporaries from the temporal and geographical space of civilization and modernity was elementary for the ideological legitimation of colonial violence and destruction, as well as for the creation of scientific and museum collections. The ideas even went so far that scientists denied that their contemporaries, such as the Australian Aboriginal people or indigenous people in today's South Africa and Namibia had any means of development opportunities at all. They were portrayed as a kind of relic of the Stone Age, »living fossils« or as »primitive peoples« without culture or history, who were ultimately doomed to extinction. German anthropologists such as Hermann Klaatsch were also quoted in the Australian press with his »research results«, i.e. statements about the alleged intermediate stage of the Aboriginal Australian People between apes and modern humans. According to Britta Lange, the large collections of human remains in scientific institutions in Europe go back to the most comprehensive possible documentation of so-called »primitive peoples«: »In the context of so-called "salvage anthropology", scientists carried out anatomical, anthropological, ethnographic and
linguistic studies on members of ‘dying peoples’. (...) In addition, they generated measurement data, body descriptions, photographs, plaster casts as well as film and sound recordings of living people."\(^{37}\)

While people were anonymized and their body parts turned into scientific preparations, researchers and collectors were honored as historical personalities, some of them even until today.\(^{38}\) According to Larissa Förster and Holger Stoecker, the anonymity and the lack of documentation of the origin is »a thoroughly wanted product of colonial knowledge systems and collecting practices and in this sense is constitutive of colonial scientific practice«.\(^{39}\) The practice of »Entinnerung« (de-membrance), of forgetting or ignoring, is a fundamental part of material appropriation itself.\(^{40}\) Even today, ignoring the circumstances of acquisition and the context of origin seems to be a prerequisite for the further use of human remains as an anthropological research resource.\(^{41}\)

Against the background of the topicality and effectiveness of racism today, there is a demand for the discipline of biological anthropology, but also for scientific research itself, to assume responsibility and also to convey the historical contribution of Western science to colonial endeavors and their ideological legitimacy to participate.\(^{42}\)

2.2. Background: Repatriation Movement

2.2.1. Case study: The search for the head of Mangi Meli

However, the looting of graves and the stealing of some corpses and skulls in the ancestral communities are not forgotten and the task of repatriating Ancestral Remains is passed on from generation to generation. In those cases where the murder of people and the subsequent robbery of their body parts took place in a publicly visible manner and was used as a political instrument by the colonial powers to break local resistance, the lack of willingness to provide information and the ignorance of politicians and institutions in the succession of colonial rulers is a continuation of the colonial inequality. This applies, for example, to the stealing of the heads of hanged leaders during the colonial wars in German East Africa, including that of Chagga Mangi Meli.\(^{43}\)
Mnyaka Sururu Mboro, himself Chagga from the Kilimanjaro region, already learned at the age of four that the - in his words - "head of the Wachagga prince Mangi Meli" had been sent to Germany. Mangi Meli was hanged by the German occupiers in March 1900 with 18 other important local personalities after suffering hours of agony in a show trial. With this and other punitive measures, the German Gouvernement wanted to break the resistance to colonization. Mboro received the order from his grandmother to bring the head of Mangi Meli home. Mboro has been on the lookout since he came to Germany in the 1980s. In doing so, he continued the search of Mangi Meli’s grandson, Isaria Anaël Meli from Tanzania, which began 50 years ago, in Germany as well. Now very old himself, Isaria Meli still hopes to be able to properly bury his grandfather’s head.

For a long time, however, Isaria Anaël Meli and Mboro in Tanzania and Germany lacked opportunities and contact persons to get information and to assert their claims for return. Mboro and his comrades were repeatedly turned away. Access to museum depots and archives is denied to non-scientists. The experience of Mboro and many other initiatives from societies of origin show that for a long time, the museums did not take inquiries from relatives about the bones and their storage locations for granted and were accordingly uncooperative. On December 4, 2013, Mnyaka Sururu Mboro, together with Tanzania-Network.de e.V. and the Association of Tanzanians in Berlin and Brandenburg UWARAB eV, submitted a request to the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz and specifically the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin and the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte, whose answer was disappointing for them, in view of the facts that became public in the following years.

The lack of knowledge and recognition of German colonial history was obvious to Mnyaka Sururu Mboro from the beginning of his search and so, as a founding member of Berlin Postkolonial e.V., he began to address and mediate it. At the same time, the many inquiries, open letters, petitions, etc. from Berlin Postcolonial and other civil society, migrant, diasporic and black initiatives have led to the anthropological collections being dealt with. This commitment is also decisive for this report, after Mnyaka Sururu Mboro and Christian Kopp, together with other initiatives and fellow campaigners, have been calling for years for a transparent handling of human remains. The main requirement is:

"The museums and universities not only have to inform the countries of origin, but also the..."
often known ancestral communities about their holdings. We need a central and publicly accessible online register of all colonial human remains in Germany, so that the descendants can also inform themselves. (...) And last but not least, we need sufficient financial resources for the work of a »transnational task force« so that the rehumanization of the ancestors in the depots of German collections does not take another 100 years.«

The knowledge about the shipment of body parts of certain people to Germany and the information about the colonial contexts in which the appropriation was made possible, for example the robbery or the desecration of the grave, which were not punished, is lost, according to the perspective of those affected, on the path of the Ancestral Remains to Germany. Not knowing where the remains ended up makes the search difficult and repatriation an impossible endeavor.

The connection between the knowledge of relatives and today’s collection facilities is often the key to repatriations, as is the experience of the repatriation of human remains from Austria to South Africa due to the research and the commitment of inter alia. Ciraj Rassool:

»What was needed was a more comprehensive engagement between the South African archive of removal and the Austrian archive of reception, perhaps as part of the production of a mutually agreed inventory, to enable the possibility of matching and identification.«

2.2.2. Dehumanization practice

The search for the head of Mangi Meli for his burial is not an isolated case. Taking and storing human remains in boxes, sometimes even in former food packaging, on shelves and depots, has caused and continues to cause incomprehension and profound psychological and spiritual injuries among relatives and people worldwide who reject the use of their ancestors as research material. Wolithiga Elder Henry Atkinson from Australia, a representative of the International Center for Cultural and Heritage Studies at Newcastle University, describes the scientific collection practice as dehumanizing:
»For those scientists who wanted to obtain whole bodies, these were put into barrels of spirits to preserve them on the long journey overseas, while others were reduced to skeletons. My people were wrapped in brown paper or put in a rough Hessian bag and shipped overseas. There was no thought of this being a person, a living human. How can the spirits of one’s ancestors rest when they have been subject to this type of inhumane treatment? How can they rest when, even to this day, they are still subject to the prying eyes and the jabbing tools of a so-called civilized society?«

For people from formerly colonized and indigenous peoples in particular, it is painful to know that their dead are in the institutions of the colonial powers. In some cases, they can still be used as »scientific resources«. All over the world, different groups-direct descendants, representatives of indigenous organizations and state institutions-are making demands for restitution based on diverse cultural and historical contexts.

In view of the dehumanizing treatment of their ancestral remains, the repatriating groups and institutions repeatedly call for rehumanization or re-subjectification, which is one of the central dynamics and goals of repatriations. The interpretation and practice is different depending on the historical context and interests involved actors, framing power relations and last but not least the decolonization strategies and representation structures of ethnic groups and indigenous minorities in post-colonial multi-ethnic nation states. Therefore, there is no uniform protocol for repatriations.

In the German-speaking context, it was in connection with the repatriation, among other things, of the San couple Klaas and Trooi Pienaar from the Naturkundemuseum Wien to South Africa in 2012, when Austrian and South African institutions explicitly formulated the goal of rehumanization for the first time. The historian Ciraj Rassool, whose provenance research and commitment resulted in the repatriation to South Africa, explains the importance of rehumanization as follows: »Above all, when we return human remains and restore their humanity, we remake ourselves as people, outside the terms and categories given to us by the empire of the museum«. In this specific context, part of the process of rehumanization was that the couple, who at that time were
particularly exposed to colonial violence, expropriation and displacement as members of the »San« or »Bushman«, were subsequently granted South African citizenship.

Edward Halealoha Ayau and the organization Hui Mālama I Nā Kūpuna 'O Hawai'i Ne searched for and returned the human remains of the ancestors of indigenous Hawai'ians, called Iwi Kūpuna, under the NAGPRA (»Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act«) in museums worldwide for 30 years. According to him, the practice of repatriations is based on »[an] effective expression of our humanity.« This is based, among other things, on the Hawaiian concept of humanity, which looks at care relationships and family ties, including the interdependent spiritual relationship between the living and their ancestors:

> Hawaiians express who we are as human beings in essential ways, including the relationships among the living and deceased and the resulting kuleana (duty, responsibility, privilege) to provide care for the ancestors in their physical and spiritual forms.«

Refusing people to take responsibility for the Ancestral Remains and thus the possibility of concrete care for their ancestors means withholding an expression of their humanity from them. Ayau describes this refusal by using arguments of property and the claim to expand the knowledge of mankind as an »expression of intellectual savagery, defined as using one's intellect to deny people their humanity.« The appropriation of the bones disturbs the reciprocal relationship of the ancestors with the living and this disturbance is continued by keeping the Iwi Kūpuna in anthropological collections. The disturbance can be countered by appropriate rituals within repatriation work. From this perspective, not the human remains have to be rehumanized, which according to Hui Mālama were ancestors before, during and after the repatriation, but the handling of them and their descendants by the German institutions.

Australian Ngarrindjeri Elder Tom Trevorrow explains the importance of the repatriation of ancestors from the anatomical department of Edinburgh University as follows:

> Our belief is that when our people’s remains are not with their people and in our country, then their spirit is wandering ... Unless they go back
home, the spirit never rests. These are people that we know are uneasy.« [55]

This restlessness of the spiritual entity has a disruptive effect not only on the descendants, but also on the country and the non-human world, which are connected to one another:

»We know that their spirit has been at unrest. We believe that the things that happen around us—our lands and waters—is all connected. It's part of it, and what's happening here [in the repatriation process] is part of the healing process, when we bring our Old People home.« [56]

In Australia, repatriations are described as processes of healing and reconciliation, even within official political statements.

2.2.3. The concept of repatriation

The issue of repatriation is closely related to the demand for recognition of colonial rule of injustice and indigenous values, territories, authority and rights. In the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act, the »right to the repatriation of their remains« is explicitly mentioned. By signing it, the Federal Republic of Germany declared that it »shall seek to enable the access and/or repatriation of ceremonial objects and human remains in their possession through fair, transparent and effective mechanisms developed in conjunction with indigenous peoples concerned.« [57]

The term »repatriation«, the retrieval and return of prisoners of war or civilian prisoners, has also established itself internationally in the museum context. In the educational materials developed in Canada, the concept of repatriation is summarized as follows:

»Repatriation is the return of cultural property to the originating country, community, family, or individual. Some cultural property may have been taken from its original owners through illegal or unethical ways. Repatriation of cultural property is an important part of acknowledging and reconciling the unjust ways that many First
Nations people were treated in the past. The repatriation of cultural property is an emotional topic for First Nations people in Canada and for Indigenous peoples around the world. Repatriation also has political and legal importance and must be understood as part of Indigenous peoples' historical and current encounters with colonization and its consequences.

In Australia, the term »unconditional repatriation« is used to make it clear that the descendants or probable ancestral community of the deceased have the power to define how to deal with the remains. Mike Pickering, long time director of the repatriation program at the National Museum of Australia, writes: »Repatriation is not simply the return of Ancestral Remains. It is also the return of authority over those Ancestral Remains and responsibility for what happens to them in the future. True repatriation must be unconditional.«

The term »repatriation« is also used in the German context for the repatriation of human remains. However, repatriation is only one possibility in which consensual agreements can be made with relatives about how to deal with the human remains of their ancestors or human remains assigned to them. The better the documentation or the results of the provenance research and the more precise the identity and thus, for example, the religious affiliation or the details of the appropriation of human remains are known, the easier it is for the relatives to formulate appropriate conditions. Repatriation is not to be equated with (re-) burial. For example, in the Australian context, where Aboriginal Ancestral Remains are first moved to a national repository in the National Museum, it often takes many more years before reburials can be carried out. The process of finding culturally authorized persons and corresponding cultural protocols for (re-)burials on the basis of the information available from provenance and repatriation research and oral history can sometimes take a long time. In some cases, authorizations and initiations must first be carried out in the relevant communities.

In almost all repatriations, purification and mourning ceremonies or special handover rituals took place, during which addressing the ancestors and rehumanization play a central role. Repatriations are not least of all memory and historical-political processes, as the ethnologist Larissa Förster states, for example: »It includes national and transnational,
cultural, scientific, identity and representation-political negotiations.«

In response to the current guidelines for dealing with human remains of the Museumsbund, the Namibian historian and museum director, Jeremy Silvester has observed that »The repatriation of human remains is not only important for Namibia, but also for Germany. Dealing with the past through 'restorative justice' is a central concept of the national revision of history, which is shaping current positions on the concept of race and international relations in Germany. «

Repatriations open a space in the areas of culture and sciences that are often marked as non-political, thus making it clear that these are highly political and interwoven in economic exploitation logics and that they were from the start (see section 2.3.2).

Unfortunately, this most important part of the repatriation work, the collection of the ancestors by delegations of relatives and representative representatives, as well as the integration of culturally authorized spiritual experts and the execution of burials of their ancestral remains, is often poorly supported financially and in terms of infrastructure. The respective museums or appropriation states only rarely bear the costs and it is therefore often a question of economic and social resources whether and when repatriations are possible. An example is the repatriation of 34 Ancestral Remains of the Haida People from Canada for the repatriation from the American Museum of Natural History in 2002: »The remains had been taken from graves in Haida Gwaii between 1897 and 1901 by anthropologist Charles F. Newcombe. It took the Haida two years to negotiate and fundraise approximately $50,000 to cover the costs of repatriating their ancestors.«

In the context of repatriations from Germany, corresponding communities also had to raise immense sums in order to be able to carry out the repatriation adequately without the corresponding institutions or state structures in Germany would have assumed responsibility for this aspect of repatriations. Successful repatriations must also be measured by the extent to which they succeed in supporting the relatives' repatriation work appropriately financially and in terms of infrastructure, even beyond the official return act.
2.2.4. The role of provenance research

One of the ambivalences in repatriation work is the role of scientific research in it, which on the one hand is the cause of and on the other hand, part of the solution to the problem at hand. The large collections of human remains acquired from all over the world against the will of the relatives of the dead and their ancestral communities were created as a result of the development of anthropology and ethnology as scientific disciplines (see section 2.3.1 below). Hence repatriation movements are implicitly concerned to stop present-day exploitation of indigenous people as research subjects.

Due to the poor documentation relating to many anthropological collections, provenance research is an essential prerequisite for repatriations. Edward Halealoha Ayau’s experience with the organization Hui Mālama I Nā Kūpuna ‘O Hawai‘i Ne in locating the human remains of the ancestors of indigenous Hawaiians, Iwi Kūpuna, shows the burden and additional effort involved when repatriation research and the search for relatives are not sufficiently supported by the institutions concerned:

»In this regard, one lesson I’ve learned is whenever you make a repatriation request to a museum, you ask them: What do you have from Hawai‘i? And whatever answer they give you, you ask them again: Are you sure that’s all you have? Can you look back in your records and your archives and determine whether or not you used to have remains of Hawai‘i and you sent is somewhere else? Or professor somebody came to your institution and stayed and took them. You’ve got to ask the whole range of possible scenarios because a lot of them, if we don’t ask them that question, they’re not going to answer them even though they might know that’s the case. Because we’ve had repatriation cases with institutions in the US where we’ve repatriated four times from them because they thought they found them all the first time, the same thing after the second time, third time, fourth time, and in some cases, they found the rest of the remains of someone who we had already reburied. There were situations where it just got worse, worse and worse, but our protocols are designed to acknowledge to our ancestors that we’re burdened by what’s going on
and that we need their help, we need their support, and in some situations we need their forgiveness because we weren’t astute enough to know that when we did the initial repatriation that some of them were left behind. So it hasn’t been easy.«

In the German context, provenance research is increasingly seen as an important aspect of museum work and in the sense of a new, innovative scientific sub-discipline, independent of specific requests for restitution. In particular when dealing with colonial history, it needs to be borne in mind that it is always a divided history that is incomplete and distorted due to a one-sided perspective and reliance solely on the colonial archive of written and pictorial sources. Especially against the background of the long history of foreign representation of colonized populations by European science, which in many cases can be described as epistemic violence, and the continuity of colonial ways of thinking, control and authority over research and the narrative by previously colonized people is of great importance. Ideally, both repatriation and provenance research should take place in a German context in close exchange with societies of origin or institutions that work together with relatives. Andreas Winkelmann, for example, concludes from the analysis of previous repatriations from Germany that interdisciplinary and collaborative provenance research is particularly central:

»It is important research into the history of colonialism. (...) More than guidelines and standardized policies, they may contribute to a lived reality of exchange between communities independent of, and in addition to, governmental efforts—an exchange that may better serve one of the central aims of repatriations, that is, reconciliation.«

In the repatriation research for the Karanga Aotearoa Repatriation Program at the New Zealand Museum Te Papa Tongarewa, working together and building relationships with ancestral communities is an integral part of the museum’s philosophy.

In the Australian context, repatriation work, for example that of the National Museum of Australia, is described as a service for and with the indigenous population. The repatriation of human remains also includes the return of
authority over research and the handling of information. To allow indigenous authorities to access and control information and data with a high level of cultural sensitivity, the web resource »Return, Reconcile, Renew« went online in March 2017. With this platform, new protocols and ethical principles in dealing with digital data archiving were discussed and developed.

2.2.5. Successes of the international repatriation movements

Notably in former European settler colonies, in which national collections and institutions stored the remains of indigenous groups whose members now lived as a minority population in the same country, returns and burials began in the mid-1970s. For the Australian context, Paul Turnbull’s quotation makes it clear that the hegemonic becoming visible of this movement was preceded by decades of work and commitment:

»By the mid-1970s, Indigenous Australians had secured sufficient political agency and resources to begin seeking the return of the remains of their Old People from museums and other medico-scientific collections in an organized fashion. By the early 1990s, community leaders had convinced Australian politicians and policy makers, museum personnel and university-based researchers with interests in human remains to recognize their right to unconditional repatriation of their ancestors’ remains.«

The individual repatriations triggered a rethink in institutions, which led to the development of structures and mechanisms that in turn facilitated further returns such as guidelines, handouts and legal regulations. From country to country very different developments took place, which are described in detail in the specialist literature. At this point, only important examples are mentioned. The US »Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act« (NAGPRA) of November 16, 1990 was the first law that not only recognized the return of human remains but made it legally binding. The law required publicly funded collections to proactively approach Native American and Native Hawaiian organizations within a few years to display human remains, funeral objects and/or
ceremonial objects in their possession. Under the NAGPRA, thousands of human remains, funeral and ceremonial objects have already been returned, but agreements have also been made to keep these in the possession of museums. 

In addition, in the absence of national guidelines, many museums and collections around the world have committed themselves to dealing with human remains in the form of requirements and guidelines. An example is the »Guideline On The Management Of Human Remains in Iziko Collections« (2005) from the Iziko Museum of Capetown, South Africa. In the South African context, the concept of the unethical collection practice »unethical collecting« is particularly relevant, which includes the collection of human remains solely for the purpose of race research or without the corresponding consent of known relatives or communities.

In New Zealand/Aotearoa, the Te Papa Museum has participated in the repatriation of Kōiwi tangata (Māori Ancestral Remains) since the 1980s. In 2003, the government of New Zealand/Aotearoa published a cabinet paper officially mandating the museum to take over the repatriation of Kōiwi tangata from international institutions and return them to their communities. In the 2005 directive, the Karanga Aotearoa Repatriation Program, six principles were agreed upon. Among other things, that the government does not claim ownership of the Kōiwi tangata and its role is one of facilitation, relief, of repatriations, which must take place with the participation of Māori and Moriori.

In Australia, the repatriation of the Ancestral Remains of Aboriginal People and Torres-Strait-Islander at home and abroad has been an important task for Australian indigenous communities and institutions in the museum sector and cultural policy since the 1980s. National political support followed the philosophy and practice developed from repatriation work. Government-sponsored research in Australia and the Australian government’s commitment to assist in the repatriation of the ancestors of the indigenous peoples have driven developments in Europe. In a joint declaration of Great Britain and Australia in 2000, the legality of some indigenous claims was recognized. As a result, an inventory and hearings took place, which resulted in general standards and guidelines for the handling of human remains in museums and collections in the »Guidance for the Care of Human Remains resulted in the Museum of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport«.

In Germany, too, the work of the Australian embassy supported the development of how to deal with human remains from colonial
contexts. In 2003, for example, collection institutions in Germany were contacted for information, and the agreement on the repatriation of the human remains of the Aboriginal people and the Torres Strait Islander to Australia in November 2008 between the chairman of the Charité board and the then Australian ambassador preceded the Charité’s pioneering research and repatriation project. 

2.3. Background: Developments in Germany

2.3.1. Repatriations from Germany

The slow processing of its own colonial history is the main reason why Germany started comparatively late to deal with the repatriation of human remains of indigenous groups. In addition to repatriation requests from outside Germany, it took decades of immigrant, diasporic, Black and post-colonial civil society interventions to create understanding, public opinion, and political pressure before those responsible for the collection and political decision-makers turned to the topic (see section 2.2.1).

Despite the immense number of human remains from colonial contexts in Germany, there have so far only been a few repatriations. Human remains were returned to Tanzania by the Überseemuseum Bremen in 1954 and to New Zealand/Aotearoa in 2006 and 2017. However, it was the repatriations of the Charité project to Namibia (2011 and 2014), Paraguay (2012) and Australia (2013 and 2014) that raised the issue of scientific, state and public awareness. The conference and the anthology »Sammeln, Erforschen, Zurückgeben?« served as a stimulus for an intensified discussion in museum and scientific circles.

The returns to Namibia in particular sparked outrage about the way German institutions dealt with the sensitive issue of the repatriation of human remains. Namibians and a critical German and international public were angry and disappointed about the lack of adequate state participation with the recognition of the genocide. The fact that the respective descendants and the Nama and OvaHerero organizations representing them were not invited, especially during the second repatriation, even though the bones were shipped to Germany immediately after the genocide of the Nama and OvaHerero by the Germans, met with particular criticism. The example of Namibia
shows that repatriations are not only a matter for the respective institutions, as has often been argued in the German context, but also require a fundamental political positioning.

The historian Hilary Howes notes that between 2011 and 2015 there was a clear change of awareness. During this time, Howes worked as assistant to the Australian Ambassador in Berlin and, among other things, responsible for a preliminary provenance research to find ancestors of the Australian Aboriginal people in German institutions. After considering the developments in Germany over the past few years, Hilary Howes comes to the following conclusion:

»Germany is beginning to engage in a sustained and serious way with questions of repatriation as it relates to the country’s colonial past. Although more recent aspects of Germany’s history continue to dominate political and public discourse, awareness of repatriation is growing amongst representatives of German collecting institutions. This growing awareness, combined with increasing pressure from foreign government representatives and civil society initiatives, has led such institutions to develop relevant policies and guidelines, undertake provenance research, and, in a few cases, repatriate human remains to their communities of origin.«

2.3.2. Case study: Rehumanization for repatriation in Saxony

Requests for the return of Ancestral Remains question confront difficulties in implementation, including historical continuities in ontological, epistemic, administrative, legal, domestic and foreign policy-making that have yet to be wholly decolonized. In the conclusion of an anthology on repatriation processes and anthropological research in recognition of the authority of the descendants worldwide, Ann Kakaliouras writes:

»Lastly, we all know that repatriation is a complex and difficult process, as every single contribution to this volume shows. (…) Worse, the intellectual and actual frameworks that support colonial projects around the world are frequently still in place, so that decolonizing
work, whether it be repatriation or other forms of restitution, must run up against the very structures that enabled the original dispossession and appropriation.«

The first repatriation of human remains from colonial contexts from Saxony in 2017, and the first that was explicitly carried out in Germany under the concept of »rehumanization«, is an example of the difficulty and complexity in the German context. The following are findings of the author from the analysis of the process the rehumanization, which was obtained through expert interviews in 2020 with key actors. Last but not least, addressing publicly the frustrating and protracted work of the Hawaiian organization Hui Mālama ʻI Nā Kūpuna ʻO Hawaiʻi Ne was important. For 26 years, the organization kept writing letters to the Dresden Völkerkunde-museum, which either went unanswered, or met with rejection and refusal to discuss the issue further, citing the museum’s legal obligation to preserve and administer the property of the Free State of Saxony.

The concept of rehumanization created a way within the rule of law to be able to apply ethical and moral principles in relation to the Iwi Kūpuna (name of the Ancestral Remains from Hawaiʻi), who had been in storage for over 100 years. This made it possible for the actors to apply human rights in the basic law and to detach the ancestral remains from the state property of the Free State of Saxony and thus from the status of the cultural asset.

To initiate the process of return, and thus also of rehumanization, an ontological rethinking on the part of the museum management and the relevant curator Birgit Scheps-Bretschneider was required. The well-documented background of the deliberate stealing of the skulls of revered and significant personalities from a grave cave against the will of the islanders could be demonstrated by the collaborative provenance research that was initiated. With this, the reclaim for decision-makers was recognized as scientifically justified. Since the Free State of Saxony was seen as the legal »owner« of the »cultural assets«, the matter was brought to the responsible minister. Furthermore, a legal basis for the repatriation was necessary. As a result the museum was asked to assign a monetary value to the human remains as »property«, which of course undermined their right to human dignity. The scientific value of the remains also had to be assessed, which required confirmation from a leading researcher at a
research institute of evolutionary anthropology that the bones would no longer be used for scientific and ethical reasons.

Furthermore, it is questionable whether the repatriation would have taken place without the consent of the National Foreign Office and the cooperation with the national government of the country of origin. In the case of Hawaii, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), drawn up in the 1990s, clarified the great potential for conflict regarding the question of the authorized contact person in the tension between the country of origin and the community of origin. Through many other smaller and larger bureaucratic obstacles, such as matters of insurance, customs and images in databases, the Iwi Kūpuna were repeatedly addressed as objects and thus the principle of rehumanization was undermined.

With the appropriation of the bones, the reciprocal relationship of the ancestors with the living was disturbed, which, as mentioned above, represent a central reason for the repatriation efforts in Hawaii (see section 2.2.2). In this sense, the return is not a reparation or a progressive moment, but initially only the end of the coloniality of active retention.

The process of rehumanization in Saxony is to be seen as a transformation process in the context of dealing with the »colonial legacy«, the continuity of the structures that i.e. declare ancestral remains as possession and thereby negate and exclude other forms of attachment. Ultimately, however, the Saxon process remained within the framework of post- and non-decolonial institutional, nation-state and public-law structures. This shows that repatriations have a decolonizing as well as (re-) colonizing potential and that not only the return itself is decisive, but also the way in which it is implemented.

In analyzing the debates in Germany, the South African historian Ciraj Rassool draws critical attention to the fact that in Germany colonialism is often still understood as a purely historically datable event: »There needs to be a deeper appreciation of how categories, institutions and disciplinary formations may be marked by coloniality, even long after colonialism’s end.« In this sense, the active insistence on the many smaller and larger aspects in the process of »rehumanization« in this case enabled colonial continuities to be made visible and negotiable and an ontological rethinking to become the core of the process for the German side. The then Saxon Minister for Science and Art Eva-Maria Stange said in her speech on October 22, 2017:
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For the descendants, the Iwi Kūpuna were never objects and accordingly did not have to be »rehumanized«. Rather, the »rehumanization« concerned the ways of thinking and structures within the Saxon and Federal German institutions, which continued the objectification of human bones even during the process of repatriation. In the process of rehumanization in Saxony, all decision-makers involved in the interviews accordingly spoke of a significant learning process, emotional participation and an intensive experience of »rethinking«. The commitment paved the way for further repatriations of human remains from colonial contexts from Saxony, to Australia in 2019 and presumably to New Zealand/Aotearoa in 2022— with the participation of relatives. Moreover, the experiences from this first repatriation from Saxony flowed into the Conference of Ministers of Education, from which the key issues paper on handling collection items from colonial contexts emerged and, for the first time, the general political will to repatriate human remains from colonial contexts was declared.

2.3.3. Key points, guidelines and research funding in Germany

What is specific about the handling of returns and colonial or post-colonial provenance research in the German-speaking context is that it developed along the lines of developments and sensitivities surrounding the handling of looted art in the context of National Socialism, which accompanied the expropriation and destruction of Jewish life. In this context the great role of the ethical and moral category of the »context of injustice« is to be understood in the German-speaking context, from which returns are also legitimized from colonial contexts. International developments also influenced the basic orientation of the handling of human remains from colonial contexts.
in Germany. The recommendations for dealing with human remains in museums and collections (2013) were initially based on the British Guidance for the Care of Human Remains in Museums of 2005, according to which every institution should develop a way of dealing with it on its own responsibility. 35 Furthermore, the long-standing collaboration between German and Australian museum experts and researchers on dealing with the ancestral remains of Aboriginal people had a major influence on the debate. 35 Shortly after the recommendations of the Museumsbund were published, the fact that the recommendations do not question Eurocentric assumptions and do not point beyond internationally established agreements was criticized in an international workshop organized by Larissa Förster and Sarah Fründt. 35 Germany can draw on the knowledge, experience and networks of over 30 years of repatriation efforts in other countries, e.g. from Australia, 36 New Zealand/Aotearoa 37 and South Africa. 38

In 2019, the federal state ministers as well as the culture ministers of the federal states and municipal umbrella organizations adopted the »Ersten Eckpunkte zum Umgang mit Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen Kontexten« (First key points for dealing with collections from colonial contexts). Thereby, the political will was declared to prioritize the processing of human remains from colonial contexts and to create the conditions for repatriation. A corresponding legal basis was and is not yet available or announced. The revision of the recommendations of the Deutscher Museumsbund (DMB) on how to deal with human remains in 2021 does not endorse unconditional returns but recommends possible returns on the basis of fully established provenance in individual cases and verifiable evidence of remains being acquired in contexts of injustice. However, the existence of injustice in acquisition is not considered a mandatory prerequisite for repatriation. As the guidelines note: »... a return can also be considered at the same time without ascertaining an injustice context, for example in order to recognize that the human remains or the objects containing them are for those who wish to be returned by are of particular importance.« 35

Based on the Kultusministerkonferenz (Standing Conference of Ministers of Culture and Education) in 2018, the publication of the key points paper was prepared and a Bund-Länder-AG (federal-state working group) »Dealing with Collection Items from Colonial Contexts« was set up, in which several central associations, the Foreign Office and the federal states' ministers of culture are organized. These are the central
control and supervisory body for the contact point for collections from colonial contexts in Germany, which was set up on October 16, 2019. It should be the point of contact for communities and countries of origin and also receive inquiries about human remains. It is obliged to provide information to the Bund-Länder AG and the responsible authorities in the federal, state, and local governments are to be involved in requests for return. In addition, it is commissioned to implement the so-called »3-way strategy«, with the goal of setting up a central register for collected items from colonial contexts in German institutions.

