

Felwine Sarr
Bénédicte Savoy

**The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage.
Toward a New Relational Ethics**

November 2018

N°2018-26

Felwine Sarr
Bénédicte Savoy

**The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage.
Toward a New Relational Ethics**

November 2018

with the assistance of

Isabelle Maréchal
Inspector General
of Cultural Affairs

Vincent Négri
Jurist and researcher at the Institut des
sciences sociales du politique



MINISTÈRE DE LA CULTURE



UMR 7220 (CNRS – ENS Paris Saclay –
Université Paris Nanterre)

Translated by Drew S. Burk

“...We pilfer from the Africans under the pretext of teaching others how to love them and get to know their culture, that is, when all is said and done, to train even more ethnographers, so they can head off to encounter them and ‘love and pilfer’ from them as well.”

Michel Leiris, Letter to his wife, September 19, 1931 (Michel Leiris, *Miroir d’Afrique*, Edited and Annotated by Jean Jamin, Paris: Gallimard, 1996, p. 204, note)

“The conservation of culture has saved the various African peoples from the attempts at erasing the history and soul of Africa’s peoples [...] and if it [culture] binds humans together, it also impels progress. This is the reason why Africa has gone to such great lengths and taken such care in recovering its cultural heritage, in defending its personality and tending to the flourishing of new branches of its culture.”

“Manifeste culturel panafricain”, *Souffles*, 16-17, 4th trimester, 1969, January-February 1970, p.9 and p. 13

Table of Contents

Introduction: Impossible no more	1
0. A Long Duration of Losses	7
<i>Appropriation of Cultural Property and Heritage: A Crime Against Peoples</i>	7
<i>The Spoils of War and the Legality of Acquisitions</i>	9
<i>Born from an Era of Violence</i>	12
<i>A Family Affair</i>	15
<i>Political Prudence and Museum Anxiety</i>	16
<i>1960, Year Zero</i>	17
<i>A Rather Long Wait</i>	19
<i>Mission Impossible</i>	21
<i>The Mobilization of Public Opinion</i>	23
1. To Restitute	27
<i>Removing the Ambiguities</i>	28
<i>What Restitution Means</i>	29
<i>Translocations, Transformations</i>	30
<i>Memory and Amnesia of Losses</i>	31
<i>Re-socializing Objects of Cultural Heritage</i>	32
<i>Of the Life and Spirit of Objects</i>	33
<i>Putting History to Work, Reconstructing Memory</i>	35
<i>Of the Circulation of Objects and the Plasticity of Categories</i>	37
<i>A New Relational Ethics</i>	39
<i>Of Compensation and of Reparation</i>	40
<i>The Question of Archives</i>	41
2. Restitutions and Collections	43
<i>The Time of Returns</i>	43
<i>African Presence</i>	44
<i>Which Africa for which Restitutions?</i>	46
<i>What History do we want to revisit?</i>	47
<i>Historical Forms of Dispossession</i>	49
Spoils	50
“Exploratory” Missions and Scientific “Raids”	54
Gifts from Private Collectors	58
After independence	59
<i>Criteria for Restitutability</i>	61
<i>Timeline for a Program of Restitutions</i>	62
First Phase (November 2018-2019)	62
Second Phase (Spring 2019-November 2022)	66
Third Phase (November 2022- Open-Ended)	69

3. Accompanying the Returns	71
<i>Juridical Aspects</i>	71
<i>How to move past the current impasse?</i>	72
<i>Transactions with the rules of public ownership</i>	73
<i>The envisioned juridical apparatus</i>	77
a. The contextual elements that guided the choice of this proposition	77
b. The Procedure of Restitution Requires a Modification of the Cultural Heritage Code	78
c. The Agreement of Cooperation	80
<i>The Financing of Actions of Restitution</i>	81
<i>Who should the restitutions be directed to?</i>	82
<i>Guaranteeing the Permanence of the Restitutions and Reinforcing the Fight against Illicit Trafficking</i>	83
<i>Popular Appropriations</i>	85
Conclusion	87
Annexes	91
<i>Methods</i>	91
General Consultation	92
“Critical Friends”	92
Museums	93
Political Actors	98
The Art Market	102
Inventories	102
The Atelier de Dakar	104
The Atelier Juridique	105
<i>Documents</i>	107
Document 1. Letter of mission	107
Document 2. The juridical apparatus	111
Document 3. The “Atelier juridique”	131
Figures	137
Inventories of the Quai Branly-Jacques Chirac Museum	197

Introduction: Impossible no more

On November 28, 2017, inside a packed amphitheater at the University of Ouaga 1, Professor Joseph Ki-Zerbo from the University of Ouagadougou, under the watchful eye of the president Roch Kaboré and those of several hundred Burkinabé students, the President of the French Republic verbally confirmed his decision to break with several decades of longstanding French practices and official discourses in terms of cultural heritage and museums: “Starting today, and within the next five years, I want to see the conditions put in place so as to allow for the temporary or definitive restitution of African cultural heritage to Africa.”¹ Applause and whistling ensued. On Twitter, the Élysée hammered down the nail of the proclamation in real-time, tossing out the age-old metaphor of the museum as carceral space: “African cultural heritage can no longer remain a prisoner of European Museums.”

This proclamation was all the more unexpected given that only one year earlier, France had categorically refused to return even the smallest amount of objects of cultural heritage to Benin by virtue of the inalienability of public French art collections. This proclamation was inscribed within a much more general approach toward the emancipation of memory: during a visit to Algiers several months earlier, Emmanuel Macron had declared that colonization was “a crime against humanity”. “Colonization was a significant part of French history. It was a crime, it was crime against humanity, a true example of barbarism. And it is an example of this past history that we must have the courage to confront by earnestly apologizing to those toward whom we have

¹ Speech made by the President of the French Republic, Emmanuel Macron at the Université Ouaga 1 Professeur Joseph Ki-Zerbo, published on November 29, 2017 on the website of the Élysée.

committed these acts.” Never before had France, as a country, explicitly called colonization by its true name.

Elsewhere in Europe, it took over 100 years for the Federal Republic of Germany to accept and apologize to the Hereros, a people from the South-West of Africa (present-day Namibia) who were victims of a genocide by poisoning, deportations, enforced labor, and even death through resisting the German Colonial Law of 1904. In 2008, Italy put an end to forty years of bitter relations with Libya by finally apologizing for the “deep wounds” inflicted on the people residing in this once Italian colony during the years between 1911-1943. The United Kingdom waited 60 years before apologizing in 2013, after a long juridical battle, for the bloody repression and tortures inflicted upon the Mau-Mau of Kenya throughout the 1950s. But we are nevertheless still far from settling the rest of Europe’s colonial past: Belgium still bears a great pain and burden of its colonial past and cannot look directly at the millions of deaths the country caused through its exploitation of the Congo between 1885 and 1908; The stunning declarations made by Emmanuel Macron come after decades of denial or even at times dangerous affirmations of France’s colonial past. The (historical, psychological, and political) responsibility of this past which indeed has not yet passed, remains one of Europe’s greatest challenges for the 21st century.²

The effects and the legacy of this very sensitive history are numerous. They can be seen in a variety of ways on a global scale: economic inequality, political instability, humanitarian tragedies. Given this context, to speak of the restitution of African cultural heritage and works of art to Africa is to open merely one chapter in a much larger, and certainly much vaster, history. But perhaps this chapter can help to open up yet another one. Underneath this beauty mask, the questions around restitution also get at the crux of the problem: a system of appropriation and alienation—the colonial system—for which certain European Museums, unwillingly have become the public archives. However, thinking restitutions implies much more than a single exploration of the past: above all, it becomes a question of building bridges for future equitable relations. Guided by dialogue, polyphony, and exchange, the act or gesture of restitution should not be considered as a dangerous action of identitarian assignation or as the territorial separation or isolationism of cultural property. On the contrary, it could allow for the opening up of the signification of the objects and open a possibility for the “universal”,

² Voir Catherine Coquery-Vidrovitch, *L’Afrique noire, de 1800 à nous jours*, avec Henri Moniot, Paris, PUF, 2005 [1974].

with whom they are so often associated in Europe, to gain a wider relevance beyond the continent.³

The following report only concerns sub-Saharan Africa. It bears witness to the specificity of the African case and situation and proposes solutions adapted precisely to this very *specific* case⁴. The report takes into account the history and the particular responsibilities of France throughout this region of the world (administrative supervision and colonial exploitation, failed attempts at decolonization, centralizing political legacies) that are much different than those left by Great Britain, Belgium, Germany, or Italy. And this report relies on the declaration that has often been reiterated by experts according to which over 90% of the material cultural legacy of sub-Saharan Africa remains preserved and housed outside of the African continent.⁵ Whereas many other regions of the world represented in Western Museum collections are still able to hold on to a significant portion of their own cultural and artistic heritage, this is not the case in sub-Saharan Africa which has been able to retain almost nothing. In this light, the project of restitution undertaken by France is inscribed within a threefold logic of reparations, a re-harmonization of a veritable global cultural geography, but also and above all, within a new point of departure.

³ For more on the distinction of the “universal” and “universalism”, see Souleymane Bachir Diagne and Jean-Loup Amselle, *En quête d’Afrique(s)*, Paris: Albin Michel, 2018.

⁴ On the African territory, the case of Algeria (which has been made the object of intensive negotiations since the 1960s and which has led to important movements of restitution or long-term deposits after independence) and the case of Egypt (which has been inscribed within a logic of multilateral exploitation of the country’s rich cultural resources by several Western nations), whose cultural heritage are both present in the public French collections, are a result of very different contexts of appropriation and therefore imply very different legislative contexts than the cases concerning sub-Saharan Africa. These cases should be the object of a more specific reflection and mission.

⁵ See Alain Godonou’s address made at the “UNESCO forum on Memory and Universality”, February 5, 2007, in: *Witness to History: A Compendium of Documents and Writings on the Return of Cultural Objects*, Ed. Lyndel V. Prott, Paris: UNESCO, 2009, p. 61. “Indeed the position of the African countries and, in particular those south of the Sahara, obviously excluding Egypt, is very different. We have sustained massive losses in quantitative and qualitative terms. I think, statistically speaking, on the basis of the inventories of the collections of all African museums, which amount, for the larger collections, to about 3,000 to 5,000 items, it is fair to say that 90 percent to 95 percent of African heritage is to be found outside the continent in the major world museums. Some African museums which get less publicity but which hold fabulous collections (l’Ecole du Patrimoine africain, the School of African Heritage, which I have the privilege to head, is one of their number) are all missionary museums like the *Torino Consolata*, and the National Lyons Museum in this country, which also hold extraordinary African collections. Thus, in comparison, the loss is huge. This is not true of Egypt. In Cairo, you have 63,000 items on show and almost 300,000 reserve objects. This is not true of Greece; there are the Parthenon sculptures, but beyond that, the Greeks know that the Great Western culture, in a manner of speaking, has its roots and broad origins in Ancient Greece, and this constitutes a source of some pride.” See as well, more recently, “Stéphane Martin : ‘L’Afrique ne peut pas être privée des témoignages de son passé’”, interview with Éric Biétry-Rivierre, *Le Figaro*, December 6, 2017 : “The proportion of cultural items taken from African soil and dispersed throughout France and throughout the rest of the world is enormous. It comprises almost the totality of its cultural heritage.”

On a continent where 60% of the population is under the age of 20 years-old, what is first and foremost of great importance is for young people to have access to their own culture, creativity, and spirituality from other eras that certainly have evolved since, but whose knowledge and recognition can no longer merely be reserved for those residing in Western countries or for those who count themselves among the African diaspora living in Europe. The youth of Africa, as much as the youth in France or Europe in general, have a right “to their artistic and cultural heritage”, to make a brief reference to a similar remark drafted in 2005 by the Faro Convention and the Council of Europe. While we should not forget to mention that this should be a *right* for all cultural heritages, we will naturally begin with those cultural and artistic resources inherited from Africa’s past itself, held and stored in museums and countries completely out of reach from the African youth who often are unaware of not only the richness and creativity of this legacy, but often are not even aware of its existence. To fall under the spell of an object, to be touched by it, moved emotionally by a piece of art in a museum, brought to tears of joy, to admire its forms of ingenuity, to like the artworks’ colors, to take a photo of it, to let oneself be transformed by it: all these experiences—which are also forms of access to knowledge—cannot simply be reserved to the inheritors of an asymmetrical history, to the benefactors of an excess of privilege and mobility.

The present report was written and edited in Dakar, Berlin, and Paris throughout the summer of 2018. It is the fruit of a vast consulting work of experts and political actors in France and throughout four Francophone African countries (Benin, Senegal, Mali, and Cameroon).⁶ This consulting work took place throughout March and July 2018. The consultations provided a way of listening, on both continents, to a variety of personalities from multiple milieus: partisans of restitutions but also skeptics; academics and researchers; museum professionals, those working in politics, in parliaments, actors within the art market, collectors, jurists, teachers, and activists. In Paris, we benefitted enormously from the constant support of the various teams at the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac as well as the museum’s president, Stéphane Martin, most notably for their help in establishing inventories for the needs of the mission, determined specifically for discerning the quality, the quantity, and the exact provenance of the African collections. Two singular workshops helped to hone our

⁶ Since it was impossible, in a period of a few months, to travel through all the African countries concerned by eventual restitutions and have an opportunity to meet with all interested parties, choices had to be made. We ended up privileging countries where the debate has been underway for quite some time (The Republic of Benin), where the museographic landscape is in the midst of a radical evolution (Senegal, with the forthcoming inauguration of the Musée des Civilisations Noires expected to open in December 2018), and countries where experiences of “temporary and definitive” restitution have already been achieved (Mali) and where alternative forms of valuing Africa’s cultural legacy have been particularly fertile (Cameroon).

reflection concerning the term “restitution”: “L’Atelier de Dakar”—the Dakar Workshop—that gathered together 20 leading cultural figures representing both Africa and France at the Musée Théodore-Monod d’art africain [also known as the IFAN Museum of African Arts] on June 12, 2018; and the “Atelier Juridique”—the Juridical Workshop—held at the Collège de France in Paris on June 26, 2018, more specifically focused on the questions around the legislative framework for the project.

The following report is partitioned into three different sections, preceded by an international overview concerning the state of the question of restitution. The first part, “To reconstitute” strives to dispel the ambiguities linked to the use of the term restitution by placing it in relation with other general questions concerning memory work and reparations. The second section (“Restitutions and Collections”) provides the evidence, with precise statistical support of the inherent ties between colonial administration and the creation of African art collections and the presence of African cultural items within French public museums in order to deduce the proper concrete recommendations in terms of restitutions. The third and final section (“Accompanying the returns”) defines the chronological, juridical, methodological and financial framework in which the return of African cultural heritage items can be effectuated back to Africa.

0. A Long Duration of Losses

Appropriation of Cultural Property and Heritage: A Crime Against Peoples

The confiscation, or the transfer of art objects, objects of worship, or those merely used on a daily basis have accompanied the projects of empire since Antiquity. And here, we can begin to see the interrelation of two dynamics: The Intellectual and Aesthetic appropriation combined with the economic appropriation of the cultural heritage of the other, which, within the cities of the conqueror, within his houses, his circles of experts and on the art market acquire a value, another life disconnected from their origins. Intentional alienation and deculturation of subordinated populations whose psychological equilibrium has been broken, sometimes definitively, through the focal objects—objects of orientation that have been passed down from one generation to the next. Two thousand years and two centuries ago, the Greek historian Polybius proposed the foundations for a political theory of acquisitions. Having lived as a political hostage in Rome during a 15-year time period, Polybius describes the dual pain that the conqueror inflicts on the conquered by not only depriving him of his cultural heritage, but then inviting him to partake in the humiliating spectacle of passing through the various cities where his home country's objects have now become the mere spoils of plundering. Polybius warns that such spectacles arouse as much anger as hatred by the victims, who plead to the future conquerors “not to create calamities of the other into the ornaments of their nation.”

Around the year 1800, when a revolutionary and imperial France dreamed of transforming Paris into the “capital of the universe” and to centralize the artistic treasures acquired by its armies throughout all of Europe, the jurist and German philosopher, Carl Heinrich Heydenreich denounced what he called a “crime against humanity” (“Verbrechen gegen die Menschheit”). He deconstructs the rhetoric of the conqueror, who, in pretending to be guided by “the most precious values” in interesting himself in the culture of the conquered, ends up actually transforming his victim into a “thing” (“Ding”), depriving him of the spiritual nourishment that is the foundation of his humanity and addresses to him, to put it this way, his “barbarian verdict”: “In the future, may it be harder for you to learn and cultivate yourself! May we wrest away the brilliant genius and tastes of your most noble sons and remove the models that can lead them to immortality, may the most beautiful works of art that diffused the most amicable and human sentiments between the nations be henceforth subtracted from their gaze forever!”⁷ The extraction and deprivation of culture heritage and cultural property not only concerns the generation who participates in the plundering as well as those who must suffer through this extraction. It becomes inscribed throughout the long duration of societies, conditioning the flourishing of certain societies while simultaneously continuing to weaken others. In times of war, conquests or occupations are—like rape, the taking of hostages, imprisonment, or the deportation of intellectuals—instruments for the dehumanization of the enemy.

In this sense, and this is what past debates have indicated, since they effect both the individual and the group as part of the foundation of their humanity (their spirituality, creativity, transmission of knowledge) acquisitions of cultural heritage should be considered within a different category: that of transgressive acts, which no juridical, administrative, cultural, or economic apparatus would be capable of legitimizing.

In one of the largest texts dedicated to the question of the presumed consent of the victims of artistic plundering, Cicero was quick to brush aside the economic argument. No, he writes, the *purchasing* of coveted pieces by a conqueror within a conquered country is not enough to legitimize the activity of appropriation and extraction of the cultural heritage of the other: “If he had the faculty of choice at his disposal”, Cicero writes in regard to the Sicilian victim of Roman predations, “he would have never chosen to sell what resided in his sanctuary and which had been left to him by his ancestors.”⁸ And taking into account the enlightened milieus of Europe around the 1800s, the

⁷ Carl Heinrich Heydenreich, “Darf der Sieger einem überwundenen Volke Werke der Litteratur und Kunst entreißen? Eine völkerrechtliche Quästion”, *Deutsche Monatsschrift*, vol. 2, August 1798, p. 293; in Bénédicte Savoy, *Patrimoine annexé*, Paris: Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l’homme, 2003, vol. 1, p. 225.

⁸ Cicero, *L’Affaire Verrès*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2015, p. 87

juridical inscription of artistic concessions in the armistices or within the peace treaties in the aftermath of “modern” wars in no way would have guaranteed and legitimized the acquisition of the cultural property of the vanquished through armed conflict: we can easily estimate, in the France of 1815, “the Muséum de Paris [...] acknowledged by treaties and conserved by capitulations, should necessarily be considered as the most un-plunderable of property”⁹; this did not however prevent the sovereign powers of Europe from exploring the question of restitution from a moral and not a legal perspective, from an ethical perspective and not a juridical one:

“The allies [...] could not do otherwise than restore [the contents of the Museum] to the countries from which, contrary to the practice of civilized warfare, they had been torn during the disastrous period of the French Revolution and the tyranny of Bonaparte”.¹⁰

The Spoils of War and the Legality of Acquisitions

From the juridical point of view all the way to the end of the 19th century, “the right to pillage and plunder what had belonged to the enemy” and “the right to appropriate for oneself what one had taken from the enemy”, to adopt the terminology used by the Dutch jurist, Hugo Grotius, were the codified and licit practices of war.¹¹ After the traumas and innumerable public debates in Europe resulting from the “artistic conquests” of the Revolution and the Empire, European nations mutually saved themselves from questioning these sorts of rather difficult affronts made on each other. However, they nevertheless were quick to export the very same practices and systematically held recourse to them throughout their wars of conquest and economic influence in Asia and Africa beginning in the middle of the 19th century.

It should be said that all over the world—and Africa is no exception—societies engage in an elaborate relation with their “material cultural heritage”, transmitted from one generation to the next, and conserved according to varying specific modalities: the safekeeping of precious manuscripts and sacred art objects (as has been the practice in Timbuktu since the 14th century at a time when an important number of libraries were

⁹ Hyppolite Mazier du Heaume, *Observations d'un Français, sur l'enlèvement des chefs-d'œuvre du Muséum de Paris*, Paris, 1815, p.14.

¹⁰ The Duke of Wellington to Lord Castlereagh, September 23, 1815.

¹¹ Hugo Grotius, *Le Droit de la guerre et de la paix (De jure belli ac pacis)*, Paris: Buon, 1625, Book III, chap. 5-6. See Mariana Muravyeva, “Ni pillage ni viol sans ordre préalable’. Codifier la guerre dans l’Europe moderne”, *Clio. Femmes, Genre, Histoire*, 39, 2014, p. 55-81.

constructed only to later amaze the European explorers who “discovered”¹² them five centuries later in the 19th century); the entire preservation of dynastic treasures within well-defined and protected spaces within a royal palace (such as in Benin City); the existence in certain cities of what could be considered as “modern” libraries, such as the one created in the middle of the 19th century by the Ethiopian emperor, Tewodros II (1818–1868), at Magdala; during times of war, methods for seeking out ways of conserving or sheltering cultural objects that would be susceptible to garnering the attention of the enemy such as the treasures of Abomey which the French army uncovered hidden in its subterranean spaces after ransacking the city.

In the 19th century, the annexation of cultural heritage becomes the natural correlate of wars and is thus absorbed both juridically and physically, by the conquering nation-states. In 1854, Sir Robert Phillimore, the most celebrated English jurist of his time, considered that “all civilized States” should recognize the maxim according to which “the acquisitions of war belong to the State”. When the acquisitions in question were considered as cultural resources, they were often publically displayed throughout 19th century European capitals and “naturally” found themselves placed at the heart of the larger national edifices dedicated to public instruction with museums and libraries being the first infrastructural sites in mind, and so one could see an increase in such acquisitions during this time period. Beginning in the 19th century, and in spite of the accepted legality of the military activities, a number of prestigious voices could be heard throughout Europe condemning such activities that so-called “civilization” inflicted upon the “barbarians”. “One day I hope that France will eventually return to China, cleaned and polished, these spoils of war”¹³, wrote Victor Hugo in the aftermath of the second Opium War.

In China (1860), in Korea (1866), in Ethiopia (1868), in the Asante Kingdom (1874), in Cameroon (1884), in the Tanganyika lake region, and the future Belgian Congo (1884), in the current region of Mali (1890), at Dahomey (1892), in the Kingdom of Benin (1897), in present-day Guinea (1898), in Indonesia (1906), in Tanzania (1907), the military raids and so-called punitive expeditions conducted by England, Belgium, Germany, Holland, and France, during the 19th century became occasions for unprecedented pillaging and acquisition of objects of cultural heritage. The type and quantity of the coveted objects, the presence of experts closely attached to certain of the armies, the close attention paid by European museums and libraries, oftentimes far in advance of the movement of the troops, with certain museums already assigned with the

¹² On the ancient history of Africa, see François-Xavier Fauvelle (ed.), *L’Afrique ancienne. De l’Acacus au Zimbabwe. 20 000 avant notre ère – XVII^e siècle*, Paris: Belin, 2018.

¹³ Victor Hugo, *Actes et Paroles. Pendant l’exil: 1852-1870*, Paris: Lévy, 1875, p. 201.

housing of specific objects immediately after their acquisition by the armies, shows to what extent the targeted and plundered locations had sometimes much more to do with the museums than military plundering *stricto sensu* (which traditionally simply had its sights set on wealth, weapons, and enemy flags). At the beginning of 1897, the director of the museum of ethnology of Berlin, rejoiced in learning of “a punitive expedition planned against the Ngolo (top secret!) in which one of his students was to participate”: “We can expect great things. M. von Arnim is well-informed on what we are in need of and will attempt to take great care in finding something for us. The costs will be minimal at best.”¹⁴

At any one of the sites, freshly seized cultural spoils were often the first objects to draw attention through the selection and internal deals made within the ranks of the army itself. Once the cultural spoils had made their way to Europe, the most spectacular of the objects were directly integrated into the national collections (the Louvre, British Museum, British Library, Bibliothèque nationale, ethnological museums or colonial museums were especially constructed for such spoils). The remaining objects were sold at auctions and massively alimented the art market that assured the transformation of the goods into capital and distribution on a European scale. Museums from a large number of European nations were then able to tap into these resources including nations whose military didn't directly serve in their acquisition. Private collectors were also able to take advantage of the spoils whose acquisition often came by way of an inheritance before eventually ending up being donated as gifts to their country's respective national museums. And certain pieces of artwork or cultural objects even ended up remaining in the hands of military families for generations only to eventually make their way either into the art market or as donations to museums or libraries. Within the context of the 19th century, one can indeed see that the violent acquisition and economic capitalization (through the art market) as well as symbolic capitalization (through the museum) of African and Asian objects of cultural heritage goes hand in hand with the wars of that same era.

As a result, one must wait until 1899 with the “Convention with Respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land and its annex: Regulations concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land”, signed at the Hague by 24 sovereign nation-states to make the practice of pillaging and plundering of cultural artifacts during military campaigns an illicit act. Two articles from section III of the convention (Of military authority concerning the territory of a State enemy) evoke the question: article 46 stipulates that “Family honors and rights, individuals lives, and private property, as well as religious convictions and liberty, must be respected. Private property cannot be confiscated.” Article 47 stipulates

¹⁴ Berlin, Archive of the Ethnologisches Museum, letter of Felix von Luschan, 1897.

that “Pillaging is formally prohibited.” The same convention, renewed in 1907, specifies in article 56 that “The property of municipalities, that of institutions dedicated to religion, charity and education, the arts and sciences, even when State property, shall be treated as private property. All seizure of, destruction or willful damage done to institutions of this character, historic monuments, works of art and science, is forbidden, and should be made the subject of legal proceedings.”

Born from an Era of Violence

And it was precisely during this same era, all over Europe and while the wars of conquest continued in various forms of occupations and colonial administration, that the nascent fields of anthropology and ethnology posited their scientific value that they intended of providing to the colonial projects of their respective governments. In 1903, the eminent British anthropologist and Henry Ling Roth, director of the Halifax Museum, writes a very thick volume on Great Benin (present-day Nigeria): “Politically, it is of the first importance that our governing officials should have thorough knowledge of the native races subject to them—and this is the knowledge that anthropology can give them—for such knowledge can teach what forms of taxation are suitable to the particular tribes, or to the stage of civilization in which we find them.”¹⁵ From the cultural devastation provoked by the European occupation Roth writes about and describes, Roth is able to sketch out an argument for legitimizing the practice of the collection and exfiltration of cultural heritage including during peacetime:

“Unlike the Tasmanians or Ancient Peruvians, the West African will never be wiped off the face of the earth, but intercourse with the white man alters his beliefs, ideas, customs, and technology, and proper records of these should be made before we destroy them. The destruction is going on apace, one of the chief contributory cause being the unsuitable European teaching given to the native races generally—unsuitable to them on the wide differences between the white and black man.”¹⁶

Several lines above this, Roth congratulates himself for the transfer of great works of art made of wood, ivory, and bronze –some of which date all the way back to the 15th century –seized at Benin City by the British expedition of 1897.