On November, 30th, 2021, selected data sets on colonial collections from 25 institutions were published, in the Deutsche Digitale Bibliothek (German Digital Library). In the next step, the form of digital recording of human remains from colonial contexts is to be examined and developed in cooperation with the countries and societies of origin.

The institutionalization of colonial provenance research was able to connect to the institutions and networks of Nazi provenance research. To support these research projects, the Deutsches Zentrum Kulturgutverluste (DZK) has set up a research and funding area in 2018, and from 2019 a department for cultural and collection items from colonial contexts with four positions and additional funds of 2 million euros.

Provenance research on human remains from colonial contexts is given particular urgency in funding decisions.

2.4. Background:

Colonial Contexts

2.4.1. On the term and focus on »colonial contexts«

It is characteristic of the long-neglected confrontation with colonial history in Germany that an understanding of the historical context and recognition of the topicality of the topic in the hegemonic discourse of recent years has emerged, not least in the debates about the specific restitution of cultural goods and repatriation of human remains. It was only in these discourses that long ignored and rejected perspectives from those affected and scientists from the former colonies were increasingly heard, also in the German context. Concrete provenance research on collection items from colonial contexts was given the task of fundamentally addressing colonial history.
and providing information on the more general understanding of »colonial contexts«.

In order to understand why the term colonial context encompasses far more than the direct acts of official colonial administration, it must first be considered that the more than 500-year colonial history is characterized by »the spatial diversity, the extraordinary diversity of colonized cultures, the plurality of colonial powers like the forms of rule and colony, the distances and shifts between cores and margins« 46. Scientific development, missionary work and economic influence are aspects that established and accompanied formal colonial rule.

The German museums were often caught unprepared by the demands made towards Germany to face up to their colonial past, which is why the Deutsche Museumsbund in 2018 wrote a »Guide on how to deal with collections from colonial contexts«. The definition of the term »colonial context« in this guide, which was revised in 2021, is also a point of reference for this report:

»Colonial contexts in the sense of this guideline are initially understood to mean circumstances and processes that have their roots either in formal colonial rule or in colonial structures outside of formal colonial rule. In such times, structures with a large imbalance in power politics can arise both between and within states or other political units, from which networks and practices have emerged that have also supported collecting and procurement practices for European museums (see p 107).« 47 Colonialism also had a massive impact on colonizing societies, which is why the term »colonial contexts« should be understood further: »Under 'colonial' is to be understood the real practice of domination, but also ideologies, discourses (including racial discourses), systems of knowledge, aesthetics and perspectives [are understood] that preceded formal and real domination, supported it and secured it, and were able to have an impact beyond it.« 48

The definition of colonial contexts, the assignment in individual cases and the evaluation of certain contexts as contexts of injustice is an ongoing and ongoing discussion. For
the question of the classification of human remains in the category »from colonial contexts« there is so far no guideline. The guide to human remains, also published by the Deutscher Museumsbund is mainly geared towards the concept of the »context of injustice«. The exchange on the coloniality of Latin American, Egyptian and Near Eastern collections of human remains, which are addressed in the specialist discipline as archaeological collections, is still at the beginning of an action-guiding understanding:

»Due to the distant temporal reference of archaeological human remains to people living today, an ethical and moral discussion about handling and presentation in Europe, but also in some non-European countries, has hardly been conducted so far.«

In the context of the present report, for reasons of capacity, this vacancy is not addressed with a further discussion and positioning, although the assignment of these collections to the category »colonial contexts« would significantly influence the result of the inventory. The same applies to collections of human remains from Eastern Europe. The focus of the inventory on human remains from colonial contexts and non-human remains per se results solely from the demands for restitution, with which previously colonized groups of people and countries forced today’s descendants and successors in institutions of the former colonial powers to grapple with their own collection history. For former colonizers, this dispute is a long overdue addition to a Eurocentric and colonial tradition of their own history. In addition, it opens up access to further aspects and gaps in the social and scientific public with regard to the history and significance of the collections.

The limitation to human remains from colonial contexts is not congruent with injustice contexts and therefore does not convey the complex and intersectional relationships of power and inequality that also pervade the European metropolises. So far there does not seem to have been a larger public who takes offense at the collections of human remains of European origin and demands a processing of the collection history of human remains from the end of the 19th century, which often came from hospitals and penal institutions and were labeled »Swiss woman«, »Swede« or with »mentally ill«, »robber«, »child murderer« were inventoried.
2.4.2. Appropriations in colonial contexts

A more intensive examination of the anthropological history of the collection, in particular against the colonial-historical background of this time, was only initiated in Germany by indigenous and political representatives' demands for the return of mortal remains.¹¹

The body parts of non-European people were appropriated under different conditions, but the majority in German collections were acquired in circumstances where colonial influence has already intervened in the sovereignty, control and self-determination of the autochthonous peoples. There was a downright trade with human remains.¹² Almost all German travelers, missionaries, soldiers and merchants were advised to «collect» for scientific purposes. In 1872, for example, the BGAEU suggested how and what should be «collected across the globe». For example, all marines under Admiral von Stosch, the head of the Imperial Navy, received instructions that also included the “collecting” of human remains.¹³ In the majority of cases, the “collection” of human remains from colonial contexts involved robbery and plundering of graves.

The practice of “collecting”, of appropriation, was an integral part of many research expeditions, military campaigns of conquest and so-called punitive expeditions by all European colonial powers during the 19th century. We find that the appropriation of cultural objects and human remains was expressed in advance through »wish lists« of objects and the accompaniment of the armies by experts »was more like a deliberate theft than a military looting in the narrower sense«.¹⁴ From the beginning of German colonization, appropriation and robbery were part of the colonial exploitation and the system of domination. In training centers such as the Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen in Berlin, and the Kolonialschule Witzenhausen, young travelers were taught how to increase the collections in Germany. Publications such as the »Deutsches Kolonialblatt« or the »Deutsch-Ostafrika-Zeitung« published news about collection successes and shipments to Germany. By the second half of the 19th century the flow of raw materials from colonial possessions included anthropometric data and actual skeletal material where it could be acquired.¹⁵ Paul Turnbull states for the German context that »...between 1860 and 1914, a disturbing symbiotic relationship existed between German scientific and colonial ambitions, which saw the collecting of
the bodily remains of local subject peoples by plundering their burial places, by the dissection of corpses in colonial prisons and hospitals, and, in a number of recorded instances, by dismembering the bodies of men and women killed by colonial military forces.«

2.4.3. Collecting as a national project

With the Federal Council resolution of February 21, 1889, there was regulation of the »treatment and distribution of scientific and ethnographic collections from the colonies, such as those from expeditions equipped by the Reich or from officers and officials from the Schutzgebiete (protected areas)«. The bundles which arrived in Berlin from expeditions or sent by colonial officials from 1891 onwards — in some instances openly labeled as spoils of war — were sent for evaluation and preservation by the city’s three leading scientific institutions: the Botanisches Museum, the Naturkundemuseum and the Museum für Völkerkunde.

The historian Katja Kaiser observes of historical sources detailing discussions between the Colonial Department of the Foreign Office, the Prussian Cultural Ministry, and these Berlin museums, that scientific research, economic and strategic political interests were inextricably linked. The museums were seen as playing a vital part in educating the German public in knowledge of the Reich’s colonial possessions and their contribution to national advancement. Kaiser writes that »The three Berlin museums established themselves as colonial archives as well as places of production and imparting knowledge about the colonies, as a repository of materials and as knowledge stores.«

In addition, minerals were given to the geologische Landesanstalt in Berlin and fossils also came to the Berliner Paläontologisches Institut. Berlin institutions were responsible for distributing the duplicates (objects or bones of which there were already copies in the Berlin museums) to other institutions in other federal states and were supposed to compile registers. The criticism about the »favoring« of the Berlin museums at that time from »circles of the scientific and ethnographic museum administrations of the German federal states as well as those of the heads of the German university collections« was dealt with at the level of the colonial administration and the Königliche
Ministerien des Innern und Äußern der Bundesländer
(Royal Ministries of the Interior and Exterior of the federal states). Ultimately, the privilege of collecting institutions in the capital was formally replaced through a share in the »yield« proportionately of the share in the financial resources of the expeditions. In the discussions, it was often emphasized that above all, it was important not to slow down the collecting zeal of German officials and travelers.

The decision of the Bundesrat makes it clear that the collections were the expression of a national project that was to establish Berlin as the capital and Germany within the European colonial powers. Against this background, the collection histories of the Berlin museums and archives are to be viewed as simultaneous, interrelated developments. The fact of international and interdisciplinary collection practice must also be reflected in a transnational and interdisciplinary approach if the potential contained therein for additions, access to sources and synergies is to be used.

2.4.4. Understanding and conveying »colonial contexts«

A sensitive and racism-critical approach is necessary, which addresses the violent history of the colonial practice of appropriating human remains for the purpose of anthropological or race research on the one hand and the associated and interwoven broader colonial backgrounds and developments on the other hand, so that people will not be re-traumatized, and racism is not reproduced. A focus on psychological and emotional coping should be planned as part of the work-through from the start.

It is crucial that the relevant collection institutions are sensitized to colonial history when dealing with reclaimed human remains and undertake a self-critical positioning in post-colonial power relations in order to cease the colonial practice. To this day, relatives or supporting persons and institutions first have to do basic awareness-raising and mediation work in order to be able to persuade those responsible to cooperate appropriately. The experience in the decades of repatriation work of the Haida, from that of the Haida Gwaii archipelago off the coast of the Canadian state of British Columbia, is an example of the great amount of educational work to enable the repatriation of their ancestors from various
museums in different countries:

»One of our bigger challenges has been gaining the trust and participation of a museum in the early stages of the repatriation process. By being diplomatic, patient and persistent, we have found that our efforts to explain our culture and our history have been successful. (...) We include museum staff in our work and ceremonies where appropriate and together we build and foster relationships. By the end of each repatriation, the employees of the museum are always so thrilled to have been a part of the process and you can see they understand and are involved from their hearts.«

This additional work of the repatriation practitioners and their supporters is often taken for granted, underestimated, in some cases appropriated and — if at all — paid less than the repatriation work of local provenance researchers and museum employees.

Rather, indigenous communities often still must finance necessary aspects of repatriation. Delegations for collection in Germany do not receive any money after repatriation from German cultural or political institutions to carry out the (re) burial. The society of origin must be able to afford repatriations if they want to carry them out adequately.

This situation neglects that fact that former colonial powers are dependent on cooperation with relatives or communities wanting to rebury their dead if they want to understand and address responsibly the legacies of their past ambitions. Moreover, it needs to be recognized that indigenous groups or identified communities of origin may not want to enter into cooperation, or are not interested in making a decision on how to decide the fate of remains without the consent of their descendants. Intra-familial or communal internal negotiations and authorization processes may be complex and lengthy, and this must be accepted.

In addition to the challenges that repatriation entails, it also offers the opportunity to advance educational initiatives that generate a critical understanding of the complexity of colonial history and counteracting its possible continuities, while also commemorating those whose remains were denied their right to burial in accordance with their cultural traditions.

The support and financing of processing and coping processes and

Read up on the website of the Skidegate Repatriation & Cultural Committee:
www.repatriation.ca/Pages/Our%20Learning.html
Two examples are given here that show how the information from provenance research or repatriation research (archival evidence, anthropological results and oral historiography) can be used to commemorate well-known personalities and unknown people, whose bones were shipped to Germany in order to be used for racial research. The first is the exhibition by Konradin Kunze and Sarita Mamseri, which complements the German colonial history, which has so far been little communicated in Germany, with local resistance history in today’s Tanzania. From the provenance research by supporters of Isaria Meli’s return application for the remains of his grandfather Mangi Meli (see section 2.2.1), both written and oral evidence were processed in an exhibition that is being held in Berlin, Dar es Salaam and now as a permanent exhibition in Moshi can be seen at the location where the assassination and subsequent appropriation of the skull took place. Precisely because the head of Mangi Meli has still not been returned, the organizers of the exhibition wanted to at least return information on the divided history from German archives.

As a second example for using information from provenance research to create a public place for learning and remembrance, the Nyamba Buru Yawuru (NBY) organization in Australia is working with the Gwarinman Memorial Area project to set up a memorial for the abducted ancestors. The project is named after the warrior Gwarinman, whose skull will be repatriated from the Natural History Museum in London after intensive repatriation work. The Broome Cemetery will be a place for the burial of the ancestors of the Yawuru and Karajarri who were repatriated to Australia or whose remains are still stored in scientific facilities. There will also be an exhibition that tells of the fate of the people and uses their experiences as a lens through which to understand the colonial history of Broome and its place in colonial economic and scientific history.

The 14 Yawuru and Karajarri men, women and children who have already been repatriated from Dresden in 2019, are also to be buried here and their life stories remembered. The handover of the relevant documents of provenance research by the Saxon institution was part of the repatriation, which is also described by the term: »Restitution of knowledge«. In the joint processing of this information with Yawaru Elders about the deceased, whose traumatic experiences of violence were visible on the bones, several strands of the history of colonial
The events were classified within the regional colonial history dating back to the first violent clashes, which the Yawuru and their Karajarri neighbors remember in oral tradition. This also shed new light on the marginalized and dark side of pearl fishing, which was hidden both in Germany and Australia and which led to the enslavement of the Aboriginal people. Sarah Yu writes: »There were no documentary accounts of so many young Aboriginal men and women being killed and then buried but their remains tell this part of the story that has been left out of the archives.« Ancestors from Dresden and other museums has the goal: »sharing of their stories so that the traumatic truth of the colonial encounter is (re) told from a Yawuru perspective.«

The picture »the soul within« by the Djugan und Yawaru artist Michael Jalaru Torres (see chapter 1.1) was created in the context of the return from Dresden. Reference should be made at this point to a second image from the »Collect« series. This is titled »Black Pearl« and shows the face of a black woman painted in black from the side. She closed her eyes and mouth. In the background, a black veil flows around her shoulders and around a red headscarf. The woman’s earrings with a small and a large white pearl fall over this ornamented fabric. »The white pearl has evolved over time of its value and importance but only today has the black pearl been valued«, so the subtitle.

Just as invisible as the people whose body parts have been turned into scientific preparations are the traumatizing and violent living and working conditions of those who were forced to exploit their own land for the profit of international companies behind the pearl, as a status symbol and commercial object. The connection through colonial history between Yawuru and people in Germany such as the Saxons, to whose state ownership the bones belonged for a long time, goes beyond the processing of anthropological research and also includes the international production and trade relations of colonial goods.

The planned exhibition of the Gwarinman memorial area in the land where the taking of remains occurred, in this case Saxony, can stimulate an interest in the region’s history and an understanding of colonial contexts. Museums and universities possessing collections of remains likewise have an educational mandate. In the coalition agreement of 2018, the colonial era was named for the first time as one of the central themes of the culture of remembrance in Germany.

Beyond provenance research, there has so far been limited reappraisal and remembrance of Berlin-based racial research of
the 19th and early 20th centuries which highlights and acknowledges its connections with past colonial ambitions. Two years ago, the federal government stated that it was neither aware of nor had initiated research and educational projects dealing with »racial anthropological research«. In the summer of 2021, as a result of social pressure and in response to the racist-motivated attacks in Hanau and Halle, the Federal Ministry of Education and Research issued a funding guideline on current and historical dynamics of right-wing extremism and racism. In the announcement, the Ministry states that »research on racism has so far been selective and scattered. (...) However, historical research into right-wing extremism and racism in Germany and Europe is of great importance in order to be able to critically question current social power relations, cultures of remembrance and knowledge production.«

Research on racism and thus also addressing the history of scientific racism is a general task for society as a whole to combat it of current forms of racism.

For this reason alone it is appropriate for people and institutions in Germany to support the sustainable financing of projects to deal with, cope with and remember the colonial legacy with a view to the future, such as the examples mentioned above. Financial and infrastructural support for those affected and public support for repatriations alone are no guarantee of progress in decolonization and, from a decolonial perspective, are not sufficient. Leaving representatives of communities of origin to deal with the emotional, mediating and caring work alone would correspond to the continuation of a patriarchal and racist separation in the discussion of colonialism and racism (see section 2.1.3) within dominant white spaces and discourses.

A discussion of race research is required, which deconstructs racism and classifies it in broader colonial contexts, structures and networks of relationships. Different formats and approaches are possible here to make a broad reflection of the personal integration into the »colonial legacy« tangible and thus also the emotional, personal, physical aspects of the impact of racism and coloniality on whites and descendants/successors of the former colonizers. How could the confrontation with the dehumanizing scientific and exploitative practice look like, which addresses people in their complicity in the institutional entanglements and continuities of colonial violence? How can the history of violence and its continuity be seen and recognized from a white perspective, which gives negatively affected actors the opportunity to be
heard and to take space? How can the reflections on thought and theory traditions, in which the appropriation of bodies for »learning« about the »others« was abused, and those where relatives as non-scientists were denied access to depots and letters remained unanswered, can be used to establish a culture of dialogue and consensual agreements? Only then the process of learning from one another can begin. And there is a lot to learn from each other, from an open exchange about the meaning of repatriations and the philosophical, moral and political questions that affect them and which arise from dealing with the remains of people in post-colonial circumstances, to addressing current appropriation processes that cause destruction and negate intersubjective relationships, to effective strategies against an environmental degradation that is threatening all life on earth.

As is emphasized again and again, it is a common experience that repatriation does not come the end, but rather at the beginning of cooperation.

3. Inventory

3.1. Institutional Entanglements

Anthropological collections were created at various locations in Berlin in the 19th and 20th centuries, and are closely linked to one another in terms of the history of their collections. As Holger Stoecker and Andreas Winkelmann emphasize, the Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte BGAEU played a central role: In this »metropolitan network [...] of collections, curators, local collectors, scientists, museums, journals, the university and Charité, the Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte« stood out prominently. As part of the Human Remains Project at the Charité, Stoecker and Winklemann obtained an overview of the collections and estimate that around 15,000 people were kept in the anthropological collections in Berlin around the time before the First World War. Felix von Luschan campaigned for an Institut für Anthropologie at the Berliner Universität that should unite all collections of the Museum für Völkerkunde, the BGAEU and his private »teaching material collection« under his directorate and with it »Berlin could boast about the possession of by far the largest anthropological collection in the whole world, since it would
then far surpass London, Washington and Paris. This did not happen, however, and the largest Berlin collection of 5,600 bones, the private teaching material collection (L-Collection) of Felix von Luschan, was sold to the American Museum of Natural History in New York after his death in 1924. The approximately 11,500 human skulls and skeletal parts have been stored since 2011 and skeletal parts of the largest anthropological collection in the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz (SPK). The largest collections therein are the so-called »Rudolf Virchow Collection« (»RV-Collection«), which the BGAEU regards and curates as its property as well as the »S collection«, which was mainly compiled by Felix von Luschan. The latter was handed over in 2011 by the Charité to the SPK together with the so-called »Rassenschädelsammlung« (a collection of racially categorized skulls), part of the anatomical collection of the Centrum für Anatomie of the Charité. Since then, the two collections, together with other remains that could not be assigned to any collection, have formed the so-called »Felix von Luschan Collection« at the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte of the SPK.

The reconstructions of the history of the collection that are possible today, especially in their scientific and colonial-historical context, are largely thanks to provenance research projects that have already been carried out. Particularly noteworthy here is the anthology published as part of the Charité Human Remains Project (2010-2013), from whose contributions many of the explanations on the history of the Berlin collections emerge. As it turned out, there are still wide research gaps in large parts of the history of the collection. For instance, it has not yet been clarified where the wooden boxes with the remains of the RV-collection were moved to in 1943. Likewise, the Naturkundemuseum Berlin has so far not been able to reconstruct the exact holdings and the time phase of the anthropological collections that were in the meantime under its responsibility.

3.1.1. The »Rudolf Virchow Collection« (RV-Collection)

The highest registered inventory number of human remains in the RV-collection is R.V. 4094. In the 1990 inventory, which the database is based on, 3365 individuals are listed. During the last move up to 2013, Horst Junker, the Archive Manager at the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte and archivist...
of the BGAEU, added a realignment. According to the current information on the BGAEU website, the RV-collection now comprises 4,500 objects. In addition to the vast majority of human skulls from all over the world, skeletons and bones, the collection also includes individual animal bones, as well as wax and plaster casts, etc.

The collection received its name from the pathologist and anthropologist Rudolf Virchow, who, as a researcher personality and central key figure of the BGAEU, built up the collection with a large network of co-workers.

In 1902, Curt Strauch was given the task of inventorying the collection, which at that time was housed in the Pathological Institute of the Charité. Due to unfavorable storage conditions, a large part of the collection was moved to the Königliches Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin, where it remained until 1943. Following Virchow’s death, the allocation from his records and his publication of the new entries were reconstructed in the so-called »Strauch directory« and published in the »Zeitschrift für Ethnologie«. Felix von Luschan, who continued to look after the collection from 1905, introduced the labeling of the skulls with the inscription »RV« and the respective number directly on the head. Since he took office in 1886 as Assistant Director at the Königliches Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin, von Luschan had been collecting human remains and was now in charge of the RV-collection in addition to the museum’s own S-collection – where the »S« stands for »skull« – and his private collection of teaching materials (L-Collection). Around 1910 a three-volume directory of the RV-collection and inventory maps with detailed entries were created.

The anthropological collection of the BGAEU, the human remains that Virchow’s wife bequeathed to the BGAEU as heiress of his estate, purchases made with funds from the Rudolf Virchow Foundation, as well as the donations made by Virchow himself and after his death to the Institute for Pathology at the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, are summarized under the name »RV-Collection«. Until 1943, the RV-collection was housed in the building complex of the Museum für Völkerkunde and after the end of the Second World War was moved to the Marstall Building, Breite Str. 30/31, together with the S collection, where it is kept to this day and recorded in a database. In 1990, a complete register of the existing skulls of 3365 individuals was created for the first time, with the highest RV number (RV 4094) indicating loss due to theft or decay.
3.1.2. »S-collection« or »Luschan-collection«

The highest registered inventory number in the S-collection is »S 6064«. The collection still contains human remains from around 5,300 individuals. The term »S-collection« goes back to Felix von Luschan, who marked the human skulls with an S + number + origin and collector data. While studying medicine in Vienna, von Luschan became interested in anthropological research and was involved in the Vienna Anthropological Society. From 1885, he worked initially as directorial assistant at the Königliches Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin, later as director of the Africa and Oceania departments. From 1900 he taught anthropology at the Berliner Universität. In his function as a full professor, he had complete responsibility for the museum's anthropological collection from 1909 onwards. Without large financial resources, this was mainly composed of mailings of human bones and soft tissues from all over the world, which responded to the constantly formulated requests for mailings from a large network—for instance military officials and travelers—that were given to the museum free of charge. More systematically and with personal financial means, von Luschan bought human skulls for his private collection of teaching materials.

The S-collection was documented using index cards, of which only 309 could be saved, in catalogs and an inventory. In 1928, four years after von Luschan's death, the collection was given to the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologe (KWI-A) and looked after by Eugen Fischer, Luschan's successor to the professorship for anthropology. Fischer himself had brought bones of the Nama from Namibia to Germany. Nevertheless, he wanted to get away from anthropometry and only reluctantly took the Luschan collection, which would otherwise have been bequeathed by Luschan's widow to the Anthropologisches Institut in Vienna under Otto Reche, so that it would no longer eke out a »shadowy existence« in the basement of the Berlin pathology department. The collection was probably expanded, i.e. with the »Schädel-Ankaufsfond« (Skull Purchase Fund) of 2,000 Reichsmarks from the Berlin University until it was outsourced during the war in 1943.

The RV and S-collections were stored together for a long time, curated and used for medical-anthropological research. After the Second World War, during which the collection documentation was almost completely lost, and the unexplained war-related relocation, a large part of the S-collection was merged with that of the RV-collection in the storage rooms of the
Museum für Naturkunde (MfN) as an institution of the Humboldt Universität in 1948. With the newly founded Institut für Anthropologie under the direction of Hans Grimm, the management of the collection fell to this institution in 1955. At the Institute for Anthropology, a new inventory of the S-collection began in 1964, together with the RV-collection. Until 1976 Ingrid Wustmann used i.e. index cards for restoration and identification work, while Ulrich Creutz later continued this work using the dBaseIV programs and, from 1994, Excel. The human remains of more than 5,300 individuals in the S-collection were identified, which were mainly collected worldwide between 1890 and 1923.
Diagram of the storage locations of the «racial anthropological» collections in Berlin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of human remains from a colonial context in Berlin (as of 08/2021)</th>
<th>Inventory overview</th>
<th>Provenance research</th>
<th>Stand repatriations / burials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3.1 Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz (SPK)</strong> (umbrella organization) Von der Heydt-Str. 16-18, 10785 Berlin</td>
<td>See subordinate institutions</td>
<td>No cross-institutional inventory within the SPK</td>
<td>See parent institutions, repatriated remains come from the holdings of the MVF and BGAEU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>About 3600 (of about 7700 skulls and bones in the «Luscharnansammlung»): (Tanzania: 213; Rwanda: 907 (6 unclear); Kenya: 11; unknown but from the former colony of German East Africa: 1; Cameroon: approx. 300; Togo: approx. 50; unclear but from the former colony «German West Africa»: 100; Micronesia: 20; Bau: 10; Palau: 10; Papua New Guinea: 2000; USA-Mariana Islands: 10; unclear but former colonial area of New Guinea: 40; Samoa: 2)</td>
<td>Complete inventory in a joint database with the »RV Collection« (BGAEU): approx. 1500 skulls and bones with no evidence of origin</td>
<td>Provenance research, project-related and v. a. externally funded: 2016–2019: Provenance research on approx. 120 human remains from New Zealand/ Antarsia in the S collection and the anatomical collection of the Charity by Winkelmann, Fröndt and Stocker 2017–19; Gerda Henkel Foundation funded research on 1153 human remains from East Africa 2018–2019; provenance research project from SPK’s own funds on 36 ancestral remains from Hawaii (MVF and BGAEU) 2021–2024; provenance research on holdings from German West Africa; Longer project on the Pacific region planned from 2024 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3.1.1 SPK – Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte (MVF)</strong> Bielestraße 1–3, 10178 Berlin</td>
<td>2009 Inventory numbers of human remains/objects with processed human remains that came into the collection in the context of a racist science and collection practice (North and East Asia: 31; North Africa, West and Central Asia: 5; South and Southeast Asia: 30; Africa: 164; North America: 31; Mesoamerica: 94; South America: 699; South Seas and Australia: 1026) Of these, from former German colonies, in the areas of the following present-day countries: (Tanzania: 21; Kenya: 1; Cameroon: 47; Togo: 16; Samoa: 17)</td>
<td>Entry in the overall museum database, inventory not yet fully completed and information partly unchecked</td>
<td>Repatriations from the collection of the MVF have not yet taken place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Tuft of hair</td>
<td>Otherwise no stock of human remains</td>
<td>The State Library is awaiting research on the skulls from the same Luschan’s estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No information given; the entire inventory of the »RV collection« amounts to the body parts, mainly the skulls of approx. 3500 individuals who came into the collection in the context of a racist scientific and collecting practice</td>
<td>Complete inventory in a joint database with the »Luscharn Collection« in the MVF</td>
<td>The library is ready to repatriate the hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3.3.1 SPK – Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (BGAEU)</strong> Potsdamer Str. 23, 10785 Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Inventory of human remains from a colonial context in Berlin (as of 08/2021)**

- **Inventory**

- **Inventory overview**

- **Provenance research**

- **Stand repatriations / burials**

### 3.3.3 Charité – anatomical collection (at the Institut für Anthropologie) und Berliner Medizinhistorisches Museum (BMM) Charitéplatz 1, 10117 Berlin

**A total of 16**

- Tanzania (Wahabé, Wasagana, Wasungu, Wasusi, Iraq): 17; Ethiopia: 1; Mozambique (Mang'anja / Mviya, Mziyalidz): 2; Rwanda (Musisi, Rwanda): 1; South Africa (Kaffer, Xhosa, Zulu, Mfengu, San, Gaka Keffer): 8; Namibia (Omaha, Ovambô): 1; Togo (Rutschen): Cameroon (Badjeng): 2; Liberia (Bay): 2; Congo 1; Oceanía (French Island, Solomon Islands, Malanggan, Tahiti, Admiralty Islands, Jap. Caroline Island): 10; unclear origin: 9

- Completely recorded, most of the provenance researched


- **9 repatriations to (year: repatriated human remains):**
  - Papua New Guinea (2012: 1)
  - Australia (2013: 33; 2014: 14 + 1 (to Tanzania); 2017: 1)
  - New Zealand / Antaeora (2019: 19)

### 3.3.4 Site of the former Kaiser-Wilhelm-Instituts für Anthropologie, menschliche Erbe u. Eugenik (KWI-A)

Innenstraße 22, 14195 Berlin

- Following the excavation of at least 16 bone fragments which were created in 2014, another 16,000 bone fragments (of at least 54, possibly more than 100 of different ages) were recovered in 2015 and 2016, which is why a colonial context cannot be ruled out

- Further bone finds are expected if the excavations are continued

- **2015-2020**: scientific supervision of the excavations and non-invasive osteological analyzes by a research group and the archaeologists Susan Pollock; So far no dedicated provenance research

- **A burial of the human remains from the subsequent excavations is being prepared**

### 3.3.5 Museum für Naturkunde der Berlin (BNH)

Invalidenstraße 43, 10115 Berlin

- Human remains, whose assignment to a colonial context should be examined further: a skull from New Guinea from the collection of Heinrich Christian Umlauff; Bones and bone fragments from Ecuador between 1868 and 1876

- An internal inventory of the human remains was started in 2021 on the occasion of the present report

- **A research project is being prepared**

### 3.3.6 Zoologische Lehramtsanstalt, Humboldt-Universität

Philippstr. 13, 10115 Berlin

- Colonial context is unlikely with 8 specimens, but cannot be ruled out

- **Most of the teaching collection can be researched in the database Kabinette des Wissens**

- **The inventory of bony human remains was recorded for the first time in 2021 on the occasion of the present report**

- **Documentation inspection carried out by Ines Drechsler and Gerhard Scholtz based on provenance information**

- **Willingness for provenance research is available and recommended by the expert**

### 3.3.7 Zoologische Lehramtsanstalt, Freie Universität Berlin

Königin-Luise-Str. 1-3, 14195 Berlin

- With 14 skulls, three skeletons and several bones and specimens, a colonial context is unlikely, but cannot be ruled out

- **The inventory of human remains was started in 2021 for the present report by Lieveen, Mboró and Reimann**

- **Willingness for provenance research existing and recommended by the expert**

### 3.3.8 Weißensee kunstakademie berlin (KAB)

Bühringstraße 20, 13088 Berlin

- With the 4 human skeletons or partial skeletons and 95 loose bones, a colonial context is unlikely, but cannot be ruled out

- **Inventory viewed in 2021, not yet inventoried**

- **Provenance research desired, support requested**

### 3.3.9 deutsches Historisches Museum (DHM)

Unter den Linden 8, 10117 Berlin

- 2 braids of hair from a colonial background; 1 shrunken head of unknown origin

- **Complete inventory**

- **In-house historical provenance research carried out, non-invasive anthropological analysis of the shrunken head pending**

### 3.3.10 Leutaurichter der Humboldt-Universität

Am Kupfergraben 5, 10117 Berlin

- 2 human larynx preparations, suspicion of colonial context neither confirmed nor eliminated

- **Complete inventory**

- **2020: Provenance research by Holger Stoecker**

- **None so far**
3.3. More detailed information on the holdings of the individual institutions

3.3.1. Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz (SPK) (Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation)
Von-der-Heydt-Str. 16-18; 10785 Berlin

History of the institute:
The Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz (SPK) (Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation) was founded in 1957. With the Errichtungsgesetz (Establishment Act), the newly founded Federal Republic of Germany handed over the collections and archives of the Prussian state as property. This also included the former royal collections that became state museums during the Weimar Republic. The stated aim of the foundation was to preserve, maintain and supplement the Prussian cultural assets transferred to it (this also includes human remains) up to a new regulation. The SPK has been financed by the federal government and all federal states since 1975. With the Einigungsvertrag (Unification Agreement) of 1990, holdings from GDR institutions were also transferred to the foundation, the financing of which is subsequently also borne by the new federal states.

As an umbrella organization, the SPK comprises the facilities of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin (SMB), the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (SBB), the Geheime Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (GStA PK), the Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut (IAI) and the Staatliches Institut für Musikforschung (SIM). The foundation employs around 2,000 people. The federal government assumes 75 percent of the publicly funded part of the operating budget of 120 million euros and the additional annual financial requirements, the federal states are covering the remaining 25 percent. The central body is the Stiftungsrat (Board of Trustees). Since 2008, the prehistorian Prof. Dr. Hermann Parzinger is the acting president, with extensive responsibility for all current affairs of the foundation. The Advisory Board has a purely advisory role. The foundation claims for itself »a central role in cultural tasks of national interest«.

Developments in dealing with human remains from colonial contexts:
After the anthropological collection was taken over by
the SPK under the management of the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte (MVF) from the Medizinhistorisches Museum of the Charité in 2011, the collection became a political issue that the foundation had not foreseen. The public debates were, for instance, triggered by the events surrounding the repatriations to Namibia in the same year. In the answer of the federal government to the parliamentary inquiry of the member of the Bundestag Niema Movassat (Die LINKE) at the end of 2013, it was said that there were no reliable indications "that there were any parts in the collection of human remains from former German colonies or from overseas that in connection with the creation of the collection were subject to an ethically problematic context". Nevertheless, the search for a new repository took place without a broader or public discussion, which was criticized by civil society institutions.

According to the SPK, the first inquiries from a society of origin came from Australia around 10 years ago. According to provenance research in the Ethnologisches Museum, the engagement of the Australian embassy led to negotiations on the still outstanding return of human remains to Australia before the summer of 2013.

In the 2013, recommendations for dealing with human remains ("ancestral remains") by the Deutscher Museumsbund, the institutions were advised to draw up their own guidelines. The SPK followed these recommendations with the publication of the "Basic Positions of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation on the Handling of Human Remains in the Collections of the National Museums in Berlin" on March 26, 2015. The guideline for action should apply to the handling of the S-collection as well as all other human remains in the holdings of the museums of the SPK. For the first time, this also included ethnological objects made of hair or skin, which were previously assigned to the cultural-historical collection. According to the basic positions, the "remains of human beings" should be treated with the greatest sensitivity and the greatest respect and at the same time be accessible to the museums’ own research and to the "scientific public of all disciplines".

In recognition of the different values in the different cultures, the following principle applies in order to find solutions that do justice to the individual case: "If human remains can be assigned to a particular society of origin, the values of this society in particular are included in all considerations. As far as possible, contact is made with representatives of this society of origin in order to involve..."
them in considerations on how to deal with the remains«. 

»successively clarifying the origin of all human remains in the collections«: »The documentation must be as good as possible and handled transparently.« With the fundamental willingness to return bones« the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz carried out a fundamental change in collection and museum policy on the question of the restitution of human remains from its collections«.

The version of the basic positions from 2015 has remained unchanged to this day and is therefore still valid, even if an adjustment to current developments and practice has been pending for years.

So far, two Toi moko have been repatriated to New Zealand/Aotearoa from the SPK in 2020, the repatriation of three individuals from Australia has been decided, but is still pending. In its statement of June 2020, the foundation board for the repatriations to Australia and New Zealand/Aotearoa states that »the foundation fundamentally [advocates] returning the remains of people it has in its care, even if German law currently does not know any legal entitlement for such returns. The prerequisite for this, however, is that it has been clarified in the context of provenance research that these remains actually come from colonial contexts, that it is known what the countries of origin and societies in question are and that they are also desired to be repatriated.«

In principle, the SPK pursues the strategy of creating a research basis through in-house provenance research, if possible in collaboration with scientists from the countries of origin. Since 2017 there has been a provenance research project on human remains from the former »Deutsch-Ost-Afrika« in the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte. The results were first made available to the embassies of the countries of origin before they are to be published at the end of 2021. In 2020, a two-year provenance project on human remains began at the Ethnologisches Museum and another MVF project for West Africa has been running since mid-2021. For a parliamentary inquiry to the Berlin Senate, the SPK stated that »the following states have information on existing human remains from the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz: Australia, Chile, Hawai‘i, Japan, Rwanda and Tanzania.«

Here the priority of information sharing at the state level becomes evident. So far, there has been little, not to mention prioritized contact or information transfer to the ancestral communities and indigenous population groups.


Stiftungsrat 2020, cited from the reply of the SPK dated 19.08.2021

Abgeordnetenhaus Berlin 2018, 3
A von Luschan Advisory Board, chaired by Prof. Dr. Albert Zink from Bozen (biologist), has been convened, but there have been no public announcements so far. The board has so far convened in with a changing group of people. So far, at least one representative from the EM and the BGAEU, as well as colleagues from other German/German-speaking institutions, members from France and non-European countries (Ciraj Rassool) have been present.

Until the request for the present report in the summer of 2021, there was neither a cross-institutional inventory nor an internal survey of all institutions within the SPK. In addition, the foundation reserves the right to examine and define the colonial context itself. The SPK refers to its own research work, which is necessary for verifying and providing information. For example, the human remains of the Vorderasiatisches Museum and the Ägyptisches Museum were classified as irrelevant for the present report and therefore no information was given about these holdings. However, it is all the more likely that the list of institutions of the SPK with holdings of human remains from colonial contexts will expand. The following is a summary of the SPK’s holdings and the status of their research under the respective supervising and managing institution.

Sources used:

Written correspondence with Carola Thielecke, head of the SPK’s legal department and the contact person authorized by Mr. Parzinger for the present report; Conversation with Carola Thielecke and Bernhard Heeb (MVF) on June 10th, 2021; Facility’s website


German Bundestag: Printed matter 18/37. Answer of the Federal Government of November 8, 2013 to the minor question from MPs Niema Movassat, Christine Buchholz, Sevim Dağdelen, other MPs and the DIE LINKE parliamentary group. Further handling of human remains from former German colonies and other


3.3.1.1. Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte (MVF)/SPK (Museum of Prehistory and Early History)
Bodestrasse 1-3, 10178 Berlin

Brief history of the institute
The former artillery officer Freiherr Leopold von Ledebur is considered the first director in the tradition of the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte. From 1829, he was responsible for the »Abtheilung für vaterländische Alterthümer« and the Königliche Kunstkammer which was opened to the general public in 1830. In 1849, the collections moved to the Neues Museum at the museum island under the name »Sammlung nordischer Altertümner«. In 1873, Adolf Bastian took over the management from Ledebur’s assistant and co-founder of the BGAEU.

Under the leadership of the director’s assistant and doctor Albert Voss, the »Sammlung nordischer Altertümner« moved into the newly built Museum für Völkerkunde at today’s Stresemannstrasse in 1886 as an independent department. In 1922, the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte in the Martin-Gropius Bau emerged. During the Nazi era, the museum was attached to the »Ahnenerbe« of the SS under director Wilhelm Unverzagt and a large part of the collection was moved to the Soviet Union at the end of the war. Since 1958, the MVF has been part of the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz and has thus been released from the sole responsibility of the State of Berlin.

Since 2011, the Felix von Luschans S-Collection, which the Charité handed over to the SPK together with the »Racial Skull Collection« (see Chapter 3.3.3), has been looked after in the depots of the Berlin Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte.

Developments in dealing with human remains from colonial contexts:
With the takeover in 2011, the »Luschan Collection« was re-established at the MVF, which combines the S-collection, the »Racial Skull Collection« and the »Osteology Charité Collection« (O-Cha-collection for short). The O-Cha collection is a new name for human remains that could not be assigned to any of the other collections or smaller collections from the Charité holdings without their own number sequence at the time of the inventory. Among them are probably some skulls that actually belong to the »S-collection«, but can no longer be recognized as such.

With the takeover of the collection of around 8,000 skulls and bones from the Charité, a cleaning process (decontamination) began in the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte in order to free the body parts of many thousands of people from all over the world from dust, dirt and mold. With the repatriation of Ancestral Remains of the Nama and OvaHerero to Namibia by the Charité in 2011, the holdings from the German colonial era became a political issue. The processing started against the background of requests for information and the first research results about the head of Mangi Meli, which Mnyaka Sururu Mboro, Christian Kopp, Konradin Kunze and other colleagues brought to the MVF, as well as a television report. A first research project on human remains from the former German East Africa has been applied for. The results were given to the Rwandan and Tanzanian
embassies. They are to be published in early 2022.

There is no fixed definition of »colonial contexts« at the MVF. A distinction is made between first and second priority for processing. The primary focus is on the origin of the bones that come from the former German colonies. For this purpose, the inventory has already been viewed and the information from the database has been summarized for the present report (see attachment 2). What counts as a second-tier colonial context is examined in practice from individual case to individual case when the processing of the primary colonial context has been completed. Ultimately, the aim is to research all the provenances of the Luschan collection in colonial contexts that are not categorized as »archaeological« (e.g. from Egypt, Central and South America) or »historical-European«.

Human remains from colonial contexts:

The Luschan collection consists of around 7,700 skulls and bones. The Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte states that there are around 3,800 human remains from the context of German colonialism alone. While little is known about the people whose body parts ended up in the collection, the MVF transmitted the names of the “collectors”, which allows further conclusions to be drawn about the identity or origin of the respective people.

For the former colony of Deutsch-Ostafrika (today’s Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi), the SPK/MVF states the recently researched stock of 1153 individuals, 992 of which were collected by Jan Czekanowski, and the others, i.e. by scientific and military members of the colonial government such as Franz Stuhlmann or Moritz Merker.

About 300 bones from today’s Cameroon area and about 50 from today’s Togo are in the MVF inventory. Here, too, it was often the military and colonial officials such as Adametz and Döring/Doering or Alfred Mansfeld, Friedrich Schäfer and Gaston Thierry who passed on human remains to the museums. Approx. 2,050–2,090 human remains are counted from the former German colonial area in New Guinea. Research travelers, zoologists, ethnologists and anthropologists, such as Otto Finsch, Georg Friederici and Richard Neuhauss, who were more or less involved in the colonial-administrative and politico-military colonial expansion, are responsible for the appropriation of the bones. In particular, Otto Finsch helped enforcing the colonization, i.e. as an agent of the New Guinea company. Adolf Roesicke and Richard Thurwald also brought human bones to
the museum. Both were participants in the so-called Kaiserin Augusta River Expedition of 1912/13, an expedition by the Reichskolonialamt, the Königliche Museen and the Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft to what was then known as the »Kaiser-Wilhelms-Land«. Two human remains come from Samoa at the time of German colonialism, here the name Schultz is mentioned as a »collector«, the former German governor of the colony.

Care of the collection:
Dr. Bernhard Heeb heads the third-party funded provenance research team.

Inventory overview:
From 2015, the MVF began to take an inventory and compile the information available about the collections taken over from the Charité. The collection consists of around 8,000 skulls and bones. There are still over 1,000 skulls for which it has not yet been possible to assign them. The holdings that could no longer be assigned, double inventories and various small collections were grouped under the name »Osteology Charité Collections« and inventoried with new numbers.

The collections are recorded in a separate database, which also includes the RV-collections of the BGAEU. In addition to the basic information, sources are also stored here. A running text is used for the provenance information. So far there is no separate module for provenance research in which z. B. Provenance chains can be recorded in a structured manner, but certain modules could be adapted for this purpose. So far there is no external interface, access is only internal. All skulls were photographed.

Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research:
2016—2019: Provenance research on approx. 120 human remains from New Zealand/Aotearoa in the S-collection and the anatomical collection of the Charité by Andreas Winkelmann, Sarah Fründt and Holger Stoecker.
2017—2019: Provenance research project funded by the Gerda Henkel Foundation on 1153 human remains from the former »Deutsch-Ost-Afrika«, today’s Tanzania, Burundi, Rwanda. There was a cooperation with scientists from Rwanda:

»In Rwanda, in cooperation with the German embassy, the German Academic Foreign Service?, the Goethe-Institut, the University of Rwanda,
the National Museums of Rwanda, the National Archives of Rwanda and the Ministry of Sport and Culture, a team of four scientists was able to work be put together. It consists of Charles Kabwete and Jean de la Croix Nkurayuja from the University of Rwanda and Maurice Mugabowagahunde and Jerome Karangwa from the National Museum Rwanda.«

Field research was incorporated into the provenance research, served to inform and question the communities concerned and was initially intended to clarify the question of whether the implementation of DNA analyzes of all skulls, desired by the Rwandan government and later rejected, would be accepted. A workshop with the presentation of the preliminary results took place in Kigali at the end of November 2019. So far, no details, results or assessments of the cooperation have been introduced or made known to the German specialist debate or the public. A publication is expected at the beginning of 2022.

In the response of the Federal Government of July 2019 to the parliamentary inquiry i.e. of the Green MPs Dr. Kirsten Kappert-Gonther announced to the SPK the name Akida Barugo/Baruku of a resident from Moshi as determined in the project as well as the affiliations to the following ethnic groups: Wabondei, Wachagga, Wadigo, Wahehe, Wamassai, Wamwera, Wandonde, Wangindo, Wapare, Wasandawe, Wasambaa, Waswahili, Wanjaturu, Watutsi, Watwa, Wagogo und Wakinga.

July 2018 – February 2019 Provenance research project on 36 skulls from Hawaii, financed with approx. 20,000 euros from the SPK’s own funds: Gesa Grimme examined 15 skulls from the Rudolf Virchow collection that were added to the collection by E. Arning; the origins of the skulls brought by Finsch and Neuhauss were examined historically by Heidrun Voigt and anthropologically by Ms. Storch.

2021–2024: Funding of provenance research made possible at short notice by the BKM from the federal culture budget with around 715,000 euros on 477 human skulls that were brought to Germany from West Africa during the colonial period. This is about research on the origin of the human remains from the areas of today’s Togo and Cameroon, possibly also Ghana and the Republic of the Congo. The team led by Mr. Heeb consists of Ms. Teßmann, Mr. Kowalak and Ms. Rexin. The plan is to work with scientists, including anthropologists from the respective countries of origin. A longer project on the Pacific region is
planned from 2024, provided that this is made possible by third-party funding. This concerns 2,800 skulls in the SPK collection at the MVF, which come from different islands and contexts.

Methods of provenance research:
Inscriptions on the skulls provide the first clues for provenance research, but these do not always stand up to the examination with lists and archival material, as the inscription sometimes took place much later (see chapter 3.1.2). Historical research is central (access files, but also travel reports, reports from the Federal Archives, etc.). Non-invasive anthropological methods are used to reconstruct information about the age, gender and cause of death of people. Invasive methods only after consultation and in a few individual cases. In Rwanda, tissue samples were taken from a site in order to be able to determine the time of death with the help of carbon dating. DNA analyzes were only carried out in one case, at the request of Isari Meli from the Kilimanjaro region, who is looking for the head of his grandfather, Prince Mangi Meli, who was murdered by the Germans. The samples were then destroyed. In individual cases, e.g. in bones with pathological features or visible trauma, 3D scans were made with a CT scanner. It is still unclear what will happen to this data, which initially serve as background information, if they are returned. The historical research is supplemented by scientists in Rwanda who are also examining the oral tradition. The three methods are intended to complement each other and are used to check the results.

Status of repatriations:
Repatriations from the collection of the MVF have not yet taken place.

Exhibition, research and teaching:
According to the basic positions of the SPK from 2015 (see above) and also according to Mr. Heeb’s statement, human remains are accessible for scientific research if they are not assigned to a »colonial background«, such as those classified as »archaeological« and »European- historical« are classified. In the case of a colonial background, research interests are discussed with the societies of origin. Provenance research is carried out internally.

Sources:
Written correspondence with Carola Thielecke, head of the
SPK's legal department and the contact person authorized by Mr. Parzinger for the present report; Conversation with Carola Thielecke and Bernhard Heeb (MVF) on June 10th, 2021; Conversation with Bernhard Heeb, Marius Kowalak, Ms. Rexin on June 22nd, 2021; Website of the institution;

**Abgeordnetenhaus Berlin:** Printed matter 17/16583.


**Kowalak, Marius:** Preliminary results of interdisciplinary provenance research on Tanzanian human remains on the island of Musila In: Immediate handling of human remains in museums and university collections. Voices and case studies, edited by Sandra Mühlenberend, Jakob Fuchs, and Vera Marušić, Dresden, 2018, pp. 111–122.

Visualised Inventory of Museum für Vor – und Frühgeschichte (MVF) / SPK (Museum of Prehistory and Early History)
Tanzania: 213
Rwanda: 907 (6 unclear)
Kenya: 22;
unknown, but from former colony of
»German Eastafrica«: 1;
Cameroon: ca. 300
Togo: ca. 50
unknown, but from former colony of
»German SouthWestafrica«: 100;
Micronesia: 20
Nauru: 10
Palau: 10
Papua-Neuguinea: 2000
USA-Marianen: 20
unknown, but from former colony of
»German Neuguinea«: 40
Samoa: 2

Ca. 3,800 (about 7,700 skulls and bones in the »Luschan-collection«)

Inventory overview
Complete inventory in a joint database with the »RV-Collection« (BGABE); approx. 1500 skulls and bones with no evidence of origin

Provenance research
Provenance research, project-related and v. a. externally funded:
.2016—2019: Provenance research on approx. 120 human remains from New Zealand/Aotearoa in the »S-collection« and the anatomical collection of the Charité by Winkelmann, Fründt and Stoecker
.2017—19 Gerda Henkel Foundation funded research on 1,153 human remains from East Africa
.2018—2019 provenance research project from SPK's own funds on 36 ancestral remains from Hawaii (MVF and BGABE)
.2021—2024 provenance research on holdings from »German SouthWestafrica«
Longer project on the Pacific region planned from 2024 onwards

Stand repatriations/burials
Repatriations from the collection of the MVF have not yet taken place.
3.3.1.2. Ethnologisches Museum Berlin (EM)/SPK (Ethnological Museum)
Landsstrasse 8; 14195 Berlin Dahlem

Brief history of the institute:
The forerunners of the Ethnologisches Museum (EM) lie in the Brandenburg-Preußische Kunstkammern of the 17th and 18th centuries, from which ethnological collections emerged in the 19th century. The establishment of an independent ethnological and anthropological museum in Berlin was decided by Kaiser Wilhelm I at the request of the BGAEU. The Ethnologisches Museum was established in 1873 as an independent institution under the direction of Adolf Bastian, co-founder of the BGAEU. The museum was intended to serve as a documentary repository for objects from non-European cultures. In 1886 the Ethnologisches Museum opened as the »Königliches Museum für Völkerkunde« in what is now Stresemannstrasse. The BGAEU also had rooms here for its anthropological collection, in addition to the »S-collection« of the Museum für Völkerkunde itself created by Luschan (see section 3.1.2). The collection grew immensely, especially during the period of German colonialism.

After the end of the Second World War, the collections were confiscated by the victorious powers and returned to the city of Berlin by the western victorious powers in the 1950s. The objects were brought out of the country as spoils of war by the Soviet Union and, in large parts, returned to the Museum für Völkerkunde in Leipzig for storage in the 1970s and returned to Berlin from 1990 onwards. The European collection of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde was given to the Museum Europäischer Kulturen in 1999.

Under the new sponsorship of the SPK, the collection was transferred to the museum complex in Berlin-Dahlem in 1964. In 2000 the name was changed to »Ethnologisches Museum«. Since 2017, preparations have been made to move the exhibition rooms to the Humboldt Forum in the newly built Berliner Schloss for 2021. The ethnomusicologist Lars-Christian Koch was appointed joint director of the Ethnologisches as well as the Asiatisches Museum in order to present both collections under the umbrella of the Humboldt Forum from 2021. The administration of the museum as well as the library and collections are still located in Berlin-Dahlem.

Developments in dealing with human remains from colonial contexts:
Against the background of national and international
debates about the repatriation of body parts of indigenous people to their descendants, the human remains in the museum have also become more of a concern among employees since 2012. In response to criticism, two Toi moko were removed from the public display that year and the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa was informed. At the engagement of the Australian embassy, negotiations were held as early as 2013 on the return of human remains in the Ethnologisches Museum to Australia. The »basic positions of the SPK on the handling of human remains in the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin« from 2015 are also an expression of the reaction to both external and internal discussions. In particular, the volunteer Katharina Kepplinger and the restorer Diana Gabler criticized the display of human remains, for example heads from the South Seas until 2016, and their appropriation as collections »instead of a matter of future repatriation efforts questioning their ownership«. They recommended that initially, a complete inventory be made of all human remains at the museum, including those that are incorporated into objects. In addition, the careful documentation should be put up for discussion even during the consultations with indigenous representatives. Under the influence of Gabler and Kepplinger, the separate collection of human remains began. As recently as 2018, the Berlin Senate’s answer to Daniel Wesener’s parliamentary inquiry was that: »the ethnological collections only contain human remains in processed form, which means that it is not possible to count by individuals.«

Even in specialist circles it had not been made known until then that there are still bones with S numbers. In 2020, the Board of Trustees of the SPK decided to repatriate human bones in a bark coffin and two child mummies, which was postponed due to Corona and is still pending.

Ilja Labinschinski’s provenance research project, which runs from 2020–2022, records all remains of human individuals at the Ethnologisches Museum, as these ended up in the collections of ethnological museums due to a racist scientific and collecting practice. According to the provenance researcher, informal, colonial structures must also be assumed for human remains from Latin America. Since the summer of 2021, the Ethnologisches Museum has published a position paper entitled »The colonial debate(s) and the museum’s self-image« on its website. This is based on the definition of »colonial contexts« in the guidelines of the Deutscher Museumsbund. In the paper, the claim for dealing with the colonial background of the museum’s collection is formulated as follows:
The employees of the Ethnologisches Museum of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin actively strive for such a self-reflective, self-critical and power-critical practice, including decolonial approaches. (...) The processing of the colonial contexts of the collections changes the work and the self-image of the museum.«

According to the museum, an open-ended dialogue about the future of human remains is to be initiated with various interest groups and with the involvement of actors from ancestral communities.

Human remains from colonial contexts:

A complete overview has not been possible so far for various reasons, i.e. because the inventory of all stocks has not yet been completed. These include skulls from anthropological collections, bones from archaeological excavations and human remains that have been processed into cultural objects. Basically, a colonial or injustice context is initially assumed for all human remains based on the background of the collection and the suspicion is checked using provenance research. The number of around 2,089 human remains from colonial contexts (as of July 2021) results from the information from the regional specialist areas recorded in the databases. The quantitative information relates to inventory numbers. Some of the remains of a person are recorded in several numbers. On the other hand, it cannot always be ruled out that the remains of several people are combined under one number or that the remains of several people were processed in one object. From the information in the database, the following numbers were found: North and East Asia (33); North Africa, West and Central Asia (5); South and Southeast Asia (30); Africa (166); North America (31); Mesoamerica (96); South America (699); South Seas and Australia (1026) and in ethnomusicology (3). After submission by the MVF, the Ethnologisches Museum also compiled the human remains from the geographical and temporal areas of official German colonial rule with information on the »significant collectors« for the present report.

According to this, the remains of 22 individuals from today’s Tanzania and one person from today’s Kenya date back to the German colonial era. With regard to the collection of the MVF, here too, among other things, Franz Stuhlmann was responsible for the transfer of human remains to the museum, as well as Bernhard Perrot and Karl Weule, who after his time at
the Völkerkundemuseum Berlin became director of the GRASSI Museum in Leipzig. The body parts of around 83 people come from the context of German colonial rule in West Africa, 67 from today's Cameroon and 16 from today's Togo. Here, too, the names Oscar Foerster (commissioner of the South Cameroon expedition), the ethnologist Alfred Mansfeld and the botanist Georg Zenker stand for the simultaneity of the scientific, military and administrative development of the colonies. There are no figures for the German colonies in New Guinea, but the same collectors as those of the MVF are named (see appendix 2).

17 human remains come from the German colonial era in Samoa. Here, too, they seem to have the same context of origin as that of the two ancestors from Samoa from the Luschan collection in the MVF, since these also came to Germany through the German governor of the Schultz colony.

Care of the collection:
The human remains are looked after by the museum's custodians in the respective regional specialist areas. The provenance research is carried out by Ilja Labinschinski, linked to the Zentralarchiv der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin.

Inventory overview:
The overview of human remains at the Ethnologisches Museum is based on the entries in the database of the Staatliche Museen in Berlin, Museum Plus. So far, not all of the museum's collections have been recorded in the database (e.g. the Oceania collection). Accordingly, the inventory information is dependent on the status of the inventory in the regional subject areas. Not all human remains are visible as such in the database entries. Others were recorded in the database, but no longer exist or can be found. The tailoring of the database to objects poses an as yet unsolved problem with the entry of human remains (e.g. category of previous owner). Furthermore, the traditional classification of human remains, for example into ethnologica and archaeologica, must be questioned and the information about animal and human materials checked in each individual case. The museum employees of all Berlin state museums can access the entries on human remains in the database, including photographs. However, if human remains appear on the online database smb digital, no images should be visible there.

Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research:
Ilja Labinschinski’s provenance research project, which runs from 2020 to 2022, is funded by the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz and is located at the Zentralarchiv of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. The project is intended as a prelude to the implementation of further in-depth and cooperative research projects. The provenance research on human remains is seen as a permanent task and a continuous process, which should continue to be pursued by the provenance research at the Zentralarchiv together with employees of the EM. At the moment, there are various projects at the Ethnologisches Museum where provenance research is also being carried out—sometimes also on objects where human remains have been incorporated—but no other specific projects on human remains.
Methods of provenance research;

The core task of the provenance research project is initially to complete the inventory of human remains at the EM, which is still in progress. These were divided into three categories (unprocessed, processed and processed in objects) in order to set priorities for further research into the history of acquisition and appropriation. Research into the circumstances under which the skulls in the anthropological collections in the EM were appropriated has priority, as is the case with remains with little or no information on their origin, such as numberless skulls and bones. For reasons of capacity, only random samples of as wide a range as possible (regional, temporal, known/unknown provenance) are subjected to further in-depth provenance research. It should then generate methods and findings for further research.

The current provenance research works mainly historically and is based on the museum’s own sources (historical file archive, library, unpublished documentation). In certain cases, the anthropologist Ms. Teßmann provides administrative assistance to the BGAEU. Invasive anthropological methods are not used.

Research is about to be completed for a part of the anthropological collection that is still at the EM (38 skulls from the so-called S-collection).

In addition to the research itself, the provenance research project has the task of conducting an internal dialogue in the state museums on how to deal with human remains and to develop an attitude towards dealing with human remains in the collections of the Ethnologisches Museum.