¹⁵ Henry Ling Roth, *Great Benin. Its Customs, Art and Horrors*, Halifax 1903, Appendix

¹⁶ *Id.*

We could multiply the number of examples such as this one that prove that the acquisition of cultural objects and resources and their transfer to the capitals of Europe were in fact at the heart of—and not at the margins—of the colonial enterprise. In 1904, in Berlin, the director of the Ethnographic Museum was ecstatic when noting the fact that “the colonial department of the minister of Foreign Affairs of the Reich, the marines, the governors of the protectorates and a great number of doctors, functionaries, and officers [were] made aware of the scientific and practical importance of the ethnology and were prepared to provide official support based on the efforts [of the Museum of Berlin]”¹⁷. In Belgium, the colonial museum of Tervuren, inaugurated in 1910, which grants a rather preponderant place to its section on “political economics”, became the beneficiary of a large influx of cultural artifacts coming from the Congo by way of the scientific missions and military expeditions during the continuing voyages and postings of territorial agents or through the framework of evangelical enterprises that were also underway at this time.

Throughout Europe along with these State institutions, we also see the addition of so-called missionary museums where a variety of ritual objects are gathered and displayed (talismans, masks, entire tombs) taken by Catholic and Protestant priests from the African peoples targeted by their attempts at Christian conversions. When these artifacts, that bore witness to an African obscurantism, or, to use the words of a missionary from Lyon, Théodore Chautard—these “vulgar idols [...] misshapen, soaked in palm oil and the blood of their victims”¹⁸—, when they were not immediately destroyed at the sites themselves, they were transferred on to Europe and displayed as a means for civil education: to display the courage of the Missionaries and the dangers which they exposed themselves to; as a reminder to the public of the importance of the civilizing mission of the Church on the dark African continent. In 1925, the largest missionary exhibit of the century is presented in Rome, the *l'Esposizione missionaria vaticana*, for which we see the mobilization of dozens of priests throughout the world to obtain as fast as possible (sometimes at great risk), a number of spectacular pieces. And still to this very day, in a number of European cities, missionary museums sometimes still receive a large number of museumgoers to contemplate the items they have on display. In France, these museums are not considered as part of public property: and therefore they fall outside the purview and the ascribed parameters of our present report.

¹⁷ Felix von Luschan, *Anleitung für ethnographische Beobachtungen und Sammlungen in Afrika und Oceanien*, Berlin:Königliches Museum für Völkerkunde, 1904.

¹⁸ Quoted in Laurick Zerbini, “La construction du discours patrimonial : les musées missionnaires à Lyon (1860-1960)”, *Outre-Mers. Revue d'histoire*, 2007, 356-357, p. 127.

In France, at the beginning of the early 1930s, the law project which instituted the famous Ethnographic and Linguistic Mission of Dakar-Djibouti insists on the crucial political role of ethnology, which “provides an indispensable contribution to the methods of colonization by revealing to the legislator, the functionary, the colonist, the uses, beliefs, and laws and techniques of the indigenous populations, [thus allowing] for a more rational exploitation of the wealth of natural resources.”¹⁹ The same law project insisted on the urgency that there was for France, within the feared context of international competition, the need for systematically “gathering” up objects that were susceptible to enriching their museums before the “daily contact between the Europeans and the indigenous became more and more intimate each day” leading to the disappearance of large portions of indigenous culture. The text specifies very clearly: “methodically constitute on the spot collections that certainly have a greater value than the price paid for them and which several years down the road it will no longer be possible of enriching the museum with, even with an unlimited backing of financial resources. The exploitation of both the natural wealth as well as the cultural wealth of colonized countries is inseparable. Applied to the translocation of cultural goods, the vocabulary of “collecting” and of “harvesting” only further implies the interconnectedness of the two operations. It also suggests an undeniable cynicism: that after the harvest season, the objects will magically grow back again like fields of wheat. To follow this logic of harvesting is precisely to deny the very principle of culture itself that—in Europe as elsewhere—is generated and regenerated throughout the centuries by way of the transmission, reproduction, adaptation, study and transformation of knowledge, of forms and objects at the heart of society. Certainly, European cultures have benefitted from the input they’ve acquired from these remote objects that will soon become integrated into the Western repertoire. But their massive departure and then their rather long absence from the countries affected by this violence, has also left a legacy that is just as important, even though it is much more difficult to measure (since its effects are derived from an absence) than the spectacular cultural production that they sparked in Europe (from Picasso to the Surrealists via the German Expressionists).

In 1975, through a critical re-evaluation regarding the history of his discipline, Claude Lévi-Strauss called anthropology the “daughter born out of an era of violence”²⁰. Today, in our 21st century capitals, the ethnographic museums as part of those museums deemed to be “universal”, which have gathered up the colonial harvests, have thus taken on the role of the “responsible brothers” of this discipline. Destruction and collection are the two sides of the same coin. The great museums of Europe are at once the

¹⁹ Pierre-Étienne Flandin, Gaston Doumergue, Mario Roustan, “Mission ethnographique et linguistique Dakar-Djibouti. Projet de loi”, *Journal de la Société des Africanistes*, 1931, vol. 1, fascicule 2, p. 300-303.

²⁰ Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Anthropologie structurale deux*, Paris: Plon, 1973, p. 69.

conservationists of incredible human creativity and the receptacles of what often amounts to a violent dynamic of appropriation that is still largely poorly understood.

A Family Affair

To speak of restitution in the year 2018 is to thus to simultaneously reopen the old colonial machine as well as the file containing the erased memories of both the Europeans and the Africans, with the Europeans no longer having any idea how to continue to maintain their prestigious museums while the Africans find themselves struggling to recover the thread of an interrupted memory. Given this context, there is nothing surprising about why the question of restitution also occupies such a large place with both the intellectuals and the press beyond the mere Franco-African framework. From the British Museum (69,000 objects from sub-Saharan Africa) to the Weltmuseum of Vienna (37,000), to the Musée Royal de l’Afrique Centrale in Belgium (180,000) to the Future Humboldt Forum (75,000), to the Vatican Museums and those of the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (70,000): the history of the African collections is a European history that has indeed been a shared history. In 2007, Alain Godonou, a specialist of African museums, estimated that in comparison “with certain rare exceptions, the inventories of the national museums in Africa itself hardly ever exceeded 3,000 cultural heritage objects and most of them had little importance or significance.”²¹ Outside of France, the pronouncement of possible French restitution has become an object of constant media attention and numerous commentaries. Inside and outside of Africa, those who have for a long time been militant regarding the return of these displaced objects of cultural heritage to their countries of origin see the beginnings of a new era. “The post Ouagadougou period has begun,”²² wrote the Ghanaian jurist and former functionary of the United Nations Kwame Opoku in December 2017.

In Germany, the French initiative was seen as entering into the lively debate on the colonial amnesia which seemed to have befallen the creators of the future Humboldt Forum—a copy of a Prussian King’s castle that is supposed to begin housing the ex-Prussian state’s collection starting in 2019. In an open letter to Angela Merkel, 40 organizations from the German African diaspora joined together in asking the German chancellor for some sort of reaction or response to the “historical initiative put forth by the French president”—and they received no response. The German authorities set in

²¹ See Alain Godonou, “À propos de l’universalité et du retour des biens culturels”, in: *Réinventer les musées. Africultures*, n°70, May-June 2007, p. 114–117.

²² Kwame Opoku, “Humboldt Forum and Selective Amnesia: Research Instead of Restitution of African Artefacts”, *ModernGhana.com*, December 21, 2017.

place *Provenienzforschung*, an investigation on the initial provenance of the objects conserved in their museums, within the federal context, where the inventory verifications that are considered as one of the sacred pillars of the French cultural “system” had not been part of an ongoing systematic political discussion (as had been the case in France), meaning that the German institutions found themselves in a position of a (nevertheless relative) uncertainty concerning the exact origins of the German ethnographic collections.²³ More recently, under the pressure of public opinion, the Berlin museums have finally ended up conceding, with the documents to prove it, that there were items in the museum collections that were a result of military pillaging. Elsewhere in Europe, the directors of several large institutions had to also come out into the open and leave the safety of their collections and museum offices. In an interview granted to *Le Monde*, Guido Gryseels, who had been director for the past 17 years at the Tervuren Museum near Brussels, declared in June 2018: “Africa was a continent that has been pillaged and plundered. We cannot continue to ignore this situation and we must seek to find solutions.” In April 2018, in London, the director of the Victoria & Albert Museum was quick to reflect, from his position, that “The speediest way, if Ethiopia wanted to have these items on display, is a long-term loan...that would be the easiest way to manage it.”²⁴ And here, in regards to the restitution of pillaged cultural heritage objects, we see something that had yet dared to be mentioned at all by most of the other parties concerned: they would rather speak of cooperation, circulations, and long-term loans.

Political Prudence and Museum Anxiety

It’s still true that even today pretty much everywhere in Europe—and France is no exception—the mere word “restitution” elicits a defensive reflex and a gesture of retreat. François Mitterrand provided a great public demonstration of this sort of reflex in 1994, when, in order to thank Helmut Kohl for the restitution of 27 French paintings stolen by the Nazis during the war, he declared: “I hope that this evening, the custodians of our countries, those responsible for our grand museums, experience a bit of anxiety. Will this become generalized? I don’t think it’s much of a risk on my part, thinking that this example will remain very singular and the contagion will be squashed out rather quickly.” Restitutions and contagions; political prudence and museum dread: we are

²³ See the *Guidelines on Dealing with Collections from Colonial Contexts* published by the German Association of Museums in May 2018 (available on MuseumsBund.de), and the public debate that followed. See also: “Eine Räuberbande will Beweise”, interview by Jörg Häntzschel and Andreas Zielcke with Wolfgang Kaleck, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, October 11, 2018.

²⁴ Mark Brown, “Looted Ethiopian treasures in UK could be returned on loan”, *The Guardian*, April 3, 2018.

part of a generation that has only known restitutions by way of painful struggles. No one in France has forgotten the resistance in 2010 by the museum custodians of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, when Nicolas Sarkozy initiated the return of more than 300 precious manuscripts as part of commercial contract negotiations with South Korea, originating from a punitive expedition by the French army in 1866. No one in Italy will forget the half-century's worth of negotiations that it took to finally return the Axum obelisk to Ethiopia initially seized by Mussolini's troops in 1937. And no one in Berlin would like to see the largest fossil of a dinosaur skeleton in the world finally returned to its place of origin in Tanzania (under the protectorate of the Reich): the Brachiosaurus Brancai, one of the idols of the Berlin museum, brought to Germany between 1909 and 1912.

In fact, in a more general manner, in Europe alone, only the restitution of human remains seems to be progressively finding its way into the institutional consciousness: in 2002, France adopted a law authorizing the restitution of the mortal remains of Saartjie Baartman to South Africa ("Venus hottentote"); in 2002, several French museums restituted the remains of 21 Maori heads to New Zealand. In October 2017, the museums of Dresden gave back to Hawaii piles of bones and human remains that had been pillaged in the early 1900s. More recently, at the end of 2018, the remains of several victims of genocide of the Hereros and Namas, perpetrated between 1904 and 1908 by the German colonial forces, were returned from various German institutions to Namibia, one of the former German colonies.

1960, Year Zero

In Africa, certain countries or communities (Ethiopia and Nigeria, for example) have pleaded and made claims for well over 50 years for the return of their cultural objects that disappeared during the colonial period. The archives of the Belgian, German, British, and French museums, those of the ministers of foreign affairs as well as the archives of the large African and European newspapers, and a number of witnesses have held on to their memories of these reclamations but they are also witnesses to a deafening silence that has also welcomed their claims and still continues to do so until this very day.

In 1957, the Queen of England restituted a rather valuable large Asante stool to Accra during the celebrations of Ghana's independence. Since that initial restitution, Ghana has waited for a much larger portion of its Asante cultural heritage and property to be returned that had initially vanished and been distributed during the punitive expedition

of 1874 against Kumasi, most notably in the form of a spectacular golden head housed at the Wallace Foundation, which had officially been requested to be returned in 1974—all in vain. In 1960, immediately after gaining its independence, Zaire sent a request to Belgium asking for the transfer of the “Museum of the Congo” (the present-day Tervuren Museum) to Kinshasa, only to obtain 15 years later, after difficult negotiations, just 144 pieces (out of the 122,000 objects inventoried at Tervuren). In 1968, Nigeria submitted a restitution project to ICOM (the International Council of Museums) requesting Western museums to make available and return several significant pieces of cultural heritage originating from Great Benin to the national museum that had just been opened in Lagos—they never received any response whatsoever. In 1969, the Pan-African Cultural Manifesto of Algiers insisted on taking “all necessary steps, including that of calling upon international institutions, so as to recuperate the works of art and archives seized by colonial powers” as well as “taking the necessary steps to stop the drain of cultural assets leaving the African continent.”

Throughout the 1960s in Europe, this subject was completely ignored and no one dared to have the courage to face the situation directly. No truly ambitious negotiations were undertaken concerning the old colonial powers. There was no structured reflection devoted to the role objects of cultural heritage could play in the emancipation of formerly colonized African countries. During the very same time period France was granting independence to a number of nation-states, it nevertheless continued to secure its economic, military, industrial, monetary and even scholarly power over the African continent, and the question concerning the thousands of cultural works that had been transferred from the colonies to French museums never even seemed to be a question worth posing.

But in reality, the question had certainly been posed—and in a much more fervent and intense manner than the voluntary discretion of the authorities would like us to believe. In fact, very early on, while the newly formed young independent African countries were still in the midst of rejoicing in their newfound freedom, the French administration took a variety of measures so as to avoid as much as possible any potential claims on the collections formed in the colonies and to assure the enjoyment and long-term holdings and proprietary rights for France alone. Already in the 1960s, both the African and Oceanic collections and the former museum of the colonies housed in the Palais de la Porte Dorée—which until then had been under the auspices of the Ministry of the Colonies (“Ministère de la France d’outre-Mer” since 1946) and which are today housed at the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac—see their administrative auspices transferred over to the Direction des Musées de France and the Ministry of Culture, as a way to symbolically “absorb” them a second time (the first symbolic gesture being their

translocation) and affirm their inalienable place as part of French national assets of cultural heritage. During this same time period, within a vastly different context, Algeria cannot avoid escaping from this same French stranglehold on cultural property and heritage: in the aftermath of the 1962 Evian Accords and several months before Algeria's independence, France orders 300 paintings from the Musée des Beaux-Arts of Algiers to be transferred to Paris which would only be restituted to Algeria seven years later after very terse negotiations. In the end, following the exact same logic, a large number of cultural objects and works of art would be loaned out from African museums to French museums between the 1930s and the 1960s and would never be returned to their institutions of origin after the independence of nations takes place, as IFAN has born witness to in Dakar. As of 2018, The IFAN Museum of African Arts in Dakar (le musée de Théodore-Monod d'art africain) is still awaiting the return of pieces of cultural heritage it loaned out to France in 1935, 1957, and 1967.²⁵

A Rather Long Wait

At the end of the 1970s, confronted with the inflexibility of the old colonial powers and under pressure from its Member States, UNESCO attempted to tackle the question of restitutions head-on. On June 7, 1978, in one of the most moving and beautiful essays ever produced on the subject in the 20th century, Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, who was then the director of UNESCO, pleaded in favor of a re-balancing of global cultural heritage between the global North and the global South. His call for "A Plea for the Return of an Irreplaceable Cultural Heritage to those who created it" deserves to be read and re-read, considering that it poses with fairness and with gravity the question that still continues to concern us today—as if no discussion had already taken place concerning the restitution of cultural heritage 40 years earlier:

“The peoples who have been victims of this plunder, sometimes for hundreds of years, have not only been despoiled of irreplaceable masterpieces but also robbed of a memory which would doubtless have helped them to greater self-knowledge and would certainly have helped others understand them better. [...] They know, of course, that art is for the world and are aware of the fact that this

²⁵ Several specific cases could also be mentioned here, most notably concerning a situation where objects were temporarily loaned out to French institutions but still remain in their museum holdings. Christine Lorre, head curator at the Musée d'Archéologie nationale de Saint-Germain-en-Laye, drew our attention to such a case involving a lithic set of tools originally from Melka Kunture (Ethiopia). These pieces were removed from the site in order to create molds of them (which were in fact displayed in the hall of comparative archeology in the museum) and they are still housed in the museum, waiting for the situation to be resolved.

art work, which tells the story of their past and shows what they really are, does not speak to them alone. They are happy that men and women elsewhere can study and admire the work of their ancestors. They also realize that certain works of art have for too long played too intimate a part in the history of the country to which they were taken for the symbols linking them with that country to be denied and for the roots that have taken hold to be severed. [...] These men and women who have been deprived of their cultural heritage therefore ask for the return of at least the art treasures which best represent their culture, which they feel are the most vital and whose absence causes them the greatest anguish. This is a legitimate claim.”²⁶

At the end of the 1970s, the call and efforts made by Mbow were able to stir the emotions of both intellectuals and public opinion in France as well as abroad. At that time, restitution seemed close at hand. During the evening news hour, the famous news anchor of TF1, Roger Gicquel explained to the French that “if we want to preserve our cultural identities, then we must also preserve cultural heritage and this means that sometimes we must perform acts of restitution”, he even added, “One must even sometimes succumb to them.” A movement appeared to be launched. UNESCO printed generic forms in three languages to help restitution requests, that were largely distributed throughout the end of the 1970s (blank forms can still be found today in the archives). In April 1982, still following this same logic of an opening toward restitution, the French Minister of Foreign Relations tasked the inspector general of the Direction of French Museums at that time, Pierre Quoniam, with the mission of a reflection regarding the restitution of African cultural heritage. Surrounded by academics, ministerial functionaries, and museum curators, he formed a “working group on Africa” tasked with figuring out the means toward action, the modalities, and the objectives for the return and restitution, “in a manner that was both rigorous and expeditious”. When the report was submitted in July of 1982, his conclusions considered restitution as an “act of solidarity and equity”. In an interview he was careful to specify that “a work of intelligence is to be done. The return of cultural property, works of art, and historical documents will allow various peoples to grasp their responsibilities. We must help these peoples rediscover their past and their self confidence.” During this same time period in West Germany, the secretary of State tasked with foreign affairs in the government of Helmut Schmidt, Hildegaard Hamm-Brücher, also called for the “generous” oversight of the question of restitutions.

²⁶ Speech held in Paris on June 7, 1978, available on the UNESCO website. See Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, “Pour le retour, à ceux qui l'ont créé, d'un patrimoine culturel irremplaçable”, *Museum*, vol. 31, n°1, 1979, p. 58.

Mission Impossible

Setting aside their verbal condescendence (these people that we must help), the conclusions of the Quoniam mission are not that dissimilar from the convictions expressed today by the authors of the present report. But if a generation after Quoniam we find ourselves tasked with a similar mission—a mission for which the current French administration has kept no memory or recollection of, and which required us to comb the archives so as to find its traces—it simply indicates that in France and in spite of this past potential opening for progress toward restitutions, there has been no progressive movement in this direction for the past 40 years. Unfortunately, it's been the exact opposite: Successive governments have continued to turn down any offer requesting restitutions, with the reasoning that the requested works of art have for a long time now been integrated as part of cultural heritage property of the French Nation, and in this light, they are inalienable.

In this respect, the most recent example of Benin is rather significant: in an official letter dated August 26, 2016, the Beninese Minister of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, Aurélien Agbenonci, asked for the restitution of anthropomorphic statues bearing royal emblems taken by the French colonel, Alfred Dodds, during the sacking of the Abomey Palace in 1892, who then offered them to the Trocadéro Museum of Ethnography, an ancestor of the newly formed Musée du quai Branly in Paris. The messenger sent from Benin indicated that these items had both a spiritual and historical value for the Beninese nation; that what was at the heart of the request were irreplaceable pieces of cultural property and heritage—witnesses to a former time and a bygone era, certainly—but they still remained as a living support for the collective memory of Benin. The reply from the French government took four months. On December 12, 2016, the French government finally replied by stating that France was also responsible and tasked with the circulation and protection of cultural heritage; that France also was cognizant and well aware of the historical and cultural importance of these items for Benin; that France ratified in 1997 the UNESCO convention of 1970 concerning the illicit exportation of cultural property; but that this convention has no retroactive scope and in conforming to the legislature in place, cannot be applied to the treasure of Abomey whose inalienability remained intact. In 2016, France admitted the legitimacy of the request but countered it with a legal detail concerning French cultural property and heritage. Mission Impossible.

A half-century after African nations gained their independence, the question concerning cultural heritage restitutions still seems stuck within a dual temporality: on the one hand, within a temporality of those who continue to wait and are filled with resignation, and on the other hand, within a temporality of those with the confidence to think that they will finally be able to confer to others, after a great many decades, the feeling of ownership, scientific legitimacy, and the proper services rendered to the cultural heritage of humanity. Both of these temporalities seem to converge around the same point: both temporalities seemed to have generated a sense of institutional numbing. Among our interlocutors, above all in France, it has often been said that our present work around restitutions was a “mission impossible”. In April 2018, Oswald Homécky, the young minister of Culture and Sports in Benin, confided to us that from his position, at Cotonou, if one day France truly restituted Africa’s cultural heritage items back to Africa it would be akin to “the fall of the Berlin Wall or the reunification of North and South Korea.”

Can we, then, envision the happy and consented restitution, motivated by the dual interest of both peoples and objects? Can we thus think of restitutions as being something more than a mere strategic maneuver—neither merely an economic or political strategy—but rather something truly cultural in the sense of the Latin verb *colere*, to “inhabit”, “cultivate”, and “honor”? The proclamation made at Ouagadougou leads one to think this is perhaps possible. This belief perhaps comes from the force felt as a new generation comes to the fore. This proclamation suggests that a new future can be envisioned. The proclamation postulates the very specificity of the African situation. And despite all expectations to the contrary, it has not provoked a large institutional blockade to which we’ve become accustomed over the past several decades when discussing this subject. The response has been completely the opposite. Invited by several media outlets to react to the declarations made by Emmanuel Macron, the president of the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Stéphane Martin was rather pleased to engage in the larger meaning of President Macron’s words, emphasizing that “we cannot allow for a continent to be so severely deprived of its past and its artistic brilliance”, that the current stand-still of the situation “has no intention of remaining as such” and “that the destiny of the cultural items would certainly lead to at least part of them being returned.”²⁷ Gathered together at the behest of the mission from the beginning of July, both the principal curators of the museums of territorial collections and the curators from the French State housing collections of African objects demonstrated a sincere openness and interest to proceed by way of restitution and the perspectives of cooperation that could be opened up by it.

²⁷ See “Stéphane Martin : ‘L’Afrique ne peut pas être privée des témoignages de son passé’”, *op. cit.*

The Mobilization of Public Opinion

We must also mention the role played by the increasing pressure exerted by public opinion felt throughout Europe. Since the early 2010s, the dossier on restitution is no longer merely constrained to the art circles of Europe or Africa. The growing interest that civil society has in these questions can be seen through the large number of novels, films, documentaries, contemporary art installations, academic conferences, tweets, and even rap songs and other types of choreography that are devoted to it. In France as well as in Germany and Great Britain, but also in Cameroon, Benin, Ethiopia, Nigeria, or in Ghana, militant non-profit organizations have begun to vigorously support reflections on restitutions over the past several years, demanding answers from the political class.

In France, the question concerning restitutions made its way onto the political agenda in 2013 thanks to the work of CRAN (The Representative Council of Black Associations) and its honorary president, Louis-Georges Tin. The campaign organized by CRAN alongside successive French presidents, as well as in Benin, largely contributed to the forward progress concerning the case of restitution. Throughout the region surrounding Paris, associations such as *Alter Natives. Héritages culturels & usages sociaux* educate the youth on the topic of restitutions in Paris and the Seine-Saint-Denis area, through conferences, trips, and workshops held in their neighborhoods concerning questions of African cultural heritage within European museums.

On the informational website, *Modern Ghana*, a former functionary of the United Nations and a militant citizen, Kwame Opoku published over 150 articles beginning in 2008, carefully and beautifully documenting a favorable case for the restitution of items of African cultural heritage to Africa. In Ethiopia, the association *Afromet (Association For the Return Of the Magdala Ethiopian Treasures)* has fought for the return of cultural items seized by the British army at Magdala in 1868. In Cameroon and in several other European cities, the foundation *AfricAvenir International*, created by the historian Kum'a Ndumbe III, has been engaged since 2013 in several awareness campaigns concerning questions of restitutions. In Benin, the Fondation Zinsou and its president, Marie-Cécile Zinsou has mobilized youth on the ground just as much as she does on social networks. And in Berlin, since 2013 as well, the association *No Humboldt 21* federates the opposition to the future ethnographic museum Humboldt Forum and is committed to fighting for the restitution of human remains and cultural items of African origin that are currently held in Germany. At the University of Cambridge, a co-ed group of students has been engaged in fighting for the restitution of art works originating from the pillaging of

Benin City by the British Army in 1897, a portion of which is conserved in the collections of the university.

In addition to these initiatives launched by associations and militants, we should also mention the numerous projects underway by (young) academic scholars: jurists, such as the *Working Group of Young International Law Scholars*, who since 2018 have run a blog dedicated to “Cultural Heritage in a Post-Colonial World”; ethnologists, like those gathered around Paul Basu at the heart of the group *Museum affordances: activating West African ethnographic archives and collections through experimental museology* at SOAS in London; art historians, such as those who have participated along with Felicity Bodenstein and Didier Houénou, in July 2018, at the Summer University of Porto-Novo in Benin around the theme of “Heritage-making Processes”²⁸. Along with these groups, we should also add a generation of young curators who, in Africa as much as in Europe and in France, (for example, in Angoulême, Nantes, or Lyon) continue to question with ever more acuity the way in which we might “re-invent the museums”, to borrow the title from the remarkable collective work directed in 2007 by El Hadji Malick Ndiaye, who is currently serving as the curator of the IFAN Museum of African Arts (Musée Théodore-Monod d’art africain) in Dakar. In a certain way, the creation by the Collège de France, in March 2016, of an international chair dedicated to the cultural history of artistic cultural heritage in Europe, and therefore also dedicated to the collections arising from out of the colonial period, bears witness to the capacity of academic institutions to attempt grasping a much larger question of a global scale.