Repatriations:

In 2020, two Toi moko were repatriated to New Zealand/Aotearoa (see chapter 3.3.1). The return of human bones in a bark coffin and two child mummies to Australia (see above), which was decided in 2020, will probably be carried out in 2022.

Exhibition, research and teaching:

The Humboldt Forum is currently exhibiting individual human remains, i.e. a mummy from Peru, as well as objects that may contain human teeth and hair, such as hair strings in the Oceania department. According to the knowledge of the provenance researcher (November 2021), 24 objects in the Oceania area will be exhibited at the Humboldt Forum in which the remains of human individuals have been processed or human remains that have been processed into objects (e.g. an earlobe piercer made from human bones). The magazine Africa shows six objects in which human remains were processed (3 from Angola, 2 from Congo and 1 from Cameroon). An object in which human remains were processed is also exhibited in the Cameroon module. See the list of a total of 31 processed human remains and incorporated into objects in Appendix 5.

In the exhibition areas of the Museum für Asian Art on Tibet and in the America exhibitions of the EM, which will all open in 2022, the exhibition of further human remains are planned. There is also a »Totenbündel« and a wig made from human hair from Peru. They are not used for anthropological teaching.
There are scientific inquiries about research, especially of human remains from archaeological finds, whereby the decision then rests with the respective custodian. Further research beyond this will only take place within the framework of provenance research, without invasive investigations, i.e. those where the body’s own material is destroyed.

**Sources used:**

- Written correspondence with Carola Thielecke, head of the legal department of the SPK and the contact person authorized by Mr. Parzinger for the present report;
- Conversation with Carola Thielecke and Bernhard Heeb (MVF) on June 10th, 2021; Conversation with Ilja Labinschinski on June 25, 2021; website of the institution;

**Abgeordnetenhaus Berlin:** Printed matter 17/12360.


Visualised Inventory of Ethnologisches Museum
Berlin (EM) / SPK (Ethnological Museum)

- North and East Asia: 33
- North Africa, West and Central Asia: 5
- South and Southeast Asia: 30
- Africa: 166
- North America: 31
- Mesoamerica: 96
- South America: 699
- South Seas and Australia: 1026

Of these, from former German colonies, in the areas of the following present-day countries: (Tanzania: 21; Kenya: 1; Cameroon: 67; Togo: 16; Samoa: 17)

2,089 Inventory numbers of human remains/objects with processed human remains that came into the collection in the context of a racist science and collection practice

Inventory overview
Entry in the overall museum database, inventory not yet fully completed and information partly unchecked

Provenance research
2020–2022: Inventory and provenance research by provenance research located at the central archive
from 2022: further provenance research projects planned

Stand repatriations / burials
See parent institution, repatriated remains come from the holdings at the EM
3.3.1.3. Staatsbibliothek Berlin/SPK
(Berlin State Library)
Unter den Linden 8, 10117 Berlin

History of the institute:
Today's Staatsbibliothek goes back to the Court library of a House of Lords in the 17th century, which was then further developed according to the interests and benevolence of the respective ruler. From 1810, it was part of the Prussian state administration, which from 1918 ran it as a public library under the name Preußische Staatsbibliothek. With the division of Germany that began after 1945, two independent successor institutions emerged, which were reunited in 1992 under the umbrella of the SPK.

Inventory of human remains from colonial contexts:
On December 1, 2017, a library user discovered a tuft of hair in the manuscript department from the estate of Felix v. Luschan and reported this. This find was not known to the library until then and, according to them, probably comes from the same estate as hundreds of skulls from Africa that went to the Völkerkundemuseum Berlin during the colonial period.
The user was Konradin Kunze, who had been involved in the search for the head of Mangi Meli (see Chapter 2.2.1) for years and who processed both written and oral testimonies in an exhibition that can now be seen in Moshi, Tanzania. Since the tufts of hair lay between the completed forms of mostly imprisoned people, which von Luschan had anthropologically measured during his trip to South Africa in 1905, Kunze concluded that the hair samples were remnants for the purpose of »racial« research and were acquired under duress.

Provenance research:
The Staatsbibliothek itself did not conduct any provenance research and is waiting for the skulls from the same Luschan's estate to be examined.

Repatriations:
According to its own information, the library is happy to return the hair from the same collection in the event that the skulls are repatriated.

Exhibition, research and teaching:
After a written consultation with the SPK lawyer, the materials were blocked for any further use.

Sources used:
Written correspondence with the Staatsbibliothek Berlin; written correspondence with Konradin Kunze; website of the institution
Visualised Inventory of the Staatsbibliothek Berlin / SPK

1 Tuft of hair

Inventory overview
Otherwise no stock of human remains
Provenance research
The State Library is awaiting research on the skulls from the same Luschan’s estate
Stand repatriations/burials
The library is ready to repatriate the hair
3.3.2. Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie,
Ethnologie und Urgeschichte/(BGAEU)
(Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and
Prehistory)
BGAEU office, Ewa Dutkiewicz,
Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte,
Geschwister-Scholl-Strasse 6, 10117 Berlin

History of the institute:
The Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie
und Urgeschichte (BGAEU) emerged from the »Berliner
Anthropologische Gesellschaft«. It was founded in 1869 by the
doctor and anthropologist Rudolf Virchow together with other
scientists from various fields such as Adolf Bastian. From the
very beginning, the Zeitschrift für Ethnologie (ZfE) was the
official publication organ of the Berliner Gesellschaft and is
still published today. The monthly meetings of the society served
to present the results of field research, travel and collecting
activities. The foundation supported excavations and excursions
with its own funds and thus contributed to the collections
of various institutions. A large network was activated of
international collectors, all men with links to politics and
business. Between 1869 and 1945, the BGAEU had a total of 3,565
ordinary, corresponding, permanent and honorary members. With
one exception, women were excluded for a long time. The BGAEU
supported the establishment of the Museum für Ethnologie and
used its own premises. However, it was important for it to build
up a purely scientific collection, which should not be open
to the public, but should only be available to the Gesellschaft
itself.

Regular general meetings are still held today. The
Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und
Urgeschichte is a non-profit organization. Prof. Dr. Elke Kaiser
has been the chairperson since 2020. Since summer 2010, the
BGAEU has curated the anthropological Rudolf Virchow collection,
claiming ownership thereof on its website. It also maintains an
archive.

Developments in dealing with human remains
from colonial contexts:
Since the BGAEU's reply itself contained little information,
the assessment of the critical public and specialist literature
is given below. After the takeover of the RV collection, Black
and post-colonial civil society associations criticized the
BGAEU's lack of transparency and reluctance to cooperate.
Representatives of the ancestral communities, for instance, were
denied access to the collection or excluded from discussions,
while at the same time, the BGAEU is offering to scientists
on the internet »the (chargeable ) research on the Rudolf
Virchow Collection, which was assembled under inhumane
circumstances«.53

The BGAEU rejected research projects to clarify the
origin of the mortal remains even if they can be clearly
assigned to a colonial context, such as human remains from the
time of the genocide of the Nama and OvaHerero from Namibia.

Contrary to previous agreements, the BGAEU was not prepared, for example, to research the exact origin of the remains of an estimated eleven people from the area of what is now Namibia in the RV-collection via the research program of the Charité Human Remains Project. As part of her employment from 2011 to 2015 at the Australian Embassy in Berlin, the scientist historian Hilary Howes also carried out preliminary provenance research in the BGAEU’s holdings in order to find ancestors of the Australian Aboriginal people in German institutions. The Australian government is committed to providing assistance in repatriating these people. Howes argues that the long-criticized refusal of the BGAEU to cooperate on questions of repatriation and provenance research is due to the attitude of the previous chairman Markus Schindlbeck. Under his successor Wolfram Schier, the BGAEU has taken a new path and worked on a position paper on the handling of human remains in the collections of the State Museums, which, according to Hilary Howes, should also affect the Rudolf Virchow Collection. Nevertheless, in an article published in 2018, the provenance researchers Larissa Förster, Dag Henrichsen, Holger Stoecker and Hans Axasi Eichab found that there is still resistance at the BGAEU to clarify the origin of the sculls and bones and formulate the following thesis:

“One would think that increased knowledge about the history of the collection would be welcomed as a positive gain. However, it seems that there is a certain vested interest in the de-historicizing of the skeletons. The fading-out of the circumstances of acquisition and the contexts of origin, which are increasingly seen as politically damaging and ethically problematic, obviously seems to be a precondition for continued use of the bones as anthropological research resources.”

The response to the request for information for the present report did not reveal any indications of a change in the institution’s attitude and information policy presented here. In a brief statement, the BGAEU characterized itself as a private institution based on voluntary work. Information is only given on inquiries whose scientific interest is justified in writing. The present report apparently does not meet these criteria. Inquiries about ethical science are investigated...
after receipt of specific information that proves a context of injustice. 

Human remains from colonial contexts: 

The BGAEU does not provide any information on the existence of human remains, as there are no explicit country lists or lists about »colonial contexts«. The database is identical to that of the S-collection. The MVF’s offer to publish the information on human remains that probably came to the collections of both institutions from the context of German colonialism was not accepted by the BGAEU. A reconstruction of the holdings from the primary and secondary literature cannot be provided within the scope of the present report. In the absence of information from the institution itself or a publicly or scientifically accessible inventory list, the approximately 3,500 human remains in the RV collection can either not be included in the inventory or can be included in their entirety. Similar to the collection of the EM, the RV collection was also created in the context of racist scientific and collection practice. As long as no evidence is presented for an individual, ethically justifiable context of appropriation of the individual remains, the assignment to the category »colonial contexts« as whole would result in a less distorted inventory than its omission.

Care of the collection: 

As a member of the BGAEU, the prehistorian and anthropologist Barbara Teßmann looks after the anthropological Rudolf Virchow collection on a voluntary basis.

Inventory overview: 

A three-volume directory of the RV-collection was created around 1910, as were inventory maps with detailed entries. Only a few of the inventory maps, which contain more detailed and therefore important information for provenance research, have survived. In the 1990 inventory, 3,365 individuals are listed. In connection with the move into the MVF, the current database, in which the RV-collection together the S-collection is shown, was compared up to 2013 and contains only a few metadata: status; ID; labeling; comment; city; island; province; region; canton; country; continent region; continent; former colony; former country attribution; ethnicity; collector; date; skeletal element. 

Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research: 

2011–2016 provenance research on the ancestral
SCIENTIFIC REPORT ON THE PRESENCE OF HUMAN REMAINS FROM COLONIAL CONTEXTS IN BERLIN

remains by Jacobus Hendrick and Oantab from today’s Namibia in the BGAEU’s holdings by Larissa Förster, Holger Stoecker, Dag Henrichsen and Hans Axasi Eichab; free research 2011–2013: Matthias Glaubrecht, Nils Seethaler, Barbara Teßmann and Katrin Koel-Abt carry out anthropological research and historical research on a skull of an Aleut from Alaska, which was brought to Berlin by Adelbert von Chamisso and which they call »biohistorical research« describe. April – August 2016: Provenance research by Hilary Howes on 19 skulls in the RV collection that were assigned to people from Australia. The research of the Australian German Association Inc. was funded by its AGA-Goethe Fellowship Program. 2017: Signing of a cooperation agreement between ONGI (OvaHerero, Mbanderu and Nama Genocides Institute) and the BGAEU to conduct provenance research on human remains from Namibia so that they can be repatriated. Due to a lack of funding, among other things, the continuation of this cooperation project is still pending. 2017–2019 in the provenance research project of the MVF on human remains from the German colonial areas in East Africa, 40–50 skulls from the BGAEU’s holdings were also included. July 2018 – February 2019 Provenance research project on 36 skulls from Hawaii, financed from the SPK’s own funds with approx. 20,000 euros: Gesa Grimme examined 15 skulls from the Rudolf Virchow collection that were added to the collection by E. Arning; the origin of the skulls brought by Finsch and Neuhauss were examined historically by Heidrun Voigt and anthropologically by Ms. Storch. 2020: Investigative journalism leads to the discovery of four skulls of the indigenous population of Canada, which were given to Virchow by William Osler in 1884. Long-time repatriation practitioner Rick Hill used the information for the chiefs of the Six Nations to write an application for the return of the skulls.

Repatriations:

In 2017, the BGAEU returned a mummy from Queensland, Australia, which Hermann Klaatsch had sent to Germany in 1905, to the relatives. In the same year, an Ainu skull was returned to Japan. The grave robbery of said skull was presented and documented at a meeting of the BGAEU in 1880. However, there are still five Ainu skulls in the Rudolf Virchow Collection and another ten in the SPK holdings. The repatriation
talks about the human remains with what is now Namibia, which began in 2011, have not yet led to any return by the BGAEU.

Exhibition, research and teaching:

The human remains of the people in the RV-collection are »available to scientists from all over the world for study and analysis,« according to the company on its website. Research projects with »irreversible interventions in the substance of the objects« or that require transport may have to be advised by the board of directors. A processing fee is payable. Since the RV collection is primarily a research collection, it is not accessible to the public outside of scientific inquiries. Individual skulls were only used for exhibition purposes in exceptional cases, e.g. on the occasion of Rudolf Virchow’s 150th birthday in 1971.

Sources used:

Written correspondence with Elke Kaiser, 1st chairwoman of the BGAEU; Conversation with employees of the MVF (Bernhard Heeb, Marius Kowalak, Ms. Rexin) on June 22nd, 2021; website of the institution;


Visualised Inventory of the Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (BGAEU)
No information given; the entire inventory of the "RV-collection" amounts to the body parts, mainly the skulls of approx. 3,500 individuals who came into the collection in the context of a racist scientific and collecting practice.

Inventory overview
Complete inventory in a joint database with the "Luschan Collection" in the MVF.

Provenance research
2016: Howes researched 19 Aboriginal Ancestral Remains funded by the Australian-German Association Inc.
2017: Unfulfilled cooperation agreement between ONGI (OvaHerero, Mbanderu and Nama Genocides Institute) and the BGAEU.
2017–2019: Provenance research project of the MVF on human remains from East Africa, with approx. 40–50 skulls from the BGAEU’s holdings.
2018–2019: Provenance research project from SPK’s own funds on 36 Ancestral Remains from Hawai‘i (in the MVF and BGAEU holdings).

Stand repatriations/burials
Repatriation to Australia in 2017: a mummy.
Repatriation to Japan 2017: 1 skull.
3.3.3. Charité – Anatomische Sammlung
(im Waldeyer Haus) und Medizinhistorische
Sammlung (BMM) (Anatomical
Collection (in the Waldeyer House) and Berlin
Medical History Collection)
Berlin Medical History Museum,
Charitéplatz 1, 10117 Berlin

History of the institute:
In 2003, the medical and university institutions of Berlin
merged under the umbrella of the »Charité-Universitätsmedizin
Berlin«. Various institutes came together here that shaped the
discipline of anatomy in Berlin. From the very beginning, human
remains were kept as specimens in collections at the anatomical
facilities where they were used for research and teaching and at
times also exhibited for a specialist audience or the general
public.
The history of Berlin’s anatomy starts in 1713 with the
first professorship for anatomy and the anatomical theater in the
halls of the Societät der Wissenschaften im Königlichen Marstall
at Charlottenstraße (today the grounds of the Staatsbibliothek
»Unter den Linden«). The anatomical collection of around 3,000
specimens put together by Professor Johann Gottfried Walters was
purchased by the Prussian king in 1803 and expanded until 1833
into an »Anatomisch Zootomisches Museum«. Karl Asmund Rudolphi,
the first university professor, was in charge of expanding the
collection for exhibition, teaching and research purposes. In
the period that followed, the collection grew rapidly. When they
moved out of the main university building in 1884, their 26,358
specimens were divided among several facilities. In addition
to a skull collection (with so-called »racial skulls«),
around 1,000 specimens found their way into the new building of
the Institute for Anatomy \(^\text{20}\), which was then headed by
Karl Reichert and, from 1883, by Wilhelm Waldeyer. The remaining
holdings were »given to zoology and pathology, among other
things.«
During the second half of the 19th century, the
researching pathologist Rudolf Virchow also collected human
specimens from the dissection operations of his institute at the
Charité. Due to his central position in the BGAEU and his well-
known research interest, he was also sent non-European human
remains. For anthropological research and the question of
colonial contexts, the aforementioned »Racial Skull Collection«,
whose origins date back to the beginning of the 18th century, is
of particular importance. It contains more than 800 skulls that
came into the collection from overseas. The majority of this
collection, as well as the S- and RV-collections that the
Charité has in the meantime stored in trust was transferred to a
depot of the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz at the end of
2011. The reason was termination of the storage facility rented
by the Charité, where the collection had previously been kept in
an «almost unworthy condition». 

Developments in dealing with human remains
from colonial contexts:
As early as 2004, inquiries from political
representatives and indigenous groups from various countries
such as New Zealand/Aotearoa, Australia and Namibia reached the
Charité. These intensified from 2008 and also included specific
demands for repatriation. On November 12th, 2008 the chairman
of the board of the Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin Karl Max
Einhäupl and the then Australian ambassador Ian Kemish signed
an agreement (memorandum of understanding), thereby agreeing on
the repatriation of the human remains of the Aboriginal people
and the Torres Strait Islander to Australia.
The Charité Human Remains Project was created in
response to inquiries to which the Charité initially had no
answers. This research project comprised extensive individual
case studies with historical-ethnological and medical-
anatomical research, coupled with a biological-anthropological
assessment, on all human remains from the requested regions of
origin in the anthropological Charité collections from
colonial contexts. In the sense of re-individualization or
re-humanization, information should, as far as possible, be
gathered to shed light on the individual backgrounds of those
people whose bodies or body parts ended up in the collections.
For contextualization, the research ultimately also aimed
at the specific history of the collection with its involvement in
colonial contexts.
According to Thomas Schnalke, director of the Berlin
Medizinhistorisches Museum at the Charité, the official
declaration by the Charité management in 2011 was also decisive
for the work. In it, the Charité undertakes to repatriate all
human remains from its anthropological collections from the
colonial era. The Charité Human Remains Project has so far
led to nine handover ceremonies with 227 individuals to Namibia,
Australia (including Tasmania), Paraguay and New Zealand/
Aotearoa. Based on the experiences of past repatriations,
provenance research has now also been initiated and carried out proactively in order to explicitly address the respective countries and ancestral communities with the research results. When contacting the indigenous communities and their local and national representatives, the Charité is concerned with discussing the further handling and whereabouts of the remains. During the research for the present report, those responsible for the Charité project refused to provide further information on the grounds that this would not serve the objectives of the project. The priority lies in forwarding the sensitive information gathered in the Case reports, initially exclusively to the ancestral communities, in order to coordinate an adequate handling of the »human remains«. In this communicative process, the voices of the communities have absolute priority with regard to determining how, besides the "human remains" themselves, the information provided is to be dealt with. In addition, there is interest to present such information in the form of publications so that it can be differentiated, contextualized and integrated and conveyed in the sense of rehumanization. Accordingly, a long list of publications (see Appendix 3) was part of the information passed on for the present report.

Human remains from colonial contexts:
The current collection of human remains from colonial appropriation in the Charité is very special, as it is part of the Charité- and S-collections that were stored together before 2011. When the large collections were handed over to the SPK and BGAEU in 2011, the Charité kept just under 300 remains from colonial contexts. These were above all those for which repatriation requests had already been received at that time. According to the institution, these are remains—mainly from the African continent—of a total of 58 people: from today’s Tanzania (17), South Africa (8), Namibia (3), Mozambique (2), Rwanda (2), Cameroon (2), Togo (1), Ethiopia (1) and Congo (1). The inventory also includes 10 human remains, which are assigned to various islands and areas in Oceania, and eight more with unclear origins from different contexts.

Care of the human remains:
Responsible for handling human remains from colonial contexts at the Charité are: Prof. Dr. Thomas Schnalke, Director of the Berlin Medizinhistorisches Museum (BMM) at the Charité and Dr. Judith Hahn, historian at the BMM, in collaboration with Dr. Holger Stoecker, historian and provenance researcher.

Inventory overview:
Since only a certain part of the collection remained in the Charité, the inventory is complete here. For the most part of the human remains, extensive case reports have already been drawn up in the course of provenance research.

Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research:
2010—2013: Funding of the Charité Human Remain Project for three years in the amount of € 300,000 by the Deutsche Forschungsgesellschaft (DFG). The project management was carried out by Thomas Schnalke and Andreas Winkelmann.
2014: Report commissioned by the Australian government on Aboriginal ancestral remains in the Charité, the Martin Luther University in Halle and the Senckenberg Nature Museum in Frankfurt, carried out by Michael Cawthorn

2016–2019: Provenance research on approx. 120 human remains from New Zealand/Aotearoa in the S collection and the anatomical collection of the Charité by Andreas Winkelmann, Sarah Fründt and Holger Stoecker

November 2018 – October 2019: Based on a research funding by the Fritz Thyssen Foundation, Holger Stoecker and Sarah Fründt carried out the proactive investigation of 37 remains from colonial contexts of the 19th and early 20th of people of presumably African origin.

Methods of provenance research:
Since the Charité Human Remains Project is considered to be pioneering in the German context and decisive in terms of methods, the interdisciplinary orientation and the practice-relevant objectives of the research should be emphasized at this point. The historian Holger Stoecker points out that the provenance research was an interdisciplinary, but not an academic or collection-internal initiative: ”Rather, it [the Charité Human Remains Project] should create a reliable knowledge base with the help of historical-ethnological, medical-anatomical and biological-anthropological expertise in a worsening political situation—with a considerable potential burden for the foreign policy relations between Germany and Namibia—in order to find a political solution to this problem, which has been partly thoughtless and partly unknown for decades.”

The working methods and experiences of the Charité Human Remains Project was groundbreaking for further provenance research projects. The methodological and technical knowledge is conveyed in a practical working tool for interdisciplinary provenance research on human remains from colonial contexts. Collaborative provenance research with scientists and ancestral communities only took place in individual cases as part of the provenance research of the human remains in the care of the Charité. Invasive methods were not used.

Repatriations:
2011: 20 Nama and OvaHerero individuals, most of whom perished in the concentration camp on Shark Island, to Namibia
2012: 1 individual (Aché) to Paraguay
2013: 22 individuals from Aboriginal people to Australia
2014: 21 individuals to Namibia, including the skeletons of two Damara women, mother and daughter, who were murdered by their employer, as well as relatives of the Nama and OvaHerero.

2014: 14 Aboriginal People and Torre Strait Islander individuals to Australia and in another repatriation, the remains of an approx. 15-year-old Tasmanian girl.

2017: 1 individual to Australia.

2018: 17 individuals of the OvaHerero, Nama, Ovambo and San to Namibia.

2019: 109 Māori and Moriori individuals to New Zealand/Aotearoa (including 1 Toi Moko, who was found in a dental collection).

Exhibition, research and teaching:
The human remains of the anthropological collections that remained in the Charité are generally not used for research, teaching or exhibition purposes today. As part of the provenance research projects that have been carried out and may still be implemented in the future, historical archive research and a biological-anthropological assessment of general physical parameters (age, gender, signs of illness) are carried out-based on the specific individual case. In the course of the discussions about human remains from colonial contexts, the practice of exhibiting human remains at the Medizinhistorisches Museum was fundamentally reconsidered.

Sources used:


Visualised Inventory of Charteré – Anatomische Sammlung (im Waldeyer Haus) und Medizinhistorische Sammlung (BMM) (Anatomical Collection (in the Waldeyer House) and Berlin Medical History Collection)

- Tanzania (Wahehe, Wapangwa, Wambugu, Maasai, Iraq): 17
- Ethiopia: 1
- Mozambique (Mang’anja/Nyanja, Monyalo): 2
- Rwanda (Mtwitzi, Rwanda): 2
- South Africa (»Kaffer«, Xhosa, Zulu, Mfengu, San, »Gaika Kaffer«): 8
- Namibia (Damara, Ovambo): 3
- Togo (Ntcham): Cameroon (Ba-ndeng): 2
- Liberia? (Kru): 2
- Congo: 1
- Oceania (French Island, Solomons Islands, Mangaia, Tahiti, Admiralty Islands, Jap.Caroline Island): 10
- unclear origin: 8

A total of 58 human remains

Inventory overview
Completely recorded, most of the provenance researched

Provenance research
- 2010–2013: Charité Human Remain Project
- 2014: Report on Aboriginal Ancestral Remains et al. at the Charité in Cawthorn, commissioned by the Australian government
- 2016–2019: Provenance research on approx. 120 human remains from New Zealand/Aotearoa in the »S-collection« and the anatomical collection of the Charité by Winkelmann, Fründt and Stoecker
- 2018–19: Fritz Thyssen Foundation funded research by Stoecker & Fründt on human remains of African origin

Stand repatriations / burials
9 repatriations to (year: repatriated human remains):
- Paraguay (2012: 1)
- Australia (2013: 33; 2014: 14 + 1 (to Tasmania); 2017: 1)
- New Zealand/Aotearoa (2019: 109)
3.3.4. Site of the former Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik (KWI-A), today’s Otto-Suhr-Institut of the Freien Universität Berlin (Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics (KWI-A)
Ihnestraße 22, 14195 Berlin

History of the institute:
There was a large number of Kaiser Wilhelm Institutes in the Empire, which were supported by the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften e.V. founded in 1911. These were supposed to serve the basic research by a scientific elite. The Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik (KWI-A), which was inaugurated in 1927 under founding director Eugen Fischer in Berlin-Dahlem, existed until 1945. Individual departments continued to work in other locations. At the KWI-A research was carried out on questions that we consider today as human genetics as well as on the conception and as support of measures of so-called »eugenics« or »racial hygiene«. Since the Weimar Republic, institute employees legitimized the forced sterilization of people and supported the National Socialist »racial policy«. In the institute building at Ihnestraße 22 scientists also carried out research on the bodies of people who were murdered in Nazi concentration camps and killing centers. In addition to other collections, the anthropological S-collection compiled by Felix von Luschan was kept by his successor to the Chair of Anthropology at the Friedrich-Wilhelms-University in Berlin Eugen Fischer in the attic of the building at Ihnestrasse 22. The role of the S-collections within the institute has so far been little researched.

Developments in dealing with human remains from colonial contexts:
In 2014, during construction work without accompanying archaeological expertise on the FU site around the former KWI-A, heavily fragmented human bones from at least 15 individuals were found. Although the site of the discovery suggested the context of »racial research« at the KWI-A, the bones were cremated after a brief examination by the forensic medicine without further examinations or consultations with representatives of groups of victims of National Socialism. This procedure was heavily criticized nationally and internationally and further investigations were called for. As a result, all

see Pollock 2016, 733
soil interventions caused by repairs, gardening or construction work were accompanied by archaeologists (construction supervision). In 2015, the then President of the Freie Universität Berlin Peter-André Alt set up a working group where members of the Freie Universität, the Max Planck Society (as a successor to the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft) and the Landesdenkmalamt Berlin are represented.

In addition to four construction supervisions, two targeted excavations were carried out under the direction of the archaeologist Prof. Dr. Susan Pollock. Human bone fragments were found in three of these six procedures: in November 2015, February 2016 and July-August 2016. A total of 16,000 more or less fragmented human bones (pieces) were found, as well as parts of human plaster casts, bones (fragments) of various animals (rabbits, rats, pigs, sheep, etc.) and objects (e.g. plastic tags). After the investigations were completed last year, the results were presented in the presence of the chairmen of the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland and the Zentralrat Deutscher Sinti und Roma. Although the findings showed that human bones came from different contexts of origin and it could not be ruled out that the period during which the collection was created predates the time of National Socialism, representatives of self-organizations with regard to colonial backgrounds were not included. It was only after a public hearing to present the study results in February 2021, at which the audience critically commented on the omission, that non-public talks did take place with a smaller number of self-organizations such as the Afrikarat Berlin-Brandenburg e. V., the Initiative Schwarze Menschen in Deutschland (ISD e.V.) and korientation e.V. Moreover, there are demands from the public for a continuation of the excavations on the site and for clarification. In January 2019, the project »History of Ihnestraße 22« started under the direction of the historian Dr. Manuela Bauche. The aim is to process and to make the history of the KWI-A visible. A racism-critical approach is pursued, which traces, for example, the lives of those affected. In addition to a scientific Advisory Board, an Advisory Board made up of representatives from self-organizations has been convened to vote on the project of an information and remembrance site. The Advisory Board, which meets twice a year, has been steadily expanded to accommodate the variety of groups historically affected by racist and ableist research and policies. There are also organizations on the Advisory Board that represent disabled people or that strive for an appropriate reminder of those who have been sterilized.

**Human remains from colonial contexts:**

The 16,000 bones come from various collections, including those that can be dated back to before the Nazi era. A colonial context cannot therefore be ruled out. The analysis by anthropologists Emmanuel Petiti and Julia Gresky revealed that the bones belong to at least 54 and possibly more than 100 people of various ages.

**Care of the collection:**

The working group set up in 2015 and chaired by the President of the Freie University (see above) is responsible for
further handling of the recovered human remains. Since July 2018, Günter M. Ziegler is President of the FU. In addition to members of the Freie Universität, the Max Planck Gesellschaft and the Landesdenkmalamt Berlin are represented in the working group, and the statements of the self-organizations and victims’ associations are included in the consultations.

Inventory overview:
In addition to the 16,000 bones recovered so far, it is very likely that there are other pits with buried human remains on the site around the former KWI-A. Moreover, it can also be assumed that there were other remains on the site that were lost during the construction of the university library without appropriate supervision of the building process. So far, little is known about the history of the various sub-collections of the KWI-A.

Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research:
Dr. Susan Pollock, from the Institut für Vorderasiatische Archäologie at the Freie Universität Berlin, led the archaeological excavations. The osteological analysis of the human bones was carried out by the anthropologists Emmanuele Petiti and Julia Gresky from the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut. The opinions of representatives of the self-organizations were consulted on the questions of need and the implementation of further methods and analyzes to clarify the provenance. Susan Pollock and Reinhard Bernbeck wrote about this in August 2021: »Since the Zentralräte der Juden, der Sinti and Roma as well as self-organizations of descendants of formerly colonized people do not want any further research on these remains, any additional analysis is prohibited.«
Moreover, the authors are of the opinion that the decision to carry out further excavations should not be left with the specialists from history and archeology or institutions, but the civil society organizations mentioned.