But besides these academic milieus and those of the various associations, it’s particularly within the world of contemporary creation—from cultural knowledge to popular culture—that the question of the possible restitution of the collections formed around the colonial period has found the most significant echo over the past several years. In 2017, one of the great gatherings of the contemporary global art world, the *documenta* held in Cassel, granted a central place to the motif of restitutions. An article from *Le Monde* by Philippe Dagen claimed that “Cassel’s *documenta* brought together the remnants of colonial pillaging and that of the Nazis. From now on, artists are taking aim at these subjects that have been kept silent for decades and our placing the facts directly in front of the public, with dates and proof.”²⁹ In May 2018, under the title “Reprendre” [To take back], The Centre Pompidou presented a series of artists’ films devoted to the same subject: *The Visitor* (2007) by the Swiss artist Uriel Orlow and *Fang: An Epic*

²⁸ See also Thomas Laely, Marc Meyer and Raphael Schwere (eds.), *Museum Cooperation between Africa and Europe: A New Field for Museum Studies*, Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2018; Julien Bondaz, Florence Graezer Bideau, Cyril Isnart and Anaïs Leblon (eds.), *Les Vocabulaires locaux du “patrimoine”. Traductions, négociations et transformations*, Berlin, LIT Verlag, 2018.

²⁹ *Le Monde*, August 17, 2017.

Journey (2001) by the American filmmaker Susan Vogel. More recently, in September 2018, the artist Kader Attia publically questioned, during a conference organized by his hosts, whether or not it was possible to “decolonize the collection”. We could continue to multiply the number of examples in the areas of literature and especially in dance, such as the astute fable woven by Arno Betina about a fictive reclamation of a Bamileke masterpiece at the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (*Des lions comme des danseuses*, 2015), the novel by Fatoumata Sissi Ngom which focuses on a curator of African origin whose life is turned upside down by the discovery of a mask in a Parisian Museum (*Le Silence du Totem*, 2018) or the performance of the dancer and choreographer Faustin Linyekula at the Metropolitan Museum of New York, *Banataba* (2017), inspired by a statue from the Lengola ethnic group housed in the American museum. As far as the film industry is concerned, it has taken hold of the subject of restitution for quite some time now, with a number of spectacular *blockbusters*: *Chinese Zodiac 12* by Jackie Chan, where the plot centers around a group of martial arts heroes attempting to recover cultural objects to take back to China that had been pillaged by the French and English during the 19th century; *Invasion 1897* (2014) by the Nigerian filmmaker Lancelot Oduwa Imasuen, where a Nigerian student steals a work of art from the British Museum in London that belonged to his ancestors; the stunning *Black Panther* by Marvel Studios (2018) that grossed over a billion dollars at the box-office, and whose plot unfurled in front of the African vitrines of a fictitious African museum, during a fascinating dialogue between a young African-American and a museum curator... Today, throughout the world, the question of translocations of cultural heritage and the property of objects that were musealized in Europe during the colonial period has become a subject shared at all levels of knowledge and culture.

Last but not least, and it’s less paradoxical than it appears: within the European milieu of art dealers and art collectors, we’re beginning to see a number of discreet and efficient attempts at taking restitution into one’s own hands with the “definitive” restitutions of African works of art, without the least expectation or support from public powers. Such is the case, for example, of the Parisian gallerist, Robert Vallois, who was the initiator and sponsor of a museum exhibiting over a hundred works from the Beninese dynasty (including royal scepters) in a Cotonou Cultural Center acquired through his sponsors and those of a group of colleagues on the international art market. There is also the case of a Dutch art collector, Jan Baptist Bedaux, who engaged in important negotiations to offer his rather impressive collection of Tellem and Dogon objects back to the National Museum of Mali in Bamako (650 pieces), and the offerings of the collector Joe Mulholland and his family, in Glasgow, who envisioned offering a hundred or so precious pieces of art to the same museum. Or the case of the British citizen, Mark Walker, the inheritor of some bronze statues taken by his grandfather from Benin City during the

punitive expeditions of 1897, who simply decided to directly retribute them to the Oba of Benin in 2014, accompanying the gesture with the following commentary: “It was very humbling to be greeted with such great enthusiasm and gratitude, for nothing really. I was just returning some art objects to a place where I feel they will be properly looked after.”³⁰

³⁰ Ellen Otzen, “The Man who Returned his Grandfather’s Looted Art”, BBC.com, February 26, 2015.

1. To Restitute

“When men perish, they enter into history. When statues perish, they enter into art. This botanical garden of death is what we call Culture.”

Chris Marker and Alain Resnais, *Les statues meurent aussi*, 1953

One of the questions that we immediately had to confront from the very beginning of the mission is the meaning we should grant to the term restitution. During his speech held on November 28, 2017, in Ouagadougou, the French president Emmanuel Macron proclaimed his desire to work toward “within the next five years, [...] seeing the conditions put in place so as to allow for the temporary or definitive restitution of African cultural heritage returned to Africa.” In the preamble of the letter of the mission that organized the framework for this present work, he just as clearly outlined his desire for “launching a determined action in favor of the circulation of works of art as well as the sharing of collective knowledge regarding the contexts in which the works of art were created, but also how they were acquired, sometimes being pilfered, sometimes saved or destroyed.” This circulation, he continues, “could perhaps take on a variety of forms even including a permanent modification of national inventories and restitutions”. The object of his comments seems clear: it’s specifically about carrying out restitutions of objects of “Cultural Heritage”, and moreover, the term is mentioned three times in the letter.

Removing the Ambiguities

Nevertheless, this mission letter, since it evokes both the idea of “temporary restitutions” and “definitive restitutions” is the harbinger of an ambiguity that appears to merit immediately being removed from the equation. At first glance, the expression “temporary restitutions” seems to function as an oxymoron: it can leave one to think that the objects concerned will only be restituted for a finite period of time, that is, that their return will not have a definitive character. This formulation thereby opens the door to debates of interpretation, as could already be demonstrated by one of the exchanges we had with some of our interlocutors, who were convinced that in the end, that the project of “restitution” was actually merely about a desire for “circulating” the acquired objects of African Cultural Heritage. This double direction invites us to propose and consider an analytical reading of the various postures polarizing the debates around restitutions. One of these readings suggests that today’s museums, as depositories of objects, should become more thoroughly engaged in the circulation and movement of the objects by initiating and amplifying more partnerships and exchanges with museums across the African continent as well as with its cultural actors and institutions. Another position that is often supported in the debates by representatives from cultures who’ve been robbed of their cultural legacy is that of the transfer of ownership, where what’s really at stake is the symbolic impact and who gets to oversee the care of the objects as the primary entities responsible for the items of cultural heritage. The present report explores and defends the path toward permanent restitutions, through a series of varied arguments that will be deployed in the following pages. For those adepts who have a vision for restitutions based on the dynamics of the “circulation” of objects, this terminological substitution appears to present several advantages. It allows for the outlining of the moral responsibility that is tied to the term “restitution”, and to thereby accept a certain impasse in the oftentimes complex biographical narratives regarding the pieces in question, as well as the oftentimes problematic conditions in which the pieces came into the hands of the national French collections. By forgoing the question around the legitimacy of ownership, this position perpetuates a sort of ongoing indebtedness of the dispossessed cultures to France, which is precisely the reason why it’s an important aspect of the debate concerning the permanent restitution of cultural heritage. Moreover, a preference for the option of “circulation” avoids legal questions around a veritable restitution: what are the terms for the transfer of property, and the conditions linked to such an approach—namely the necessary modifications to the French law concerning cultural heritage and their inalienability and inaccessibility. Within the

framework of our mission, we have chosen to provide the following definition for the expression “temporary restitutions”, as it appears in the mission letter: a transitory solution, allowing for the proper time to create the juridical dispositives allowing and assuring the definitive return, without any other stipulations or conditions, of cultural heritage objects of sub-Saharan Africa back onto the African continent.

What Restitution Means

“To restitute”, literally means to return an item to its legitimate owner. This term serves to remind us that the appropriation and enjoyment of an item that one restitutes rest on a morally reprehensible act (rape, pillaging, spoliation, ruse, forced consent, etc.) In this case, *to restitute* aims to *re-institute* the cultural item to the legitimate owner for his legal use and enjoyment, as well as all the other prerogatives that the item confers (*usus, fructus, and abusus*). The implicit act of the *gesture* of restitution is very clearly the recognition of the illegitimacy of the property that one had previously claimed ownership of, no matter what the duration of time was. As a consequence, the act of restitution attempts to put things back in order, into proper harmony. To openly speak of restitutions is to speak of justice, or a re-balancing, recognition, of restoration and reparation, but above all: it’s a way to open a pathway toward establishing new cultural relations based on a newly reflected upon ethical relation.

Consequently, the questions that emerge from thinking about restitutions are thus far from being limited to only the juridical aspects and to questions of legitimate ownership. The implications tied to the method of restitution are also of a political and symbolic order, if not also of a philosophical and relational order. Restitutions open up a profound reflection on history, memories, and the colonial past, concerning the history as well as the formation and development of Western museum collections. But just as importantly the question of restitution also bears on the question of the different interpretations or conceptions of cultural heritage, of the museum, and their various modalities of the presentation of objects as well as their circulation and, in the end, the nature and quality of relations between people and nations.

Translocations, Transformations

For the societies who have waited several decades for the return of their cultural objects, and in some cases, have endured centuries of their absence, a fundamental question naturally emerges regarding their symbolic re-appropriation. Is it possible to *re-institute* cultural artifacts back into their societal milieus of origin, to see them regain their proper function and use, after such a long absence? If certain symbolic dispositives remain operational, the large majority of these originary environments have undergone profound mutations, certain geographies have even been displaced, and history has continued to carve out its unpredictable invisible paths.

What the ensemble of displaced objects constitute is in fact a “diaspora”³¹, according to the specialist of Modern African Art, John Pepper. Once they have been displaced, the objects endure a variety of processes and experiences of successive re-semanticization, and have undergone an excessive imposition of several layers of signification. The cultural theorist, Lotte Arndt, for her part, notes that besides the literal violence such as theft or embargo, one must also consider the additional violence inflected onto the objects themselves, who often see their “accouterments” despoiled, varnished, or remodeled and in the end, their names, identities, and significations, and functions, completely destroyed or altered.”³² How are we able then to reconstitute to these objects the sense and functions that once belonged to them, without neglecting the fact that they had been captured and then reshaped by a plurality of semantic, symbolic, and epistemological dispositives for more than a century? In certain cases, the sacred items or objects of worship have become works of art worth contemplating in their own right, ethnographic objects, or mere artifacts whose value can be derived by considering them as witnesses of history. Simon Njami emphasizes that the return of objects does not mean restituting them as they once were, but re-investing them with a social function. It’s not about a return of the same, but of a “different same”.³³

And here we can see all the entanglement of questions, of the additions and subtractions of value that the question of the restitution of objects of cultural heritage brings forth within a different space-time.

So why then seek to reconstitute? Is it a question of attempting to alleviate the symbolically “cumbersome” collections so as to sell off a heavy burden of a colonial

³¹ John Pepper, “Africa’s diasporas of images”, *Third Text*, vol. 19, n. 4, July 2005, p. 339.

³² Lotte Arndt, “Réflexions sur le renversement de la charge de la preuve comme levier postcolonial”, *bs n°12. Le journal de Bétonsalon*, 2011-2012, p. 11-19.

³³ Atelier de Dakar, panel “Ce que restituer veut dire”, June 12, 2018

past, and, along with it any attempt at rendering this past intelligible? To use the symbolic space as a tool of *soft power* aiming to “revalorize” France’s image to an African generation of youth that is less and less francophile? To send a message to the African diasporas in France? Or is it to institute a new relational ethics between peoples by helping to give back to them an impeded or *blocked* memory? So as to let them set about doing the necessary work regarding their own history by accepting to debate around one of the chapters of Africa’s colonial past as well as the demand for truth which is a corollary of this chapter? For the Africans themselves, what could restitutions possibly mean?

Memory and Amnesia of Losses

The majority of objects present in European ethnographic museums were acquired within the colonial framework. For some of the African nations, in some cases it is still possible to locate the aesthetic and cultural context of the pieces [oeuvres] once they have been restituted. Certain communities have been able to keep a relation with their objects of cultural heritage alive through the perpetuation of traditions and rituals: chiefdoms in Western Cameroon, the religious communities in Benin, Senegal, or Nigeria. Within these social contexts, certain objects would have little trouble rediscovering a function, even if it is somewhat reinvented, within the cultural landscape of the communities.³⁴

For other African communities, the amnesia has already done its work and the erasure of memory has been so successful that communities have even begun to lose any remaining knowledge of this cultural heritage or recognize the depth of the loss that has been suffered. This information explains the various gaps in interest around the question of restitutions on the African continent, as we were able to discern throughout the interviews we were able to conduct on site. In countries where the loss of items of cultural heritage was linked to violent, painful, or tragic events (the end of the Abomey Kingdom, the sacking of Benin City, the battle of Adwa in Ethiopia, etc.) the memory is still very alive and the question still holds a fiery place within the collective. For other communities, the question of restitution appears to be secondary, the translocation having taken place without making much noise nor

³⁴ During the workshop held in Dakar on June 12, 2018, the Prince Kum’a Ndumbe III reminded everyone that object will not be returned into the void, and that Africa is alive and well. The objects will be re-integrated into a “family”, and will provide the occasion for an extraordinary opportunity for a “rebirth” for the continent. Their return will formulate a synthesis between “what has always already been there, and that which returns and lives again”.

in arousing much antagonism, through ethnographic missions or the release of objects into the art market. It is clear that the question of memory work, of memorialization and the work of history (the work of writing or re-writing of history) are just as important as restitutions strictly speaking.

Re-socializing Objects of Cultural Heritage

Thus, for the African countries, it's about accomplishing a twofold task of the reconstruction of their memories and one of self-reinvention, through a re-semanticization and a re-socialization of the objects of their cultural heritage, through reconnecting these objects with the current societies and the questions and problems that these contemporary societies pose. It will be up to these new African communities to define their own vision of cultural heritage, the epistemological dispositives and the ecologies in which they would like to re-insert these objects, and these ecologies are necessarily plural.

Our travels throughout several African countries led us to taking into account a variety of potential welcoming apparatuses: from ultra-modern institutions (such as the Musée des Civilisations Noires in Dakar), to the “cultural space” (the palace to the king of Bafoussam in Cameroon); from classical first rate museums (such as the National Museum of Mali in Bamako) to more traditional forms of architecture that have been re-vitalized by new architectural innovations (musée du Sultan des Bamoun in Famboun in Cameroon)—across the entire African continent, cultural heritage sites exist, and in certain countries they are numerous and have emerged from out of a variety of typologies (Fig. 1).

According to the various functions designated to them upon their return, the objects could find their place within art centers, university museums, schools, or even at the center of the communities for ritual uses, with the possibility of an oscillating use and return of the objects to local centers charged with their preservation. This is already the case in Mali where the National Museum regularly loans out certain objects to communities for ritual practices, and after these rituals have taken place, the museum will come and recuperate the objects in order to continuing preserving them in the National Museum, as the current director of the sites, Salia Malé was able to explain to us. Our fieldwork was thus also able to reveal that the distribution of objects of cultural heritage within social space could be conceived of in a variety of different ways and configurations, and that the model of a centralized museum for all objects of cultural heritage is only one possible example among many others.

This spatial explosion of cultural heritage thus allows for objects to be disseminated within social space, and to thereby fulfill a different function at each site (pedagogical, memorial, creative, spiritual, mediator, etc.).

Objects of cultural heritage can also lead to redefining and redesigning territorialities thus inscribing themselves within geographies that exceed a national framework. As a result of colonialism, certain objects produced by communities today find themselves straddling several borders. In these instances, objects of cultural heritage would serve the function of precisely abolishing the border sketched out by the conference of Berlin (1884-1885) through the mobilization of communities around material items symbolizing their unity and their fluid identity within geographies that transcend borders. For example, the Omarian family as descendants of the El Hadj Omar Tall, are spread throughout Senegal, Mali, Mauritania, and Guinea. Every year, they organize a gathering around the spiritual heritage of El Hadj Omar Tall, a portion of whose relics are currently housed in the National History Museum of the Havre, with other manuscripts being housed (517 items) in the Fond Archinard at the French National Library, and his sabre being housed at the Musée de l'Armée in Paris. Since 1994, this community has asked for the French authorities for the return of these relics along with the digitizing of the manuscripts. So far, all requests have been in vain.

This is simply one example among many others of how we can begin to think and reflect on the notion of objects of cultural heritage in a much more open and nuanced manner. At the heart of African societies, to think the relation between things and their life cycle, to think the very idea itself of conservation or shared ownership, but also the modalities of their appropriations by communities, takes on a plurality of forms. In this way, the potential return of objects should take into account the wealth and multiplicity of these alternative conceptions of cultural heritage, through releasing oneself from the lone framework of European thought. It therefore seems necessary, within the framework of reflections concerning restitutions, to *demystify* Western notions of cultural heritage and preservation.

Of the Life and Spirit of Objects

The question of a life of an object is often thought of solely from the unique perspective of their conservation. This question often plays the part of a hidden fear on the part of the professionals of Western museums and the public at large. This often leads to regular issues questioning the adequate competencies throughout

African museums in regards to the conservation of objects, without ever having a larger discussion about how these societies were able to conserve items produced there over a number of centuries within their respective climates and ecologies. If indeed the question concerning the various ways of conserving these objects is important it will only be facilitated by the project of restitution: the situation of museums in Africa varies considerably from one country to the next, and the return of objects to the museums will certainly lead, when necessary, to a reexamination of the upkeep of the pieces.³⁵ We can also add to this the fact that societies often have a poor understanding of how to maintain the life cycles of the artifacts which they themselves have created.

In a number of African societies, *statues also perish*. They have a certain lifespan and are caught within a regenerative economic cycle founded on a fluid materiality and ontological identity. Certain masks are buried for several years and then reproduced so as to then renew the energetic influxes that grant them an operative power. Within a rather particular modality of the articulation of the relations between the spirit, matter, and the living, they are the depositories of flows and energetic fields that turn them into animated objects and into active forces, thus mediating between the different orders of reality. These objects are also the bearers of a reserve of the imagination as well as the material manifestation of forms of knowledge [saviors]. Fishing nets that encode algorithms from fractals to anthropomorphic statues in passing by amulet-filled vests: the work of decoding the various forms of knowledge they conceal as well as the comprehension of the epistemes that have produced them still remains largely a work to be done. Throughout large parts of their history, African societies have produced original forms of mediation between the spirit, matter, and the living. Achille Mbembe has been very specific in indicating that these societies generated open systems of mutual resource-sharing concerning the forms of knowledge at the heart of participative ecosystems, wherein the world is a reservoir of potentials.³⁶ Furthermore, certain of these artifacts are not mere objects but active subjects. And it's by way of rituals, ceremonies, and through these

³⁵ There are at least 500 museums in sub-Saharan Africa. The state of the museums in this part of the African continent is heterogeneous. Some countries have museums of quality and the necessary expertise to immediately welcome objects that will be carefully housed and conserved (South Africa, Nigeria, Mali, Senegal, etc.); others have already begun to set the necessary groundwork for constructing new museum infrastructures as well as the restoration of the already existing museum infrastructures (as is the case in Benin and Cameroon); and for still another final category of museums, work is still yet to be done so as to improve and ensure the quality of the museum infrastructure. However, the history of restitutions has shown that once works are returned, the Nation-States are quick to welcome them and prepare the adequate political infrastructures necessary.

³⁶ Achille Mbembe, *Notes sur les objets sauvages*, forthcoming.

relations of reciprocity, Mbembe clarifies, that we see the operation of an attribution of a subjectivity to a given inanimate object.

Objects are the mediators of correspondences, of metamorphoses, and passages within an ecosystem characterized by fluidity and circularity. Within a reticular universe, objects become the operators of a relational and plastic identity where the goal is to participate in the world and to basically dominate it. In African art, as philosopher Souleymane Bachir Diagne is quick to emphasize, the African statuary cannot only be understood as derived from a figurative or analogical art: it is the support and vector of a philosophical and symbolic discourse as well as the expression of the ontology of primary force.³⁷ All these archives, forms of knowledge, universes, and the cognitive resources they conceal remain to be explored and could lead to ambitious (academic and artistic) research programs.

Putting History to Work, Reconstructing Memory

The African continent evolves within a regime of historicity where the memories of the colonial situation influence the contemporary presence in the world of African peoples. These memories continue to structure ways of being, the relations between nations that were long ago formed through the viewpoint of the colonized and the colonizer, and this set of relations could be seen as much on the African continent as in the diasporas. Postcolonial studies, in the way in which they have developed since the 1980s, reveal the latent and diffuse coloniality within the multiple relations in which the now independent nations engage with their former (political, economic, epistemological, and cultural) metropolis. To escape from the representations and the lack of reflections about this past requires a work of history as well as the imaginaries of a relation that, as well, needs to be decolonized.

Within this framework, it seems essential here to recall that the absence of cultural heritage can render memory silent and make the essential work of history of the young nations rather difficult when faced with the delicate question of the construction of a political community and a project for the future. To envision the possible of the future requires clearing away the painful legacies of the colonial past, of doing away with a sense of indebtedness. If this can be accompanied by a return of emblematic objects, the memory work can function as an operator for the reconstruction of the identity of subjects and communities. When the collective

³⁷ Souleymane Bachir Diagne, *African Art as Philosophy*, Kolkata: Seagull Books, 2012.

considers the past as a “problem to resolve”, above all if this past has left a trail of trauma (violence, wars, genocides), a work of re-appropriation and negotiation vis-à-vis the past is necessary in order for a cure to take hold along with a process of resilience. And here, a history is inevitable: it undoes the narrative of the present and offers up an intelligibility of the contemporary dynamics, and the part of these dynamics that was determined by the past. As the historian Marc Bloch highlights, history as a “science of humanity within time” allows us to think of ourselves as a “social body” in movement.

The American historian, Lynn Hunt reminds us that historical truth, as irrefutable and proven as it may be, that is, based on archives, traces, and eyewitness accounts, is never completely sheltered from threats.³⁸ This “truth” is all the more fragile when the traces that were supposed to document it were flawed. We must understand that the context in which these objects of cultural heritage were taken, spoiled, or transferred. The archives and objects of cultural heritage contribute to this intelligibility. This work on historiography allows, among other things, to escape the idea of a single narrative and assume a plurality of perspectives.

The younger generation of Africans who have not lived through the colonial moment, but who are the inheritors of a history that has been transmitted via fragments and a memory occluded by a truncated history, remain hostages to an inadmissible history since it has yet to be worked through by way of speech and representation. In a recent work on colonial “trauma”, Karima Lazali rightfully emphasizes that “the part of History refused by politics is transmitted from generation to generation and fabricates psychic mechanisms that keep the subject within a position of shame for existing.”³⁹ The necessity for the comprehension of these effects of coloniality on contemporary African and European subjectivities is fundamental. The after-effects of colonialism in Europe and Africa will not simply be overcome through slogans stating that it’s now time to move on, but rather through a collective work concerning the ill-considered reflection on a history that we are the inheritors of, and through the clarification concerning the responsibilities each party had in the construction of this history. The question of displaced cultural legacy is one of these ill-considered reflections. Lazali is also quick to emphasize the importance of dealing with the invisible and silent remnants of colonial violence (in the clinical sense of the term: to care and examine), most notably an examination of the survivals that leave no trace. Here what we must begin to deal with is the work

³⁸ Lynn Hunt, *History Why It Matters*, Cambridge (Mass.): Polity, 2018.

³⁹ Karima Lazali, *Le trauma colonial. Une enquête sur les effets psychiques et politiques contemporains de l’oppression coloniale en Algérie*, Paris: La Découverte, 2015.

of the reconstruction and recuperation of these missing traces of history and memory—as if they were phantom limbs—above all when history has been deprived of available archives.

Of the Circulation of Objects and the Plasticity of Categories

Since the 19th century, the museum has been conceived in Europe as the site for the conservation of national and universal cultural heritage. A space for the instruction and production of forms of knowledge, a “microcosm” “in which objects, that are systematically displayed, are supposed to seduce and convince” according to the equation put forth by Phillippe Descola.⁴⁰ From its very origins, and within a logic of national affirmation, the museum allows for European powers to stage their aptitude for the absorption and classification of the world. Competition between European museums leads to a typological inventiveness. In this context, we can think of how the arts, cultures, eras, things from nature, ways of life and people are placed into a coherent system, so they can then be placed into a series and compared.

The problem arises when the museum no longer becomes the site for the affirmation of national identity, but, as Benoît de L’Estoile indicates, is seen rather as a museum of the *Others*⁴¹; when the museum conserves objects procured from somewhere else and assumes the right to speak about these *Others* (or in the name of the *Others*) and claims to declare the truth concerning them. Germain Viatte, director of the museological project of the Musée du quai Branly has been specific in stating that the Quai Branly museum’s task was devoted to “the art of non-Western cultures and civilizations”. As such, the ethnographic museums, which some have taken to labeling as “universal” where artifacts from Africa are collected under a myriad of diverse imperatives, have been and continue to remain the sites of the production of discourses and representations of African societies. However, any power is first and foremost a power of controlling the narrative, as the historian Patrick Boucheron is quick to remind us.⁴² Through these objects and the narratives placed onto these so-called ethnographic collections are ways of controlling representations of societies, often essentializing them, as well as creating a

⁴⁰ Philippe Descola, “Passages de témoins”, *Le Débat*, no. 147, 2007, p. 138.

⁴¹ Benoît de L’Estoile, *Le Goût des autres: de l’Exposition coloniale aux arts premiers*, Paris: Flammarion, 2007.

⁴² See Patrick Boucheron’s “leçon inaugurale” at the Collège de France, December 17, 2015 (*Ce que peut l’histoire*, Paris: Fayard, 2016)

crystallization of categories oftentimes produced by coloniality upon the peoples and African cultures. In the past, certain documentary regimes and scientific paradigms have been applied to these objects. Today these same regimes and scientific paradigms have come under great scrutiny thereby calling their legitimacy into question if not rendering them completely devoid of meaning. Not to mention that the very duration, temporality, and meaning of these objects has been under an exclusive control and authority of Western institutional museum structures that decide how long one can have access to these objects.

Operations for placing these cultural objects on loan to African museums for a specific duration have recently been underway within a framework of international cooperation. In 2006-2007, for the occasion of the exhibit, *Béhanzin, Roi d'Abomey*, 30 objects from the royal treasure that had been integrated into the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac were presented to Benin, at Cotonou, via the Fondation Zinsou. The event—that was extended due to the success of the exhibition and the large interest on the part of the viewing public of Benin—had an important reverberating impact on the rest of the continent. Nevertheless, at the same time that this sort of promising circulation of art was happening, France was still actively refusing to reopen the debate concerning the restitution of the art objects in question. The material and cultural appropriation of objects not only leads to having control over their mobility, but also over their semantic subversion. In the relation of history/power, for the objects present within the French ethnographic collections, it thus becomes a question of a fixed monopoly concerning their significations on the part of those who had the means at their disposal to produce the narratives about these cultural art objects.

Restitution, through the transfer of propriety that it allows for, breaks up this monopoly of control concerning the mobility of objects by Western museums. These cultural objects are then free to circulate in a new manner, but within a temporality, a rhythm and a meaning, placed on them by their legitimate owners. These newly freed objects could help to re-draw trans-national territorial borders thereby re-occupying spaces of the circulation of communities, but also so as to help expand the circulation of these objects on a more continental and global scale. Furthermore, re-appropriating for *oneself*, as a culture, allows for a toppling of colonial categories, thereby helping to re-fluidify fixed geographies and to invert the colonial hegemonic relationship in place that was instituted by a fixed location of the cultural objects along with monopoly of the discourse concerning them. Restitution also allows for the recreation of the historiography of the collections through reconsidering the history of the objects as well as having access to *epistemogonies* that have

established them within a primary universe of sense. But also, it allows for the cohabitation of several regimes of forms of knowledge concerning the objects of these communities.

A New Relational Ethics

Objects, having become diasporas, are the mediators of a relation that needs to be reinvented. Their return to their communities of origin does not have as its aim to substitute one form of physical and semantic imprisonment by another, that would this time be justified by the idea of the “rightful property owner”. It is indeed a question of re-activating a concealed memory and restituting to the cultural heritage its signifying, integrative, dynamic, and mediating functions within contemporary African societies. But, through the re-appropriation of these objects, it’s also about once again becoming the guardians of the human community. These objects, while being geographically localized, are the expression of human brilliance and are a material translation of humanity’s creativity. The faces of human experience they reflect are universal. Most of the museum curators on the African continent with whom we spoke see restitution in this manner and are prepared to circulate the pieces of cultural heritage within both a continental and global geography. It is even possible to consider the creation of apparatuses to fill the void left by these objects, in the guise of the creation of replicas to be housed in the Western museums, whose energetic aura will be assured through the machinery of narrative and the possibilities that digital tools allow for as well as ICT [Internet Communications Technology]. In the Ardèche, the Pont’Arc Cave has proposed a facsimile of the Chauvet cave so as to allow visitors to continue to appreciate cultural history while also preserving the original and simultaneously losing none of the experiential and emotional effects of a visit to such a site. The objects from sub-Saharan Africa have also benefitted from the welcoming hospitality of communities, curators, researchers, and visitors, throughout centuries, without having to go seek this hospitality out, and have maintained this relation in Europe, sometimes becoming rather attached to it.

The argument according to which the act of restitution implies that cultural heritage objects only retain their legitimate life within their originary geocultural environments—and equating this with the idea that the cultural objects must therefore remain at their originary home, is not acceptable. This position only leads to an impasse in the long and rich history of museum cooperation between Europe

and Africa and the shared the circulation of art works and collections. Hamady Bocoum⁴³, the director of the Musée des Civilisations Noires [Museum of Black Civilizations] in Dakar, is even of the opinion that the cultural heritage and legacy of African museums is not merely limited to African objects. Other civilizations must also be represented in African museums.

Furthermore, as Benoît de L'Estoile has noted, the return of objects to Africa does not imply resigning them to a new form of an enslavement to a cultural identity, but rather bears the promise of a new economy of exchange⁴⁴. These cultural objects have become the products of a relational history. These objects can enjoy a new life and become what Krzysztof Pomian calls “semiophores”—objects as carriers of *new* meaning.⁴⁵

Of Compensation and of Reparation

Nevertheless, this new relational ethics cannot possibly take into account the entire work of historical truth concerning the diverse conditions in which these objects were displaced; concerning the reality and the depth of this loss that African societies have suffered through, a wound that can still be permanently felt in a variety of ways even today. The thorny question of reparations cannot be eluded. It is a question that is often evoked in the context of crimes against humanity (the genocide of the Hereros and the Namas), in the context of violent massacres linked to colonial conquests, or the predation of economic resources for which losses seem more easily quantifiable. However, when we reflect on the question of cultural heritage objects, we must understand that it's not simply objects that were taken, but reserves of energy, creative resources, reservoirs of potentials, forces engendering alternative figures and forms of the real, forces of germination; and this loss is incommensurable. Simply giving back these cultural objects won't be the proper compensation. This force arises from a relation and mode of participation in the world that has been irremediably trampled upon.

Thus, it's less a question of reclaiming financial compensation than a symbolic re-establishment through a demand for truth. Compensation here consists in offering to repair the relation. The restitution of objects (having become the nodes of a

⁴³ June 12, Dakar Workshop, Théodore-Monod d'art africain at IFAN.

⁴⁴ Conference at the Collège de France during the symposium “Du droit des objets à disposer d'eux-mêmes”, June 21, 2018, organized by Bénédicte Savoy and Yann Potin.

⁴⁵ Krzysztof Pomian, *Collectionneurs, amateurs et curieux. Paris, Venise : XVI-XVIII siècle*, Paris: Gallimard, Bibliothèque des histoires, 1987, p. 49.

relation), also implies a fair and just historiographic work and a new relational ethics; by operating a symbolic redistribution repairing the ties and renewing them around reinvented relational modalities that are qualitatively improved.

Human communities are also thought within their imaginary, as physical and sometimes mystical bodies for religious communities. The absent member finds the community. In *Reflecting memory*, Kader Attia shows that the recognition of this absent one allows for the restitution of something that, if it is not there, continues to demand to be put back in its proper place.⁴⁶ It operates like the mirror that, by reflecting the missing limb of the amputee, allows him to mourn, and to palliate the pain, which is indeed real, caused by the phantom limb. The analogy can be made between individual pain and those pains of immaterial collectives, that have become obscured through a collective denial (the refusal of recognizing and working through painful memories as a result of colonialism for example.) In these instances, the work of restitution and the production of meaning that accompanies it, repairs the absence of the objects of cultural heritage and their effect on the collective psyche.

However, the cure linked to the process of reparation, for the communities affected by the loss of their cultural heritage, can remain problematic if it is not founded on something other than on the recognition of the other as an inflicted prejudice. It can lead to a syndrome of incompleteness, if this cure doesn't take place. A hobbled resilience, since it is exclusively dependent on the recognition of the other (by the other). An auto-soteriological process, taking the form of self-reparations, through a work on one's own history should take place by endogenizing the latter and by emancipating oneself from the acts and speech of the other.

The Question of Archives

Intimately tied to the collective consciousness and to the historical processes in question regarding the restitution of objects, the archives constituted during the colonial era play a central role in the reconstruction process of memory. For quite some time, several former French colonies, Algeria being the first to come to mind, have requested access to the archives of their own history. In Africa, all of our interlocutors insisted not only on the restitution of cultural heritage objects held in French museums but also on the need for a serious reflection on the question of

⁴⁶ Kader Attia, *Reflecting Memory*, Documentary film, 2016, HD film, 40 min.

archives. In many places, these archives have become a veritable topos of *missing links*, relayed by the press, certain contemporary artists, and political personnel in Africa as well as historians on both continents.

To stick with the one French example of this: at the time of the independence of the colonies, the archives produced by the colonial authorities on the African continent were divided up into two large collections: the archives of Western French Africa remained in Dakar by way of a common accord between France and Senegal. Those of French Equatorial Africa were transferred overseas to Aix-en-Provence (to the sovereign archives) while some of them remained in Brazzaville (in the archives of management), this division of archives was not always the strictest. Other types of documents stemming from ethnographic inquiries led in sub-Saharan Africa during the 1930s were handed over to the museum archives or university institutions. For several years now, concerted efforts were made in Europe to remedy this lack of sources and resources.⁴⁷

Within the framework of our present mission concerning restitutions, only the archives that are currently conserved in public museums (or affiliated establishments) will be taken into consideration: 1. files concerning art works, inventory records, any form of surplus expertise produced during their entrance into the museum; 2. audio-visual material derived from ethnographic inquiries, sound recordings, photos, documentary films on African societies and the individuals studied by French scientists. As far as the principal questions of administrative, military, and diplomatic archives, they largely surpass the question of “the temporary or definitive restitution of African cultural heritage to Africa” requested by Emmanuel Macron. It is of our opinion that this other question is also of the utmost urgency and should be the object of another specific mission handed over to specialists on archives and also those on the history of Africa.

⁴⁷ In 2013, within a framework of a general program on African borders, France officially provided print as well as digital copies of the French archives documenting the process of the demarcation of borders in Africa beginning in the middle of the 19th century. In 2015, two historians and specialists of Africa, Jean-Pierre Bat (National Archives in France) and Vincent Hiribarren (King’s College London) along with the support and cooperation of Brice Isnove Owabira (director of the national archives of the Congo) and Raoul Ngokaba (director of administrative and financial affairs at the General direction of cultural heritage archives) created a website online offering a glimpse into the documents conserved in Brazzaville concerning not only the Republic of the Congo but also Gabon, The Central African Republic, and Chad. More recently, at the end of September 2018, Belgium began digitizing “all the archives contained in the AfricaMuseum (Musée de l’Afrique central) in Tervuren and the royal archives” and “gave them” back to Rwanda following a series of priorities laid out by a Rwandan delegation of archivists. The project will take place over two years and will have a budget of 400,000 euros.

2. Restitutions and Collections

Wanting “to reconstitute African cultural heritage to Africa”, as Emmanuel Macron proposes, requires a precise knowledge of the African collections conserved in France (Where are they located? What do they comprise?) It also requires complete clarity on the historical and scientific context regarding how the collections became conserved and housed within the current museum collections. It will also require a common group of professionals from museums and those working in cultural heritage, in France as much as in Africa, who will become the historical actors within a complex project. The temporality of the restitutions, the choice of objects whose return will be prioritized, and a common elaboration of “know-how” regarding the departures and returns of the objects are all just as important and meaningful as the acts of restitution themselves.

The Time of Returns

In France, the massive arrival and musealization of African cultural heritage didn't happen over night. It took place over a relatively long period, beginning in the latter part of the 19th century and continuing through the second half of the 20th century. Obviously, no one in France or Africa foresees the return of the entirety of these historically formed ensembles which have been progressively transformed through a symbolic, economic, and scientific usage that has taken place in France.

What's more, and we must insist on this point, at the current time, the process of restitutions can only concern a portion of the objects in question. The process must be a progressive one. It must be supported by a rigorous analysis of the historical, typological, and symbolic criteria. It must recognize the place that these displaced items of cultural heritage have occupied within the political struggles and imaginaries of their communities of origin. They must demonstrate their flexibility. And this process must keep in mind that, within the Western museum complex, individual and collective emotions as well as unexpected aesthetic pollinations and crystallizations have taken place in relation to these cultural items, which are at the very heart of the idea of culture and humanity. Culture not in the completed sense as "the sum of all forms of knowledge", but in the dynamic sense of an elaboration and a construction, of cultural mixing and hybridizations. All over the world, from one generation to the next, these objects continue to traverse temporalities and the preoccupations of mortals. These objects that traverse time contain within them a power of germination, which is a force in itself. And by interacting with them, new generations create new things, actualize new ideas and shepherd new forms into the world that until then, had not existed.

It can seem somewhat vain to want to obsessively formalize the criteria for restitutability, given the varied modes of appropriation of African cultural property and heritage by France and taking into account the spectrum of emotional responses (anger, claims, aspirations) in their countries of origin that are just as varied as a result of their absence. Certainly, these emotions should be expressed and used as a sort of navigational compass. But the "intellectual effort", to refer back again to the words of Pierre Quoniam, above all consists of positing, between different parameters, and on a case by case basis, an ethically just equation that is also juridically viable. The restitutions must therefore be negotiated by way of these two criteria and should be adapted to the delays and rhythms of every party involved.

African Presence

Currently, within the French Public Collections, there are at least 90,000 objects originating from sub-Saharan Africa (Fig. 2). 70,000 pieces alone are housed in the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 20,000 more—and that's a modest estimate, there's probably a much larger number⁴⁸—are housed throughout several port cities

⁴⁸ According to the partial information we were able to gather from the Ministry of Culture within the framework of this mission, there are around 17,636 objects originating from sub-Saharan Africa currently housed in around 50 public museums in France. Due to a lack of reliable information at the time of the editing of this report, (for example, this estimate does not include those object housed in other important

(Cherbourg, Le Havre, La Rochelle, Bordeaux, Nantes, Marseille), in cities along the rivers connecting these cities with the inlands of French territory (Angoulême, Rennes) as well as in Lyon, Grenoble, Toulouse, Besançon, Dijon, and several other Parisian museums such as the Musée de l'Armée or in the Cultural Heritage Collection of La Monnaie de Paris. This very particular geography is divided into a second network of libraries who have generally benefitted from the distribution of an initially coherent collection of cultural heritage items, whereby the cultural heritage items in question were more than likely directly connected to books and manuscripts housed in the libraries originating from the same places as the cultural objects. These two types of institutions (museums and libraries) along with several public archives also conserve and house collections of photography, cinematographic collections, and sound documentation created during the colonial period, which, for African countries, represents a source of memory of the first order.

In France, three dynamics explain this unequal re-distribution of African cultural heritage: First—state dynamics that, since the French revolution and following a dual logic of national affirmation and international competition, are pushing France toward a “hyper-centralization” in Paris of the collections of cultural heritage judged to be the most important. Second—a flow dynamic, which explains the presence of a number of African objects within coastal cities implicated within mercantile trade with Africa as the arrival points for mercantile boats or military vessels. Third—a dynamic of inheritance, gifts, records, and donations important examples of which can be found as part of the initial constituting pieces of the French African collections in such museums as the Musée des Confluences in Lyon or those *spotlights* on African cultural items in museums in Besançon, Toulouse, or Grenoble. In addition to these secular museums, there are also what are called Mission Museums such as the Musée Africain de Lyon (which was closed to the public in 2017) sometimes housing several thousand objects collected in Africa by religious congregations.

With the exception of the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac and several regional museums (Angoulême, Lyon), the large diversity and majority of African collections are not that well known in France, not all of these collections are available for public viewing, and the cultural politics valuing these collections has not been of the same level of enthusiasm everywhere the collections are held, and the inventory is not always available. Without the existence of a single catalog detailing and containing all the collections of African cultural heritage in France, the criteria for the restitutability of

museum collections such as those in Marseille or the Havre) we can presume that the estimate presented here is much lower than the actual number of objects contained in French museums.

African cultural heritage relies mostly on the 70,000 items from sub-Saharan Africa housed in the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, that one can consult on-site through the management software for the collections, TMS. In additions to these cultural objects, there are another 90,000 documents held in the *iconothèque* (photographs, graphic art, drawings, post cards, posters, stamps...) regarding the quasi-totality of African countries that are materially present in the archives (vitrines, negatives, paper prints, photographic negatives, rolls of film...). A campaign for the digitization of the archives has led to a portion of these documents being available online through the databases at the museum.

Which Africa for which Restitutions?

All the sub-Saharan African countries, as they are situated within their current national borders, are represented within the collection of the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (Fig. 3-4)⁴⁹ With almost 10,000 pieces inventoried, Chad, which is located at a geographical and cultural transition point between North Africa and sub-Saharan Africa, arrives at the top of the list (with 9,296 objects). The second position is held by Cameroon (7,838), followed by the island of Madagascar (7,590), Mali (6,910), Ivory Coast (3,951), Benin (3,157), the Republic of the Congo (2,593), Gabon (2,448), Senegal (2,281), and Guinea (1,997). These countries at the top of the list, exclusively comprised of former French colonies, also include Ethiopia (3,081 pieces) which remained sovereign during and after Italy's occupation between 1936 and 1941. Among the former British colonies, only Ghana (1,656) and Nigeria (1,148) are significantly represented, and the same can be said for the current Democratic Republic of the Congo (1,428), once under Belgian colonial rule. Objects from Southern Africa (9,282 all together, 1,692 without Madagascar) and East Africa (5,343) are proportionally much less present throughout France whether in regard to the Parisian collections or in other French museums in general.

What can we learn from such information? That the geography of the French colonies in Africa and the African collections in the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac—and more generally in France—are strictly convergent. That, as a result, the project of restitutions must consider the question of the relation between colonial law and cultural heritage extraction, and along with it, whether (or not) there was *consent* from the

⁴⁹ The figures provided here are representative of the objects (not including the "Iconothèque") conserved in the "Afrique" Unit (Unité patrimoniale "Afrique") of the Quai Branly-Jacques Chirac Museum but a small portion of the cultural heritage objects are also included in the "Mondialisation historique et contemporaine" unit.

countries of origin during the time of the acquisition and removal of the objects and their dispatch to mainland France.

These figures also indicate that among the objects from countries that weren't colonized by France, such as those from Ethiopia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nigeria, and Ghana, comprise the most important group. These countries have been largely engaged in making their claims for the restitution of their displaced cultural heritage objects since the early days of their independence in the 1960s. By taking this into consideration, it is of our opinion that the cultural heritage objects from these countries should be given the same amount of attention and importance within the process of restitution as those objects coming from the former French colonies.

If we want to learn as much about the mechanisms that led France to acquiring the possession of these objects, we should, beyond a simple geographical approach, sketch out a chronology of acquisitions, so as to note whether or not there was a marked indication of an increase in the collections *before* and *after* colonization took place. This will allow us to discern the legitimacy of the acquisitions during each era—including the most recent era.

What History do we want to revisit?

The history of the integration of African cultural heritage objects by France into its national collections began prior to the colonial period and continued well after the independence of nations. Three major moments can be seen successively following after each other: The first moment is prior to the Berlin conference that sealed the agreement between the European powers (1884/1885) on how they planned to divide up their control of Africa. The second moment covers the colonial period up until the independence of nations (1960). The third moment began in the 1960s, and still continues to this very day to provide cultural heritage items to French collections.

When this partitioning of the acquisition into three unique periods is applied to the collections currently held at the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, something becomes very clear: before 1885, the African collections housed at the museum were comprised of roughly less than a thousand objects (Fig. 4a).⁵⁰ Between 1885 and 1960,

⁵⁰ The following statistics are based on the databases of the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac that were consulted using the TMS management software of the collections. Each item in the collection begins with a number referring to its institution of origin. The number "71" therefore refers to the former collections housed at the Musée de l'Homme (previously known as the musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadéro); the number "73" refers to the African collection held in the Musée national des arts d'Afrique

the number of cultural heritage items skyrocketed to an increase of more than 45,000 pieces, a figure that represents around 66% of the entire collection of objects from sub-Saharan Africa in the museum (Fig. 4b; Fig. 5a), equally redistributed between the phase of colonial conquest (up until 1914) and the permanent installation of colonial conquest (until 1960). This significant increase can most notably be explained by the progressive development of ethnographic missions beginning at the end of the 1920s: during the single 10-year timeframe from 1928-1938, 20,000 objects found their way into the inventory. After 1960, the collections continued to increase with the addition of another 20,000 more cultural heritage objects (Fig. 4c), until we arrive at the current figure of 70,000 pieces that are now housed in the museum, but whose original geographical location (the modes and sites of acquisition) has changed in part due to the fact that the former French colonies are no longer as directly linked to their acquisition as before.

The example of Cameroon perfectly illustrates this phenomenon: until 1885, only three pieces originating from Cameroon were recorded as part of the inventory in the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (Fig. 5b). Between 1885 and 1960, 6,968 more cultural heritage items found their way into the museum's inventory in contrast to only 713 after 1960. Conversely, pieces originating from Ghana (Fig. 5c) or Nigeria (Fig. 5b)—ex-British colonies—saw their numbers increase *after* these countries gained their independence. The Parisian cultural institution thus engaged in a continuing systematic politics of a diversification of its collections: 41 objects from Nigeria are recorded as being part of the inventory of the museum before 1885, and we only see that number increase to 254 new pieces between 1885 and 1960, in contrast to the 840 pieces acquired after 1960. This same evolution can be seen in the case of Ghana as well: 5 pieces before 1885, 376 pieces between 1885 and 1960, and 1,258 pieces after 1960.

Given all the evidence, the colonial period would seem to correspond with a complete disinhibition in terms of the “procurement” of cultural heritage objects in its own colonies: a utter bulimia of cultural objects. Thus, in terms of the process of cultural heritage restitution, one must naturally think of the translocations of cultural heritage objects that took place during this period. Nevertheless, the era immediately following this time period needs to be examined just as thoroughly.

Indeed, after 1960, it was not a rare occurrence to see even more African cultural heritage objects find their way into the French museum collections. A number of objects

et d'Océanie ; the number “70” refers to the acquisitions of the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac since its very beginnings. This number is followed by the year of its classification as an object into the inventory of the national collections. If these dates do not always coincide with the exact moment of the arrival of the object into the collection, it nevertheless provides a reliable idea of the time period it was acquired. Other items that need to be taken into account are objects collected throughout the 19th and 20th centuries but which only entered the inventory database much later.

that were acquired on the African continent throughout the wars leading to the colonial conquests as well as during the reign of the colonial period entered into the collections during this time. Either these cultural heritage items were often held by families of former colonial officers or administrators before then being donated to public institutions; or these objects circulated on the art market before then entering into the French collections. For example, at the Musée de l'Armée, the last recording and inventorying of cultural heritage objects from the colonial period goes back to 1994: almost 100 years separated their initial acquisition in Africa and their eventual entrance into the museum.⁵¹ Today, in the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, several objects acquired from the sacking of Abomey in 1892 entered into the national collections (within the framework of gifts or donations) stretching as far back as the end of the 19th century and most recently as 2003.⁵² After 1960, the circulation of African art continued to develop in Europe as well as in Africa, resulting from professional actors on both continents who, by relying on both formal and informal local representatives, contributed to an “influx of legally commercial objects bearing an illicit origin”.⁵³ It is not uncommon for these objects to have entered the collections of French public museums through donations, legacies or purchases (see “After independence”).

Historical Forms of Dispossession

In the introduction, we considered the generalized spoils of war during the colonial conflicts and the systematic military and administrative support which the ethnological missions benefitted from that were officially responsible for the “collections” in the colonized regions. The conditions—of exchange, purchase, gifts, and symbolic or physical violence—in which the removal of these objects took place, have left their marks on the collective memory as much as the absence of the actual physically displaced objects themselves. Reflections on criteria for restitutability must therefore certainly reflect on the gestures of appropriation. In a more general fashion, leading all the way up to the independence of the former colonies, the French state encouraged the procurement of objects *in situ*. Military tradition, aesthetic and scientific curiosity, along

⁵¹ See Olivier Kodjalbaye Banguiam, *Les officiers français : constitution et devenir de leurs collections africaines issues de la conquête coloniale*, doctoral thesis done at l'université Paris Ouest-Nanterre La Défense under the direction of Didier Musiedlak, defended May 19, 2016.

⁵² For more on the “Trésor de Béhanzin”, see Gaëlle Beaujean-Baltzer, *L'Art de cour d'Abomey : le sens des objets*, doctoral thesis undertaken at l'EHESS under the direction of Jean-Paul Colleyn, submitted November 25, 2015.

⁵³ Bernard Darties, cited in the information report n° 361 (2002-2003) of M. Jacques Legendre, made in the name of the French delegation at the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, filed on June 24, 2003, concerning the protection of African Cultural property.

with an acute awareness of the economic value that such objects could bring on the European market, is combined with an acute undertaking in Paris of museums capable of rivaling those of Berlin or London: all of these elements enter into the equation through the implementation of the French system of cultural extraction in Africa (and throughout the rest of the world). Starting in the 1880s, those in the military as well as civilians, colonial administrators and scientific experts are invited to gather samples of African cultural materials that had already been handed over or which were soon to be collected and to assure their transfer back to mainland France. The acquisition of cultural goods assures a form of expropriation that no single intellectual observation can obviously guarantee. Instructions begin to circulate concerning the nature of the pieces to procure and regarding the way one should handle them. While on furlough, upon returning from Africa, during their vacation time in France, the actors implicated within the colonial process become accustomed to leaving the best of their finds within museums whether in Paris or elsewhere. "You asked me to bring you some skulls from the Niger valley, I've brought you back two skulls of Samory warriors killed at Bamako"⁵⁴ writes one of the French officers to the museum director of ethnography of the Trocadéro in 1883. Military contributions often went hand in hand with the gathering of groups of objects in an almost fortuitous manner, oftentimes in accordance with the specific interest of the particular agent. However, eventually, as the decades past, and most notably in the 1930s, the organization of missions specifically designed for the procurement of cultural items becomes more and more generalized.

Spoils

Within collective memories, in Africa as much as anywhere else, the violence committed during war occupies a very singular position, especially when attributed to playing a role in the collapse of certain dynasties that had endured for centuries. The art objects, manuscripts, jewelry, dynastic emblems, architectural ornaments, the plundered weapons and armor: all these captured cultural items crystalize specific emotions. Concerted reflections in France around restitutions must carefully consider this evidence: among the aestheticized objects upon their arrival to France, musealized and then integrated into a chronological, stylistic, typological series (including series of manuscripts), a large number have continued to remain attached to their original cultural context and—in spite of, or actually due to their absence, in spite of, or actually due to the destruction of the kingdoms they were taken from—, have maintained a status of relic or *regalia*. In these cases, over time, the relics have become local symbols

⁵⁴ Cited by Olivier Kodjalbaye Banguiam, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

of resistance against the colonial aggressor. Even within a context where the memory attached to the objects is lost, that of the events that led to their loss is usually very alive and the connection is quickly established (including its instrumentalization for political ends). In these particular cases, the fact that current reclamations still fall on the deaf ears of the French institutions housing them, arouses a great deal of emotion.

Several different spoils of war compiled during the colonial period are housed in the French collections. They are difficult to identify as such for (at least) three reasons: a) the coherent set they formed during their capture (“treasures”) was split up once they arrived in France and redistributed into separate institutions; b) inside these other institutions, when one consults the rubric of information, these objects are inventoried as “gifts” from specific individuals; c) the military officials responsible for these “gifts” were not limited to simply acquiring enemy “treasures”, some of them, along with their troops, took to collecting a large scale of cultural items outside the battlefield, which complicates the identification of spoils *stricto sensu*. In fact, one has to change one’s perspective in order to locate these spoils within the French museum collections: don’t attempt trying to find their trace through the information that is parsimoniously provided by the French institutions themselves, but by way of the colonial military historiography, on one hand, and through the traces of memory left within the regions affected by these acts of plundering, on the other.