Methods of provenance research:
The human remains from the test excavations of 2015 and 2016 were examined using non-invasive osteological analyzes by a research group led by archaeologist Prof. Dr. Susan Pollock from the Freie Universität Berlin for age, gender, skeletal part (localization of the bone part in the human body), pathological and taphonomic features and traces of processing and impact. In a non-public round of talks, the chairmen of the Zentralrat der Juden in and the Zentralrat Deutscher Sinti und Roma spoke out
against invasive methods for further research into the victims of racist research.

Exhibition, research and teaching:
The human remains are expected to be buried in a cemetery and will not be released for exhibitions, research and teaching.

Sources used:


Visualised Inventory of bone fragments on the Site of the former Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik (KWI-A), today's Otto-Suhr-Institut of the Freien Universität Berlin (Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics (KWI–A))
This graph presents the number of bone fragments found during excavations on the KWI-A site. No conclusions can be drawn about the actual number of individuals, whose remains were found.
This graph presents the number of bone fragments found during excavations on the KWI-A site. No conclusions can be drawn about the actual number of individuals, whose remains were found.
Following the excavation of at least 15 bone fragments which were cremated in 2014, another 16,000 bone fragments (of at least 54, possibly more than 100 of different ages) were recovered in 2015 and 2016, which is why a colonial context cannot be ruled out.

Inventory overview
Further bone finds are suspected if the excavations are continued.

Provenance research
2015–2020 scientific supervision of the excavations and non-invasive osteological analyzes by a research group led by the archaeologist Susan Pollock; So far no dedicated provenance research

Stand repatriations/burials
Human bones of at least 15 individuals found in 2014 were cremated without further examination. A burial of the human remains from the subsequent excavations is being prepared.
3.3.5. Museum für Naturkunde Berlin (MfN)
(Museum of Natural History Berlin)
Invalidenstr. 43, 10115 Berlin

**History of the institution:**
The opening of the Berliner Universität in 1810 was the starting point for the development of scientific collections, including in the Anatomisch-Zootomisches, Zoologisches Museum as well as from 1814, the Mineralogisches Museum. Today's Museum für Naturkunde (MfN) was founded in 1889 to centralize the three collections in a new building on Invalidenstraße. As a university facility, it was intended to be a center for scientific research as well as a museum. To this day, the MfN is a globally networked research museum.

After the opening by Kaiser Wilhelm II and a resolution by the Bundesrat of the same year, the Museum für Naturkunde was awarded all natural history objects from all expeditions equipped at imperial costs as well as the materials from the colonial areas collected by colonial officials. The collection grew rapidly during the period of German colonialism. During the Second World War, part of the collection and the building were destroyed, rebuilt in the post-war period and continued to operate in divided east of Berlin.

The museum has been a foundation under public law since 2009 and has been affiliated to the Leibniz-Gemeinschaft as an Institut für Evolutions- und Biodiversitätsforschung. From 2018 to 2027 it will be funded with 660 million euros, equally funded by the federal government and the state of Berlin. With over 30 million objects, the MfN collection is the largest natural history collection in Germany.

**Developments in dealing with human remains from colonial contexts:**
Up until the request for this report, there was no explicit concern with human remains from colonial contexts in the MfN. In its written reply (see Appendix 4), the museum describes the collection history of the Museum für Naturkunde in the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century with regard to human remains as a research gap. For the first time, an institute-wide internal survey was carried out, human remains were recorded separately and the classification and research on provenance began. The history of the human remains in the S- and RV-collections, which were housed in the MfN for a period of time, has also not been fully reconstructed. Parts of the

---

S-collection and RV-collection were moved to the storage rooms of the Museum für Naturkunde after the war-related relocation in 1948. In the course of the university reform in 1970, the anthropological collections (or parts of them) went to the Museum für Naturkunde: »The anthropology collections were formally part of the Museum für Naturkunde until mid-1986. T. in trust management. At that time, anthropology left the museum and was incorporated into the Charité. However, the collection rooms were only vacated 10 years later. Initially, the workplaces of the anthropology staff were also in the museum for years.«

Since the reconstruction of the history with regard to the appropriation of dinosaur bones as part of the Tendaguru expedition in today’s Tanzania, the subject of the collection items from colonial contexts in general and the colonial history of the museum have been further investigated. At the moment, Ina Heumann and Katja Kaiser are creating guidelines on how to use them with natural history collections from colonial contexts. In its assessments of the colonial provenance of human remains and since summer 2021 also on its website, the Museum für Naturkunde refers to the definition of »colonial contexts« from the guidelines of the Deutscher Museumsbund. The website states that a critical examination of the history of its colonial institutions and collections was started at the MfN under the following premises:

»When researching the history of collections, we prioritize collections from areas that belonged to the German colonial empire. In addition, the projects look at earlier colonial and racist structures that went beyond the colonial era. In addition to the history of the institution and its collection, it is also a matter of examining our current scientific practices, our use of language and our values.«

Human remains from colonial contexts:

According to the current status, there are no human remains in the MfN that can be assigned to colonial contexts with certainty. As this is an ongoing process of research into the circumstances of the acquisition, the results are therefore preliminary. In the Paleontology department, there is a skull with a lower jaw from New Guinea from the collection of Heinrich Christian Umlauff, which is likely to be assigned to a colonial context.
In addition, human bones and bone fragments come from Ecuador, which were collected by the chemists and mineralogists Wilhelm Reiss and Alphons Stübel between 1868 and 1876. In its reply, the museum assumes a context of »continuing colonial structures that determined the circumstances in which Europeans acquired the remains of the indigenous population.« Based on the provenance research that has begun, the review of primary and secondary literature that describes the circumstances under which the bones were collected, the MfN is putting the following initial assessment up for discussion:

»The employment context was therefore neither characterized by violence nor by looting of graves or other conditions that would suggest an injustice context. Reiß und Stübel bought collections of bones from the local population for which they paid. Reiss und Stübel was interested in fossil mammalian bones, the human remains were mixed with the fossil bones and were evidently not purposely acquired.«

Care of the collection:
The human remains are looked after by the custodians of paleontology. The contact person for human remains from colonial contexts and provenance research is the historian Dr. Katja Kaiser.

Inventory status and transparency:
For the present report, an internal inventory of human remains was started. A list or documentation of the human remains that were previously in the possession of the Naturkundemuseum Berlin has not yet been found or reconstructed.

Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research:
Provenance research began at the same time as the internal survey on human remains in early summer 2021. An evaluation of the archive holdings is pending and, according to the historian Holger Stoecker, would also be relevant for cross-institutional Germany-wide provenance research. A research project on the history of the institute, including as a basis for systematic provenance research is planned:

»Nonetheless, the Museum für Naturkunde aims to research its collection history in relation to..."
human remains and in the context of Berlin’s institutions. In our opinion, this research gap must urgently be addressed not only with a view to the Museum für Naturkunde, but also to the interdependence of the museums and university collections in Berlin and throughout Germany. We are currently looking for financial support for this comprehensive research project. «v

Methods of provenance research:
So far, an internal museum survey has been carried out and historical provenance research was started.

Repatriations:
So far none.

Exhibition, research and teaching:
It is very likely that the human remains relevant for the report have not yet been used for research. It is also not known that they were on display. The skull from New Guinea may have been used for teaching purposes in the past, or at least this is suggested by the storage context in a cabinet on the »History of Human Development«, which contains further parts of teaching collections. The skull could also be found for many years on the MfN's website for the paleontological collection. In recent years the objects have not been used for exhibition, research or teaching purposes.

Sources used:
Written correspondence; Website of the institution;
Visual Inventory of the Museum für Naturkunde (MfN) (Museum of Natural History Berlin)

Inventory
Human remains, whose assignment to a colonial context should be examined further: a skull from New Guinea from the collection of Heinrich Christian Umlauff; Bones and bone fragments from Ecuador between 1868 and 1876.

Inventory overview
An internal inventory of the human remains was started in 2021 on the occasion of the present report. It has not yet been possible to list or document the human remains that were in the Berlin Naturkundemuseum in the past.

Provenance research
A research project is being prepared

Stand repatriations/burials

Human bones of at least 15 individuals found in 2014 were cremated without further examination. A burial of the human remains from the subsequent excavations is being prepared.
3.3.6. Zoologische Lehrammlung des Instituts für Biologie der Humboldt-Universität Berlin/
Zoological teaching collection of the Institute for Biology at HU Berlin
Philippstrasse 13, 10115 Berlin

**History of the institute:**

After the establishment of the Zoologisches Institut in 1884, the first director Franz Eilhard Schulze created the teaching collection from holdings of anatomical-zoological collections. In 1888, the company moved to Invalidenstrasse. 43, the newly created scientific and technical institute and museum center, where the Museum für Naturkunde was opened in 1889.

The collection was expanded accordingly through donations from the Museum für Naturkunde as well as anatomical specimens mostly made in the institute itself, part of which was lost due to war damage. In 1968, the Zoologisches Institut was merged with the Zoologisches Institut mit dem Institut für Zoologie der Landwirtschaftlich-Gärtnerischen Fakultät, with human remains in both institutes. In 1970, under the management of Hans Georg Herbst, a decision was made to reduce the size of the collection. In 1995, Dr. Gerhard Scholtz (*1954), Professor of Comparative Zoology, took over the management of the Lehrsammlung at the 1989 renamed Institut für Verhaltensbiologie und Zoologie which was merged with the Institut für Biologie in 1994. The Lehrsammlung now contains over 30,000 objects, around 27,500 of which are microscopic specimens. The majority of the Lehrsammlung can be researched in the database »Kabinette des Wissens«.

**Human remains from colonial contexts:**

In order to answer to the present report, Ms. Drescher carried out an initial inventory of the bony human remains. Ms. Drescher has been a technical assistant in Comparative Zoology since 1998 and is the supervisor of the Zoologische Lehrammlung. For the inventory, all bony and larger human remains at the institute were tabulated. A colonial context can be ruled out for half of the 16 specimens, including skeletons and wet specimens for teaching purposes. These come, for example, from the Berlin anatomy. For the other half, a colonial context cannot be ruled out, even if it is rather unlikely. The 27,500 microscopic slides were not included in the inventory. What is known, however, is a microscopic preparation dating back to 1901 with an inscription, that contains a
derogatory term for Black people, "N* skin". A comparable preparation is also mentioned in the 1915 catalog under no. 395:

»Homo [N*], skin, incision, canada balsam, bought from H. Böcker/Wetzlar«. Statements about the origin cannot be made at the moment.

Care of the collection:
As head of the working group »Comparative Zoology« at the HU’s Institut für Biologie, Mr. Nyakatura is also head of the HU Zoological Teaching Collection. Ms. Drescher has been a technical assistant and supervisor of the Lehrsammlung since 1998.

Inventory status and transparency:
The majority of the Lehrsammlung can be researched in the database »Kabinette des Wissens«; At the initiative of the expert opinion, the bony human remains were recorded for the first time in tabular form by Ms. Drescher in 2021, examined for provenance features and combined with the information in catalogs and index cards.

Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research:
Ms. Drescher has already started to research the state of knowledge about the origin of the human remains. Further provenance research was recommended by the author of this report. There is no capacity at the institute itself, but in principle, there is a willingness to support provenance research. After carefully examining three skeletons, Mr. Gerhard Scholtz, former head of the teaching collection, declared the search for provenance features to be over. Since there is no hope of further determining the origin, the burial of the skeletons is being prepared.

Research, teaching and exhibition:
Basically, the aim of the Lehrsammlung is to bring zoological teaching closer. The proportion of human remains is no longer used in teaching due to the disciplinary orientation of the institute. In addition, there is no actual scientific interest in the human remains at the institute.

Sources used:
Written correspondence with John Nyakatura; Conversation with the manager of the collection, John Nyakatura, and the supervisor Ines Drescher on June 18, 2021; Conversation with Gerhard Scholtz, former head of the teaching material collection, on July 27th, 21st; Facility's website.
Visualised Inventory of Zoologische Lehrammlung des Instituts für Biologie der Humboldt-Universität Berlin/Zoological teaching collection of the Institute for Biology at HU Berlin

Colonial context is unlikely with 8 specimens, but cannot be ruled out. There is also a known microscopic specimen from 1901 with the inscription "N * haut", the provenance of which is unclear.

Inventory overview
Most of the teaching collection can be researched in the database "Kabinette des Wissens". The inventory of bony human remains was recorded for the first time in 2021 on the occasion of the present report.

Provenance research
Documentation inspection carried out by Ines Drescher and Gerhard Scholtz based on provenance information.
Willingness for provenance research is available and recommended by the expert.

Stand repatriations/burials
The burial is prepared for three skeletons for which Gerhard Scholtz' examination did not reveal any evidence of their origin.
3.3.7. Zoologische Lehrsammlung im Institut für Biologie/Zoologie der Freien Universität Berlin/
Zoological teaching collection in the Institute for Biology/Zoology at the Free University of Berlin
Königin-Luise-Str. 1-3, 14195 Berlin

History of the institute:
The construction of the exhibition or Lehrsammlung began in 1949 and accompanied the establishment of the Zoologisches Institut der Freie Universität Berlin in Dahlem from the beginning. The collection grew quickly. The personal contacts of the institute director Prof. Dr. W. Ulrich relevant to the bourgeois circles of collectors and dealers of the Weimar period. The taxidermist Steinmetzler and students made new preparations. For this purpose, dead pets and increasingly also deceased animals from the Berlin Zoologischer Garten were used.

In 1969, a position for a scientific Collection Manager was created for the first time and held by Mr. Jung held. After the construction of the Berlin Wall, he was intensively involved in setting up a Naturkundemuseum in the western part of the city. In 1989, the Naturwissenschaftliche Sammlung was officially opened at Schloßstraße 69a in Berlin Charlottenburg. This resulted in an exchange of objects. When the location at Schloßstraße was closed in 2011, part of the collection was also transferred to the Zoologische Lehrsammlung. During the renovation of the building on Königin-Luise-Straße, Alexander Lieven took over the preservation and reorganization of the collection, for which he is still the contact person today. The Lehrsammlung can be used for teaching in an “open system”.

Overview of human remains from colonial contexts:
When human remains were included, 14 skulls, three entire skeletons, several bones and specimens were found in the Lehrsammlung. The Lehrsammlung has existed since 1949 and therefore, according to Lieven, had no separate, relevant racial ideological or colonial collection mandate. The provenance of all human preparations is so far unclear, a colonial background initially unlikely. Human remains could have come to the collection in cooperation with the Human Anatomy Sections of the FU. Provenance research is recommended.

A colonial context is to be examined further, especially for parts of the pelvis with the designation »Pygmäe« (casts and an unnumbered, original tailbone, which is listed according to the inventory numbers of the pelvic casts) from Niemitz’s list. The objects themselves cannot be found at the moment. Rumors that the long bones in the Lehrsammlung originate from Rudolf Virchow’s collection must be investigated. There is at least one skull with heavily worn teeth, where an assessment by an anthropologist using non-invasive methods is recommended.

Care of the collection:
Dr. Alexander Fürst von Lieven is the supervisor and contact person and takes care of the usability as a Lehrsammlung. However, he is neither a director nor a custodian in the strict sense of the word. There is currently no
collection manager or agency for inventory, maintenance and expansion of the collection.

**Inventory overview:**

There is no complete inventory. A slip box and catalogs are available. A digital acquisition was started a few years ago but not completed. There are no real-time plans to continue inventorying or digitizing. The recording of the human remains was started on June 21, 2021 by Mr. Lieven, Mr. Mboro and Ms. Reimann.

A comparison with the takeover list of the collection of human biological preparations, impressions and models from the human biological institute of Prof. Dr. Carsten Niemitz in the Zoologische Lehrsammlung was started in winter 2010 and 2011. In the documents, the origin is indicated with »Human Biology« or »Human Biology/TU Collection«. There is no further indication of provenance.

**Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research:**

The origin of the preparations has not yet been specifically investigated, even if Mr. Lieven considers this question to be appropriate—not only for human remains, but also for some of the exotic animal preparations. Provenance research on the collection was recommended by the author of the report. It is not planned, but in principle it is welcome. After the conversation with Mnyaka Sururu Mbombo and his presentation of his own search for the head of Mangi Meli, Mr. Lieven reflects on the problem of disposing of human remains without examination. If the human remains and their whereabouts are viewed not only as a problem for the institute, but also as that of the searching relatives who need to conclude the story, then the space must be created to preserve them, says Lieven.

**Research, teaching and exhibition:**

No anthropological research was and is not carried out on the remains. It is true that professors at the institute had a private interest in such research and examined, among other things, in working groups, skeletons from excavations. However, the bones in the collection were all used exclusively as teaching material. According to Lieven, there is no separate research collection. The collection, including the human anatomical specimens, was and is used today in a toxicologically safe manner (covering with Plexiglas, etc.) in teaching. In teaching, for example, skulls are used to explain topics of evolutionary history and skulls are used depending on the needs of the teacher, e.g. in comparison with monkey skulls or with casts of skulls like those of Homo neanderthalensis, to illustrate characteristics relevant to the family tree.

The assessment by Mnyaka Sururu Mbombo and Isabelle Reimann was passed on that as long as a colonial context or an injustice context cannot be ruled out and/or the consent of those affected and relatives is not available, the use of the bones and sculls in research and teaching remains a research ethical political issue.
Sources used:

Written correspondence; Inventory and interview with Dr. Alexander Fürst von Lieven, research assistant at the Institut für Biologie at the Freie Universität Berlin, and Mnyaka Sururu Mboro on June 21, 2021; Historical sources and documentation in the collection.
Visualised Inventory of Zoologische Lehrammlung
im Institut für Biologie/Zoologie der Freien
Universität Berlin/ Zoological teaching collection
in the Institute for Biology/Zoology at the Free
University of Berlin

With 14 skulls, three skeletons and several bones and specimens, a colonial
context is unlikely, but cannot be ruled out.

Inventory overview
.no complete inventory
.The inventory of human remains was started in 2021 for the present report
by Lieven, Mboro and Reimann

Provenance research
Willingness for provenance research existing and recommended by the expert

Stand repatriations/burials
None so far
3.3.8. weißensee kunsthochschule berlin (khb)
(Weiβensee Academy of Art Berlin)
Bühringstraße 20, 13086 Berlin

History of the institute:
The weißensee kunsthochschule berlin was founded in 1946
in the former Trumpf chocolate factory by artists who were
close to the Bauhaus. In the 1950s, the head of the college’s
architecture department, Professor Selman Selmanagic,
had the art college expanded into the East-Berlin. After
reunification, the university was expanded to include
further buildings and departments which continues to this day.

Developments in dealing with human remains
from colonial contexts:
The new director Dr. Angelika Richter (since June 2021)
declared her specific interest in a proactive handling of the
human remains in the house. Together Tyyne Claudia Pollmann,
Professor of Anatomy and Morphology, she has obtained an initial
overview and is planning further steps towards processing.

Human remains from colonial contexts:
The weißensee kunsthochschule berlin has four human
skeletons or partial skeletons and 95 loose bones or bones that
can be assigned to at least five other individuals. The
ligamentous skeleton of a child and the plaster cast by Vargas
(1940) were transferred to the anatomical collection of
the Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden on permanent loan.
Since no investigations have taken place so far, a colonial
context cannot be ruled out. According to the current state of
knowledge, there are no remains of people whose origins are more
likely to be assigned to a colonial context.

Care of the collection:
There is currently no supervision of the collection.

Inventory overview:
To the best of Professor Pollmann’s knowledge, the human
remains have not yet been inventoried. In addition, no documentation
of the bones is known at the art college, so that the arrival
of the bones at the khb and thus their immediate origin are also
unknown.

Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research:
So far, no provenance research has been carried out. The
rector Dr. Angelika Richter expressed great interest, but needs
professional support, as she emphasized in the conversation and
the correspondence on the present report:
»I would like to emphasize once again that the
kunsthochschule considers an inter-institutional
research project in Berlin to be extremely
valuable and welcome. Participation would be
extremely helpful: otherwise appropriate research
and appropriate handling would only be possible
by requesting separate funds and with considerable effort. That is unlikely to be feasible for us.«

Exhibition, research and teaching:
The collection is not used for teaching and is not accessible to the public.

Sources used:
E-mail correspondent; interview with the director Dr. Angelika Richter on August 17, 2021; website of the institution;
Visualised Inventory of kunsthochschule weissensee (khb)

With the 4 human skeletons or partial skeletons and 95 loose bones, a colonial context is unlikely, but cannot be ruled out.

**Inventory overview**
inventory viewed in 2021, not yet inventoried

**Provenance research**
Provenance research desired, support requested

**Stand repatriations/burials**
none so far
3.3.9. Deutsches Historisches Museum (DHM)
(German Historical Museum)
Unter den Linden 2, 10117 Berlin

History of the institute:
The Deutsches Historisches Museum was founded in 1987 on
the occasion of the 750-year anniversary of Berlin and merged
with the Geschichtsmuseum of the GDR after reunification. The
museum has the status of a foundation under public law based in
Berlin. The museum's collection comprises more than 1,000,000
objects, which have now been entered into an online database for
research and the interested public.

On the occasion of the special event »125 years of the
Berlin Africa Conference: Remembering, processing, making
amends« 2009/10, which took place on the initiative of black and
postcolonial associations and lasted several months, five
historians started independent public tours of the history of
German colonialism through the DHM and developed an audio walk.
It became apparent that the colonial history, which so far had
only been mentioned in a single showcase in the museum, should
not be thematized and presented separately from other historical
events. In a special exhibition from October 2016 to mid-May
2017 under the title: »German Colonialism. Fragments of its past
and present«, the DHM devoted itself to the topic more
comprehensively for the first time.

Developments in dealing with human remains from colonial
cross contexts:
There are permanent positions for provenance research
at the Deutsches Historisches Museum which are headed by
Dr. Brigitte Reineke. After the museum drew a lot of criticism
by hiding the colonial history and showing it in the special
exhibition, awareness of colonial provenance research took
place. The provenance researchers carried out research on human
remains from colonial contexts at the DHM.

Existence of human remains from colonial contexts:
The collection of the DHM contains a pigtail of hair and
a cap with a pigtail attached, both of which come from the
context of the so-called Boxer Rebellion in China.
A shrunken head is also indicated.

Care of the collection:
The human remains are looked after by the responsible
managers of the Alltagskultur collection or, the general
collections department.
Provenance research on the human remains is headed by Dr.
Brigitte Reineke.

Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research:
The research takes place in the context of provenance
research at the DHM, which mainly deals with cases in the NS and
GDR context. The research on the two braids dragged on for
several years, with new traces being followed over and over
again, but which did not lead to any further results. An
anthropological analysis of the shrunken head is intended, but has not yet been carried out. The reasons given for this are the low capacities and resources in-house and the low availability of specialists.

Methods of provenance research:
So far only historical methods of provenance research have been used, an anthropological analysis of the head is planned.

Repatriations:
None so far.

Exhibition, research and teaching:
According to Ms. Reineke, the human remains have so far not been used for exhibition, research or teaching purposes because the circumstances of their creation, use or access to the collections have not been clarified.

Sources used:
E-mail correspondence and information from Ms. Reinecke; website of the institution.
Visualised Inventory of the German Historical Museum/ Deutschen Historischen Museums (DHM)

2 braids of hair from a colonial background; 1 shrunken head of unknown origin

Inventory overview
Complete inventory

Provenance research
In-house historical provenance research carried out, non-invasive anthropological analysis of the shrunken head pending

Stand repatriations / burials
None so far
3.3.10. Lautarchiv der Humboldt-Universität
zu Berlin am Hermann von Helmholtz-Zentrum
(Sounds Archive of the Humboldt University
at the Hermann von Helmholtz Center)
Am Kupfergraben 5, 10117 Berlin

History of the institute:
The Lautarchiv was set up as a separate department at the
Preußische Staatsbibliothek in 1920. Recordings date back
to 1909, when the language teacher Wilhelm Doegen began making
records for school lessons.
The basis of the Lautarchiv was also formed by the
gramophone recordings (1650 sound records) from a prisoner-of-war
camp during the First World War. Scientific access, especially
to colonial soldiers from all over the world, was subsidized by
the state. While i.e. Felix von Luschan and Otto Reche carried
out body measurements, the Preußische Ministerium für Wissenschaft,
Kunst und Volksbildung appointed a Königlich Preußische
Phonographische Kommission to record the internees. For this
purpose, the Lautarchiv cooperated with the Phonogrammarchiv of
the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin in the production of over
1031 wax rollers and the already mentioned 1650 sound plates by
the end of the war.
The acoustic collection today consists of around 7,500
recording formats such as shellac records, wax cylinders or
tapes, which have been digitized since 1999 and entered into the
»Kabinette des Wissens« (cabinets of knowledge) database for
online research. The Lautarchiv is integrated into teaching and
was and is used and critically questioned in a series of
academic qualification projects, which are documented on the
Lautarchiv website. In 2020, the Lautarchiv was the only
collection at the Humboldt University to move completely into
the Humboldt Forum.

Developments in dealing with human remains
from colonial contexts:
In 2010, two human larynx were rediscovered in the
Lautarchiv. At that time, Anette Hoffmann and Britta Lange were
doing research in the archive on the DFG-funded project »Captive
Voices. ‘Foreign peoples’ in historical sound recordings using
the example of the German-Austrian prisoner-of-war projects,
1915–1918«. In this context, the Lautarchiv was also examined as
a colonial archive and thought was given to dealing with
»sensitive collections«.
Nevertheless, it took almost ten years before the human remains became an issue again, namely when the curator of the Humboldt Laboratory's opening exhibition "Nach der Natur" (After Nature) for the newly built Humboldt Forum visited the Lautarchiv. This time, a provenance research was commissioned to determine where and from whom the larynx came from.

However, even after the provenance research by Holger Stoecker, a dignified handling of the human remains in the Lautarchiv was not implemented. Christopher Li, the new head of the Lautarchiv since December 2020, found the larynx by chance during the inventory in an old corrugated cardboard box, along with various other items. His essay is to appear in 2022 where he will discuss the handling of the larynx preparations in the Lautarchiv from a philosophical-ethical point of view.

In the context of the provenance investigation of the dry preparations of the larynx by Holger Stoecker with Johanna Stapelfeldt (Humboldt Lab), the handout "What to do if human remains are found in university collections?« was created for employees of university collections at the Humboldt-Universität (see Appendix 6). It is also worth mentioning that in the meantime, there has been a discussion about the extent to which voices in the Lautarchiv are to be understood as human remains, although ultimately no assignment to this category was made here.

**Human remains from colonial contexts:**

The holdings of the Lautarchiv contain two human larynxes, which were probably processed into preparations between 1900–1930. The provenance research did not provide any concrete evidence of the origin, but based on the facts, it seemed realistic to assume a colonial context, as the currently unpublished provenance report by Holger Stoecker concluded:

> "Institutional structures, research approaches and personal networks may give plausible cause for their origin from the German colonial war against Herero and Nama 1904–1908, their entry into the Berlin anatomy and their use there for research on racial anthropology, but still remain hypothetical."

**Care of the collection:**

Dr. Christopher Li is the head of the collection of the Lautarchiv.

**Inventory overview:**

From 1998–2014 the development and digitization of the sound recordings took place. A general inventory of the holdings has been carried out since January 2021, during which no further human remains were found in the Lautarchiv.

**Completed, ongoing or planned provenance research:**

January to June 2020: Provenance investigation of the two human dry larynx preparations (carried out by Holger Stoecker) funded by the Deutsche Zentrum Kulturgutverluste. A handout on how to deal with human remains in university.
collections was developed in the context of this research in collaboration between Holger Stöcker and Johanna Stapelfeldt (Humboldt Lab).

Methods of provenance research:
The project included historical provenance research.

Exhibition, research and teaching:
The larynx is currently not used in exhibitions, research or teaching.

Sources used:
Written correspondence and conversation with Dr. Christopher Li; Website of the institution;

Lange, Britta: "Think about this thing for yourself..."

Visualised Inventory of the Lautarchiv der Humboldt-Universität (Sounds Archive of the Humboldt University at the Hermann von Helmholtz Center)

2 braids of hair from a colonial background; 1 shrunken head of unknown origin

Inventory overview
Complete inventory

Provenance research
In-house historical provenance research carried out, non-invasive anthropological analysis of the shrunken head pending

Stand repatriations / burials
None so far
3.4. Classification of the results in relation to the methodological approach

The result of the present inventory is largely determined by the decision to exclusively determine the existing holdings, and thus depends on the cooperation and willingness of the collection institutions themselves to provide information. The reconstruction of the collections from historical sources, such as the MfV’s acquisition books digitally published in 2021 or the Zeitschrift für Ethnologie was not intended.

In discussions with experts, a list of places and institutions was drawn up where human remains from colonial contexts are known or suspected. This list formed the basis of the individual written or digital inquiries. A request for information was also sent via the Berlin email distribution list of the coordination office for academic university collections in Germany. Human remains in collections from private individuals were not included.

Based on the methodological approach of other projects on supra-institutional, topic-related inventories, the request initially contained a request for insight into the processing and the status of the documentation. Based on the actually available data, the information/categories relevant to the report and appropriate for publication from a moral and ethical point of view should be discussed with those responsible for collections and repatriation practitioners. In the case of some of the requested institutions, it was not possible to develop modalities for an insight into the status of the recording and documentation and the cooperation for the use of the existing data for this report.

In a second step, the project outline in the appendix was therefore developed as a basis for a more specific survey of the institutions (see Appendix 1). The requested information listed here was the result of an exchange and reflection process. The selection should also serve the criterion of being helpful or even necessary for the search for ancestral remains of relatives, their supporters and free and/or international provenance researchers and at the same time not too problematic or sensitive for publication.

The return of information in the second phase of inquiry forms the basis for the present inventory. The results are based on the information selected and therefore also censored by the institutions. The information that was made available to the institutions can be viewed at: www.smb.museum/museen-einrichtungen/ethnologisches-museum/sammeln-forschen/erwerbungsbuecher/
expert was already what the institutions wanted to make available to the public at their own discretion. The selection of information is therefore subject to various influencing factors: the institute’s internal definition of “human remains from colonial contexts”, the inter-institutional decision-making structures, information policy, the existing knowledge and data infrastructure in the institutions, personnel capacities and political, ethical and moral positions in relation to the holdings. In addition, the official, but also the personal, and in some cases still processing, positioning of the respective collection managers, the custodians and collection supervisors with regard to certain questions play an important role.

A third round of inquiries and responses to supplement the inventory information was only carried out in very small parts and, on the whole, there was no push for further disclosure of information. From a supra-institutional perspective, it is less the result of a systematic inventory, but rather an evaluation of a limited survey process. In many institutions, the inventory information is also to be viewed as a provisional result of a further inventory and provenance research process. The author is already aware of other holdings in the institutions listed that have not yet been officially specified, but for which a colonial context cannot be ruled out without further research.

The present report also reflects a snapshot of the ongoing discussion on the scientific, political, ethical and moral debates about the preservation and repatriation of human remains in public and private collections. This leads to the exclusion of holdings whose discussed relevance for the category “colonial contexts” has not yet been dealt with at the time of this report. Particularly noteworthy here is the inclusion of the remains of people within the prehistoric, archaeological and paleontological collections who have so far received little attention in the current debates in Germany due to the length of their past death. For example, at the time of the survey, it was still possible to justify the refusal to provide information or to talk to the curators about the holdings of human remains from the non-European area of the Vorderasiatisches Museum and the Ägyptisches Museum Berlin by stating that the collections contained only human remains that were several thousand years old and therefore neither came from colonized people nor from their immediate ancestors. An inclusion of the prehistoric, archaeological and paleontological collections of human remains, the appropriation of which cannot
be ruled out in a colonial context, would affect both the list
of institutions and the inventory of individual institutions.
In individual cases, these have already been included in this
inventory, for example in the information provided by the
Ethnologisches Museum Berlin.

Conclusions about omissions and the proportion of the
specified "holdings from colonial contexts" in the total
holdings could not be systematically included in the report,
among other things, since the majority of the institutions did
not provide any information at all on the total number of human
remains, or in some cases even explicitly refused to answer
them.

3.5. Negative responses to requests
for information

In addition to the institutions mentioned under 3.3.1 to
3.3.10, the following institutions have announced that they have
no human remains from colonial contexts or no human remains at
all:

- Robert Koch Institut
- Berliner Missionswerk
- Institut für Sozial- and Kulturanthropologie FU
- Kunsthbibliothek der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin –
  Preußischer Kulturbesitz (SPK)
- Rathgen Forschungslabor (SPK)
- Museum of Asiatische Kunst (SPK)
- Vorderasiatisches Museum (SPK)
- Ägyptisches Museum (SPK)
- Staatliches Institut für Musikforschung (SPK)
- Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut (SPK)
- Geheimes Staatsarchiv (SPK)

The following institutions proactively responded to the
request for information via the distribution list of the
scientific university collections with a negative result:

- Collections at the Botanischer Garten and
  Botanisches Museum
- Vilém Flusser Archiv (Universität der Künste Berlin)
- Julius Kühn Institut (JKI) – Bundesforschungsinstitut
  für Kulturpflanzen
- University archive of the Universität der Künste Berlin
- Subject area of paleontology of the Freien Universität
  Berlin

It should be explicitly mentioned here that in
individual correspondence despite the negative information,
great interest in the processing of other colonial holdings was
communicated.
4. Conclusions and recommendations

4.1. Inventory

The number of actually existing human remains from colonial contexts in Berlin could not be fully determined within the scope of the report.

The present report is limited to inquiries about human remains according to the definition of the Leitfaden zum Umgang mit menschlichen Überresten in Museen und Sammlungen (Guideline for dealing with human remains in museums and collections) of the Deutscher Museumsbund of 2021. The requests for information therefore contained neither funeral objects nor body casts, measurement data, photographs, sound recordings etc. made without the consent of the persons, not even those that are directly related to racial anthropological research. The present report was also based on the definition of "colonial contexts" from the guidelines for dealing with collections from colonial contexts of the Deutscher Museumsbund of 2020.

The feedback from the institutions showed that there are at least 5,958 remains of people in museum and scientific collections in the geographic area of Berlin, whose appropriation is situated in a colonial context. If you add the entire Rudolf Virchow collection (approx. 3,500 individuals) due to the lack of information from the BGAEU, there are 9,458 human remains.

The number of human remains for which a colonial context cannot be ruled out and which includes all human remains from the racial anthropological Luschan and Rudolf Virchow collection is approximately 13,500. In addition, there are 16,000 bone fragments from the human bones of at least 54, possibly more than 100 people of various ages, which were recovered from the excavations on the site of the former Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik (KWI-A) and for which a colonial context cannot be ruled out either.

The reasons for the incompleteness and the difficulty in determining the inventory and the arguments against the disclosure of data from the correspondence with the institutionally authorized contact persons of the various institutions are as follows:
4.1.1. Information and data situation

Inquiries within the framework of this survey led to the first separate inventory of human remains in three scientific institutions, which have been completed. It can be assumed that inter-institutional surveys, including those of retired employees in other institutions, will reveal further human remains.

The large »racial anthropological« collection institutions (MVF, EM, BGAEU) have inventories transferred to databases that are also still being worked on. The inventory in the Ethnologisches Museum has not yet been completed, which is why the information is only provisional so far.

According to the SPK, the inventory list of the Luschan collection is partially flawed and in large parts unchecked, which is why its publication is considered problematic. According to the BGAEU, there are no country lists or lists relating to the colonial context of the Rudolf Virchow Collection. They were also not prepared to accept the support offered by the MVF to provide information on the holdings from the former German colonies for the present report.

All institutions stated that they only had limited capacities for the processing and preparation of the available information and provenance research, as well as for the inventory and basic processing of the holdings. In some institutions, support and processing with regard to the problem of the expert opinion is carried out on a voluntary basis (e.g. Zoologische Lehrammlungen HU and FU, BGAEU).

4.1.2. Access to information:

There is no supra-institutional, ethical and political consensus on who is granted access to the inventory and documentation information. Institutions (with large collections) do not see the release of information as independent of repatriation processes. This shows that there is no basic ethical consensus on the question of whether repatriations and their underlying provenance research as well as the exchange of information between institutions and so-called »communities of origin« should be treated as a state, binational matter and to what extent the public is involved.

The disclosure of information was also restricted in individual cases for the following reasons:

- Inventory information is only issued for scientific purposes; the institution wanted to examine suspected cases of scientific ethics itself as individual cases
- Internal decision-making hierarchies slow down communication and access to information; independent questioning of the subordinate institutions by the author of this review herself was not desired in some cases and was therefore refrained from.
- Inventory information was withheld for ethical reasons.

Based on various experiences in the context of repatriations and on the basis of a debate that has lasted for decades, there are
different views of what is considered to be »sensitive information«. As was mentioned, the priority access to information and the decision about publications should, at best, be reserved for the societies of origin and the countries of origin.

The order situation of the present report played a role due to the following aspects:

- Federal institutions do not consider themselves to be obliged to provide information with regard to an inquiry at state level.
- Private institutions do not consider themselves to be obliged to provide information with regard to an inquiry at state level.
- Due to the civil society and activist orientation of the commissioner of this report, the Coordination office for a city-wide concept for coming to terms with Berlin's colonial past of the Decolonize Berlin network, there was a certain reluctance in the institutions to provide information. Information was withheld due to a lack of control over the use of this information.

4.1.3. Definition »colonial contexts«:

The restriction to the »stock of human remains from colonial contexts« has highlighted two fundamental problems:

- There is no cross-institutional understanding or definition of what constitutes a »colonial context«. Even within the institutions of the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz there are contradicting interpretations on how, for instance human remains from Latin America, often referred to as »Archäologica«, are to be classified (see Chapters 3.3.1.1. and 3.3.1.2.)

The definition according to the Leitlinien des Museumsbundes is a point of reference for some institutions (e.g. EM, MfN), for others the human remains from the former areas and times of German foreign rule have priority, while others are to be regarded as individual cases (MfV).

- An overview of human remains from colonial contexts is not yet available in any institution. An exception are the holdings of the Ethnologisches Museum for which a colonial background is generally assumed for all human remains, since these »ended up in the collections of ethnomological museums due to a racist scientific and collecting practice«.

The release or compilation of information under the premise of wanting to make their own assignment is already based on the results of provenance research or the preliminary work on provenance research, which should be presented in a contextualized and differentiated manner. Several institutions want to carry out the research on and examination of suspected cases themselves. Following the last aspect, there is great uncertainty/reluctance to release information that has not been checked through extensive provenance research itself. Here, for example, the concern was expressed that uncertain information
would be interpreted as fixed results, which could then no longer be »captured« or would result in requests for return that were based on an incorrect premise.

4.1.4. Summary

The number of existing human remains from colonial contexts in Berlin, based on the definitions of the Deutscher Museumsbund could not be fully determined within the scope of the report. In summary, the reasons for this are:

- The lack of information and data at the facilities themselves
- Limitations in the access to information that are politically, collection-preserving and ethically/morally justified in varying degrees. Internal hierarchies and the specific assignment situation of the present report also led to restrictions
- The limitation of the query exclusively to human remains from a »colonial context« - whose assignment is already a partial result of provenance research - that individual institutions consider to be under their control. Provenance research has so far only been completed or only just begun for a limited number of collection holdings.

Nonetheless, the query was a trigger for some institutions to determine their inventory on human remains for the first time and to start looking through documentation and source material for provenance research.

The obligation of the institutions to draw up an inventory could speed up the process, which has hitherto been purely voluntary. The legal obligation in the USA since 1990 is exemplary. Under NAGPRA §3003, the facilities with collections of human remains and related funeral objects by Native American people are obliged to take inventories within five years in consultation with the representatives of the indigenous self-governments and organizations, and to make them available to an examination board. In addition, at the request of indigenous organizations and authorities, American institutions are required to provide all additionally available documents for the purpose of determining geographical origin, cultural affiliation and the basic facts relating to the acquisition and reception of human remains of the Native American people and the associated funerary objects.
4.1.5. Recommendation: Advisory Board with a say or commission

Based on the outcome that the definitions, access and type of information in the context of an »inventory of human remains from colonial contexts« cannot be separated from provenance research that has already been initiated and require fundamental decisions, which – based on the principle of Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) – should be made in consultation with indigenous peoples: an Advisory Board or a commission is recommended to accompany the further provenance research and repatriation work, including the handling of the inventory information.

The Advisory Board or commission should include experienced repatriation practitioners as well as representatives of communities and indigenous organizations whose ancestors are likely to be in the collections. Accordingly, the Advisory Board should be able to be expanded independently and on the basis of new research results.

The advisory board must be given a say in all questions relating to the storage, treatment, handling, control and return of human remains, for which a colonial context cannot be ruled out or for which the persons or their relatives have not given their consent for storage and use or can be voted on. The Board or the Commission should be given the opportunity to veto important decisions. The authority of the body should be made publicly transparent and, i.e. extend to the following aspects:

- Questions about the inventory to be determined (definitions and delimitation of »colonial context«, »human remains«, inclusion of funeral objects, death masks, etc.)
- Questions about the access and organization of information
- Questions about the methodology of provenance research
- Dealing with unassociated human remains
- Dealing with historical impressions, photographs and measurement data
- Handling of new research data

4.2. Use of human remains from colonial contexts in research, exhibitions and teaching

Human remains, for whom a colonial context cannot be excluded, are used in Berlin for research, exhibitions and teaching. The BGAEU releases the human remains for research without any indication that there may be restrictions due to ethical aspects (see Chapter 3.3.2). Human remains from the collection of the Ethnologisches Museum are exhibited at the Humboldt Forum. In the context of the provenance research project all of these remains are initially assessed worthy of scrutiny due to the museum’s racist science and collection
practice (see Chapter 3.3.1.2). The human remains from the
. Zoologische Lehrammungen can in principle be used in
teaching, even though they are rarely utilized (see Chapter
3.3.7). Accordingly, there is no consensus among institutions not
to use human remains for research, exhibitions and teaching
where a colonial context cannot be ruled out. Research,
exhibition and teaching of human remains, whose provenance has
not been sufficiently clarified and which have been checked for a
colonial or injustice context, is increasingly only authorized
after consultation with ancestral communities.

The Charité and the SPK, for instance, have also adopted
international ethical codes in their »racial anthropological«
collections, which prioritize provenance research and do not
use human remains from colonial contexts for more extensive or
invasive research without consulting the societies of origin.
The Deutsches Historisches Museum also justified the blocking of
the human remains by arguing that the circumstances of their
creation, use or access to the collections had not yet been
clarified. The FU Berlin consulted with self-organizations about
their wish for further provenance research on the bones
recovered during excavations on the site of the former KWI-As
and is preparing the burial.

The responses indicate the tendency of institutions that
conduct provenance research to rather not subject the human
remains to any further research. In particular, institutions
that explicitly release the bones for research are not
very interested in researching the origin of the human remains.
This supports the thesis of the provenance researchers
Förster, Henrichsen, Stoecker and Axasi-Eichab that hiding the
circumstances of the acquisition and provenance is a
prerequisite for the further use of human remains as an
anthropological research resource.

The use of human remains continue to represent a
political issue in terms of research ethics where a colonial
context cannot be excluded and/or there is no informed consent
of the person or relatives. In the response of the Federal
Government of July 2019 to the parliamentary inquiry, i.e. of
the Green MP Dr. Kirsten Kappert-Gontner is presented with the
following position: »The Federal Government is of the opinion
that human remains from colonial contexts should not be used for
scientific research purposes.«

A more binding regulation is pending. Until then, the
recommended action of the above-mentioned Advisory Board or
Commission should be taken into account in the decision-making
process.
4.3. Status of the processing of the provenances and collection histories

4.3.1. Provenance research processing status

No institution has completely processed the origins or even the identity of the people in their collection whose body parts were made into scientific preparations. The results of the inventory with regard to the status of provenance research indicate that the clarification across institutions is still at the beginning. Depending on provenance research that has already been carried out, the completeness or quality of which has not been checked for the present report, the research desiderata in the facilities are as follows:

- The remainder of the racial anthropological collections of 58 human remains at the Charité, who apparently came from violent or colonial contexts or for whom repatriation requests had already been received, has been processed the furthest. According to the institution, provenance research has already been completed for the most part. Research is pending for 10 individuals from Oceania, two human remains labeled »Kru«, presumably from Liberia, and one labeled »Congo«, as well as 8 human remains of unclear origins.

- There are no in-house offices or a fixed budget for provenance research for the large holdings of the Luschan collection of around 7,700 human remains at the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte. The research on 1153 individuals from East Africa was financed from 2017–2019 through project funds, the results of which are to be published in early 2022. After the application by another foundation for the funding of research into the origin of human remains from West Africa was rejected, the State Ministry of Culture and Media stepped in so as not to delay the research. This illustrates the precarious state of funding for provenance research. According to Mr. Heeb, project manager for provenance research at the MVF, one desideratum lies in the not only short-term and project-related but permanent funding of provenance research.

Only after the provenance research on West Africa has been completed, probably in 2024, another more complex and multi-year project on Oceania will be carried out. Further collections will follow thereafter. With project-related and purely internal research, the processing of the origins of the human remains in the »Luschan Collection« at the MVF will take many years to complete.
Provenance research at the Ethnological Museum is carried out by a permanent employee who fills one of the four provenance research positions located at the central archive of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Ilja Labinschinski’s provenance research project is scheduled for 2020-2022. For reasons of capacity, only a few of the 2,000 human remains will be subjected to in-depth provenance research during this time, and methods and findings for further research will be generated and evaluated. The provenance research on the more than 2,000 human remains at the EM is therefore still at the very beginning.

The BGAEU’s reply does not indicate a turn to proactive and systematic provenance research. In addition, all tasks are based on voluntary work, which greatly limits the possibilities of internal research into the appropriation backgrounds of thousands of human remains, mostly sculls.

Provenance research on the human bones from the excavations on the site of the former KWI-A and excavations to recover the other human bones on the site will be decided in consultation with self-organizations.

In the case of the three natural history collections that have identified their human remains for the first time for the present report (MFN, Zoologische Lehrsammlungen of the FU and HU), a research desideratum was determined with regard to the origin of the holdings. The Museum for Natural History and the Institute of Biology at the HU have viewed the documentation as part of the first survey of the collections of human remains. In the case of the Museum of Natural History the existing project to develop guidelines for provenance research by Ina Heumann and Katja Kaiser proved to be helpful so that an internal survey and first expert research could be carried out in this context. The other institutions stated that they neither have the capacities nor technical expertise to carry out or initiate extensive provenance research of their own, which is why the need for prompt implementation of a supra-institutional research project is formally imposed.

The weissenkunsthochschule berlin (khb) currently has no capacities or specialist expertise in dealing with human remains, which is why the director, Dr. Angelika Richter wrote:

»I would like to underline once again that the
art college considers an inter-institutional research project in Berlin to be extremely valuable and welcome. Participation would be extremely helpful: otherwise appropriate research and appropriate handling would only be possible by requesting separate funds and with considerable effort. That is unlikely to be feasible for us.«

The Deutsches Historisches Museum has carried out provenance research and will continue if and when there is new information available. An anthropological analysis of the shrunken head has so far not been carried out citing limited in-house capacities and resources as well as inaccessible specialists.

The extensive historical provenance research of the dry larynx preparations at the Lautarchiv of the Humboldt-Universität has not come to any reliable result. It is unclear whether a further research project can provide new insights.

3) Provenance research has so far been carried out purely on a voluntary basis if the institutions themselves recognize the legitimacy of requests for information and repatriation requests, or due to moral and political pressure from outside. In the German context, there is no research obligation resulting from inquiries from representatives of indigenous peoples or descendants. At least since the 2013 recommendation »Empfehlungen zum Umgang mit menschlichen Überresten in Museen und Sammlungen« of the Deutscher Museumsbund, it is suggested to the relevant collecting institutions to give high priority to prompt post-processing in the event of incomplete or unclear provenance. With the expansion of the funding line of the Deutsches Zentrum Kulturbverluste (DZK) as of January 1, 2019 in order to include provenance research from colonial contexts, funding for provenance research on human remains was given particular relevance and urgency if a colonial context cannot be ruled out. It is the department’s recommendation to build joint projects. Moreover, cooperation with relatives and/or scientists in the countries of origin should be pursued and checked as a prerequisite for funding: »The involvement of institutions, communities and experts as natural or legal persons from countries and societies of origin is to be checked in the planning and implementation of the project.«

E-Mail from Ms. Richter, 27.08.2021
Deutscher Museumsbund e.V. (ed.) 2013, 49 i.a.
See Deutsches Zentrum Kulturbverluste 2021, 3
ibd. 4
capacity limits have not yet been reached. Funding from the DZK is not a substitute for the intra-institutional prioritization of provenance research as an independent core task, as it does not provide any institutional or permanent funding.⁴

4.3.2. Collaborative research with relatives and scientists from countries of origin and ancestral communities

A cooperative provenance research involving direct relatives and members of the indigenous peoples concerned/formerly colonized population groups whose ancestral or body parts of ancestors are in the collection facilities in the Berlin area, where the framework conditions for the research were jointly developed, could not be determined during the research for this report. The signing of a cooperation agreement between the Berliner Gesellschaft für Archäologie, Ethnologie and Urgeschichte (BGAEU) and the OvaHerero/Mbanderu and Nama Genocides Institute (ONGI) for the provenance research of human remains of the Nama and OvaHerero is the only event known to the reviewer and pointing in this direction. (see chapter 3.3.2).

Exchanges and individual cooperation with international scientists, state authorities and institutions such as the Te papa Museum with official repatriation programs are taking place. For the Charité research projects, for instance, international scientists were consulted on individual human remains and detailed questions, such as Ciraj Rassool in South Africa or Amber Aranui, project manager of the national repatriation program at the Te Papa Tongarewa Museum in New Zealand/Aotearoa with a Māori background.

For the 2017-2019 research project of the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte on human remains from Tanzania and Rwanda, four scientists from the University of Rwanda and the National Museum of Rwanda participated. So far, however, voices and results of such cooperation have not been visible or audible, neither in the German public nor in specialist circles. Therefore, the quality of the cooperation has not yet been evident.

The »collaboration with societies of origin« which is often mentioned in specialist circles and described as necessary – theoretically and practically – is hardly established in the Berlin area with regard to provenance research on human remains from colonial contexts.
Despite the great importance of the Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) in the recognition of indigenous rights over their concerns, including their ancestral remains, there are hardly any protocols so far about consultation processes or structures and formalities for the institutions to (self-) oblige or clarify the cooperation in a binding manner. In particular, following the late ratification of Convention No. 169 of the International Labor Organization (ILO) on the protection of the rights of indigenous peoples by Germany in April 2021, these must also be developed for other issues such as land and resource use in indigenous territories.

No basic ethical or political consensus could be established among the institutions and the experts questioned for the present report as to who counts as »entitled to information« and on what basis the determination of »cooperation partners« is made. The decision and control with whom to collaborate and who has access to the research results or inventory information should not lie with the collection-preserving institutions or political representatives of the previous colonial power. Only the access to information for relatives, affected persons, but also their (political) representatives provides the basis for the process of finding and preparing culturally authorized persons to carry out the task of repatriation work, a process that in some cases could take years. Collaborations should be made on a voluntary basis and not forced by access restrictions to information and ancestors.

As long as there is no non-binding access to information for affected communities and descendants, the recommendation is to either give such access to existing information and research status to the Advisory Board or the commission mentioned above, or even now, to cooperate with the already established repatriation and research programs and their data repositories in Australia and New Zealand/Aotearoa. These can also be contact points for indigenous groups and relatives from other countries searching for their ancestral remains in German institutions, and can provide an important advisory function based on many years of experience from the perspective of those affected. Their advice can be helpful even before the initial contact with German institutions. On the African continent, too, access to information, documentation and research on the human remains should be established and a means for advice and support from the perspective of those affected should be set up and given a mediating position.

4.3.3. Supra-institutional provenance research and exchange between the institutions

Against the background of the colonial collection histories (see Chapter 2.4.2) and the national interest, as they i.e. became effective in the Federal Council resolution (»Bundesratsbeschuß«) of 1889 (see Chapter 2.4.3), there are human remains from the same contexts or from the same consignors in different institutions. An interdisciplinary practice
of appropriation, which divides bundles and thus also the documentation into different institutions in the country of appropriation, makes supra-institutional research or intensive collaboration in provenance research projects obvious. As an example, the Ethnologisches Museum and the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte list several identical names under the category of »significant collectors«. The processing of the holdings in the capital is closely linked to collections of other »object groups« and those in other federal states.

This finding is contrasted by the collaboration between the institutions, which has so far only taken place in individual provenance research projects. For example, during research on East Africa at the MVF, skulls from the BGAEU’s holdings were also researched for their origin. In the conversations with institutions, everyone mentioned a lack of exchange and cooperation. Even among institutions that are organized under the umbrella of the SPK and in the association with the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, there is little exchange and the cooperation is described as expandable. Contradicting information from various institutions, for example about the remains with S-numbers at the Ethnologisches Museum or the bony remains belonging to the tufts of hair at the Staatsbibliothek (see Chapter 3.3.1.3) underline the finding of a lack of agreement between the institutions.

4.3.4. Dealing with human remains, whose origin cannot be further elucidated

Those responsible for the collection have described the handling of human remains, the origin of which is unlikely to be further clarified, as an open question, among them the director of the Berlin Medical History Museum (BMM) of the Charité Thomas Schnalke at the interdisciplinary workshop "Colonial collections in Berlin Universities" of the Berlin University Alliance on April 27, 2021. This is also a topic for the Zoologische Lehrsammlungen and the weißensee kunsthochschule berlin. Appropriate handling of the skeletons from the Zoologische Lehrsammlung at the HU with no references to their origin is being planned. A supra-institutional exchange under the influence of the Advisory Board/the commission is also recommended on this topic.

4.3.5. Processing of the history of institutions and collections – especially with regard to the “racial anthropological” collections

1) The historical processing of the »racial anthropological« research of the 19th and early 20th centuries and the corresponding collection has begun and continues in the provenance research projects described above. In connection with the Charité Human Remains Project the anthology »Sammeln, Forschen Zurückgeben?« (Collecting, Exploring, Returning?) also provides an editing and publication of the collection
stories. Particularly noteworthy is the reconstruction of the whereabouts of the S- and RV-collections by the long-time supervisor of the Ulrich Creutz collection. At the same time, there are further ambiguities and research gaps, for example about the role of the S-collection in the KWIA or the war-related relocation. The Museum für Naturkunde Berlin was unable to provide any information about when and exactly which human remains from the anthropological collections were located at Invalidenstraße.

2) In addition to the provenance research projects mentioned above, a single planned research project was explicitly mentioned on the history of the collection (in addition to the ongoing project to process the history of the institute at KWIA, in which the S-collection will also be included in the future). In recognition of the research desideratum with regard to its collection history regarding human remains, the Museum für Naturkunde Berlin states that it will draw conclusions from this and is planning a third-party funded project:

»Nonetheless, the Museum für Naturkunde aims to research its collection history in relation to human remains and in the context of Berlin's institutions. In our opinion, this research gap needs to be addressed not only with a view to the Museum für Naturkunde, but also to the interdependence of the museums and university collections in Berlin and throughout Germany. We are currently looking for financial support for this comprehensive research project.«

3) The support of this research project is i.e. highly recommended for the following reasons:

a) The processing of the institutional history is a basis for systematic provenance research.

b) Sifting through and indexing of sources associated with the processing is essential for international provenance and repatriation research. In its reply, the Museum für Naturkunde gives the following assessment of its archive holdings: »The historian Holger Stoecker, who has dealt extensively with human remains in Berlin
Institutions, such as those in Berlin which are in possession of Human Remains, have not fully processed the origins or even the identity of the people in their collections whose body parts were made into specimens. The implementation of the cross-institutional research project on the history of collections of Human Remains of the MfN Berlin as a joint project is underway.

4.3.6 Summary

1) No institution has fully processed the origins or even the identity of the people in their collections whose body parts were made into specimens.

2) Provenance research is still pending for the majority of human remains from colonial contexts. With regard to the completion or even the start of provenance research on some individual human bones, it is not expected in the next 15 years.

3) So far, provenance research has hardly been financed and carried out by the institutions' own funds or permanent positions.

4) In order to support the smaller or non-specialist institutions, the author of this report recommends examining the feasibility of a joint project.
positions, which is also a condition for the stated sustainable cooperation with societies of origin. The provenance research department, which is firmly established at the Deutsches Historisches Museum has been an exception so far, although the lack of funds and technical expertise for provenance research on human remains was also mentioned here. The provenance research department located at the central archive of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin should also be mentioned here. However, it only employs one employee for the holdings of human remains at the EM and is therefore completely understaffed.

4) The cooperative provenance research, which, according to Andreas Winkelmann, represents the prerequisite and an essential function of repatriation work—more than guidelines and standardized measures—is often mentioned theoretically but only partially included in practice.\textsuperscript{25}

5) The need for supra-institutional research projects or for collaboration between the collections to research the origin of human remains has been recognized. Almost all of the contact persons agreed that such research can and should be expanded.

6) The need for exchange and the desire for ethical guidelines, among other things, on how to deal with human remains, the origin of which cannot be further elucidated, was expressed in the context of the inventory.

7) The processing of institutional and collection histories with regard to human remains, especially from racial anthropological research of the 19th and early 20th centuries, is a research desideratum. The Museum für Naturkunde is planning a research project, the implementation of which is also strongly recommended as a basis for more systematic provenance research. The expansion into a supra-institutional and/or joint project was recommended by the reviewer.

4.3.7. Recommendation: A supra-institutional reappraisal project

In recent years, civil society initiatives, individual politicians and scientists have repeatedly submitted recommendations for supra-institutional provenance research to politicians, whether as a »transnational task force«\textsuperscript{26} or a body set up by the federal and state governments.\textsuperscript{27} Against the background of the research desideratum that has only become visible for Berlin, the position of the federal government from 2011 should once again be reconsidered, which at that time still saw »no need for a research program in

\textsuperscript{25} Winkelmann 2020, 47
\textsuperscript{26} Mboro/Kopp 2018, 44
\textsuperscript{27} Wegmann 2013, 401
this regard set up by the state«. A meaningful and complete
overview of human remains from colonial contexts, as announced
in the context of the 3-way strategy, can only be achieved
through a large effort in recording and collaborative
provenance research. The announced prioritization to clarify
the background of human remains from colonial contexts in the
key points paper should be expressed in the implementation
through innovative and appropriate research structures, which
also have the potential to lead to research on less prioritized
aspects.

In addition to the projects that have already been carried
out and started to deal with the individual colonial
backgrounds and biographies of the people whose bodies were made
into preparations for the »racial anthropological« collection,
further measures are necessary for a timely processing. This
also applies to the background to the human remains, for which
a colonial context is unlikely but cannot be ruled out, as well
as to the processing of the relevant institutional and
collection histories. The recommendation is: one or more cross-
institutional, interdisciplinary and transnationally-oriented
research projects/repatriation projects—under the control and
decision-making influence of the Advisory Board outlined above
or the commission of repatriation practitioners.

As a basis for systematic provenance research, the
research project planned by the Museum für Naturkunde to
investigate its collection history in relation to human remains
in the context of the Berlin institutions must be supported and
its funding secured. It should also be advised whether and to
what extent this project can be expanded into a joint project.

**Supra-institutional:**

In the inventory of the state of research, it became
already apparent that a supra-institutional exchange on the
handling of and provenance research on the holdings with human
remains, for which a colonial context of appropriation cannot be
ruled out, is imminent. In order to address the needs of smaller
institutions, ways should be explored in which larger
institutions or university bodies could assume responsibility.