Ségou, 1890

The items procured by Colonel Louis Archinard register as some of the most significant cultural heritage items plundered and yet remain some of the least studied. When all the math has been done, one notes that within the French museum collections, over a thousand pieces were inventoried as “gifts” from the French general heralding from La Havre. Among these items, there is a very precious group of objects: jewels, weapons, and manuscripts taken from the sacking of the Ségou royal palace, the capital of the Toucouleur empire in present-day Mali, as well as during the bloody capture of the city of Ouossébougou in 1890 which marked the end of the Toucouleur empire and the transfer of control of the region to France, who then created the French Sudan. The precious objects and manuscripts seized at Ségou had been gathered together by the spiritual leader, El Hadj Omar (the founder of the Toucouleur empire) along with his son, Ahmadou. Upon its arrival in France, “the Ségou treasure” was partially auctioned off to draw a profit for the nation, but Archinard offered the pieces considered to be the most important to various

museums. Today, we can find these important pieces redistributed between the Musée de l'Armée, the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (129 pieces), the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (518 volumes⁵⁵) and the National History Museum of the Havre. Since 1944, the descendants of El Hadj Omar have made requests for the return of these objects.⁵⁶

Abomey, 1892

The spoils of war donated by Colonel Alfred Amédée Dodds are part of a specific group of cultural items that harbor a bit more renown within the French collections. These items are related to the royal city of Abomey, which would have been located in present-day Benin, a city that was emptied of its wealth and emblems of its dynasty after a series of bloody battles terminating on November 17, 1892. The fall of Abomey and the humiliating capture of king Béhanzin as well as his subsequent deportation outside of Africa, marked the end of a multi-secular kingdom which then became integrated into the French colony of Dahomey. Between 1893 and 1895, several French officers, including Dodds, handed over to the musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadéro a portion of their war spoils: more specifically 27 objects. Other pieces, that were "gifted" by other officers or members of their family, are today conserved in the Périgueux and Lyon museums.⁵⁷ For a many number of years now, the items acquired during the plundering of Abomey have been requested to be returned to the Republic of Benin.

Campaign of reprisals against Samory Touré, 1898

Within post-colonial historiography, Samory Touré is considered a hero of the African resistance to colonial expansion. Alpha Blondy even wrote a song about him (Bory Samory, 1984). Founder of the Wassoulou Empire, he resisted the French penetration into West Africa for over two decades, within a territory located between present-day Guinea and Ivory Coast. In the autumn of 1898, Samory Touré becomes the object of a campaign of reprisals led by the French

⁵⁵ See Louis Brenner, Noureddine Ghali, Sidi Mohamed Mahibou, *Inventaire de la bibliothèque umarienne de Ségou*, Paris: CNRS Éditions, 1985.

⁵⁶ Concerning the history of these pieces, their inventory, as well as the theft of around 40 bracelets and necklaces in November 1937, (while they were displayed in the Musée de la France outre-mer) see the archives of the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, D004164/46980.

⁵⁷ See Gaëlle Beaujean-Baltzer, *L'Art de cour d'Abomey, op. cit.*

general Henri Gouraud. He was arrested and deported to Gabon where he would die two years later. The “treasure of Samory”, seized during his surrender, is valued at between 200,000 or 300,000 Francs in the currency of the era and fills 12 large crates. In his journals, general Gouraud notes: “With the departure of the treasure, we will also see the partial departure of memories of Samory to the Musée de l’Armée—his saddle, sword, Almamy war-bonnet, one of his rifles [...], *dialas*, necklaces from Saranké Mory and Ahmadou Touré, strange rings, a match case, and above all, Saranké Mory’s war boubou [tunic], a very vibrant piece. We will also be sending to the general Trentinian, Samory’s battle axe, his *chasse-mouche* (fly swatter), made from a silver encrusted elephant’s tail, and another of his swords given to me by Sarankégny Mory at the moment of his surrender.” Today, these items are mostly housed at the Musée de l’Armée.⁵⁸ These objects were included on display as part of a “visit” of recognition of the Marabout Cheikh Ousmane Badji.

Along with these carefully identified “French” spoils of war, we should also add the following:

- Objects coming from the spoils of war from other foreign armies (notably the British) by way of brutal circumstances which have left profound traces in the collective memories of the countries concerned (the sacking of Benin City in 1897, for example). These objects have oftentimes circulated on the art market before being acquired by French museums.
- Hundreds of African objects (both used in military operations and not) given to French institutions by officers and military doctors implicated within diverse operations of reconnaissance, conquest, or law enforcement. Even if part of these objects were not collected from a battlefield, the military context of the spoils and the authority which the army could confer over any future donors of cultural objects through their force of arms leads one to believe that there was a complete absence of consent on the part of local populations during the extraction of these objects—except in certain cases when there is evidence indicating consent (for example, such a case of consent can be found in documents concerning the gifts made to the French museums by Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza (250 pieces at the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac alone).

⁵⁸ Musée de l’Armée. Chasse-mouche de Samory inventory number 04739; Bonnet de guerre de Samory, inventory number 2292; Hache de Samory, inventory number 8870; War cloth of his son, inventory number 2300.

It is our recommendation to respond favorably and grant restitutions concerning objects seized within the military contexts described above, in spite of the specific juridical statute concerning military trophies obtained before the adoption in 1899 of the first Hague Conventions codifying the laws of war.

“Exploratory” Missions and Scientific “Raids”

Throughout the entirety of the colonial period, French museums were the beneficiaries of successive contributions of exploratory colonial missions (lasting until the early 20th century) as well as scientific expeditions (beginning around 1925).

In the 1890s, under the auspices of public or private institutions such as the Société de Géographie or the Comité d’Afrique française, several successive exploratory missions were launched on the continent, aiming to consolidate the zones of French influence in competition with Great Britain and Germany. Entrusted to certain rather young scientists, these hybrid missions, both political and commercial in their interests, became occasions for compiling stunning collections of cultural heritage. As can be seen by the Comité d’Afrique française entrusting the agronomist Jean Dybowski with the task of tracking down the traces of another expedition similar to his own, dispatched the previous year but which had gone missing. His “small team” as we read in a report, “is composed of 44 Senegalese [skirmishers] and 48 porters.”⁵⁹ At Bangui (the present-day capital of the Central African Republic), the naturalist exclaims, “I was able to send back 29 chests to Europe filled with items for collections. It is my wish that they remain housed in museums until my return; I will then create a general exhibit from out of them and then they can be distributed throughout other museums.”⁶⁰ The exhibit eventually did take place in 1893. All together, the number of items displayed was estimated at 7,000 pieces of natural history (most notably various killed mammals and birds) along with weapons, furs, and textiles systematically collected by Dybowski within the territory of present-day Central African Republic which were subsequently handed over to French museums. During the exhibit at the Natural History Museum in 1893, the strategically positioned vitrine 1 presents “clothing and objects found on men killed on the night of the 22 and 23rd of November 1891, [...] along with three of their skulls.”⁶¹ Today, only the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac still contains over 600 pieces

⁵⁹ *Bulletin du comité de l’Afrique française*, April, 1892, p. 3.

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ See Albin Arnera, “Science et colonisation : la mission Dybowski (1891-1892)”, *Outre-mers*, t. 89, n. 336-337, 2nd Semester, 2002, “Traites et esclavages : vieux problèmes, nouvelles perspectives ?”, Olivier Pétré-Grenouilleau (dir.), p. 328.

(weapons, jewelry, musical instruments, amulets) expedited from Africa within this context.

One generation later, the extraction of cultural heritage becomes professionalized. While the colonial administration locks down the territories that have already been captured, and while the territories that have been explored have already been given over to their exploitation, and while Ethnology imposes itself as a new unheralded scientific discipline, missions exclusively dedicated to the removal and collection of ethnographic information and objects are put in place. Created in 1925 and financed by the Ministère des Colonies, the Institute of Ethnology at the University of Paris will from now on play a central role. Between 1926 and 1940, the institute sponsors 40 ethnographic missions, 30 of which are in Africa. Certain of them resemble veritable “scientific raids” (in the words of Éric Jolly), combining new technologies (cinematography, photography, aerial reconnaissance), scientific performance, and adventure travel. Their principal initiator and the director of the expeditions is Marcel Griaule. Throughout this time period, “the objective of the ethnographers is to see everything, to grasp everything, and eventually to bring back, according to a complex protocol, the objects, beliefs, and details regarding the most secret of activities, carpets behind the walls of the houses or the silence of their informers.”⁶²

Hundreds of individualized information sheets accompany the objects transferred on to France. Griaule apprehends his work through a threefold military, judiciary, and medical logic. One of the exploratory campaigns held during a mission to the Sahara-Cameroon in 1936-1937 is compared to “a series of probes on the ground and as a stethoscope applied to the men living there”; the objects taken from the Africans are considered as “exhibit pieces”, whose “collection will form the most revelatory and secure archives, much more so than the written archives.” “The Black man is an ‘auxiliary assistant’ that we can ‘make talk’, which is not the ideal situation [...] but we’re doing the best we can.”⁶³ In his book, *L’Afrique fantôme* and in his correspondence, Michel Leiris describes and denounces the logic of suspicion, intimidation, and force, tied with the capturing of objects during the famous Dakar-Djibouti mission (1931-1933), for which he undertook the secretarial duties and which would greatly enrich the French museums. Since it operated simultaneously in the territories under French authority and within the independent empire of Ethiopia, and because it’s extremely well-documented, this mission is able to give off the feeling of how much the colonial framework is in favor of

⁶² Éric Jolly, “Marcel Griaule, ethnologue : La construction d’une discipline (1925-1956) », *Journal des africanistes*, 2001, vol. 71, no. 1, *Les empreintes du renard pâle*, Marc-Henri Piault and Joëlle Hauzeur (Ed.), p. 168.

⁶³ Marcel Griaule, quoted by Éric Jolly, *op. cit.*, p. 163 et p. 168.

and facilitates the massive exportation of cultural items, an exportation—outside the colonies—which met with much more resistance. In Ethiopia, three years prior to its annexation by a Fascist Italy, the French mission seeks out and secures the support of the (Fascist) Italian consul of Gondar, Raffaele di Lauro, who authorizes them to set up camp for several months on the grounds of the consulate. The objects acquired (including a 60 meters squared painted mural, removed piece by piece from a 17th century church in the town) provoked a great number of instances of resistance that were well documented. In fear of the Ethiopian authorities, certain pieces were carefully hidden before finally being exfiltrated back to Eritrea (then an Italian colony). One of the objects, a portable wooden altar, was even burned before passing through customs.⁶⁴

During the ethnographic missions of the 1930s, the large majority of the objects were actually purchased with the exact amounts paid often accounted for.⁶⁵ For a zoomorphic mask from the Ségou region, today exhibited in the halls of the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (71.1931.74.1048.1) the Dakar-Djibouti mission paid 7 francs (the equivalent price for a dozen eggs at that time) whereas recent research has shown that during that same year of 1931, the average price at auction for an African mask, was around 200 francs⁶⁶. During the sale of the collection belonging to Paul Éluard and André Breton at the Hôtel Drouot during the month of July 1931, the highest price paid at auction for an African mask was 1,150 francs (Number 16, “Masque. Fétiche M’Gallé. Figure humaine stylisée dont la coiffure en forme de croissant est surmontée d’une rangée de spirales doubles. Bois recouvert de cuivre. Gabon, région de l’Ogoué, h53cm”) The very same year, the record price received at Drouot for an African mask was set at 2,300 francs (May 7, Drouot, 1931, n°27, “Masque Dan en bois sculpté patiné noir. Visage de femme aux grands yeux. Côte d’Ivoire, h24 cm”).

From the avowals made by the actors themselves on the ground, the transactions resemble “forced methods for purchases so as not to say requisition”⁶⁷ (Michel Leiris); even resembling “a kind of raid led by a troop of Europeans who, with a pencil and ruler in hand, haphazardly searched for items everywhere.”⁶⁸ (Éric Lutten) Under these conditions it is hard to interpret the actual amount of money paid, during the “scientific

⁶⁴ See Claire Bosc-Tiessé with Anais Wion, *Peintures sacrées d’Éthiopie. Collection de la Mission Dakar-Djibouti*, Saint-Maur-des-Fossés: Sépia, 2005.

⁶⁵ Jolly, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

⁶⁶ See the work of Léa Saint-Raymond and Élodie Vaudry on non-European objects on the French art market. See also Léa Saint-Raymond, *Le Pari des enchères : le lancement de nouveaux marchés artistiques à Paris entre les années 1830 et 1939*, doctoral thesis, université Paris-Nanterre, 2018.

⁶⁷ Lettre from Michel Leiris to his wife, September 19, 1931, in: Michel Leiris, *Miroir de l’Afrique*, Jean Jamin (Ed.), Paris: Gallimard, 1996, p. 204.

⁶⁸ Éric Lutten, “Les enfants noirs ont aussi des poupées”, *Le Monde colonial illustré*, 129, mai 1934, p. 79 (quoted by Éric Jolly, “Les collectes d’objets ethnographiques”, in: *À la naissance de l’ethnologie française. Les missions ethnographiques en Afrique subsaharienne (1928-1939)*, NaissanceEthnologie.fr, 2016).

missions” as a sign of consent on the populations targeted. Other forms of acquisition, bartering or gifts, are inscribed within the same logic or urgency and a more or less explicit constraint. Within the colonial context, the authority of the White Man, the pressure of taxes and the threat of (often fictitious) reprisals “incites or obliges” those concerned “to accept the offers made by the ethnographers for purchasing the objects”.⁶⁹

Today, the Quai Branly-Jacques Chirac Museum houses several thousand pieces of African cultural heritage originating from these civil missions (first embarked upon as hybrid missions then later exclusively as scientific).⁷⁰ 640 pieces resulted from the Dybowski mission in Central Africa (1893), 688 pieces from the mission undertaken by Robert Du Bourg de Bozas in East and Central Africa (1901-1902); 493 pieces from the missions made by Louis Desplagnes in what is now present-day Mali (1903-1904) and to Benin (1907-1909); 147 pieces from the first mission undertaken by Henri Labouret in present-day Burkina Faso (1929); 212 objects from the first mission by Émile-Georges Waterlot in present-day Mali (1930); 3,600 pieces from the Dakar-Djibouti mission (1931-1933), 395 objects come from the second mission by Henri Labouret in Senegal and Guinea (1932). 1,245 pieces were acquired from his third mission to Cameroon (1934), 161 pieces from the mission confided to Denise Paulme and Deborah Lifchitz to Mali (1934), 247 pieces arise from out of the mission confided to Charles Le Cœur to Chad (1933-1935); more than 350 pieces were collected during the “Sahara-Sudan” mission (1935), 297 during the second mission of Émile-Georges Waterlot to the Sudan, Mauritania, and Guinea (1936), about 800 more pieces were gathered during the “Sahara-Cameroon” mission (1936-1937), and more than 500 from the Niger-Iro Lake mission (1938-1939) to only cite the most important expeditions. Several hundred other pieces arising out of the same missions are still housed today in the museums of several large French cities (for example, in Toulouse, where the Collection Labouret still plays an important role).

Far from being a mere fortuitous addition of cultural items gathered from repeated missions, this large sum of items reveals the existence of a veritable rationalized *system* of exploitation, in some ways comparable to the exploitation of natural resources.

It is our recommendation to respond favorably and grant restitutions concerning objects collected in Africa during these types of “scientific expeditions”, unless there is explicit evidence or information witnessing to the full consent on the part

⁶⁹ Éric Jolly, *op. cit.*

⁷⁰ The following statistics can vary depending on the methods used to account for them. They have been arrived at based on the available databases or, in certain cases, according to the academic work dedicated to one of the specific missions mentioned.

of the owners or initial guardians of the objects at the moment when the objects were separated from them.

Gifts from Private Collectors

For a long time now, French museums have traditionally counted on gifts and the donations of legacy collections from patrons of the arts. At the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, the rubric of “donors” includes a great number of men and women who have, although this isn’t always the case, a full name attached to their gift. It is therefore sometimes difficult to identify these donors. Furthermore, in France, certain public museums owe a large part if not the quasi-totality of their African collections to these gifts made by art patrons who, like the doctor Jules Lhomme in Angoulême or Marie and Joseph Colomb in Grenoble have chosen to hand over their collections to their hometowns. Sometimes, the actual objects gifted to the museums come years after the death of the collectors and it’s often difficult to reconstitute the conditions in which the pieces were initially acquired in Africa. Among these art donors a very unique group can be discerned which includes agents of the former colonial administration (or the diplomatic corps residing in African countries that weren’t colonized by France): according to their specific interest and their expertise, these personnel holding government posts in Africa were able to form very specific collections (ancient manuscripts, prehistoric objects) or, on the contrary, their collections were more “touristy” in nature based on what they were able to collect haphazardly at the markets or from living artists who specialized in the production of copies of African pieces corresponding to the tastes of Europeans. At the present time, the art market has applied a very rigorous distinction between these works merely created to please the tastes of Europeans (pieces whose value is judged to be rather low) and “authentic” African pieces, bearing the traces of use or the inscriptions for rituals. Gifts and donations to French museums have revealed the existence of both these categories: the gifts made by Christian Merlo in the 1930s, for example, which concerns around 100 objects with the majority bearing rather contemporary markings, acquired at Dahomey (present-day Benin) where the patron was an administrator; those objects donated by the ethnographer, François Arthur Florian de Zeltner who was named the “principal adjunct of indigenous affairs in West Africa” in 1918 (also gifted to the museum in 1930) includes 1,213 ethnographic pieces: textiles, jewelry, containers, and several masks for ritual dances, originating from present-day Mali, Burkina Faso, and Niger.

We favorably recommend welcoming requests for restitution that could have bearing on objects donated or gifted to French museums by agents of the French

colonial administration or their descendants as long as consent on behalf of the original seller can be attested. For this category of objects, the principal effort will consist in determining the identities of the donors, beyond the mere listing of family names or first names (i.e. their implication within the colonial apparatus, whether they are descendants of colonial agents or members of the military.

After independence

After the first 17 African nations obtained independence during the year of 1960, the acquisition and entrance of African cultural heritage objects into the French museum does not end. It merely changes its source of procurement. The scientifically guided missions for the accumulation of objects within the former French colonies, in the same manner as they had been practiced beforehand, disappear; new regions (such as Nigeria, formerly under British rule) become the object of a more systematic attention; purchases of cultural objects continue to multiply and the international art market affirms itself as a key actor in relation to the museums. Beginning in 1970, the rules of this market are (weakly) structured within the framework of the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export, and Ownership of Cultural Property, which was signed and ratified much later by France in 1997; more rules were also put in place in Africa by the progressive adoption, nation-state by nation-state, of legislation protecting cultural heritage including archeological items.

However, these measures could not prevent the illicit trafficking of objects on a global scale. Several interviews within the framework of our present inquiry have helped us to understand, with the supporting documents, how the organized illicit exportation of valuable cultural items from West Africa, Mali, and Nigeria was already taking place a number of years ago and still continues to this very day. The current legislations in place and the deontology of museum professionals structured within ICOM (The International Council of Museums), prevents museums from purchasing or exhibiting such objects. Their presence in Europe is oftentimes surrounded in secrecy. The cloudiness around such trafficking of cultural objects surpasses the framework attributed to our mission, which is concerned only with public collections. Nevertheless, the question of restitutions is inseparable from that of illicit trafficking, which continues to have a large effect on the ongoing loss of African cultural heritage and property and will continue to do so if no effort is made to prevent it.

In the middle of the 1990s, with the announced opening of the Musée du quai Branly (inaugurated in 2006), the French state led a very well funded, energetic campaign for the acquisitions of pieces which involved the international art market, collectors, as well as French donors often with very close ties to political power. Between the announcement and the opening of the museum, around a thousand pieces found their way into the Parisian institution, sometimes through large purchases of cultural objects in bulk. The most spectacular example of such a purchase and acquisition is without a doubt the “collection nigériane Barbier-Mueller”: 276 pieces acquired by the French state for the estimated sum of 48 million francs.⁷¹ In the race for acquiring beautiful pieces, questions surrounding the exact provenance and the licit or illicit character of the objects for sale is not usually the main priority—as the Nok statuettes (Nigeria) currently exhibited in the Sessions pavilion of the Louvre attest to. Purchased in 1998 for the Musée du quai Branly from a Belgian merchant, these pieces actually fell into the category of pieces considered to be forbidden from exportation by way of the Nigerian law adopted in 1979, and were included on a list indicating objects affected by illicit trafficking identified by ICOM. These statuettes led to an international ordeal for France with the *New York Times* publishing an article with the title, “Chirac Exalts African Art, Legal and (Maybe) Illegal”.⁷² After several delays, France finally acquiesced and recognized that these pieces were the property of Nigeria, who for its part, agreed to allow them to remain in Paris and to be loaned out within a renewable framework of 25 years. During this time, ICOM deplored the cynicism of the museums which it had asked to adopt “scrupulous rules in terms of the acquisition of objects”. In a retrospective interview with the president of the museum, Stéphane Martin described the acquisition in terms of “taking ethical risks”: “We purchased these Nok statuettes under perfectly legal circumstances with regard to the French legislation of the era. Our risk taking in this case was ethical but it was not juridical. [...] We therefore estimated that the risk was worth it in relation to the message we wanted to send. These acquisitions led to a double complaint. [...] We decided to back-pedal. We made amends and we decided to retribute them, to offer them back to Nigeria.”⁷³ The “ethical risk” entered into the equation throughout the 1990s concerning several other acquisitions.

⁷¹ Archives of the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, “Collection nigériane du musée Barbier-Mueller”, D004970/49349.

⁷² Alan Riding, “Chirac Exalts African Art, Legal and (Maybe) Illegal”, *The New York Times*, November 25, 2000.

⁷³ “Le musée du quai Branly est un outil évolutif”. Interview conducted by Ayoko Mensah and Malick Ndiaye with Stéphane Martin”, *Africultures*, July 23, 2007.

We recommend the restitution of pieces acquired after 1960 that have been proven to be acquired through illicit trafficking.

Criteria for Restitutability

The massive and continuous integration—over the past 150 years—of cultural heritage material from Africa into French collections leads us to a response in terms of the following schema in regards to the demands for restitutions coming from Africa:

1. **Restitution** in a swift and thorough manner without any supplementary research regarding their provenance or origins, of any objects taken by force or presumed to be acquired through inequitable conditions:
 - a. through military aggressions (spoils, trophies), whether these pieces went on directly to France or whether passed through the international art market before then finding their way to being integrated into collections.
 - b. by way of military personnel or active administrators on the continent during the colonial period (1885-1960) or by their descendants.
 - c. through scientific expeditions prior to 1960.
 - d. certain museums continue to house pieces of African origin which were initially loaned out to them by African institutions for exhibits or campaigns of restoration, but which were never given back. These objects should be swiftly returned to their institutions of origin.⁷⁴

2. **Complementary Research** for pieces that entered into the museums after 1960 and those received as gifts or donations to the museum where we have a good reason to believe the pieces left African soil before 1960 (but which remained within families for several generations). In cases where research is not able to ascertain the initial circumstances around their acquisition during the colonial period, the pieces requested can be restituted based on justification of their interest by the country making the request.

⁷⁴Several specific cases could also be mentioned here, most notably concerning a situation where objects were temporarily loaned out to French institutions but still remain in their museum holdings. Christine Lorre, head curator at the Musée d'Archéologie nationale de Saint-Germain-en-Laye, drew our attention to such a case involving a lithic set of tools originally from Melka Kunture (Ethiopia). These pieces were removed from the site in order to create molds of them (which were in fact displayed in the hall of comparative archeology in the museum) and they are still housed in the museum, waiting for the situation to be resolved.

3. **Preservation within the French collections** of pieces of African art objects and cultural heritage where the following has been established:
 - a. after confirmation that a freely consented to and documented transaction took place that was agreed upon and equitable.
 - b. that the pieces acquired conformed to the necessary rigor and careful monitoring of the apparatus in place on the art market after the application of the UNESCO Convention of 1970, in other words, without “taking any ethical risks”. Gifts from foreign Heads of State to French governments remain as acquisitions for France except in cases where the heads of state concerned have been ruled against for the misuse of public funds.

Timeline for a Program of Restitutions

We recommend a process of restitutions taking place through three specific phases beginning with the submission of this present report. The translocation of cultural heritage that has affected Africa for the benefit and profit of France has taken place over a long period of time. In order for the restitutions to be considered as permanent and enduring so as not to cause any unnecessary risks to the objects in question—and to grant the proper time to all actors, on both continents, so as to establish a common “know-how” for the restitutions—the process of restitution itself must adhere and adapt to the rhythms and to the preparations of each nation-state concerned. Concerning these very sensitive cultural questions, the French State must not impose its rhythm and political agenda onto the African States. Nevertheless, it is important to provide assurances and pledges of confidence to the African countries in a timely fashion, particularly to those countries that have been engaged within a logic of reclamations for quite some time (either addressed to France or other European nations).

First Phase (November 2018-2019)

To the African states concerned, the formal submission of the inventory of pieces coming from their territory (according to their present borders) which are currently held in public French collections. The formal restitution of several largely symbolic pieces whose return has been requested for a long time by various African nations or

communities, so as to show and demonstrate the true wish for restitution on the part of the French State. • The common establishment—on the part of museum experts and those of cultural heritage in Africa and in France—of a practical methodology for restitutions. • The transfer (i.e. the material return) of these pieces to their countries of origin if the countries seeking reclamations consider that the infrastructures for housing them are ready and prepared to receive them. • In parallel with these initial actions, there should be an adoption of legislative measures and rules so as to ensure that these restitutions remain irrevocable. • NB: The organization of temporary exhibits to emphasize the “return” of these pieces which will then be sent back to France while the State owners make the necessary preparations for their permanent housing, should, in our opinion, be avoided at all costs. Several past examples of similar situations have demonstrated the deleterious effects that this can have on the African public through this “second departure” of pieces they believed to be permanently returned (the exhibition “Béhanzin, Roi d’Abomey” to the Fondation Zinsou in Benin in 2006-2007; the exhibition “Ciwara, collections du musée du quai Branly” at the National Museum of Bamako in Mali in 2011).

In our eyes, this first phase could concern⁷⁵:

1. *Benin*. The statues and *regalia* resulting from the sacking of Abomey in 1892, more specifically the following inventoried pieces housed at the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, which have already been for a long time the object of reclamations:
 - *Bochio* statue in the image of the king Ghezo (71.1893.45.1, Fig. 6)
 - Royal anthro-zoomorphic statue (71.1893.45.2, Fig. 7)
 - Royal anthro-zoomorphic statue (71.1893.45.3, Fig. 8)
 - Four royal doors from the Abomey palace (71.1893.45.4 — 71.1893.45.7, Fig. 9-10)
 - A royal stool (71.1893.45.8, Fig. 11)
 - Sculpture dedicated to Gou (71.1894.32.1, Fig. 12)
 - Throne of King Glèlè (71.1895.16.7, Fig. 13)
 - Throne of King Ghezo (71.1895.16.8, Fig. 14)

⁷⁵ The following list is an open proposition: it does not claim to be exhaustive and primarily concerns pieces that have for a long time already been requested to be returned to their country of origin.