**Interdisciplinary:**

Interdisciplinarity should not only be the guiding
principle for provenance research that requires historical and
anthropological research. It should also critically question the
disciplinary separation at the time the collections were
created in the context of the development and valorization of
the colonies for its domination and exploitation. This includes
separating bundles from the same appropriation context according
to the disciplines, materials and techniques (natural history,
ethnological, anthropological objects, documentation, photos,
measurements, sound recordings and human remains of a person in
different locations and archives).

Transnationally oriented:
The desideratum of collaborative provenance research
with ancestral communities and relatives became evident. With
regard to this aspect in particular, innovative and progressive
research structures should be established. The decision
and control with whom to collaborate and who has access to the
research results or inventory information should not lie with
the collection-preserving institutions or representatives of
the previous colonial power (see above). Ideally, the research
should be carried out right from the start in close consultation
of and control by descendants and societies of origin, or should
be carried out by them themselves, whereby the local museums
should continue to provide, the necessary infrastructure and
preparatory. Accordingly, the question of international research
should not only be limited to the participation of individual
scientists as experts and informants, but rather structures
should be created that enable participation and help proactively
reduce existing power inequalities. Here, for example,
decentralized research hubs in the countries of origin could be
supported. These could be documentation and research centers
where research on the diverse collections of different museums
and sectors from the same region of origin could be bundled and
systematically coordinated, while local expertise could flow more
easily and more sustainable contacts with ancestral communities
could be established than in the European institutions
themselves. This would also ensure the often sluggish transfer
of knowledge and accessibility that would be less dependent on
visa requirements and reimbursement of travel expenses. For the
German institutions, an international orientation would mean
handing over sole control over the human remains and all
provenance research thereto, but not the responsibility for the
appropriate processing of their history and their dignified
treatment.

A first step is convening a round table to come back to
the recommendations made by Thomas Schnalke, the director of the
Medizinhistorisches Museum of the Charité. It must be ensured
that representatives of self-organizations, repatriation
practitioners and actors from critical civil society are
informed and involved. Recommended is also the advisory
participation of the Deutsches Zentrum Kulturgutverluste whose
funding line covers provenance research on human remains.

4.4. Processing of Berlin's colonial past

The processing of the holdings and institutional histories
of the former race research is of particular importance, which
results from the connection described in section 2.1.3 with
the still powerful ideologies of racism and Eurocentrism. This reappraisal is therefore essential for the mediation and integration into the city-wide concept of remembrance of Berlin’s colonial past and takes place on two levels. On the one hand, the appropriation of human remains for the purpose of anthropological or race research must be seen against the broader colonial backgrounds and developments of the past. And on the other hand, this colonial practice is in part still actively maintained today, for example in the recognition of ownership of human remains without the consent of relatives, which represents a colonial continuity in the present.

In addition to addressing the colonial past, civil society pressure and a racism-critical and decolonial debate outside and within the relevant institutions are needed to end colonial structures of thought and appropriation for the time being. The fact that critical civil society processing and constant initiatives are necessary is shown not least by the placing of the order for this report, which prompted individual institutions to take stock for the first time. But even in the case of a publication of the holdings and an active repatriation policy of the institutions, accompanying coping and awareness-raising work remains necessary. A sensitive and racism-critical approach to history and a focus on coping with it should be part of the process from the beginning.

In addition to ending dehumanizing practice, the reconstruction of the biographies and living conditions of the respective people, in the best case even testimonials from the people themselves, is of great relevance for a culture of mediation, awareness and remembrance in the Berlin context. In relation to the creation of a place of learning and remembrance at and around the premises of the former KWI-A, where the »S-Sammlung« (see section 3.1.2) was once kept, the Black historian Manuela Bauche explained that it relies on rehumanizing provenance research to tell the history of the institute in a way that is critical of racism. As a further central starting point for dealing with history from the perspective of the previously colonized and dehumanized people, opportunities should be created for the sympathy with and support of relatives in repatriation work and in their memory and appreciation of deceased people.

The collection-preserving institutions and representatives of the appropriation communities can already contribute to countering racist and colonial thought patterns by recognizing the decades of awareness-raising and mediation work of repatriation practitioners, but also of migrant, diasporic, post-colonial civil society activists and organizations and included those who for years have pushed the education on and processing of the colonial past and its continuity. Naming this important work and making it visible, appreciating and actively supporting and defending it against racist hostility already contributes to the mediation and creation of a culture of remembrance which also uncovers the resistance that accompanied colonial rule and appropriations from the very start. Both the concrete remembrance of the people whose body parts were stolen and are kept in anthropological collections to this day, and the processing and communication...
of the historical colonial contexts in which the appropriations took place, as well as the history of resistance that led to an active handling of the collections should find their way into a city-wide concept of mediation and remembrance of Berlin’s colonial past. This concept is not limited to urban areas, but also applies to school and extracurricular educational work.

4.5. Policy Recommendations:

In order for the further processing of the colonial legacy and the political will to repatriate not to remain lip service, fair, transparent and effective mechanisms in the implementation of indigenous rights should be created with the descendants and indigenous peoples concerned, as well as formerly colonized population groups, to ensure access and fully informed consent for the dignified handling of the remains of their ancestors. The state should create constitutional conditions that recognize human remains as the ancestors of real people and also guarantee the dignity of human beings in relation to their mortal remains. The recognition of indigenous rights should guide the handling of human remains from colonial contexts. In individual cases, descendants should be asked if they need support so that they can appropriately care for their ancestors and deceased members of the ancestral communities to be able to fulfill their family and cultural responsibilities and such support must be given accordingly.

**Appropriate measures are recommended:**

- Rescinding of property rights to human remains from colonial contexts in the sense of a temporary trusteeship
- Obligation of institutions with human remains from colonial contexts to provide members and representatives of ancestral communities with comprehensive information on and direct access to the remains of their ancestors and the associated data
- Obligation to obtain Free, Prior, and Informed Consent from members of the relevant indigenous peoples and groups before researching, exhibiting, or using human remains from colonial contexts for teaching purposes and to authorize the handling of the data and materials already available

In addition, politicians must ensure the basic conditions and comprehensive equipment to implement the recommendations for dealing with the holdings of human remains from colonial contexts:

- Establishment of an Advisory Board/commission with repatriation practitioners and descendants to continue the inventory and discuss further steps
- Provenance research and processing of the collection and institute histories through one or more cross-institutional, interdisciplinary and transnationally-oriented research project(s)
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Comments and Responses to the draft of the ‘Scientific report on the existence of human remains from colonial contexts in Berlin’ by Isabelle Reimann

By Edward Halealoha Ayau, ‘Ōiwi (Native Hawaiian) (December 2021)

The continued storage of human remains in collection institutions without consent of the deceased of their family is a major problem.

Halealoha: The importance and consequences of this ‘major problem’ are immense over a time continuum whereby the ancestors whose iwi have been displaced experience posthumous anguish laced with anger, confusion and shame from being mistreated through exposure and the prevention of their return to Pō — to the Hawaiian depths of darkness, to that place for the dead. This condition in turn results in the creation of kaumaha (spiritual, emotional, physical anguish) experienced by living descendants, especially those aware of all of these harmful conditions. This kaumaha dynamic contributes to undermining the ability to make good decisions and to live free including negatively impacting the foundations of clear understanding and safety protections to effectively care for the unborn generations.

The layers of harm caused by this ‘major problem’ are distinct and powerful making it extremely difficult to sustain the ability to overcome other challenges, all the while knowing that the ancestral foundation has and continues to be under attack and requires keen attention, courage, focus and energy to restore. And if things weren’t bad enough, and to make matters worse—coming under attack from your own people when they lash out with their kaumaha at those trying to rescue and care for the ancestors. Hawaiian leadership practically demands your blood be spilled in order to understand and appreciate what is required to overcome this kaumaha.
If colonial military force served to physically exert control over Indigenous Hawaiian populations, removal and collection practices served to spiritually exert colonial control over the same people by withholding the *iwi* (bones) from ultimately disintegrating in to the *‘āina* (land) thereby temporarily suspending their journey to complete the transition to *Pō*. By doing so, a powerful crippling effect is created that starts with the ancestors and ripples through to the unborn causing harm and destruction of Hawaiian humanity in its wake. To describe colonial collection of ancestral remains as a ‘major problem’ is an understatement. But it is a challenge that has and will continue to be addressed and overcome, as a sacred duty to restore the ancestral foundation and free the ancestors to transition safely — and for the living to get on with challenges of living.

The responsibility towards the ancestors does not only exist for those in the direct lineal succession, but also for the other cultural and spiritual affiliations and ties that have not yet been recognized by German legal definitions. The importance of self-determination, of dignified recognition and respect for the dead as well as today’s relatives can often be seen against the background of a violent colonial history.

**Halealoha:** This is a significant revelation in that the responsibility or kuleana to support the return of the ancestors is shared by all living descendants committed to standing in the space of courage and aloha to do so. It is ironic (and frankly laughable) when a museum imposes the requirement that claimants to human remains in their collections must prove direct lineal descent when the museum staff who houses the remains themselves are incapable of meeting the same standard of proof. This colonial approach reeks of intellectual savagery by conveying the message that while the museum failed to acquire requisite consent to collect the remains and would fail to establish lineal connection to continue to house them if they ever bothered to try, should an indigenous claimant dare to request restitution, they must first prove lineal descent from them, which requires identification of the individuals skeletal remains by name. Further exacerbating the situation is that the museum is ill qualified to assess any lineal descendant claims for its lack of knowledge of Hawaiian genealogies. It makes one wonder whether the rule was ever intended to be implemented or rather just form a formidable deterrent to restitution claims.

Instead, the standard of repatriation should consist of evidence of cultural affiliation established by the circumstances surrounding collection, provenance to Hawai‘i or the Sandwich Isles, and proof of *kaumaha* (spiritual, emotional, physical anguish) caused by the awareness of the condition the ancestral remains are housed in a foreign institution and subject to exposure. It is important when Hawaiians conduct repatriation that we ensure that the ancestral remains that are the target of repatriation claims, are in fact Hawaiian and from the Hawaiian islands which historically for a time were referred to as the Sandwich Isles. Part of our cultural process involves ceremonial prayers and chants that serve
to connect us to the ancestors to attempt to engage them in their own rescue and seek guidance on their preferences for the return especially where they want to be reinterred. In an NAGPRA Review Committee appeal involving the refusal of the Phoebe Apperson Hearst Museum to repatriate two ancestral remains to our organization Hui Mālama I Nā Kūpuna O Hawai‘i Nei in 1993, we asserted the results of our ceremonial process as proof to establish that the two skulls are those of ancestral Hawaiians. When their findings and recommendations were reported, the NAGPRA Review Committee referred to our testimony as »spiritual evidence,« and gave it due weight with additional historic documentation of provenance in its finding that that one of the two skulls was Hawaiian. However, the Committee did not have the courage to allow the evidence to stand alone, finding that the second skull should be subject to physical examination to clarify cultural affiliation. That examination established the second skull was also Hawaiian. We were incensed by the second recommendation because our indigenous Hawaiian way of knowing was only respected in addition to existing documentation but not allowed to stand on its own. Nonetheless, it was a powerful start in the right direction.

In addition, the reference to colonial »violence« in this passage is perpetrated upon the Hawaiian soul whereby some reach deep despair in the realization of how the hell will we ever be able to protect the unborn generations, when we were and continue to be powerless to prevent desecration and disturbance of the iwi kūpuna (ancestral bones)? This conundrum fails to give the unborn much faith in us, the living. But since we are all they have, it is imperative upon us to kūlia i ka nu‘u (strive to reach the summit), do our very best and more. It is our sacred duty to do so. Failure is not an option.

For some people, the remains of their ancestors in the collecting institutions are not objects, but spiritually living entities...to see human remains as the ancestors of very real people and to recognize the dignity of human beings also in relation to their mortal remains... On the other hand, colonial relationships persist.

Halealoha: This passage is especially true for Hawaiians, as our ancestors live on through us and through our ancestral memories of their names, words, and deeds. We recall them in mele moʻokūʻauhau (genealogical chants) that celebrate their accomplishments and relationships. Déjà vu realizations are inherited ancestral memories and affirmations of connection. Our ancestors yearn in death to remain a part of the ‘ohana (family), to be helpful and relevant to their living descendants and family members. Examples include the fashioning of fishhooks from their bones, providing inspiration and courage when requested, and helping guide when required. Their role in our lives is essential for the magic to happen. The concept of everlasting life is not new to Hawaiians, we practice it in our daily ‘ohana (family) ways but have stopped for generations largely as a result to our commitment to the foreign practices of Christianity, since ancestral connection it is not a primary focus of its teachings. Similarly, to be forgotten
by your descendants and others is to achieve true death. The ancestors
who are disturbed, whose iwi are acquired and removed, are
especially vulnerable to being spiritually trapped. They require our
attention to return their bones home, to replant them and to
support their ability to transition. This interdependence is critical
to understanding the respective roles of the deceased, the
living and the unborn.

On the other hand, an example of the persistence of the colonial
relationships as shared in this passage is exemplified by the
attitudes of Dr Alexander Pashos of the Berliner Gesellschaft für
Anthropologie Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (BGAEU), who
maintained the view that all burials are 'available' unless explicitly
restricted and therefore the burden of proof is not on the
collector, but the claimant to demonstrate collection occurred in a
narrowly-defined 'context of injustice.' Pashos rejected our
position that all collections of Hawaiian skeletal remains are an
injustice because it violated our Hawaiian family values of
aloha and mālama, in other words, violations of the very core of our
Hawaiian humanity. Unfortunately, Dr Pashos only deemed
murder or military executions as a »context of injustice«, and
everything else in his mind was fair game for scientific collection.
He is an example of an intellectual savage, one who uses
his intellect to deny another their humanity. The days of his Nazi-
era thinking are numbered, as humanity forges forward to
overcome the shackles of colonialism.

»They [our Ancestral Relatives] are treated as
property and reside in a perpetual state of
posthumous slavery.«

Halealoha: First of all, this quote is more properly attributed
to my co-author Honor Keeler. My own comment to Honor's
statement here cites the soon to be published writing, Emotion and
the Return of Ancestors: repatriation as affective practice
Cressida Fforde, Jilda Andrews, Edward Halealoha Ayau, Laurajane
Smith, Paul Turnbull:

One pronounced argument that effectively captures
the diametric opposition of our respective
worldviews is when museum officials frame their
scientific approach as objective and in the
pursuit of pure knowledge and our Hawaiian cultural
approach as subjective and prone to emotion.
Moreover, that we Hawaiians have a duty to
the rest of the world to contribute to the body of
knowledge by allowing physical examination and
testing of Ancestral Remains. There is an inherent
discrimination in this view whereby it prioritises
science over culture and incorrectly assumes
that culture is devoid of science. Most importantly,
it weaponises science to overcome our humanity,
our family values and beliefs with respect to
the treatment of the dead. As if our family values
are no longer important, effectively outweighed by
objective science. This view incorrectly
presumes that our ancestors mated for the purpose
of creating osteological material rather than to raise a loving family. — Edward Halealoha Ayau.

This passage conveys the view that science when applied to ancestral skeletal remains, have co-opted our family values, and replaced the intent of our ancestral parents to create loving families. This therefore represents the true heinous nature of colonial efforts to remove ancestral remains in that it represents a highly offensive intrusion into the family, by non-family members.

The legal protection and the social acceptance of private or state property supports their reification and prevents the pursuit of responsibilities that result from other ties and relationships with the Ancestral Remains.

Halealoha: This is one of the most important points of this chapter, the need to improve the context in which iwi kūpuna (ancestral bones) are to be viewed to provide a more humane and accurate perspective — as it is not a competition of views, but instead the completion of the actual picture. The objectifying of human remains is a colonial harm that paves the way for additional harms including physical examination, photography and destructive analysis. This process serves to dehumanize the ancestors to justify the illicit collection and in doing so dehumanizes the living descendants. This is a very dangerous practice — the art of dehumanizing — because it both harms the target Indigenous population while simultaneously providing the colonizer with a false sense of their importance, effectively distancing themselves from the human family. It supports the misguided assertions of social, intellectual, and physical superiority and as a consequent is completely devoid of aloha. One shining example of how this objectification/dehumanization was overcome involved the Museum of Ethnology in Dresden, Germany whom in 2017, after 26 years of advocacy efforts by this author and others, the museum and high-level German officials addressed this monster head on and slayed it in a powerfully humanitarian fashion. First, Nanette Snoep, Director of the Museum of Ethnology, Dresden stated,

»Today is for the first time that we restitute ancestral remains from Hawai‘i back to their homeland. Back to their earth, sand where they come from. Back to the people who has waited for more than 100 years for the return of their ancestors.«

Second, Dr Marion Ackerman Director-General of the Dresden State Art Collections said,

»The restitution of human remains has of great importance; it is an act of humanity... That is an important part in the process of healing of historical injustice and for a better understanding and a common future in a global world. The ancestral remains from Hawai‘i will find now their way back home. I want to make clear that we feel
deeply sorry for the long-lasting way of the return, and we apologize for that from all of our heart.«

Next, Dr Eva-Maria Stange, State Minister of Science and Arts of Free State of Saxony eloquently stated,

»Human remains ... acquired in the 19th and ... 20th century through theft, grave robbery or in the course of colonial wars, also reached the collections of Saxony's institutions in diverse ways. In this case, they became ‘scientific objects.’ Today... we are looking at these collections from a different angle. They are being rehumanized... these are no longer objects – they are the mortal remains of human beings. With their return, we are giving back their value to the deceased persons and their families. Their life stories made them victims in the name of science and colonialism.«

Finally, in reflecting on what the Dresden repatriation effort involved and what it meant in the larger scheme of things, Native Hawaiian Noelle Kahanu, who participated in the ceremonies at Dresden summarized as follows,

»Someone asked recently, what is the future direction of repatriation? I responded that we should look to those examples rising from an international context. These returns happened, not because a federal law mandated it, but because of individual and institutional relationships that have developed over time, because doors were opened by those who understood the humanity in returning iwi kūpuna to their homelands... It is a network of people working together, inside, and outside of museums, redefining ethics, and reasserting notions of human dignity, that will bring the last of our iwi kūpuna home. In doing so, we will be liberating museum relations into the future.«

On 23 October 2017, the world took a step forward in terms of its collective humanity thanks to these courageous women who sought to undo the powerfully harmful effects of colonialism on the Native Hawaiians people.

Assigning universal values to the European sciences, prioritizing their interests and separating them from the mostly unethical appropriate practices in this case leads to their mystification.

Halealoha: The use of scientific methods to justify collection of ancestral remains is the epitome of colonization’s negative impacts upon Indigenous populations. It’s use to justify social policies of controlling populations considered savage and lesser in status is clear. However, our experience in 2013 with the
repatriation of 144 *iwi kūpuna* from the Natural History Museum in London, England and the years that followed taught us about the scientific practice of craniometrics, or which I refer to as 'scientific sleight of hand' and 'scientific voo-doo', in that what we were led to believe was well-accepted, proven scientific methodology utilized by the NHM London to deny the return of 8 ancestral remains whose provenance was *Hawai'i* based upon historic documentation. Years later, we learn from physical anthropology experts and anthropological experts that the practice of craniometrics is highly suspect and deemed incapable of use to deny a repatriation claim in the light of provenance documentation.

In the soon to be published, *Craniometry and Indigenous Repatriation*, it states,

> »Craniometry plays a vexed role in the analysis of human remains. Proponents of cranial studies continue to study and develop programs and techniques to hopefully discriminate populations to assist in ancestry determination. This occurs despite persistent criticism from experts in the same disciplines that the accuracy of these methodologies is limited at best and should not be relied upon as evidence.«

We have learned over the past 32 years not to assign ‘universal values to the European sciences', not to prioritize their interests and separate them from the mostly unethical appropriate practices. We learned to learn about them to demystify them and better understand their uses and misuses.

...anthropological scientific collection and research were inseparable from colonial expansion and development---and structures of exploitation are anchored... The present report aims to be beyond the factual inventory to contribute to the ontological and epistemic rethinking triggered by the repatriation movements, among other things, to be anchored to a certain extent in museums and scientific institutions.

**Halealoha:** Let the 'repatriation movement' be an indictment of the inescapable failures of the human condition. Colonizing deceased Indigenous ancestors, some of whom died at the hands of colonization, eerily epitomizes the dead heart of western civilization in their unending lust for 'progress' fueled by greed and privilege. This disgraceful phenomenon was also powered by Christianity, as poetized in this mele (song) by the American music band called the Eagles:

> You can leave it all behind and sail to Lahaina
> Just like the missionaries did so many years ago
> They even brought a neon sign »Jesus is coming«
> Brought the white man's burden down
> Brought the white man's reign
> Who will provide the grand design?
> What is yours and what is mine?
'Cause there is no more new frontier  
We have got to make it here  
We satisfy our endless needs  
And justify our bloody deeds  
In the name of destiny  
And in the name of God  

Here the writer speaks of manifest destiny and to organized Christian religion as major factors in the taking of Native Americans and Native Hawaiians lands and resources by Whites. I suggest that these factors should also be considered in the overall impacts of colonization.
Comment: After reading the document it became clear to us that the German State, as a constitutional practitioner, and human rights guarantor must take the lead in resolving long-standing claims by descendants and right holders to “Human Remains obtained in the Colonial Context”. The colonial legacy of Germany (the German state) is in resistance to the inconvenient truth and to the recognition of it, as deeds, done bei dem Deutschen Volk.

This resistance in part, is the overwhelming lack of political will in Berlin’s Bundestag despite having resources and the ability to set State Mandated clear Singular Guideline for Restitution that empowers both the custodians and descendants of the Human Remains in question. Having as a result a conclusion for the custodian and finality to the descendants. To envision this process in practice, new and simple norms must be contemplated and enacted to which museums institutions, and private collections must adhere to for a period of ten years. Therefore, resources will be allocated to expedite the restitution to claims of descendants and rightholders pursuant to the State Mandate, Singular Guideline for Restitution. Recognizing Human Remains as diseased relative or ancestor, as well as mandating that all human remains currently in Germany obtained in the colonial context must be declared in to a data bank where information can be relied upon for further analysis. This will revert centuries of warped colonial education to the extreme contrary. Ending on going post mortem bondage of ancestors from all over the world.

New Vision: A new plan must be presented to the current elected political decision makers in Berlin. That clearly underlines tangible solutions in accordance to the German Constitution to address the question »Restitution of Human Remains in the colonial context« in Germany. Offering the Legislative Power, the Bundestag the most relevant and up to date information on the subject matter. Giving them the unique opportunity to take action to enact a singular guideline in the form of a State Mandate. Enabling with resources at ministerial level agencies at the national and state level governments to work expeditiously with Museums in possession of Human Remains from the colonial
context. This will be undertaken by, and in coordination with the descendants and rightholders of every claim, in order to implement the proposed new measure the State Mandate; Singular Guideline for Restitution applicable to, and for all Human Remains in Germany »obtained in the colonial context« as part of Germany’s colonial legacy.

**Custodian-Descendants Process:** After the Museum completes its internal review regarding provenance followed by a restitution plan made in collaboration with descendant and rightholders. And, once provenance has been verified; rightholders activates their own sanctioned burial protocols for their citizens in custody at the location of their Remains. Immediately after, a simple, one page application to the State activates the full rigor of the New State Mandate, the Singular Guideline for Restitution. At this moment the State acts as chief enabler by providing the means and legal authority to complete in dignity the satisfactory restitution of all Human Remains in State Museums institutions, private collections, and in civil society institutions »obtained in the colonial context« as part of Deutschland living colonial legacy. Giving closure and finality to the descendants of both Rightholders and Custodians.
Discarding the Linguistic Ballast of the Imagi.Nation(s)
Decolonial AfroFuturism by Adetoun and Michael Küppers-Adebisi
From the annals of the Encyclopedia Africana Germanica by AFROTAK TV cyberNomads.

Is poetry possible after genocide?
the language & its books of past of libraries of stuffing fabric of world-destroying knowledge are throwing off the tribes of the new being

samuel thomas soemmerring describes in 1784
his observations while dissecting dieing of diseases caused by climatic circumstances or becoming mentally ill killing the selve formerly by white supremacy enslaved people of african descent
sag ihren namen (say their Names)
sag ihren namen (say their Names)
irgendwie siehst du aus wie'ne gestalt aus dem zwielicht (your looking kind of shady)

the language
Discarding the Linguistic Ballast of the Imag. Nation(s)

GLOSSARY

- dissecting without consent - desecration of the dead
- M-word - Moors
- E-word - Europeans
- R.-word - races
- M-word heads - Moors heads
- head_money_hunters - degenerated western people hunting people in colonies
- protectorates - colonies
- German cultural circles - spheres of influence of white supremacy
- human experiments protectorate - crimes against humanity
- colonial concentration camps - labor and extermination camps
- forced sterilization - inducing procreative incapacity in people without consent

ihrer buecher
& its books
of past
of libraries
of stuffing fabric
of world-destroying knowledge

in der aus weisser rassistischer Ideologie geborenen Publikation:
On the physical difference of the M(-word) from the E(-word)

1786 johann friedrich blumenbach receives from johann wolfgang von goethe the head of a human

being cast off from the selve

Until 1798 johann friedrich blumenbach dissects 82 heads

sag ihren namen (say their Names)
sag ihren namen (say their Names)
irgendifie siehst du aus wie'ne gestalt aus dem zwielicht (your looking kind of shady)

he invents a fith category
R.-word
for people of human descent

the tribes of new beings

he is considered the founder of the caucasian category and of scientific anti-racism

the language
& its books
of past
of libraries
of stuffing fabric
of world-destroying knowledge
are throwing off
the tribes
of the new being

1892
In Leipzig for the first time formatted
as M-word heads (Tête de Nègre)
body parts of People of of African Descent
as a sweet dish are being offered for consumption

1898
the resistance fighter
Chief Mkwavinyika Munyigumba Mwamuyinga
lets himself be killed
not to be touched by the hands
of the prosecutors of white German Descent

The
head_money_hunter
Johann Merkl, Sergeant at arms
and later member of parliament of the Bavarian People’s Party
in Tanzania cuts of the dead Mkwawa
his
head
off

sag ihren namen (say their Names)
sag ihren namen (say their Names)
irgendwie siehst du aus wie'ne gestalt aus dem zwielicht
(your looking kind of shady)

with the blood money
he
buys a farm near the Kilimanjaro
the
head
is probably
kidnapped by lieutenant tom von prince
to germany

Is poetry possible after genocide?

Language commandment
thou shalt not recognize
& does thou recognize yet
so believe not what saw thee
In 1906 in the German *protectorate* today's Namibia experiments are carried out on 778 *heads*

the increase of the inhumanity of the German *cultural circles*:
war prisoner OvaHerero women are forced to boil the *heads* of their victims and to scrape off the flesh with broken glass

they are not considered the founders of the Caucasian anti-colonial resistance and scientific anti-racism

sag ihren namen (say their Names)

The scraped *heads* are being packed in boxes and deported to Germany

sag ihren namen (say their Names)

1905 to 1906 Robert Koch conducts systematic *experiments* on 1000 *humans* of African Descent in colonial *concentration camps* in Namibia

sag ihren namen (say their Names)

1907 guerrilla warrior Cornelius Fredericks dies in the colonial *concentration camp* shark island his *head* also — by white supremacy is being deported to Germany and examined by scholars
eugen fischer *dissects* the *dead bodies* and *heads*

of 17 Afro-German Nama killed in the course of the genocide in Namibia

sag ihren namen (say their Names)

1359 gestorbene Menschen sind in den Aufzeichnungen der Betreiber*innen des deutschen Kolonial-KZ's Haifischbucht verzeichnet

1359 dead people are listed in the records of the operators of the German colonial *concentration camp* Haifischbucht
They must be recognized as Germans!

sag ihren namen (say their Names)
sag ihren namen (say their Names)
irgendwie siehst du aus wie 'ne gestalt aus dem zwielicht
(your looking kind of shady)

Is poetry possible after genocide?

the language
& its books
of past
of libraries
of stuffing fabric
of world-destroying knowledge

discarding
are throwing off
the tribes
of the new being

In 1919 Germany
by article 246 of the treaty of Versailles
is being obliged
to return
the head
of Mkwavinyika Munyigumba Mwamuyinga
to Tanzania

1933 Eugen Fischer
as rector of the University of Berlin dismisses Jewish scientists
and supports

burning of their books
pasts
libraries
of parallel universities of knowledge

1937 setzte eugen fischer die Zwangssterilisierung
Afro-Deutscher Kinder im Rheinland durch

1937 eugen fischer enforces the forced sterilization
of Afro-German children in the rhineland

sag ihren namen (say their Names)
sag ihren namen (say their Names)
irgendwie siehst du aus wie 'ne gestalt aus dem zwielicht
(your looking kind of shady)
1944 eugen fischer receives
the highest possible award for science in the german Reich

**Language commandment**

thou shalt not
cause change
for the sake
of power
the balance
must be

the British governor
in Tanzania
in 1954 returns
from the Overseas
Museum in Bremen
a **head**
as the **head**
of
Mkwavinyika Munyigumba Mwamuyinga
back to Tanzania

**Communication commandment**

thou shalt not
write

this too
is senseless
aberration of ghosts
turned into ego-obscured expressions
measured by the price

art destroys
artificial structures
of marionettes
with feather core

the toll to pay
1/2 extasy alcohol ganja
or white angel dust

prevent communication
& intensify

the lonely feeling
the body lost
the languages
of nightmare_dream_free
detox_nation_(s)
in zones
of re_spiritualized skulls
(heads)
and corpses
(bodies of dead people)
of serial exclusiveness

the head
of Cornelius Fredericks
was presumably amongst
at least 19 other heads
in the Charité in Berlin
and was possibly in 2011
in a grey cardboard box
brought back to Namibia

say their Names
say their Names

Language commandment

thou shalt not lose
the shame

this
is
the
hope in the age

of our generation
Quellenangaben
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Stand 17. Mai

**Zielsetzung**

Beauftragt von der Koordinierungsstelle für ein gesamtstädtisches Konzept zur Aufarbeitung Berlins kolonialer Vergangenheit dient das Gutachten als Grundlage für den Maßnahmenkatalog, den sie dem Berliner Senat Ende 2021 vorlegt (www.decolonize-berlin.de/de/koordinierungsstelle). Als solche soll es enthalten:

- Aufbereitung von Informationen über menschliche Überreste in Berlin
- Übersichtserstellung zur Evaluierung und Empfehlung nächster Schritte und Maßnahmen, beispielsweise im Bereich der kooperativen Provenienzforschung

**Inhalt des Gutachtens**

- Hintergrund Sammlungsgeschichten
- Hintergrund Repatriierungsbewegung
- internationale Entwicklungen, rechtliche Aspekte und Dateninfrastruktur
- Rückforderungen und Auskunftsgesuche an Berliner Einrichtungen
- Entwicklungen in Deutschland: Handreichung, Eckpunkte, Provenienzforschung
- Problematiken (Zusammenarbeit, allgemeine Regelungen, Provenienzforschung, Information und Öffentlichkeit)
- Definitionen menschliche Überreste und kolonialer Kontext
- Methodisches Vorgehen
- Ergebnisse der Bestandsaufnahme in tabellarischer Form
- Zusammenfassung
- Ausblick Stand 17. Mai
Inhalt der tabellarischen Aufstellung

- Übersicht über verschiedene Orte und Institutionen inklusive Negativantworten (jeweils Stand der Inventarisierung; abgeschlossene, laufende oder geplante Provenienzforschungen; Methoden der Provenienzforschung; Zusammenarbeit mit Herkunfts-gesellschaften/ Angehörigen; Stand Repatriierungen; Betreuung der Sammlung, interne Berichte und Veröffentlichungen)

- Übersicht menschlicher Überreste aus kolonialen Kontexten gemäß untenstehender Definitionen:

Institution
Hinweise zur Identität / Biographie des Individuums
(falls vorhanden)
Herkunft laut Institution (geografisch)
Herkunft laut Institution (ethnisch)
Zuordnung heutiger Staat
Inventarnummer
Zugangsdatum
Einliefernde Personen oder Körperschaften
Sammler*in laut Institution
Sammlungsdatum / -zeitraum
Stand der Provenienzforschung
Sonstige Anmerkungen

Definitionen

»Menschliche Überreste«
Definition aus Empfehlungen zum Umgang mit menschlichen Überresten in Museen und Sammlungen des Deutschen Museumsbundes (2013); Menschliche Überreste sind laut diesen Empfehlungen alle körperlichen Überreste, die der biologischen Art Homo sapiens zuzurechnen sind. Dazu zählen:
- alle unbearbeiteten, bearbeiteten oder konservierten Erhaltungsformen menschlicher Körper sowie Teile davon.
Darunter fallen insbesondere Knochen, Mumien, Moorleichen, Weichteile, Organe, Gewebeschnitte, Embryonen, Fötten, Haut, Haare, Fingernägel und Fußnägel (die vier letztgenannten auch, wenn sie von Lebenden stammen) sowie Leichenbrand
- alle (Ritual-)Gegenstände, in die menschliche Überreste nach der oben genannten Definition bewusst eingearbeitet wurden

»Kolonialer Kontext«
Kategorie 1: Objekte aus formalen Kolonialherrschaften
Kategorie 2: Objekte aus kolonialen Kontexten außerhalb formaler Kolonialherrschaften
Kategorie 3: Rezeptionsobjekte aus kolonialen Kontexten
Anhang 2: Vollständige tabellarische Bestandsangaben der Institutionen mit größeren „rassenanthropologischen“ und ethnographischen Beständen


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Auskunft der Institutionen mit größeren „rassenanthropologischen“ und ethnographischen Beständen menschlicher Überreste hinsichtlich der kolonialen Kontexte in ihren Beständen Stand November 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPK - Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte</td>
<td>Information by institutions with larger “racial anthropological” and ethnographic inventories of human remains with regard to the colonial contexts in their holdings. The following information has been provided by the institutions in this form and often includes historical designations and therefore also attributions and racist language. Status: November 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gebiet</th>
<th>Wahrscheinlich</th>
<th>Unklar</th>
<th>Insgesamt</th>
<th>Signifikante Sammler / significant collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alle Objekte aus dt.Kolonien</td>
<td>wahrscheinlich</td>
<td>unklar</td>
<td>Insgesamt</td>
<td>more than 10 HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all human remains from former German colonies</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. &quot;Dt. Ostafrika&quot; / &quot;German East Africa&quot;</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tansania/Tanzania</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda/Ruanda</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenia/Kenya</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unbekannt/unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. &quot;Dt. Westafrika&quot; / &quot;CIRCA German West Africa&quot; / CIRCA</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Adameit, Döring (Doering), Eckhardt, Kerating, Mansfield, Marwitz, Schäfer, Simon, Thierry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamerun/Cameroon</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &quot;Dt. Neuguinea&quot; / &quot;CIRCA German New Guinea&quot; / CIRCA</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>Finsch, Friederici, Fritz, Neuhäus, Parkinson, Rossicke (Rösick), Schlegelnhauen, Schöde (Schöde), Thurnwald, Walden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikronesien/Micronesia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua-Neuguinea/ Papua-New Guinea</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA (Marianen)/ USA Mariana Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &quot;Dt. Samoa&quot; / &quot;German Samoa&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutionen

| Auskunft der Institutionen mit größeren "rassenanthropologischen" und ethnographischen Beständen menschlicher Überreste hinsichtlich der kolonialen Kontexte in ihren Beständen | Stand: November 2021 |

Information by institutions with larger "racial anthropological" and ethnographic inventories of human remains with regard to the colonial contexts in their holdings. The following information has been provided by the institutions in this form and often includes historical designations and therefore also attributions and racist language. Status: November 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>SPK - Ethnologisches Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


For provenance research at the Ethnological Museum, a colonial context is generally assumed: «Thus, we are dealing with the remains of human individuals that are now part of the collections of ethnological museums due to racist scientific research and collecting practices». (Response letter EM) There are approximately 2,000 human remains in the collections of the Ethnological Museum. The quantitative information refers to inventory numbers. In some cases, the remains of one person are recorded under several numbers. On the other hand, it cannot always be ruled out that the mortal remains of several persons are grouped under one number or that the remains of several persons were processed in one object.

Nach regionalen Fachreferaten lässt sich die Anzahl folgendermaßen aufteilen:
According to regional units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Anzahl Überreste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nord- und Ostasien/North- and East Asia</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordafrika, West- und Zentralasien/North Africa, West and Central Asia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Süd- und Südostasien/South and Southeast Asia</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrika/Africa</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordamerika/North America</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesoamerika/Mesoamerica</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Südamerika/South America</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Südsee und Australien/South Seas and Australia</td>
<td>1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musikethnologie/Music ethnology</td>
<td>3 (insgesamt 2089)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insgesamt/total signifikante Sammler/significant collectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Überreste aus dt. Kolonien/ all human remains from German colonies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tansania/Tanzania</td>
<td>22 Franz Stuhlmann, Bernhard Perrot, Karl Weule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruanda/Ruanda</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenia/Kenya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamerun/Cameroon</td>
<td>83 Alfred Mansler, Hans Glauning, Oscar Foerster, Georg Zenker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papuа-Neuguinea/ Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikronesien/Micronesia</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA (Marianen)/ USA Mariana Islands</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Frühgeschichte (BGAEU)</td>
<td>nicht vorliegend/ no found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

keine Auskunft erteilt; der Gesamtbestand der „RV-Sammlung“ beläuft sich auf die Körperenteile, hauptsächlich der Schädel von ca. 3500 Individuen
Human Remains from colonial contexts in the Charité: anatomical collection and BMM

In total, the Charité stated that it preserved the remains of 58 individuals (The additional Toimoko listed under Oceania have already repatriated to New Zealand in 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herkunft/Origin</th>
<th>Stand/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tansania/Tanzania</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
<td>Botschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
<td>Official information was given to Tanzanian embassy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wapangwa</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wambugu</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massai</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unbekannt/unknown</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irapa (Wambulu)</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Äthiopien/Ethopia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosambik/Mozambique</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mang’anja / Manganja / Marari / Ryanja</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monyalo</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruanda/Rwanda</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbuti</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruanda/Rwanda</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Südafrika/South Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unbekannt/unknown «Kaffer»</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa, historisch/historically «Kaffer»</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfengu</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>«Gaika Kaffer»</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San?</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damara</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovambo</td>
<td>Provenienz erforscht/Provenance researched</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charité – Anatomische Sammlung (im Institut für Anatomie) und Berliner Medizinhistorisches Museum (BMM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menschliche Überreste aus kolonialen Kontexten in der Charité: Anatomie &amp; BMM Human Remains from colonial contexts in the Charité: anatomical collection and BMM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntcham (Bassari)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon/Cameroon 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba-ndeng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia 7 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongo/Congo 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>»Kongo«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania/Oceania 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomons Inseln/Solomons Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raitea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiralitätsinseln/Manus Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiralitätsinseln/Manus Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiralitätsinseln/Manus Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>»Jap. Karolinen-Insel/Caroline Islands (former japanese colony)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuseeland/New Zealand, Toi Moko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unklar/unclear 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zungen-Präparat: Zunge eines »Buschmann« Feuchtpräparat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue-preparation: tongue of a »bushman«, wet preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>»N* schädel«, Walter`sche Sammlung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>»N* skull«, Walter`sche collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>»Beide Ohrenschmalzen einer »N*« Feuchtpräparat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both auricles of a »N*«, wet preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>menschlicher Schädel mit eckigem Etikett: »Eingeborener aus China« Human skull with square label: »Native from China«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>menschlicher Schädel mit eckigem Etikett: »Mongole a. d. Manchurie« Human skull with square label: »Mongolian from Manchuria«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schädel mit Aufkleber: »Schädel eines Mongolen« Human skull with sticker »skull from a Mongolian«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brustbein »Australier« Sternum »Australian«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schulterblatt »N* 1918« Shoulder blade »N*1918«</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Die Abkürzung der abwertenden Sammelbezeichnung Schwarzer Menschen in Deutschen, deren Verwendung von Betroffenen als Reproduktion von Rassismus abgelehnt wird, wurde durch die Autorin des Gutachtens vorgenommen.

* The abbreviation of the German racial slur referring to Black people was made by the author, as the word is rejected by Black People as a reproduction of racism.
Publikationen

hervorgegangen aus den Provenienzforschungsprojekten über menschliche Überreste aus kolonialen Kontexten an der Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin


Winkelmann, Andreas/ Holger Stoecker/ Sarah Fründt/ Larissa Förster: Interdisziplinäre Provenienzforschung zu menschlichen Überresten aus kolonialen Kontexten. Eine methodische Arbeitshilfe
Sehr geehrte Frau Reimann,


Das Museum für Naturkunde widmet sich im Rahmen des Zukunftsplans intensiv der Sammlungserschließung und -entwicklung. 

www.museumfuernaturkunde.berlin/de/zukunft/zukunftsplan


Sie hatten zwei Fragen an uns formuliert, zu den wir Ihnen heute gern die Ergebnisse erster Recherchen mitteilen möchten.

1) Gibt es am Museum für Naturkunde Berlin momentan Sammlungsobjekte oder Forschungsmaterial aus oder mit menschlichen Gebeinen, Weichteilen, Haaren oder anderen menschlichen Überresten?

2) Können Sie mir eine Auflistung oder Dokumentation der menschlichen Überreste zukommen lassen, die sich in der Vergangenheit im Naturkundemuseum Berlin befunden haben?

Zusammenfassend sind als die drei wichtigsten Punkte voranzustellen:


- Eine Auflistung oder Dokumentation der menschlichen Überreste, die sich in der Vergangenheit im Naturkundemuseum Berlin befunden haben, können wir Ihnen leider nicht zukommen lassen, da uns eine solche Übersicht bislang nicht vorliegt.

Über die Möglichkeit, die Finanzierung dieses Forschungsvorhaben mit der Koordinierungsstelle zu besprechen, würden wir uns sehr freuen.

Zu Ihren Fragen:

Zu 1.)


darunter Mumienbündel, ausgruben, widmeten sie eine umfassende Publikation.  

Nachforschungen zum Erwerbskontext der durch Reiß und Stübel gesammelten sterblichen Überreste der indigenen Bevölkerung Ecuadors am Museum für Naturkunde haben folgendes Ergebnis gebracht:

Die im Sammlungskatalog und auf den Etiketten genannte Abhandlung enthält im Vorwort folgende Bemerkungen des Sammlers Wilhelm Reiss: »Ich möchte noch bemerken, dass in den von den Indianern der Umgebung erworbenen Sammlungen Knochen von lebenden Haustieren und auch von Menschen vermischt mit den fossilen Resten erhalten wurden. Ebenso wie die aus den Tuffen ausgewaschenen fossilen Knochen müssen auch die Skelett-heile der gegenwärtig auf den Weiden und Wegen gefallenen Thiere, sowie auch die Reste aus den in den Quebradas (Bergschluchten KK) angelegten Indianergräbern schliesslich in dem Bachbett zusammengeschwemmt werden. Für den Indianer sind alle Knochen gleich werthlos, da aber der Fremde die Kochen bezahlt, so bringt er ihm Alles, was er finden kann.«  

Weitere Ausführungen zum Erwerbskontext schildern die Situation in der »Knochenschlucht« von Punin folgendermaßen: Viele fossile Säugetierknochen lagen herum, es wäre ansonsten auch schwer gewesen, sie aus dem Tuffstein zu lösen: »Man ist darauf angewiesen, die durch die Regenwasser ausgewaschenen fossilen Reste zu sammeln, oder muss sich wenigstens auf die Loslösung solcher Stücke beschränken, bei welchem die Atmosphärilen schon vorgearbeitet haben. Und daran ist hier kein Mangel. Im Bachbett und an den Seiten sind Schädel entblösst, an den Schluchtwänden ragen die grossen Röhrenknochen Röhrenhaken hervor, und viele finden sich lose zwischen den grossen Blöcken im Grund der Schlucht.«  

Über Ihre Einschätzung, wie dieser Erwerbskontext zu bewerten ist, und möglicherweise Hinweise zu ähnlichen Fällen würden wir uns sehr freuen.

Zu 2.)

Eine Auflistung oder Dokumentation der menschlichen Überreste, die sich in der Vergangenheit im Naturkundemuseum Berlin befunden haben, können wir Ihnen leider nicht zu-kommen lassen, da uns eine solche Übersicht nicht vorliegt. Dies lässt sich mit der wechselvollen Institutionen- und Sammlungsgeschichte erklären: 

In Berlin existierten im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert mehrere anthropologische Sammlungen. Auch wenn es Wechsel in Hinblick auf die institutionelle Zugehörigkeit dieser Sammlungen gab, sind sie aus historischer und sammlungsgeschichtlicher
Perspektive mitgeinander verflochten. Es ist von einem gemeinsamen historischen Zusammenhang auszugehen, der die überinstitutionelle Untersuchung der Provenienzen unabdingbar macht.\textsuperscript{10}


Neben der ältesten anthropologischen Sammlung, der Anatomischen Sammlung der Charité, entstand eine weitere Sammlung

\textsuperscript{10} Stoecker (2016), S. 474
\textsuperscript{11} Ein Schädel konnte am Anatomischen Institut der Charité ausgemacht werden. Glaubrecht et al. (2013).


Bislang konnten keine „Übergabelisten“ oder vergleichbare Dokumente, welche die vom Anthropologischen Institut an die Charité abgegebenen Bestände dokumentieren, ausfindig gemacht werden. Eine Auflistung oder Dokumentation der menschlichen Überreste, die sich in der Vergangenheit im Naturkundemuseum Berlin befunden haben, können wir Ihnen ab diesem Zeitpunkt nicht übermitteln.

Gleichwohl strebt das Museum für Naturkunde eine Erforschung seiner Sammlungsge-schichte in Bezug auf human remains und im Kontext der Berliner Institutionen an. Diese Forschungslücke...
muss unserer Einschätzung nach nicht nur mit Blick auf das Museum für Naturkunde, sondern auf die Verpflichtungen der Museen und Universitätssammlungen in Berlin und deutschlandweit dringen bearbeitet werden. Für dieses umfassende Forschungsvorhaben suchen wir momentan noch finanzielle Unterstützung.


Mit freundlichen Grüßen
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### Anhang 5: Bearbeitete und in Objekten verarbeitete menschliche Bereste, die im Humboldt Forum ausgestellt sind. Liste bereitgestellt durch die SPK (Ilja Labischinski) 2021.

### Appendix 5: List of human remains which are crafted and worked into objects on display at the Humboldt Forum, provided by SPK (Ilja Labischinski) in 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nackenstütze</td>
<td>Melanesien Nordost-Neuguinea Mittel-Sepik</td>
<td>Holz, geschnitzt, rot, weiß und schwarz bemalt, Beine und Bindungen aus Rotan, menschliches Haar, Kaurischneckengehäuse</td>
<td>Anna Merk-Ikier, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Sepik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trages für Tonkrug</td>
<td>Melanesien Nordost-Neuguinea Mittel-Sepik Dorf III unterhalb Tschesebandai</td>
<td>geflochtene Pflanzenfasern, Rattan, zum Teil mit Erde beschichtet und rot bemalt; Haar</td>
<td>Sepik-Expedition (Kaiserin-Augusta-Fluss Expedition), Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Sepik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rednerpult</td>
<td>Melanesien Nordost-Neuguinea Mittel-Sepik Kaulagu</td>
<td>Holz, geschnitzt, rot, weiß und schwarz bemalt; Kaurischneckengehäuse, menschliches Haar, Pflanzenfaser</td>
<td>Sepik-Expedition (Kaiserin-Augusta-Fluss Expedition), Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Sepik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aufhängehaken</td>
<td>Melanesien Nordost-Neuguinea Unter-Sepik Kap de la Torre</td>
<td>Holz, geschnitzt, schwarz, rot und weiß bemalt; menschliches Haar; Rattan</td>
<td>Anna Merk-Ikier, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Sepik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brustpanzer</td>
<td>Mikronesien Gilbert-Inseln</td>
<td>Kokosfaser, menschliches Haar, geknüpft</td>
<td>P. Otto Zembach, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Schaumagazin Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Panzer</td>
<td>Mikronesien Nauru</td>
<td>Kokosfaser, menschliches Haar, geknüpft</td>
<td>Otto Finich, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Schaumagazin Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gürtel</td>
<td>Mikronesien Gilbert-Inseln Tabiteuea Ata</td>
<td>Haar (menschlich), geflochten</td>
<td>Gerda Koch, Sammler; Gilbert-Inseln-Expedition, Expedition</td>
<td>Modul 15/Schaumagazin Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fächer</td>
<td>Polynesiens Niue</td>
<td>Kokosfederblätterstreifen, Pandanusblätterstreifen, Kieto-Holz, Menschenhaar-schnur</td>
<td>Hilke Thode-Avara, Sammler; Verein der Freunde des Ethnologischen Museums e.V., Veräußerer</td>
<td>Modul 15/Schaumagazin Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pinsel</td>
<td>Mikronesien Nauru</td>
<td>Kokosfaser, Pandanusfaser, Menschenhaar, Muschelstücke</td>
<td>Georg Irmer, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Schaumagazin Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kopfschmuck</td>
<td>Polynesiens Marquesas (Inselgruppe) Nuku Hiva Matheu</td>
<td>menschliche Barthaare (?), Kokosfaser</td>
<td>Karl von den Steinen, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Schaumagazin Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ohrläppchen Durchstecher</td>
<td>Polynesiens Marquesas</td>
<td>Knochen (menschlich), geschnitzt</td>
<td>Karl von den Steinen, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Schaumagazin Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teiles eines Tatauerkames</td>
<td>Polynesiens Marquesas Fatu Hiva Hanavave</td>
<td>Knochen (menschlich)</td>
<td>Karl von den Steinen, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Schaumagazin Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Teiles eines Tatauerkames</td>
<td>Polynesiens Marquesas Fatu Hiva Hanavave</td>
<td>Knochen (menschlich)</td>
<td>Karl von den Steinen, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 15/Schaumagazin Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identnr.</td>
<td>Sachbegriff</td>
<td>GeoBezug</td>
<td>Pers./Inst.</td>
<td>Ausstellung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 VI 15924 c</td>
<td>Teiles eines Tatauerkammes</td>
<td>Polynesien Marquesas Fatuhiva Hanavave</td>
<td>Federn, Perlmutt, menschliches Haar, Hundeähnche, Samenkapseln</td>
<td>James Cook, Sammler; Martin Heinrich Karl Lichtenstein, Vorbesitzer; Königliche Preußische Kunstkammer, Ethnografische Abteilung, Vorbesitzer</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 VI 253</td>
<td>Federkopf</td>
<td>Polynesien Hawaii</td>
<td>Holz, geschnitzt, Einlege-arbeit aus Muschelkäle, menschliche Zähne</td>
<td>Eduard von Arning, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 VI 15924 c</td>
<td>Teiles eines Tatauerkammes</td>
<td>Polynesien Marquesas Fatuhiva Hanavave</td>
<td>Federn, Perlmutt, menschliches Haar, Hundeähnche, Samenkapseln</td>
<td>James Cook, Sammler; Martin Heinrich Karl Lichtenstein, Vorbesitzer; Königliche Preußische Kunstkammer, Ethnografische Abteilung, Vorbesitzer</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 VI 253</td>
<td>Federkopf</td>
<td>Polynesien Hawaii</td>
<td>Holz, geschnitzt, Einlege-arbeit aus Muschelkäle, menschliche Zähne</td>
<td>Eduard von Arning, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 VI 24966</td>
<td>Häuptlingsstab</td>
<td>Polynesien Marquesas</td>
<td>Holz, geschnitzt; Pflanzenfaser-schnur, menschliches Haar</td>
<td>C.A. Pöhl, Verärgerter, Zuordnung unsicher</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 VI 4734</td>
<td>Schneckentrompete</td>
<td>Polynesien Marquesas</td>
<td>Schneckengehäuse, Kokosfaser-schnur, geflochten; menschliches Haar, Haar, Knochen, geschlitzt</td>
<td>Johann Carl Pfluger, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Halsschmuck</td>
<td>Polynesien Hawaii (Inselgruppe)</td>
<td>Johann Carl Pfluger, Sammler</td>
<td>geflochtene Schnüre aus menschlichen Haar und Pflanzenfaser, Anhänger aus Walzahn geschlitzt und durchbohrt</td>
<td>Johann Carl Pfluger, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 VI 7345 a</td>
<td>Knochenperle</td>
<td>Polynesien Marquesas</td>
<td>Menschlicher Knochen</td>
<td>Karl von den Steinen, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 VI 15641 a</td>
<td>OhrläppchenDurchstecker</td>
<td>Polynesien Marquesas Ta Pou Hakahau</td>
<td>Knochen, geschlitzt</td>
<td>Karl von den Steinen, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 VI 15643</td>
<td>OhrläppchenDurchstecker</td>
<td>Polynesien</td>
<td>Knochen, geschlitzt</td>
<td>Karl von den Steinen, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 VI 15649</td>
<td>OhrläppchenDurchstecker</td>
<td>Polynesien Marquesas</td>
<td>Knochen, geschlitzt</td>
<td>Arthur Max Heinrich Speyer, Vorbesitzer</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 VI 41905 b</td>
<td>Haarschmuck</td>
<td>Polynesien Samoa</td>
<td>gebleichtes menschliches Haar, Pflanzenfaser-schnur, Pflanzenfaser</td>
<td>Arthur Max Heinrich Speyer, Vorbesitzer</td>
<td>Modul 16/ Ozeanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 III C 975</td>
<td>Weibliche Figur mit Schnupftabakdose</td>
<td>Chokwe Angola</td>
<td>Holz; Pflanzenfaser; Glasperlen; Menschenhaar; Tintil; Tierhaut (nicht zerstörungs-frei bestimbar); Kalebasse</td>
<td>Paul Pogge, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 16-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identnr.</td>
<td>Sachbegriff</td>
<td>GeoBezug</td>
<td>Pers./Inst.</td>
<td>Ausstellung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>III C 1255 Skulptur König und Kulturheros Chibinda Ilunga</td>
<td>Holz; menschliches Haar</td>
<td>Gustav Nachtigal, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 36-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>III C 2969 Skulptur Angola Chokwe</td>
<td>Eisen, Holz, Kupfer, Horn, Zahn (menschlich ?)</td>
<td>Ludwig Wolf, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 36-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>III C 3543 Schwert Kongo Songye</td>
<td>Eisen, Holz, Kupfer, Horn, Zahn (menschlich ?)</td>
<td>Ludwig Wolf, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 36-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>III C 16997 Kopfaufsatzmaske Kamerun Bangwa Keaka</td>
<td>Holz, Leder, menschliches Haar, Eisen, Bast, Knochen</td>
<td>August Hoffmann, Veräußerer</td>
<td>Modul 36-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>III C 10754 Männliche Zauberfigur Kongo Loango</td>
<td>Holz, Pflanzenmaterial, Zahn (menschlich ?)</td>
<td>Robert Visser, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 36-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>III C 20648 Maske Kamerun Bekom</td>
<td>Holz, Haar (Mensch), Harz (?), Erde (?)</td>
<td>Hans Caspar Gans Edler Herr zu Putlitz, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 37/ Kamerun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>III C 1255 Skulptur König und Kulturheros Chibinda Ilunga</td>
<td>Holz; menschliches Haar</td>
<td>Gustav Nachtigal, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 36-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>III C 2969 Skulptur Angola Chokwe</td>
<td>Eisen, Holz, Kupfer, Horn, Zahn (menschlich ?)</td>
<td>Ludwig Wolf, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 36-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>III C 3543 Schwert Kongo Songye</td>
<td>Eisen, Holz, Kupfer, Horn, Zahn (menschlich ?)</td>
<td>Ludwig Wolf, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 36-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>III C 16997 Kopfaufsatzmaske Kamerun Bangwa Keaka</td>
<td>Holz, Leder, menschliches Haar, Eisen, Bast, Knochen</td>
<td>August Hoffmann, Veräußerer</td>
<td>Modul 36-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>III C 10754 Männliche Zauberfigur Kongo Loango</td>
<td>Holz, Pflanzenmaterial, Zahn (menschlich ?)</td>
<td>Robert Visser, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 36-2/ Schaumagazin Afrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>III C 20648 Maske Kamerun Bekom</td>
<td>Holz, Haar (Mensch), Harz (?), Erde (?)</td>
<td>Hans Caspar Gans Edler Herr zu Putlitz, Sammler</td>
<td>Modul 37/ Kamerun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Weiterführende Leitfäden und Empfehlungen**


https://jcms.icom.org/ethische-richtlinien-fuer-museen

**Kontakt**

Humboldt Universität zu Berlin
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Zentrum für Kultur- und Umweltforschung (ZfK)
Unter den Linden 6, D-10099 Berlin
E-Mail: sammlungen@hu-berlin.de
Kulturarchiv Berlin: diebstahl@hu-berlin.de
humboldlab.de
Berlin, 2021

---

**Was sind menschliche Überreste?**

Als menschliche Überreste werden in dieser Handreichung (meist abgekürzt) Teile des Körpers von verstorbener Menschen verstanden.

**Warum sensibel?**

Der Umgang mit menschlichen Überresten erfordert eine besondere Sensibilität. Externe handelt sich um sensible Objekte von individuellen, sozialen oder historischen Bedeutung. Vor allem, wenn die Personen, von denen die Überreste stammen, in einer heute nicht existierenden Vorgeschichte gelebt haben, ist zu beachten, dass der Umgang mit ihnen verantwortlich zu wenden ist, indem potentielle Informationen dieser Personen gepflegt werden. In manchen Kulturen gelten menschliche Überreste zwingend nicht als Objekte, sondern als Seelenform.

Zudem muss bei menschlichen Überresten vor allem aus anthropologischem Grunde dann abgesagt werden, dass ihre Erinnerungshäute heute als problematisch zu bewerten sind.

**Was tun?**

1. **Dokumentieren**
   - Olle in der Sammlung
   - Sensitiv aufbewahrte Objekte
   - Bölliges Inventarverzeichnis
   - Der Sammlung ausgewählte wichtige Exponate und wichtige Provenienzforschung.

2. **Informieren**
   - Mitarbeiter und Mitarbeiterinnen
   - Sammlungsleiter
   - Direkt der Kompetenten
   - Sammlungskommission (K. Kontakt)

3. **Sichern**
   - Aus dem Abhängigkeit Forschung, Benutzung der Sammlung herausarbeiten
   - Gelände, dass für Sammlungstheorie nicht zugänglich ist
   - Würdige und historisch eigenwertige Aufbewahrung organisieren in Sonderlager eingeschlossen in Tüten, die verschlossen (im Schrank) deponieren
   - Falls Mitarbeiter und Mitarbeiterinnen sensibel auf die Verantwortung in den Sammlungsstätten reagieren, eine Aufbewahrung außerhalb der Arbeitsräume finden

4. **Räumen auf der Basis von Anspruch einen herausfordernden oder einen ethischen oder anderen, nicht rechtlichen Gründen, in einer derartigen Entscheidung kann eine INSTITUTION ANEBEN

5. In einer anderen Sammlung IMMER IN: Die über geplanten Aufbewahrungsmöglichkeiten und/oder funktionalen Experten verfügt

6. In einem anderen Fall, von der Kompetenten, wird abhängig davon angemessen Aufbewahrungsmaßnahmen gefunden, um unter Umständen in Beratung gehen, ob menschliche Überreste wichtige RESTE.
The consciously southead map presented above, locates the amount of all human remains listed in this report (February 2022).

The representation of artificially drawn country borders was deliberately avoided, but the rough hatching with crayons allows a broad orientation of the origins of the here listed human remains.

The consciously southead map presented above, locates the amount of all human remains listed in this report (February 2022).

The representation of artificially drawn country borders was deliberately avoided, but the rough hatching with crayons allows a broad orientation of the origins of the here listed human remains.