Other pieces with the same provenance will be restituted during a second phase.
(See above)

2. *Senegal*. The following pieces derived from the spoils of war that took place at Ségou (the “treasure” of El Hadj Omar Tall/ Ahmadou) housed at the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, the musée de l’Armée, and the Natural History Museum in Le Havre.

- Sabre of El Hadj Omar Tall (Musée de l’Armée, Inv. 6995, Fig. 15)
- Objects housed at the Muséum d’histoire naturelle du Havre
- Necklaces, pendants, pearls and medallions (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 75.8142, 75.8148, 75.8159.1-2, 75.8160, 75.8162, 75.8164, Fig. 16)

Others pieces with the same provenance could also be restituted or become part of an agreement concerning digitization (manuscripts from the Bibliothèque nationale de France) later on (see above), with an agreement made with the Tall Family.

3. *Nigeria*. The following pieces, originating from the sacking of Benin City by the British Army in 1897 and which have circulated in museums/ or on the European Art market before later being acquired by the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac. The restitution of objects seized during the punitive expedition of 1897 have been requested to be returned for several decades by Nigeria and occupy a large place within the public imaginary (several films have been made for the public at large on the subject, the existence of the international “Benin Dialogue Group”, etc.). The pieces below are classified by way of their priority:

- Relief plaque (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 71.1931.49.19, Fig. 17)
- Ivory tusk (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 73.1962.7.1, Fig. 18)
- Commemorative Head (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 73.1969.3.1 bis, Fig. 19)
- Relief plaque (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 73.1997.4.1, Fig. 20)

- Commemorative Head (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 73.1997.4.3, Fig. 21)

Other pieces of similar provenance should be restituted during a second period of time (see above), in agreement with the Nigerian authorities and the royal (Oba) family.

4. *Ethiopia*. The sacred paintings of detached pieces from the walls of the Saint-Antoine Church (Abbā Antonios) of Gondar illicitly exported from Ethiopia in 1932 (during the Dakar-Djibouti Mission). Ethiopia was opposed to these exportations at the time they took place. Ethiopia has been one of the most active of African nations requesting the return of its cultural heritage for a number of decades now.

- Paintings of the Abbā Antonios Church (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 71.1931.74.3584-71.1931.74.3595, Fig. 22)

A number of other pieces of similar provenance (including a number of manuscripts) can also be restituted, if they are requested, within the second phase of restitutions (see below).

5. *Mali*. Certain of the following pieces were “collected” during the Labouret missions (1932), Dakar-Djibouti (1931-1933), Sahara-Sudan (1935) and Niger-Lake Iro (1938-1939):

- Zoomorphic mask Ciwara kun (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 71.1930.26.3, Fig. 23)
- Mask and bust of young girl (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 71.1930.31.22.1-2, Fig. 24)
- Anthropomorphic mask Satimbe (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 71.1931.74.1948, Fig. 25)
- Mother of masks Imina na (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 71.1931.74.2002, Fig. 26)
- Composite sacred object, Boli, (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 71.1931.74.1091.1, Fig. 27)
- Mask Sim (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 71.1935.60.169, Fig. 28)

- Mask Sim Kalama Nāngala (Institut d'ethnologie de l'université de Strasbourg, 2002.0.241, Fig. 29)

The selection of the pieces whose return should be made a priority should be decided through a dialogue and following an established protocol with the director of the National Museum of Mali, and in agreement with the Malian authorities. Other pieces originating from the same locale could be restituted during a second phase of restitution (see below).⁷⁶

6. *Cameroon*. Throne “collected” in Cameroon within the framework of the Henri Labouret Mission in 1934.

- Throne (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, 71.1934.171.1, Fig. 30)

Other pieces of similar provenance should be restituted during a second period of time (see below), in agreement with the Cameroonian authorities.

Second Phase (Spring 2019-November 2022)

The second phase involves the process of inventorying, the sharing of digital files, and an intensive transcontinental dialogue. This phase will be supported by way of four distinct components and should—between now and the next five years—either lead to setting up free online access to, or organizing the restitutions of, the iconographic, cinematographic, and sound materials concerning African societies as well as a certain number of authentic works judged to be important by the Nation-States and communities concerned.

a. Inventory

⁷⁶ For example, at the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac: 71.1930.31.22.1-2, masque et poitrine postiche de jeune fille (Labouret); 71.1931.74.1048.1, masque zoomorphe (Dakar-Djibouti); 71.1931.74.1907, masque zoomorphe Omono (Dakar-Djibouti); 71.1931.74.1948, masque anthropomorphe (Dakar-Djibouti); 71.1931.74.1999, masque facial zoomorphe Dyodyomini (Dakar-Djibouti); 71.1935.60.198, masque zoomorphe (Sahara-Soudan); 71.1935.60.233, masque facial anthropo-zoomorphe Gomitogo (Sahara-Soudan); 71.1935.60.286, masque anthropo-zoomorphe Kanaga (Sahara-Soudan); 71.1935.60.325, masque anthropomorphe imina na (Sahara-Soudan); 71.1935.105.27, masque zoomorphe Na; 71.1935.105.34, masque zoomorphe (Mission Paulme-Lifchitz).

The mobilization of all the human and financial means necessary for the swift establishment of an accessible online database containing the inventory of all the cultural heritage pieces in the African collections conserved in French public museums. This inventory is still very much lacking for a large number of museums. Without inventory and an easy way to access it, the requests for restitution will only continue to remain in limbo. This inventory work must be lead by museum professionals and experts in cultural heritage in France and Africa working together, hand in hand. This work will constitute, from the African perspective, the first step in re(establishing) contact with collections whose existence (due to the lack of easy access to the catalogued inventory) is often not known by the African professionals themselves, and *a fortiori*, to the public.

b. Sharing of Digital Content

A large number of photographic, cinematographic, or sound documents concerning African societies once held by former colonial administrations have recently been part of intensive campaigns for digitization projects (such as the “iconothèque” in the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac). Within the framework of the project of restitutions, these digitized objects must be made part of a radical practice of sharing, including how one rethinks the politics of image rights use. Given the large number of French institutions concerned and the difficulty that a foreign public has for navigating through these museums, we recommend the creation of a single portal providing access to this precious documentation in the form of a platform that would be *open access*. After a dialogue with the other institutions and parties involved, a plan for the systematic digitization of documents that have yet to be digitized concerning Africa should be established, including the collections of (Ethiopian, Omarian, etc) manuscripts from the Bibliothèque nationale de France. It goes without saying that questions around the rights for the reproduction of images needs to be the object of a complete revision regarding requests coming from African countries from which these works originated including any photographs, films, and recording of these societies. Free access to these materials as well as the free use of the images and documents should be the end goal.

c. Workshops

Structured and held regularly, in France as well as the other African countries concerned, bilateral or multilateral workshops allowing for the actors directly concerned by restitutions (museum curators, those in charge of cultural heritage, representatives of communities, restorers, patrons) to share and establish a common “know-how” regarding the restitutions and the accompanying of their return (and departures) from France to Africa.

d. Joint Commissions

The creation of joint commissions between France and each of one of the concerned African nation-states desiring to recover their cultural heritage. These commissions will structure and moderate the dialogue between the French institutions and the representatives of the museums and the communities concerned designated by the African nation-states.

Their missions will consist in the following:

- Examine the requests for restitutions and provide an opinion according to the procedure presented in part 3 of this present report. This will allow for each commission to oversee the shared information between all the actors and institutions concerned, in France as well as Africa, regarding the modalities of restitution and the existing support structures to put them into place.
- Advise on the areas of research necessary for establishing the lists of restitutable objects. To this end, this research will be done in concert with the institutional partnerships that will have already been put into place between the experts, researchers, or curators from the countries and museums involved so as to establish the origins of the cultural heritage objects.
- Advise, on a case by case basis, the accompanying measures requisite for assuring the successful operations for “departure” and “return”. These accompanying measures can include, among other things, actions of scholarly cooperation, the provisions of equipment for the welcoming and conservation of the restituted object, and even the necessary supplementary education for preparing the persons charged with caring for these objects’ conservation and mediation. The search for private patrons or sponsors is also included in this approach.

- The formulation for the recommendation of the presentation of African objects in museums in France. This is informed by way of exhibitions.

Third Phase (November 2022-Open-Ended)

The translocations of cultural heritage objects affecting Africa for the benefit of France took place over a long period of time. The process of restitution should not be limited in time. We should avoid giving the impression that the historical window which opened up during the speech at Ouagadougou in 2017 is at risk of shutting again anytime soon and at the same time, avoid the precipitated actions by the nation-states who, for social, political, or economic reasons (or for other reasons) don't yet feel concerned by these restitutions or ready to engage in this process. The African states concerned should be assured that their eventual requests for restitutions can also be welcomed even after the next "five years" (to refer back to the specific agenda set by Emmanuel Macron), when, for example, the political situation or the museum landscape finally allows them to serenely envision such a return, re-installation, and/or circulation of recovered pieces of cultural heritage. With this in mind, it is especially important that the commission and the workshops put into place during the abovementioned second time period are conceived of in such a way as to endure and that their financing is assured.

3. Accompanying the Returns

Organizing the return of African objects is a task with a number of dimensions. The first dimension—and the one which will constitute the rupture with the prior situation—is to institute, through national law, a definitive path toward restitution, according to the requests, through the creation of an *ad hoc* procedure proposing the basis for a calm process toward restitution. It will also require the rationalization and the development within a bilateral framework, on a case by case basis, of the diverse actions of cooperation surrounding the decision of restitution and which will then establish a new context of cultural relations between France and each of the African countries.⁷⁷

Juridical Aspects

The ambition for re-establishing relations with African countries through cultural heritage must pass through the necessary symbolic stage of the definitive restitution of objects housed in French collections. This definitive restitution is inscribed within a more general framework of cultural cooperation, which furthermore provides one of the

⁷⁷ The reflections and recommendations that follow have been developed within the framework of Juridical Workshop held on June 26, 2018 at the Collège de France in Paris by Isabelle Maréchal and Vincent Négri (see the Annexes).

issues up for difficult debate regarding the preservation of the general principle of inalienability of the collections.

The procedure of restitution supposes a positive evolution of law, within the framework of a modification of the cultural heritage code, articulated in the principle of inalienability of public collections.

On the other hand, the restitution of cultural heritage objects shines a light on the fight against the trafficking of cultural goods; beyond the objects taken during the colonial period, African cultural objects have been a primed target of traffickers and forgers, of all nationalities, over the past several decades in the aftermath of the colonial period. The approach of restitution can only lead to questioning the current tools for fighting—or better, for the prevention—of these sorts of trafficking activities, so as to inscribe the objects restituted into a reinforced apparatus of protection (see farther down).

How to move past the current impasse?

The law presently in place, which up until now has opposed any efforts to respond to the demands for restitution, rests on an interplay of mixed dispositions regarding the cultural heritage code and the general code of the property of public personnel (CG3P). The cultural heritage code and the CG3P, adopted by rulings made in 2004 and 2006 respectively, have created a situation that is more locked down than was previously the case, where the protection of the museum collections essentially rests on jurisprudence. Current law posits a definition of public propriety that includes all cultural goods—most notably public museum collections—thereby generating a protection backed by rules of imprescriptibility and the inalienability of public ownership in this case creating an obstacle for requests of restitutions.

This blockade or freeze placed on any sort of restitutions seems to us more a result of the strict application of the texts while hardly conforming to the spirit of the laws. A number of people working in parliament have attempted on several occasions to attenuate the absolute character of the inalienability of objects in the museum collections which is the principal obstacle to restitutions.

Transactions with the rules of public ownership

The rare cases of restitution over the past 20 years have only been possible through transactions applying the rules of public ownership. Two means have been used:

a. The simplest solution was recourse to the law of exception, breaking with the texts applicable in terms of cultural heritage and public heritage. This tactic was used for the restitution of “the mortal remains of the person known by the name of Saartjie Baartman” aka. Vénus hottentote, in 2002, (loi n°2002-323, from March 6, 2002 concerning the restitution by France of the mortal remains of Saartjie Baartman to South Africa), and then again for the restitution of “Maori heads housed in the French museums” in 2010 (loi n°2010-501, May 10, 2010 authorizing the restitution by France of Maori heads back to New Zealand and their subsequent management within museum collections); It will also be used once again and applied very soon regarding the restitution of the skulls of Algerian resistance fighters taken during colonization.

Through its visibility and formality—armed with the dual principle of dignity and respect for the dead—it severely limits the possible cases of restitution.

These unique laws highlight the specific character of “human remains” and the discussion concerning their appropriation, which is elsewhere appreciated in an unequal fashion: jurisprudence has admitted that the code concerning cultural heritage, which renders the items of a public person as inalienable, thereby constituting a collection in one of the French museums, places these personal items under a rigid and unique form of protection, whereby the civil code is not an obstacle, most notably article 16-1 which places the human body (excluding any appropriation), its elements, and products, outside of commerce.⁷⁸

Beyond this jurisprudence, the respect given to the dead correlating with the importance of human remains (notably for their community of origin) has led, through a legislative path and a certain consensus, to a way of getting around the application of the normal procedures for the releasing of an object from being considered as public property which otherwise would have normally led to a refusal of the return of the body.

⁷⁸ TA Rouen, December 27, 2007, Prefect of the Seine-Maritime C/City of Rouen, n°0702737, CAA Douai, July 24, 2008, City of Rouen, n°08DA00405. The administrative judge tosses out the argumentation of the city of Rouen who tried to denote the worth of human remains, Maori heads, thereby making them insusceptible to public or private appropriation and that these objects could therefore not be a part of the museum collection, the advisory procedures indicated by the cultural heritage code could not oppose his ruling.

b. The second means for achieving a similar way of getting around this jurisprudence is to avoid applying texts regarding public property to the object in question, through its status of non-belonging to the collection.

Its non-belonging can be considered as *de facto*.

We know that works that have been stamped MNR since 1953 (Musées Nationaux Récupération) remain as outstanding objects of restitution among the 60,000 works pillaged by the Nazis during the occupation, having never been integrated into the French public collections, so as to precisely assure their restitution once the family or the rights holder has been identified or made known. To consider things from yet another perspective, the restitution of Chinese cultural property⁷⁹, which was effectuated in 2015, was made possible through the withdrawal, by way of a request to the State, of the donation of the objects made several years earlier by a private collector to the Musée Guimet. As soon as these objects became private property, they could immediately be restituted by the donor to the Chinese State.

... or this merely leads to the discovery of an original irreparable technicality tarnishing the acquisition:

As such, cultural items collected from the illicit trafficking that would have entered public collections after 1997,⁸⁰ as a result of negligence in the verification of the provenance during the acquisition process, or whose illicit character is revealed through the discovery of new elements can be made an object, since the creation of the LCAP law from July 7, 2016,⁸¹ of a cancellation by way of the legal path to their acquisition (by sale, gift, or inheritance) on the initiative of the public person exploited.⁸²

The object thus reputed, will have never entered into public property and therefore will avoid any questions concerning releasing the object from the classification of public property, the new article L. 124-1 of the cultural heritage code prepares the way for the judge to arrange the its restitution to the original owner.

⁷⁹ Four golden plates etched with stylized images of birds left China before the ratification of the UNESCO convention and whose origins were deemed dubious after a common work of analysis done by both French and Chinese experts effectuated 20 years later.

⁸⁰ The ratification by France on January 7, 1997, of the UNESCO Convention of 1970 concerning the measures to take in order to forbid and prevent the importing, exporting, and transfer of the illicit ownership of cultural items.

⁸¹ Law n°2016-925 from July 7, 2016 concerning the freedom of creation, architecture and cultural heritage property.

⁸² This possibility is essentially tied with discouraging the trafficking of cultural goods and notably the financing of terrorism. The preparatory work done by the LCAP also envisioned a dispositive calling into question the initiative, on behalf of the owner, of the entrance of human remains and cultural spoils as a result of Nazism into the collections but these two cases were not kept a part of the inter-ministerial arbitration.

Resonances with the method for the restitution of African Cultural Heritage

These procedures or arrangements that have in the past led to punctual restitutions cannot respond to the method of restitution as it has been outlined in a variety of ways throughout the dialogues and discussions comprising this present mission:

Our current task is above all centered on remedying the situation of the largest expatriation of African cultural heritage ever known. The rarity of this cultural heritage in its countries of origin is not only detrimental to the preservation of national cultures and various communities, but it risks damaging, in the long-term, the perspectives for the constitution of a prestigious museum offering bearing on economic development. It is thus necessary to establish the means for a global reflection on the African collections conserved in France, the research into the provenance⁸³ of these objects, and to determine a procedure, integrating scholarly objectives, for a process of restitution potentially bearing on a very large number of cultural objects.

The processing of a request for restitution requires taking into account two major difficulties, besides that of the inalienability of the collections.

- a. The first difficulty is that a number of objects found in museum collections were initially acquired by way of violence or some form of deceit or within iniquitous conditions notably tied to the asymmetry of the “colonial context”, but also, in large part, during a period prior to the Hague conventions of 1899 and 1907, when the practice of acquiring the spoils of war or that of trophies was still largely acceptable. The collection of cultural objects through scientific expeditions, financed by the State, throughout the exploration and conquest of new territories was also another mode that was largely placed into effect in parallel with military operations.

The context of acquisition will therefore play a determinant role in how we handle requests for restitution, even though, as unacceptable as these acts appear to us today, they are not legally quantifiable as crimes under international law, in contrast to the Nazi spoils for which a specific juridical act was placed into effect,⁸⁴ and the plundering and destruction that happened after the UNESCO Convention of 1954 for the protection of cultural heritage items in case of armed conflict.

⁸³ The research done on the “provenance” concerning the geographical and cultural origin of the object, its use, and the modalities of its acquisition from its original owner(s), the circumstances of its exit from its natural territory, and its entrance into the collections of a museum in France.

⁸⁴ An inter-ally declaration from London in 1943 against the acts of dispossession committed in the territories under occupation and enemy control.

Nevertheless, given that international law would certainly propose such a law toward reparations for similar acts committed in our present times, analogous to those committed in the past, as much concerning the violence as the results of this violence, it is certainly legitimate to pose the question of a law for the restitution of objects taken under similar circumstances and acts of violence committed during the colonial period.

- b.** The second difficulty is that a large portion of the African cultural objects in the public French collections were inherited by the museums, or donated to the museums by heirs from the colonies or from members of the military engaged in operations of conquest, by administrators of the colonies or by missionaries oftentimes several decades after the death of their relative. The modalities of the initial acquisition of these objects, going back almost 150 years, certainly came under a variety of circumstances: spoils of war certainly, theft, gifts that were more or less freely consented to, but also by bartering, purchases,⁸⁵ whether equitable or not, or even by direct purchase orders from local artists and artisans.

It was most often the case that the museums that benefitted from these gifts had very little information about the conditions of the initial acquisitions of the objects, and sometimes this included a lack of knowledge about their exact provenance.

Furthermore, museum objects resulting from gifts or inheritance benefit from an explicit inalienability, following the cultural heritage code, and the material in question is controlled by the civil code which makes no distinction between whether the donor is considered as public person or private person.

Finally, the important thing to take into account concerning a new method of restitution is the willingness of a Franco-African partnership to establish a list of objects susceptible to requests for restitution so as to lead, when a given case arises and when it is necessary, the proper research on the provenance of the object in order to establish common forms of “know-how” regarding restitution and the object’s museographical accompaniment on both continents.

Under these conditions, the work of this present report and mission is oriented toward the creation of an entirely new and specific procedure for how to proceed with

⁸⁵ To clarify this a bit more: we were able to discern the appearance of fabricated counterfeits very early on during colonization so as to satisfy the demand of this new “clientele”... the oldest pieces were dated back to Spanish conquest of Mexico during the 16th century.

restitutions, resulting from the dialogues at the workshop held on June 26, 2018 (Document 3) as well as the dialogues with the museum directors held on July 4, 2018.

The envisioned juridical apparatus

The juridical apparatus will be articulated through the contours of two essential positions of the method employed: definitive restitution as the founding key-element of heightened cultural cooperation, made concrete through the signature of *a bilateral agreement, which will legitimize the new procedure of restitution* introduced into the code concerning cultural heritage. This juridical apparatus will decide a procedure for exception but which will not be limited to objects only housed in museums.

a. The contextual elements that guided the choice of this proposition

The difficulty of this exercise was to allow for the undertaking of the process of restitution, without however, calling into question the general principle of the inalienability of publicly owned cultural objects—the founding principle of the legislation of French museums.

The proposed solution rests on the indivisible link between the new procedure of restitution introduced into the Cultural Heritage Code and the bilateral agreement that establishes the exemption of the general principle of inalienability and limits it to this sole hypothesis.

This approach exists in other areas, most notably in terms of medicine, which allows for the submittal of an exception to common legislative law⁸⁶ through a bilateral agreement for the benefit of a foreign country.

This new procedure will be introduced into Book 1 of the Cultural Heritage Code devoted to “Common Legal Provisions for the Whole Sector”, in Chapter 2 of Title 1 that deals with restitutions effectuated through the application of the European directive of 1993 (revised in 2014) concerning the illicit exit of cultural goods.

The choice of Book 1 is also dictated by a concern for not wanting to limit the restitution of items to those that have only formally entered into the museum collections. Even though these museum collections are by far the richest in restitutable African cultural heritage objects, the process of restitution could certainly end up concerning other objects from the Cultural Heritage Code (archives, works from libraries).

⁸⁶ Article L.4111-1-2 of the Public Health Code

The second difficulty was reconciling the apparent voluntaristic character of the intention of restitution, when our knowledge of the provenance of the objects housed on our territory is largely unequal. However, as has been explained on several occasions earlier on in our report, the knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the initial acquisition is an essential part of our approach.

The procedural framework proposed is supple enough so as to allow for swift restitutions when questions concerning the provenance of the objects have been established and are clearly known and the defect of consent during acquisition of the objects is manifest or strongly presumed which will be emblematic of the reality and desire to break with previous impasses in regards to restitution.

But we must also make the approach to restitutions capable of adapting to a variety of situations and the state of knowledge regarding the African collections in France as well as the variety of expectations by the partnering countries. This requires leaving a necessary place for a common work of research and dialogue, either to establish the certainty for the circumstances of acquisition, or so as to gather together the elements of sufficient presumption for an acquisition done under duress. In the end, this approach aims at the timely restitution of objects whose conditions of acquisition, despite the research done, will remain unknown, but whose scientific interest for the African collections remains certain.

The final and formal decision of restitution belongs to the public owner and is formalized by a decree, taken, if it is a case of a territorial collectivity, after a vote following the competent deliberation of an assembly authorizing the mayor or the President of the collectivity to proceed toward restitution. This decision cannot be made under duress, most notably when the provenance of the objects in question remains uncertain.

b. The Procedure of Restitution Requires a Modification of the Cultural Heritage Code

This new procedure will take the place, in Book 1 of the Cultural Heritage Code devoted to “Common Legal Provisions for the Whole Sector”, in Chapter 2 of Title 1, where a section 5 will be inserted into the chapter concerning the restitution of cultural heritage items based on the foundation of a bilateral agreement of cultural cooperation with the formerly colonized countries, protectorates, or territories managed under French mandate (see the legislative proposition, presented in the form of a table, in the annex of the present report: Annex, Document 2).

The restitution is undertaken on the basis of a formal demand from the country making the request, which could swiftly receive the cultural object whose origin and conditions of acquisition are sufficiently known so that the establishment of an investigation file does not require further research. Throughout the duration of the validity of the cooperative agreement, renewable according to the desires of the Parties, other demands could bear on a (several) list(s) of objects whose interest and provenance will have to be studied and scrutinized within a framework of a partnership of research outlined by the triennial programs (see *infra*: b.) The agreement of cooperation).

The joint commission of experts designated by the States of the parties, whose composition and mission are defined through each agreement of cooperation, will evaluate the investigation files of the objects submitted to the list. In order to formulate its opinion, the commission will consider the elements relative to the origins of the objects and, in cases where the initial conditions of the acquisitions cannot be established, the commission will consider the objects' complementarity with other objects that have been restituted or their interest for the country or community of origin.

The commission will also verify the state of the national collections after restitution, and be informed, if the case arises, of measures envisioned for guaranteeing the continuity and presence of the art and history of the contracting country on national territory.

The commission's examination must therefore be modulated, according to the degree of knowledge concerning the origin of the object:

- It will simply be a question of the verification of the conclusions brought to light by the research work regarding the provenance of the objects, when these objects have have been presumed or deemed as having been acquired under conditions of duress.
- However, the commission will also provide its opinion in terms of restitution regarding the scholarly interest of the objects in the collection for the requesting country when the circumstances of the acquisition of the object requested, despite the research done, remain unknown.

The favorable opinion of the experts of the commission will allow for the object to depart from the museum collection in which it was housed and for its restitution, on the decision of the public owner, to the requesting country.

This schema of the procedure of restitution is detailed and made explicit in the legislative proposition, annexed within the present report.

An analysis of the cases of this procedure and its application to objects arising from donations or inheritance is also included in the annex. (Annex, Document 2).

c. The Agreement of Cooperation

The agreement of cultural cooperation, agreed upon between France and each requesting country, a model example of which, adapted on a case by case basis, will be included in the annex of this present report (Annex, Document 2) as the foundation for the objective of definitive restitution.

With this goal in mind, the agreement of cultural cooperation outlines, among other things, the establishment or completion of the inventorying of cultural objects originating from the contracting African countries, the creation of renewable triennial research partnership programs in order to determine the provenance of certain cultural objects whose initial conditions of acquisition currently remain unknown, the creation of a joint commission of experts designated by both countries in order to examine and analyze the restitution requests and the modalities of cultural and scientific cooperation over the long term as well to establish activities for the education and training of professionals and the facilitation of public awareness, and finally, the advent of a monitoring committee to oversee the ensemble of these activities.

The list (or lists) of objects established within the framework of this agreement comprises the foundation of the request for restitution. Unless it is known before the conclusion of this agreement,⁸⁷ the establishment of this list necessitates that the inventory of African objects in the museums be completed and made accessible, and that partnerships are put in place between experts, researchers, or curators from the countries and museums concerned so as to establish the provenance of these cultural objects.

The agreement outlines activities of scholarly cooperation, the programming of the accompaniment of the objects in the form of welcoming teams, and the conservation of the restituted objects, in the form of training of the personnel responsible for their conservation and their eventual necessary mediation. The agreement also outlines the modalities of financing these actions and research work.

Under the auspices of the joint committee of experts, the institutions and communities concerned, in France as well as in Africa, will be informed or associated according to the modalities defined for the methods of restitution.

⁸⁷ Which could be the case for request made much earlier or in the distant past.

The agreement also integrates an acute cooperation in terms of the fight against the trafficking of cultural goods.

Depending on the case, the ratification of the agreement will serve as a good precautionary measure for guaranteeing financial engagements, despite the delays that this procedure could generate.

The Financing of Actions of Restitution

The programs of research partnerships could include, when necessary, an inventory of the African collections, from which questions of the provenance of the cultural objects could be studied as well as the creation of the proposals for restitution.

The other actions of cooperation (support and investment in the creation or modernization of museums, the training of curators, restorers, temporary exhibits, the sharing of information on the trafficking of cultural goods) could be financed according to customary modalities, as soon as a dedicated budget is reserved for the implementation of the bilateral agreements for restitution.

In any event, the return of these pieces requires a budget devoted to the cost of transportation as well as the price of insurance that we know can fluctuate depending on the fragility of the work in question and its value on the market.⁸⁸

On the French/European side, two paths toward financing appear to be at our disposal:

- The AFD essentially finances investments, but the transportation cost and insurance necessary for the return of art objects could be a complementary component of an investment program in the creation or modernization of museums such as that already underway and under construction for a portion of the reserves and collections of the Musée National de Yaoundé. The AFD has recently increased its intervention into financing archeological research programs within the framework of construction.
- European funding from the partnership between the European Union and African Union, a mechanism of European support and development to which France

⁸⁸ As an example, the return of 96 objects from the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac sent to the musée Théodore-Monod d'art africain in Dakar cost 42,000 euros for packing them, escort fees and airfreight, before including the insurance. The insurance cost was an extra 200 euros.

contributes 17% for the period running from 2017/2020, that is 5.5 Mds €,⁸⁹ could also be approached for contributing to this method of restitution from the viewpoint of development aid.

And finally, the cost for funding the joint commission of experts shouldn't be glossed over and should be taken into account in the allocation of funds attributed to the course and methods of restitution, and should be considered independently from the necessary hirings within the core of the services of the French museums.⁹⁰

Who should the restitutions be directed to?

Within the framework of these international relations, the French State must be carefully attentive to respecting the sovereignty of the various nation-states; With this in mind, the procedures of restitution will be undertaken on a state by state basis, which doesn't exclude the possibility of administrative arrangements in working toward direct collaborations with other State institutions or administrations and their homologues in other countries. The same would not apply for territorial collectivities that could develop relations of cooperation with other local collectivities or foreign institutions.⁹¹

The property of the French State will thereby be granted to the requesting state, it is then this (requesting) state's responsibility, after the negotiations, to give this property back to its community or initial owner. This was how the "Maori heads" were given back to New Zealand, the New Zealand government representing juridically, within the framework of international relations, the interests of the community of origin.⁹²

⁸⁹ France is the second contributor after Germany (20%) and ahead of Great Britain and Italy.

⁹⁰ We can estimate around 20,000 Euros (travel and lodging costs) for each meeting of a Franco-African commission of 12 persons (6 French experts, 6 experts designated from the African country concerned) for the duration of two days. Even in supposing that each commission only meets once a year and that the minister of culture puts in place this commission process for five different African countries every year, the provision costs will be around 100,000 Euros.

⁹¹ In the same vein as the Conventions de Lomé and the Cotonou Agreement, the Africa-EU partnership—the official framework of cooperation between the European Union and the African continent adopted in 2007 by the heads of state and the governments during the second official EU-Africa Summit—situates territorial collectivities as potential actors within European politics of development aid, commonly referred to within this framework as "decentralized development cooperation". Furthermore, in the 1990s, we see the emergence of new modalities for the international action of territorial collectivities, these being a means for inserting the territories into globalization.

⁹² The restituted heads are reserved at The Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa in Wellington where they are housed in a specific room only accessible to authorized members of the community of origin.

The very importance itself of restitutions for certain communities and the concern of not wanting to interfere in the interior state politics of the African nations concerned leads to privileging a procedure of state to state management, which is moreover much easier to consolidate on a scholarly level and will remain to be evaluated in its realization.

The envisioned procedure necessitates that the state of origin is the lone entity authorized to present a request of restitution that will be presented to the French state and to it alone. In a case where the states concerned are not in a position to work with each other, other forms of direct cooperation could be considered (inter-museum or inter-university cooperation). If the request is informed by those more closely connected to it on the ground such as by experts within the French museums concerned in France or in Africa, its examination is centralized through the obligatory passage in front of the bilateral commission of experts as well as the registering of restitutions throughout the process of their intervention.

The objects of the territorial collectivities could be restituted by their community representative, but the remittance and delivery of the object would only be made to the representative of the requesting state.

However, the accompanying measures and research works and projects would find their place within the framework of bilateral cooperation that is decentralized and which could be coherently inscribed within an agreement of bilateral cooperation.

Guaranteeing the Permanence of the Restitutions and Reinforcing the Fight against Illicit Trafficking

Restituting African cultural heritage in Africa re-establishes a relation between European nation-states—one being France—and African nation-states, notably built through the writing of a shared past.

The political designs of the re-establishment of this relation requires, so as to guarantee the permanence of the African collections to Africa, the formulation of a common law between France and the African States concerning the future of restitutions.

This problematic of writing and adopting common rules between states so as to guarantee restitutions for cultural goods first emerged in Europe, more specifically, among the member States of the European Union. As such, these European States already have at their disposal instruments for economic, cultural, and normative

integration that have already been thoroughly developed in certain aspects, most notably regarding the restitution of cultural property; But the functioning and benefits of these mechanisms of automatic restitution for stolen or illicitly exported cultural property are at present only valid for member States of the European Union. The directive 2014/60/UE of the European Parliament and of the Council from May 2014 relative to the restitution of cultural property that have illicitly left the territory of a member State formulates this law for the restitution of cultural property.⁹³

The case proceeds differently when the request for restitution comes from an extra-European State. In such a scenario, the protection of the buyer of good faith and the principle of the territoriality of laws—the principle according to which the judge only pronounces in virtue of the lone law of the country where the cultural good is located at the time of the claim—will be an obstacle in the satisfaction of the request for restitution.⁹⁴ What's more, the UNESCO Convention of 1970 concerning the measures to take in order to forbid and prevent the importation, exportation, and transfer of illicit ownership of cultural property, ratified by France in 1997, contains nothing regarding what to do if the cultural goods in question are found in the hands of a private individual. Concerning this question, we should call to mind again the jurisprudence regarding the claim for the Nok statuettes by Nigeria: “The dispositions of this convention are not directly applicable within the internal juridical order of the State parties in such a way that M.X. is found to maintain that the convention only stipulates obligations to the responsibilities of the latter and in no way creates a direct obligation on behalf of the leader of their citizens...”⁹⁵

As for good faith, the French Supreme Court confirmed a decision by the Court of Appeals of Paris, recalling that “good faith is always presumed and that it is up to the one who invokes fraud to prove it”; in this affair, the judge comments that “there is a mention in the catalog under the signature of an expert indicating that a certain number

⁹³ This directive performs a revision of the directive 93/7/CEE of the Council from March 15, 1993 relative to the restitution of cultural property having illicitly left the territory of a State member, thereby reinforcing the principles of restitution.

⁹⁴ Concerning claims made by Iran for archeological cultural objects which are property of Iran through the application of the Iranian legislation involving archeological cultural heritage, the French judge made his ruling in the following manner: “the litigious objects being located in France, the Islamic Republic of Iran has no founding for soliciting for the application of Iranian law” (CA Paris, June 6, 1989, M. Y. c/ The Islamic Republic of Iran, aff. n°88/20267 : confirmed by Cass. Civ. 1, April 4, 1991, n°89-18020).

⁹⁵ CA Paris, April 5, 2004, The Federal Republic of Nigeria, c/ M. X., aff. 2002/09897 ; confirmed by Cass civ. 1, September 20, 2006, n°04-115599.

of objects came from clandestine digs,"⁹⁶ without this claim in any way altering the good faith of the purchaser of these archeological objects.

This imbalance between applicable law within the circle of European states, on the one hand, and the principles that the judge opposes to the extra-European states on the other, affects the future of restitutions. The compensation for this imbalance and the writing of a common law of restitution between France and Africa requires that both the France and the African states concerned ratify the UNIDROIT Convention concerning stolen cultural objects adopted on June 24, 1995; This convention puts in place an automatic mechanism of restitution for any future claims.

This Convention is the lone juridical tool capable of compensating for the present imbalance and thereby establishing a common law for restitution as well as insuring the permanence of the process undertaken for the cultural objects stockpiled during the colonial period.

In other words, the ratification of the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention will inscribe the restitutions within a perspective of durability.

We will note that the European states have already established such an ambition among themselves by infusing the principles of the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention into the European directive of May 15, 2014, mentioned above, relative to the restitution of cultural objects. As such, the extension of these principles to extra-European states, using the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention as a springboard, shouldn't pose any difficulties.

Popular Appropriations

Accompanying restitutions also implies working to ensure that the communities concerned as well as the public at large are able to claim ownership of this practice in all its aspects. The first groups that should be prioritized in this list are the African youth, those coming from the diasporas, and the European youth who all are beginning to demonstrate the extent to which they are concerned by the question of restitution. This work should be in partnership with collectives and associations already acting on the ground, thanks to the implication of the scientific community, but also authors, artists, filmmakers and documentarians on both continents. In parallel, an important work of a polyphonic narrative will also be undertaken.

⁹⁶ CA Paris, June 6, 1989, M. Y. c/ The Islamic Republic of Iran, aff. n°88/20267 : confirmed by Cass. Civ. 1, April 4, 1991, n°89-18020).

Vital in its import, this work will allow—in a variety of forms accessible to everyone—to evoke the often tangled histories of the cultural pieces in question and through these narratives, help to initiate a thorough reflection on the very notions of memory, “cultural heritage”, and shared history. These practices could lead to the production of works, brochures and documentary films, as well as the organization of events allowing for the stimulation of cultural exchange and dialogue (conferences, public debates, concerts, installations), but also traveling exhibitions that could in the end, constitute an ideal framework for such exchange.

The creation of an online portal around the theme of the circulation of cultural objects that would contain general information about the situation and redistribution of cultural heritage from the African continent outside of Africa, while also proposing detailed narratives of the trajectories of certain pieces (with the help of accompanying texts and multimedia documents) would also be a creative and engaging way to create a pathway of discovery.

And finally, restitutions also imply continued rethinking of the modalities of the mediatization of the information originating from the core of the museums themselves. Far from merely being reducible to a list of dates, sites, and names on museum labels, these other forms of knowledge are not only requested by the younger audiences, but are positioned to accompany—by also enriching it—the intuitive or sensorial relation to the art works. The objective here is to make it so that the material and symbolic stakes provoked by the question of restitutions are not merely limited to a circle of initiates, but also can reach a larger public inside and outside the museum space.

Conclusion

The historical window that opened up in Ouagadougou on November 28, 2017, preparing the path toward the restitution of African cultural heritage objects currently held in French national collections, establishes a new era in cultural relations between France and Africa, and in a larger and more general manner, between Europe and Africa. By recognizing the legitimacy of the requests made by African countries to recover a significant part of their cultural heritage and their memory, while at the same time working toward a better understanding about this moment of colonial history, the process of restitution allows for the possibility of writing a new page of a shared and peaceful history, where each protagonist can provide his or her fair piece of the common story.

These objects which for a large part have been ripped away from their cultures of origin by way of colonial violence, but which were welcomed and cared for by generations of curators in their new places of residence, from now on bear within them an irremediable piece of Europe and Africa. Having incorporated several regimes of meaning, they become sites of the *creolization* of cultures and as a result they are equipped to serve as mediators of a new relationality.

The best approach and method for the restitution of African cultural objects is to establish another relational ethics. By working through the space of the symbolic, this space becomes tectonic and its aftershocks, and the new values it ushers in, will leave no site of exchange between European and African societies unscathed

(whether it be economic, political, or societal). The restitution of African cultural items will therefore initiate a new economy of relations whose effects will not be limited to cultural spaces or those of museographical exchange.

20 years ago, one of the greatest voices of African poetry, the Nigerian, Niyi Osundare (*1947), called out to the moon and the seasons in the poem, “Africa’s Memory”.⁹⁷ The poem is about four objects dispersed to the four corners of the world, about African kingdoms and Western cities, about the wind that carries away memory and broken spells. Within the depths of the English syntax resides the mother tongue of the poet: the Yoruba language, a few chimerical words, composed and condensed of real words, unique as proper nouns brimming with multiple meanings, far off from the generic Western names that reduce things to a list one can catalogue in a museum:

I ask for Oluyenyetuye bronze of Ife
The moon says it is in Bonn

I ask for Ogidigbonyingboyin mask of Benin
The moon says it is in London

I ask for Dinkowawa stool of Ashanti
The moon says it is in Paris

I ask for Togongorewa bust of Zimbabwe
The moon says it is in New York

I ask
I ask
I ask for the memory of Africa
The seasons say it is blowing in the wind

The hunchback cannot hide his burden

This text is a powerful witness to an absence and to a quest. It is at the heart of the subject that concerns us: the unequal distribution of African cultural heritage around the world, of its beautiful presence in Western museums, the gaps in memory as a result of its absence in Africa, and the responsibility of each and everyone of us—in staring up at the moon, the seasons, and the future—to assure the establishment of equity.

⁹⁷ Niyi Osundare, *Horses of Memory*, Ibadan 1998, p. 43.

The relation to others is often mediated by history (the past). The condition for freedom is not to be governed by the past, but to re-write it in the present (time). Through the chaotic disruption of old forms of relationality that it incites, restitutions prefigure a new cosmology where the reception of cultural heritage, values from another time, give way to a new relation with the world, based on the recognition of our mutual interdependence and the fundamental relational character of our identities. And it is only by taking care of these identities that we will be able to render this world inhabitable for everyone.

Annexes

Methods

The present report was conceived and edited between Dakar, Nantes, Paris and Berlin. It takes into account the rapid evolution of the public debate around restitutions in Europe as much as in Africa. It is founded upon:

- A vast consultation of experts and political actors in France and in four francophone African countries (Benin, Senegal, Mali, and Cameroon)
- The establishment of inventories and statistics allowing us to discern the quality, quantity, and origins of the African collections in the French museums.
- Exchanges led during two workshops with unique points of reflection: “L’Atelier de Dakar” and “L’Atelier juridique”.

ISABELLE MARECHAL, the inspector general of cultural affairs at the Ministry of Culture, carefully oversaw and ensured the proper institutional proceedings of the mission and assumed the responsibilities of the juridical side of things along with VINCENT NEGRI, jurist and researcher at the Institut des Sciences sociales du Politique (ISP / UMR 7220 : CNRS – ENS Paris Saclay – Université Paris Nanterre).

VICTOR CLAASS, art historian, PhD, coordinated the activities, contributed to the elaboration of the inventories as well as accompanied the compilation of this report.

General Consultation

“Critical Friends”

Upon reception of the letter dated March 19, 2018, we invited a circle of “critical friends” to take part in the reflection. The transcontinental and interdisciplinary composition of this circle sought to guarantee a plurality of views on the subject matter with multiple symbolic, political, and juridical implications and controversies. The group gathered together on two occasions: in the months of March and September, 2018. Throughout the entire process, several of its members were also consulted individually.

The first exchanges took place March 26, 2018 at the Collège de France in Paris. Those present included: CHRISTIANE FALGAYRETTES-LEVEAU (director of the musée Dapper, Paris), STÉPHANE MARTIN (Président of the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris), BONAVENTURE NDIKUNG (founder and artistic director of SAVVY Contemporary, Berlin), VINCENT NÉGRI (jurist and researcher at the l’Institut des Sciences sociales du Politique, ISP / UMR 7720), LOUIS-GEORGES TIN (then president, now honorary president of the Conseil représentatif des associations noires de France, Paris), MARIE-CÉCILE ZINSOU (president of the Fondation Zinsou, Paris/Cotonou). Those who were also invited but who were unable to attend were the following: SOULEYMANE BACHIR DIAGNE (philosopher, Columbia University, New York), HAMADY BOCOUM (archeologist, director of the musée des Civilisations noires de Dakar), KWAME OPOKU (former juridical advisor, retired from the Bureau of the United Nations in Vienna).

The participants were reminded of their role in the debate concerning restitutions, they expressed their convictions and their doubts regarding the feasibility of the project. They helped to problematize the question so as to reveal a plurality of dimensions from each of their own singular perspectives. They assured their institutional and intellectual support to the authors of this report.

A second meeting of “critical friends” took place in Paris on September 24, 2018 at the Collège de France. Those present included: CLAIRE BOSC-TIESSÉ (Institut national d’histoire de l’art, Paris), CHRISTIANE FALGAYRETTES-LEVEAU (director of the musée Dapper, Paris), ANNE LAFONT (Director of studies à l’EHESS, Paris), ISABELLE MARECHAL (the inspector general of cultural affairs at the Ministry of Culture, Paris), STÉPHANE MARTIN (president of the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris), VINCENT NÉGRI (jurist and researcher at the l’Institut des Sciences sociales du Politique, ISP / UMR 7720), KWAME OPOKU (former juridical advisor, retired from the Bureau of the United Nations in Vienna) LOUIS-GEORGES TIN (then president, now honorary president of the Conseil représentatif des associations noires de France, Paris), MARIE-CÉCILE ZINSOU (president of the Fondation Zinsou, Paris/Cotonou).

This second meeting allowed us to take stock on the progress of the report and discuss the final form it would take. Exchanges also took place concerning the place that should

be granted to scholarly research in the debates regarding restitutions and reaffirmed the prospective and operational dimension of the report.

Museums

Given the specificity of the relations that curators have with the collections they oversee, throughout the world and from the very beginning of each institution's existence, beyond the circle of "critical friends", we also participated in a dialogue with this specific group of museum professionals in France and in Africa, as this group would be the first ones affected by the eventual restitutions. For want of repertoires documenting the already existing scholarly cooperation between French and African museums, throughout the interview, it also became a way for establishing a cartography of the active (and the most promising) ties between institutions.

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac

At the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, we held a meeting on April 26, 2018 during which were present: GAËLLE BEAUJEAN-BALTZER (curator of the African collections), SARAH FRIOUX-SALGAS (responsible for the Documentation of the collections and archives), AURÉLIEN GABORIT (curator of the African collections), HÉLÈNE JOUBERT (curator of the African collections), EMMANUEL KASARHÉROU (deputy to the director of the Département du patrimoine et des collections, responsible for the scholarly coordination of the collections), YVES LE FUR (director of the Département du patrimoine et des collections). The president of the museum, STÉPHANE MARTIN, also took part in the meeting. The meeting also helped to create a direct and fruitful collaboration with the services of the archives of the museum for the use and analysis of the inventories. Furthermore, Hélène Joubert and Gaëlle Beaujean-Baltzer lent their expertise in terms of the history of the collections and the origins of certain of the objects during the "Atelier juridique" organized on June 26, 2018 (see above).

Other Parisian museums and museums of territorial collectivities

A meeting organized on July 4, 2018 in the auditorium of the C2RMF at the Louvre helped the authors of this report to expand the horizon of their consultation to include museums and collections of territorial collectivities. Those invited to this exchange included the directors (or their colleagues) from the other public museums who, outside the Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, also house important African collections in France (for the musées d'État) : CHRISTOPHE PINCEMAILLE (for the musée de l'Île d'Aix), MICHEL GUIRAUD (director of the collections au Muséum national d'histoire naturelle) and ANNE NIVARD (curator at the Muséum national d'histoire naturelle), ANDRÉ DEPLUECH

(director of the département musée de l'Homme), ARIANE JAMES-SARAZIN (deputy director of the musée de l'Armée), FRÉDÉRIQUE CHAPELAY (curator at the musée de la Marine), EROL OK and JOHAN POPELAR (musée Picasso), CHRISTIAN LANDES (curator at the Musée d'archéologie nationale de Saint-Germain-en-Laye). For the museums of the territorial collectivities : JEAN-FRANÇOIS TOURNEPICHE and ÉMILIE SALABERRY (musée d'Angoulême), CÉDRIC CRÉMIÈRE (Muséum d'histoire naturelle du Havre), MARIE PERRIER (curator at the musée des Confluences de Lyon), FLORIANE PICARD HARDY (Musée de la Vieille charité), FRANÇOIS COULON (musée des Beaux-arts de Rennes), PIERRE DALOUS (Muséum d'histoire naturelle de Toulouse). For private institutions: LAURICK ZERBINI and JEAN-PAUL KPATCHA (Société des missions africaines), AUDE LEVEAU (Fondation Dapper). To this list of names we also would like to add ISABELLE NYFFENHEGGER (Bibliothèque nationale de France), SYLVIE WATELET (C2RMF), CLAIRE CHASTANIER et BÉNÉDICTE ROLLAND-VILLEMOT (Service des musées de France), as well as those museum advisors from DRAC (Direction régionale des affaires culturelles) : NICOLAS BEL and MARIE-FRANÇOISE GÉRARD (Aquitaine), BERTRAND BERGBAUER and SANDRA PASCALIS (Grand Est), FLORE COLLETTE (Occitanie), ELISE FAU (Pays de la Loire), LAURENCE ISNARD and SYLVIE MULLER (Île-de-France), EVELYNE SCHMITT (Bretagne), LIONEL BERGATTO (Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes), DIANA GAY (Centre-Val de Loire).

The discussion gave way to a collective reflection on the varied typology of the African items housed in the museums (military trophies, ethnographic collections, private collections formed by merchants and traders, collections from artists). The discussion also helped us to take stock of the existence (or not), and in certain cases, the scientific quality of the inventoried objects from sub-Saharan Africa found in the museums of the territorial collectivities. The exchanges also led to a discussion on the fruitful cooperation between institutions in France and Africa that were already taking place by certain museums; notably between the Muséum d'histoire naturelle du Havre and museums in Dakar (Cédric Crémière); the initiatives of the musée d'Angoulême for sharing of knowledge and expertise and the transfer of competence with Senegal (Émilie Salaberry), or the initiative by Rhône-Alpes region and the exhibit *L'Afrique de nos reserves*, presented in 2011-2012 at the musée du Chateau d'Annecy (Laurick Zerbin).

Senegal

Several interviews took place in Dakar with EL HADJI MALICK NDIAYE, curator at the IFAN Museum of African Art, (the musée Théodore-Monod d'art africain), and HAMADY BOCOUM, director of the musée des Civilisations noires (whose inauguration is slated for December 6, 2018) between March and November 2018 (specifically the 2 and 3 of May 2018 as well as on the occasion of the Dakar Biennale during August 2018), but also in Paris during the International Conference on the Circulation of Cultural Property held at UNESCO, June 1, 2018. And it was by the invitation of El Hadji Malick Ndiaye that an organized workshop took place on June 12, 2018 within the framework of the mission.

The exchange with the Dakar curators confirmed the interest they have in a project of restitution and their goodwill to provide an institutional and intellectual framework for a public debate considered as indispensable concerning the question in Senegal. The pertinence of the “ethnographic” category was discussed at length. In Dakar, the specific institutional link that ties the musée Théodore-Monod to the University of Dakar (Université Cheikh Anta Diop) more specifically invited us to think of the restitutions in the terms of the future forms of cooperation between universities and museums, in particular in the area of epistemology—certain traditional objects encapsulating mathematical and astronomical forms of knowledge, for example. The question of signifiers of the term “restitution”, that of the re-socialization of objects, and the stakes of the re-appropriation of cultural heritage, as well as the question of the circulation of art pieces were discussed in depth and at length during the “Atelier de Dakar”, mentioned below.

Mali

At the Musée National de Mali in Bamako, since the beginning of June, we were able to have an exchange with SALIA MALE, the director of the museum, as well as with his predecessor and current director of the National Park of Mali, SAMUEL SIDIBE, as well as with BABA KEITA (a consultant for UNESCO). All of them are for the project of restitutions. Out of all the museums on the African continent, the Musée National de Bamako is perhaps considered to be the museum with the most connections and past cooperation with the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac. The National Park that surrounds the museum and serves as a beautiful backdrop for it was conceived of through the framework of a public-private partnership between the Malian government and the Aga Khan Trust for Culture (AKTC).

Three points emerged from our discussions in Mali: the existence of negotiations that were already rather advanced with private interlocutors firstly wanting to promote the return to Mali of their collection, such as JAN BAPTIST BEDAUX. Mixed feelings in regard to the mere “circulation” of cultural property if it is separated from the act of “restitutions” still harboring the very present bittersweet memories of traveling exhibits. Consequently, SALIA MALE evoked, “Ciwara, collections du musée du quai Branly”, an exhibit that presented objects common to the culture of these regions but which, after generating a lot of enthusiasm from the public, created a great deal of despair when the works were sent back to France. And the final point concerned a discussion around the “ritual and social life” of the museum objects and the question of the “national” museum in general and the relationship with the communities from which the collections originated.

Our interlocutors bemoan a lack of personnel and funds, effects of the crisis that since 2013 directly and indirectly effects the institution (the drying up of tourism, fears linked

to terrorism...); as well as the practices of the art market which continues to grow in an illicit manner within the Malian territory.

Cameroon

The geography of the museums in Cameroon is characterized by the co-existence of prestigious State structures and extremely well engaged (dynastic) private museums. We did our best to consult both sorts of museums.

- **Musée National du Cameroun.** We had a chance to speak with the director of the Musée National du Cameroun, RAYMOND ASOMBANG NEBA'ANE, within the framework of the workshop in Dakar on June 12, 2018. We also had the chance to visit his museum in Yaoundé on July 18, 2018. We were also able to do a quick interview beforehand with SEBASTIEN ZONGHERO, who was given responsibility by the Minister of French Culture of compiling the *Rapport de mission d'évaluation du Musée national de Yaoundé* within the framework of funds granted by the ADF.

The museum of Yaoundé is a site of national affirmation. It is housed in the former presidential palace, which is itself the former palace of French governors that was transformed into a museum in 1988. Between 2009 and 2015, it was the object of a large renovation before re-opening its doors on January 16, 2015. Inside, one will discover rooms filled with the ancient history and various cultures of Cameroon juxtaposed with a private museum displaying contemporary art along with apologetic displays concerning the recent political action of the presidents Ahmadou Ahidjo (1960-1982) and Paul Biya (1982-...). The idea of restitutions is most welcomed within a logic of a centralized presentation of the various different cultures and populations comprising Cameroon.

- **Musée royal de Foumban—Musée royal de Bafoussam.** Our exchanges with the director of the royal museum of Foumban and the family of the Sultan, represented by the PRINCESS RABIATOU NJOYA, took place at Foumban, on July 17, 2018. Everyone confirmed their support for a project of restitutions and insisted on the need for cooperating with the former colonial powers. A large number of cultural objects from Foumban are currently housed in Paris and Berlin. The representatives of the Sultan have made us aware of the considerable costs invested in the construction and upkeep of the new museum whose inauguration is imminent and which bears witness to an interest in the notion of public dynastic cultural heritage. The initiative of these museums comes from the current Sultan, Ibrahim Mbombo Njoya, who conferred its conception to the architect, *Issoufou Mbouombou*. From the 1930s until now, the collections of the museum were displayed in the palace of the Sultan, in close proximity with the

current museum. The museum includes 12,000 art objects, trophies from war, and relics linked to the history of this dynasty founded in the 14th century.

- Other **traditional chiefdoms**, such as that of the the King FO NJITACK NGOMPE PELE of Bafoussam whom we met during our visit in July 2018, possess a vast collection of ritual objects. In Baffoussam, a museum is in the midst of being constructed in the immediate surroundings of the royal palace. There are also private museums in Cameroon. In particular, we visited the Musée ethnographique des peuples de la forêt in Yaoundé and spoke with its founder and director, Dr. THÉRÈSE FOUDA, pharmacist by profession. She deploys an important pedagogical activity in cooperation with the local neighboring schools.

Benin

In Benin, where there are three public museums under construction, the exchange with the actors of cultural heritage took place between April 19 and April 25 within the framework of a co-sponsored invitation addressed to Bénédicte Savoy by both the French and German embassies. This trip, organized before the announcement of the mission concerning restitution and organized by the Institut Français, gave way to an important series of visits and meetings at Porto Novo, Ouidah, Abomey, and Cotonou. The first part of the mission was dedicated to visiting cultural heritage sites and meetings with a variety of actors of actors implicated within the development of culture and the promotion of cultural heritage in Benin. In this way, Bénédicte Savoy was able to gain some knowledge, both material and immaterial, of the cultural heritage of Porto Novo, the memorial site of Ouidah, and the royal palaces of Abomey, and visit the Pan-African Foundation for Cultural Development (FONPADEC) and meet its founder, NOUREINI TIDJANI-SERPOS, the two locations of the Fondation Zinsou (Cotonou and Ouidah), and the Petit musée de la récade (Abomey-Calavi).

These visits alternated between meetings with representatives of Benin's civil society and professionals of the conservation and preservation of cultural heritage. These individuals include JOSÉ PLYA (Director of the Agency for the Promotion of Cultural Heritage and the Development of Tourism, Cotonou), CAROLE BORNA (deputy director of Cultural Heritage at the Ministry of Culture) and ROCHARD SOGAN (advisor to the Minister of Culture) as well as GABIN DJIMASSÈ (director of the Office of Tourism of Abomey, responsible for the construction project of the Musée de l'épopée des rois in Abomey).

Fruitful discussions were also held with sculptors, in particular ROMUALD HAZOUME and DOMINIQUE ZINKPE, both in charge of cultural centers; as well as with researcher-instructors from the université d'Abomey Calavi (UAC), with students from the Institut national des métiers d'art, archeologie, et de la culture (INMAAC) and the Department of Germanic Studies of UAC as well as former students from the Masters program in

Cultural Heritage from the université Senghor d’Alexandrie. Within the framework of the two public conferences, Bénédicte Savoy was able to elucidate the important questions raised by the translocations of cultural objects.

These moments set aside for observation and interactions helped to nourish our reflections on the wealth and current conditions of the promotion of Beninese cultural heritage, on projects overseen by Beninese authorities in terms of the promotion of culture and cultural heritage, and regarding the level of the debate concerning the restitution of cultural objects and their acceptance by a variety of categories of individuals within the population. These interactions also attest to extraordinary complexity of the effective return of cultural heritage objects to their places of origin, and have provided precious indications concerning the hierarchization of challenges for the political decision-makers to take into consideration. These rather valuable moments spent in discussions with various members from different parts of the Beninese cultural and artistic community confirm that the debate is underway and remains open, at least for certain parts of the society often split between a pessimism of reason and an optimism of action.

Political Actors

In France

The Ministry of European and Foreign Affairs (MAE). On June 25, 2018 a work meeting was held with the Ministry of European and Foreign Affairs. Those present at the meeting included: LAURENCE AUER (director of culture, teaching, research, and networking), PATRICK COMOY (deputy sub-director of teaching and research), GAETEN BRUEL (advisor to the ministry), LUCILE BORDET (chief of the research bureau), MAELLE SERGHERAERT (chief of the pole of human and social sciences, archeology, and cultural heritage), AXEL BENREGIER (editor following questions concerning cultural heritage and property) ALEXIS MOCIO-MATHIEU (editor following questions concerning cultural heritage, the trafficking of cultural goods, and the restitution of cultural goods UNESCO-Cultural Heritage), as well as STÉPHANE GATTA (responsible for the African mission), and ISABELLE MARÉCHAL (inspector general of cultural affairs at the Ministry of Culture).

The MAE regularly receives requests for restitution from nation-states or other communities. These requests concern as much cultural goods as they do human remains. The ministry sets out the typology, but only considers requests coming from Nation-States that have been carefully researched. In taking into account the juridical framework, the ministry generally counters these requests with staunch refusals. We have already provided the overview for the lack of restitutions and the examples of the few cases that have been successful (Maori heads, Korean manuscripts, etc.) in regards to cooperation between museums and other pending questions (such as the restitution of Algerian skulls). The MAE showed themselves to be very open to accompanying us in

our mission and expressed their desire for an evolution of the juridical framework relative to French cultural heritage law, this evolution thereby allowing to consider a proper and affirmative response to certain of the specific requests of the restitution of cultural heritage goods they receive and in consideration of the fluidity of diplomatic relations with certain countries. In April 2018, at Cotonou, Bénédicte Savoy was received successively by the ambassador to France in Benin, S.E. Véronique Brumeaux, and by her German homologue, Achim Tröster. On July 18, 2018, in Yaoundé, we were received by the French Ambassador to Cameroon, S.E. Gilles Thibault. During the month of June 2018, in Dakar, we were able to have a fruitful conversation with the primary advisor of the French Embassy in Senegal, Luc Briard. We were also welcome on several occasions to the French Embassy in Berlin in order to discuss, with the ambassador S.E. Anne-Marie Descôtes and advisory minister Guillaume Ollagnier, the stakes of our cultural mission within the German context.

Ministry of Culture. On April 26, 2018, a meeting was held in Paris at the Ministry of Culture. Those present included: VINCENT BERJOT (general director of cultural heritage), BLANDINE CHAVANNE (sub-director of museum politics to the general director of cultural heritage), CLAIRE CHASTANIER (principle attaché to general director of cultural heritage), SEBASTIEN ZONGHERO (project manager for the promotion of technical expertise in cultural heritage), ISABELLE MARÉCHAL (inspector general of cultural affairs).

Questions were brought up discussing the parameters and nature of our mission, questions about cultural heritage law, in particular the clauses around the inalienability and non-transferability that prevents the restitution of cultural items. One thing that came from the meeting was that the law must be flexible and that if the politicians truly wanted it to be as such, the law could evolve. Throughout the meeting questions concerning the definitive list of the principal French collections of African cultural objects, the difficulty of discerning the exact provenance of the objects, the ongoing cooperation between French and African museums—in particular the cooperation with the Musée de Yaoundé via the ADF (the contract of debt reduction). During these discussions, other significant items mentioned included the processes involved in the restitution of Korean manuscripts, Chinese funerary plates, and the Maori heads.

The National Assembly. On July 4, 2018, in Paris, we took part in a hearing, in presence of Isabelle Maréchal, thanks to the committee studying Cultural Heritage at the National Assembly, which is comprised of a diverse cross-section of parliamentary members across the political spectrum. The debates were moderated by CONSTANCE LE GRIP and RAPAHÉL GERARD, co-presidents of the committee and members of Commission on Cultural and Educational Affairs, those present at the meeting included: JACQUELINE DUBOIS, BRIGITTE KUSTER, and MAXIME MINOT, as well as the parliamentary attachés representing their deputies.

This hearing, which lasted around two hours, provided us with the occasion to remind ourselves of the objectives of our mission and to re-evaluate our methods and approach. A question-response session followed the hearing during which the parliamentary members asked us a number of questions ranging from the situation of museums in Africa to questions about cultural heritage law, the nature of the objects to be restituted, etc. The overall feeling we retained from the hearing was that we were able to clarify for the members the content of our mission, its importance, and the political and historical stakes for the relations between France and Africa.

In Africa

On May 4, 2018, outside of the Dakar Biennale, a meeting of the ministers of culture of the UEMOA Zone (West African Economic and Monetary Union) was held, to which we were invited by the Minister of Culture in Senegal, ABOU LATIF COULIBALY to speak about our work regarding restitutions. We had an opportunity to touch on a number of topics in one single place with a number of different ministers of Culture from the African continent and to make them aware of stakes regarding the question of restitution.

A meeting between Felwine Sarr and the President of the Republic of Mali, IBRAHIM BOUBACAR KEITA took place on June 3, 2018 at his residence in Bamako. This meeting provided an opportunity to get the president up to speed concerning the mission. It also provided an opportunity to reference the Malian cultural heritage objects housed in French museums as well as discuss the Musée National de Mali and the other museums of the region and reflect on the stakes of the mission, in particular for Mali, concerning questions tied to history and national construction.

Two consecutive meetings took place (Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy) in Paris with the Ambassador to Benin, S.E.M. AUGUSTE ALAVO, also attended by his advisor in cooperation with political affairs, ANGELO DAN. Throughout both of these meetings, the stakes of our mission and our approach were discussed. The request for restitution made by Benin, which had previously been the object of a stonewalling tactic by the French minister of foreign affairs, Jean-Marc Ayrault in 2016-2017, was evoked. Also mentioned were the efforts undertaken by Benin for the construction of new museums and for a new definition of political cultural heritage.

On two occasions, at Cotonou and Paris, Bénédicte Savoy had a chance to speak with OSWALD HOMEKY, the Minister of Tourism, Culture, and Sports in Benin. Like everyone else in the Beninese government, the Minister of Culture is largely engaged in the project of restitutions. The Minister of Culture specifically emphasized the historical scope of the subject, in particular for the younger generations.

In Bamako, we met up with Mali's former Minister of Culture and Tourism (1997-2000), AMINATA DRAMANE TRAORE. Aminata Traore worked extremely hard concerning questions

of the illicit trafficking of cultural goods during the time of her mandate. She even published a key text in 2006 concerning the question of restitutions of cultural property, *Ainsi nos œuvres d'art ont droit de cité là où nous sommes, dans l'ensemble, interdits de séjour*. We very much welcomed her opinion on how things have progressed around this discussion in France. She drew our attention to the profound crisis that is spreading throughout Mali, to the effects that war is having on the civilian population, in particular on the women, and to the difficult question of visas. She provided us with a brief summary of her political work in terms of cultural heritage in the 1990s. She praised the work we were doing.

In preparation for the international conference organized by UNESCO on June 1, 2018, "Circulation des biens culturels et du patrimoine commun: quelles nouvelles perspectives?"⁹⁸ Bénédicte Savoy had a long conversation with the general director of UNESCO, AUDREY AZOULAY, and then, continued her discussion with PATRICE TALON, the President of the Republic of Benin. The opening lecture of the conference was conferred to Bénédicte Savoy and was entitled "Retour vers le futur"⁹⁹ The ministers of culture, tourism, and antiquities from France, Germany, Burkina Faso, Gabon, Jordan, Lebanon, Peru, Senegal, and the Republic of the Congo took part in a discussion around the question of restitutions, the representatives of countries often stripped of their goods and cultural heritage in a very clear and frank manner. The hearing was comprised of 400 ministers, academics, representatives of international organizations, museum professionals and professionals of cultural heritage from all over the world. When all was said and done, the evidence seemed to point to the fact that UNESCO, which had made considerable progress concerning the question of restitutions, aimed to continue to be a part of the redefinition of the debate sparked by the pronouncement made by Emmanuel Macron at Ouagadougou.

Communities: a meeting took place with the Omarian Family in Dakar on August 6, 2018. Present alongside the Omarian Family was M. Sy, one of their collaborators and the Khalife of the Omarian Family, THIerno MOUNTAGA TALL. The latter informed us that since 1994, the family has focused their attention on restitutions concerning the objects belonging to El Hadj Omar Foutiyou Tall (his manuscripts, sabre, golden jewelry, and other assorted objects). The family made several trips to France and paid their own travel expenses. They were able to discern the presence in the Fonds Archinard of El Hadji Omar's manuscripts at the Bibliothèque nationale de France, seized at Ségou; they also found relics belonging to him at the Havre museum as well as his sabre at the musée de l'Armée. The latter of which was loaned out and shown in Dakar on several occasions: in 1998 and 2008. The family indicated that its requests for restitutions were met with a

⁹⁸ In English, the title and program can be found on the UNESCO website "'Major International Conference on circulation of cultural property and shared heritage: what new perspectives?'" <https://en.unesco.org/news/major-international-conference-circulation-cultural-property-and-shared-heritage-what-new>

⁹⁹ In English, the title would be "Back to the Future".

staunch refusal invoking the inalienability of the French National Collections. The family also requested that his manuscripts be digitized but they were merely told that they would have to wait until the Bibliothèque nationale de France finally reached to the Fonds Archinard as the library continued efforts to digitize its various collections.

On July 16, 2018, in Douala, we met a number of traditional tribal leaders of Cameroon at the AfricAvenir foundation located in the Bonabéri neighborhood. These leaders had been called together by PRINCE KUM'A NDUMBE III for a meeting around the question of restitutions. After presenting the object of our mission, we were able to meet with them for two hours on the subject. These leaders spoke with us at length about their concerns regarding the return of objects of their cultural heritage that were currently housed in European museums and we were able to discern the importance and great interest that each of the leaders held in regard to the question of restitution, as well as their thorough reflection on the subject. In the days that followed, we traveled throughout the West of Cameroon—to Dschang, Baffoussam and Foumbam, in order to meet other traditional tribal leaders (some of them had been present at the meeting in Douala) and visit their traditional residences and museums where they conserved their objects. These visits educated us as to the wealth and plurality of apparatuses of preservation already in place as well as the great interest the leaders had in preserving their cultural heritage.

The Art Market

We also, individually, made an effort to engage in a dialogue with representatives from the African art market in both France and Africa. On the European front, we shared our reflections with the gallerists ROBERT VALLOIS (Paris) and the Belgian-Congolese antiquarian, DIDIER CLAES (Brussels) by specifically inviting them to the “Atelier de Dakar” on June 12, 2018. On the African front, we sought to learn more about the problems and mechanisms of illicit trafficking in the art market by meeting with a merchant from Lomé, a bustling area where the trafficking of African art between Europe and West Africa, who provided us with a much needed awareness of the sites, places, methods, and actors involved in this market—most notably in the exfiltration of pieces from Nigeria and Mali to Europe.

Inventories

To this very day, no precise map or centralized directory exists of the totality of African cultural heritage pieces in France. Such a centralized directory would certainly have been a beneficial tool in compiling this present report. Outside of several institutions which have maintained a thorough inventory of their exact holdings, the total number, at

a national scale, of the pieces housed in museums in France would be difficult to estimate.

The museum collections housed in the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (70,000 objects of solely “African” Cultural Heritage items) are well documented and are partly accessible online through the museum’s website. The graphs and statistics included in this documentation of the inventory are based on the museum’s own databases of their collections, which one can consult on-site, via the management software of the collections, TMS. This latter software program offers more detailed information than what one can uncover through the information online and allows one to export spreadsheets, “reports”, or the compilation of CSV files which makes any work around locating meta-data of the pieces in question much easier to wade through. At the center for the Documentation and collection of Archives of the museum, we met with SARAH FRIOUX-SALGAS (in charge of the service) and were helped in our navigations of the archive by JEAN-ANDRÉ ASSIÉ and ANGÈLE MARTIN, as well as by THOMAS CONVENT (at the hub for the computerized management and inventory of the collection of objects) who helped with the compilation of “reports” for each country proposed in the annex.

The meeting held on July 4, 2018 with representatives from the museums of the collectivities were quick to clarify and emphasize that the important methods undertaken by the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac for the digitization and placement online of a thorough documentation of their collections had not necessarily sparked a similar movement elsewhere in other institutions in France. The databases for the museum objects in France that are accessible online (*Joconde*), whose indications of objects is largely inferior to what is actually housed in the museum collections, in no way provides a means for ascertaining a trustworthy account for the inventory in the collections of a cultural heritage that is spread out and shared between art museums, museums of ethnography and the natural sciences, and even university institutes. Thus the inventory numbers we were provided varied as much in their format as in the degree of precision regarding the provenance of the pieces. We have tried our best here, along with the help of VINCENT LEFEVRE (sub-director of the collections at the Services des musées de France) and Isabelle Maréchal, to compile a maximum of information on the current state of African Cultural Heritage and Cultural Property in France.

An important amount of inventory work still remains to be done, which could be supported by already existing approaches and methods. In this light, the association “MuseoArtPremier”, via an online platform, proposes an initial census of the entire extra-European collections housed in French museums (MuseoArtPremier.com) and also promotes their cultural value. The program “Vestiges, indices, paradigmes : lieux et temps des objets d’Afrique (XIVe – XIXe siècle)” recently launched at the l’institut national d’histoire de l’art under the direction of Claire Bosc-Tiesse, also has, as one of its objectives, the creation of a database of the objects housed from this period in the public collections.

Workshops

The two workshops (Ateliers) held for reflection organized within the framework of the elaboration of this report have helped us to gather together the ideas and opinions, as well as the critical experts and actors located within a variety of fields. The “Atelier de Dakar” during the month of June helped us to explore in greater detail all the problematics tied to questions of restitutions—from the most pragmatic aspects to the most symbolic. The workshop’s organization (transportation, food, and lodging) was jointly financed by the ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Culture, along with the onsite support of the French Embassy in Senegal as well as the IFAN Museum of African Arts (the musée Théodore-Monod d’art africain). As for the “Atelier juridique”—thanks to the assembly of a large panel of experts—it was focused on the question of legality and past experiences of restitution. Its organization received funding support from the Ministry of Culture.

The Atelier de Dakar

This workshop of reflection was held on June 12, 2018 at the IFAN Museum of African Arts (the musée Théodore-Monod d’art africain), in the presence of the following personalities: HAMADY BOCOUM (archeologist, director of the Musée des civilisations noires, Dakar), CAROLE BORNA (deputy director of Cultural Heritage at the Ministry of culture, Cotonou), VIYÉ DIBA (artist-painter, Dakar), GABIN DJIMASSÈ (director of the Office of tourism of Abomey, responsible for the construction of the Musée de l’épopée des rois à Abomey), PRINCE KUM’A NDUMBE III (founder of AfricAvenir International, Douala), DIDIER HOUÉNOUDÉ (art historian, director of the Institut d’histoire de l’art et d’archéologie UAC, Cotonou), SALIA MALÉ (ethnologist, director of the département de la conservation au Musée national du Mali, Bamako), EL HADJI MALICK NDIAYE (art historian and curator at the musée Théodore-Monod d’art africain, Dakar), SIMON NJAMI (art critic, exhibition curator, Paris), JOSÉ PLYA (director of the Agence pour la promotion des patrimoines et de développement du tourisme, Cotonou), ROBERT VALLOIS (gallerist, Petit musée de la récade, Paris/Cotonou), DANIELLE WOZNY (consultant, expert in culture and Cultural Heritage. Also invited were the art historian ANNE LAFONT (director of studies à l’EHESS) and CÉDRIC CRÉMIÈRE (director of the Muséum d’histoire naturelle du Havre), both of whom *in extremis* were unable to attend.

The format of the workshop, behind closed doors for a very intensive space-time, was chosen so as to favor the emergence of a collective, transcontinental, and autonomous reflection. We devoted three sessions of three hours each to the following areas:

1. What does it mean to retribute: pragmatics, symbolic, temporalities

The inaugural session allowed us to consider, in a very general manner, the gesture of restitution in the multiplicity of its significations, and to posit the

terms and stakes of the debate. The existence of several conceptions of cultural heritage and various memorial regimes were also at the heart of our discussions.

2. Re-socializing Cultural Heritage: epistemological spaces and regimes of culture

This second section bore much more concretely on the potentialities of a re-integration of objects into their environment of origin, and the possibilities offered up through re-socialization and re-symbolization. The discussion bore on the variety of cultural and territorial situations, through precise examples, and on the re-definition of the function of objects whose significations had been altered by history.

3. Thinking the future and the logics of distribution: mutuality as horizon?

The final, most prospective panel of the three, explored the possibilities opened up by restitutions within the framework of a re-definition of inter-African and inter-continental relations. The circulation of art works and the museum geography of Africa was also discussed.

The discussions and exchanges of this workshop were the object of an audio-visual recording. A press conference in one of the halls of the IFAN Museum of African Arts about the exchanges helped to inform the media about the results of this day-long workshop and, more generally, about the ongoing stakes and the progress of the mission.

The Atelier Juridique

The “Atelier Juridique” [Juridical Workshop] took place at the Collège de France in Paris, on June 26, 2018. Its conception and organization was jointly assured by Isabelle Maréchal (the inspector general of cultural affairs to the Minister of Culture) and Vincent Negri (ISP / UMR 7220 : CNRS – ENS Paris Saclay – Université Paris Nanterre) in connection with the “critical friends” part of the mission for his knowledge of African Cultural Heritage Law as well as international law in terms of Cultural Heritage.

This event was conceived for an audience comprised of a select number of interlocutors including (the Minister of Culture, the Minister of Europe and Foreign Affairs, the Senate, ICOM, academics, jurists and historians, practicing curators) chosen for their experience in terms of restitutions. Those who chose to respond during this event included : LAURENCE AUER (director of Culture, Teaching, Research and Networking (the Minister of Europe and Foreign Affairs), GAËLLE BEAUJEAN-BALTZER (in charge of the collections the hub for l'Unité patrimoniale Afrique at the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac), CLAIRE CHASTANIER (deputy to the sub-director of the collections, Service des musées de France), MARIE CORNU (director of research at the CNRS – Institut des Sciences sociales du politique, ISP/UMR 7220), STÉPHANE DUROY (professeur de droit public à la

Faculté Jean Monnet – Université Paris-Sud Paris Saclay), MANLIO FRIGO (professor international law at the l'université de Milan, lawyer in the firm BonelliErede Milan), HÉLÈNE JOUBERT (person in charge of l'Unité patrimoniale Afrique au musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac), EMMANUEL KASARHÉROU (deputy director in the Département du patrimoine et des collections, responsable de la coordination scientifique des collections au musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac), SÉBASTIEN MINCHIN (director of the Muséum d'histoire naturelle de Bourges), KWAME OPOKU (former juridical advisor, retired from the bureau of United Nations in Vienna), XAVIER PERROT (professor of history and law at l'université de Limoges), JULIETTE RAOUL-DUVAL (president of the French Committee of the International Council of Museums).

The program helped us to take stock of the situation concerning international law, French internal law, African law, but also to provide commentaries on the methodological documentation given to the public by the Association des musées allemands. Several cases of restitution that have already been carried out were examined. By way of a presentation about three African objects from the collections of the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac that entered into the collections according the modalities at different historical time periods, among other things, the program helped us to engage in a concrete reflection on the modalities and precautions to take in the hypothetical situation of future restitutions, and allowed for a confrontation of viewpoints concerning the different future actors concerned in this process.

Documents

Document 1. Letter of mission

LE PRÉSIDENT DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE

Paris le

Madame,

L'ambition culturelle de la France est de favoriser l'accès de tous aux œuvres de l'humanité. Si les grands musées universels contribuent à cette vocation, l'accès aux œuvres doit faire l'objet partout dans le monde d'initiatives et de partenariats concrets au profit de tous les publics, en particulier dans les régions où ces œuvres n'existent plus ou ne sont pas accessibles. J'ai donc fait de la protection et de la circulation des œuvres une priorité de notre politique culturelle internationale.

Depuis les engagements pris dans le discours de la Pnyx à Athènes à l'égard du patrimoine européen, en passant par Abou Dhabi et par Alger, jusqu'à l'Université de Ouagadougou le 28 novembre dernier, j'ai souhaité lancer une action déterminée en faveur de la circulation des œuvres et du partage de la connaissance collective des contextes dans lesquels ces œuvres ont été créées, mais aussi prises, parfois pillées, sauvées ou détruites. Cette circulation pourra prendre différentes formes, jusqu'à des modifications pérennes de nos inventaires nationaux et à des restitutions. Tout ne passe par ailleurs pas par les *musées* et par le *patrimoine*, qui sont des « intraduisibles » des langues européennes.

Pour cette raison, j'ai souhaité que cette action soit conduite dans le cadre d'une réflexion approfondie sur nos collections nationales, en lien étroit avec le Ministère de la culture, le Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères et le Ministère de l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche. Trois groupes de travail sont constitués pour aborder différents aspects de cette question complexe, portant sur la circulation des œuvres et sur les restitutions.

S'agissant plus spécifiquement de l'Afrique, je me suis engagé pour que d'ici cinq ans les conditions soient réunies pour des restitutions temporaires ou définitives du patrimoine africain en Afrique. Un des trois groupes de travail sera consacré à tracer le chemin vers cet objectif. Connaissant votre travail universitaire et votre engagement, je souhaite vous confier, aux côtés de M. Felwine SARR, la direction de ce groupe.

Vous engagerez un dialogue transparent et participatif avec les différents acteurs les plus concernés par ces questions – musées, juristes, organisations internationales, marché de l'art, universitaires – tant en Europe, où vous chercherez à mobiliser nos principaux partenaires, que sur le continent africain.

Madame Bénédicte SAVOY

Vous me proposerez dans un premier temps la méthode de travail et les étapes principales de ce processus. Vous veillerez à constituer autour de vous et de M. Sarr un groupe de personnalités de bonne volonté, issues des différentes parties prenantes de cette question (musées et conservation du patrimoine, droit international, recherche, organisations internationales, milieu associatif, politique et militant, marché de l'art, etc.), qui puissent exprimer des points de vue diversifiés et ouverts sur ces questions. Vous garantirez la composition intercontinentale et paritaire de ce groupe de travail. Vous prendrez en compte les résultats des travaux parlementaires et de recherche passés ou en cours sur ces sujets. Le dialogue et la participation devront accompagner toutes les étapes de ces travaux.

A l'issue de ce processus, vous me transmettez des propositions concrètes d'actions, réalisables à court, à moyen et à long terme, sous forme d'un rapport qui sera remis en novembre 2018.

Pour mener à bien cette mission, outre l'accompagnement de mon cabinet, vous pourrez vous appuyer sur le concours des services des trois ministères et sur l'appui d'un inspecteur général des affaires culturelles qui sera désigné pour cette mission.

Je compte sur votre engagement et vous remercie très sincèrement pour votre contribution décisive à cette nouvelle approche universelle des collections.

*Merci pour votre implication,
Bonne nuit,*

Emmanuel Macron
Emmanuel MACRON

Paris le

Monsieur,

L'ambition culturelle de la France est de favoriser l'accès de tous aux œuvres de l'humanité. Si les grands musées universels contribuent à cette vocation, l'accès aux œuvres doit faire l'objet partout dans le monde d'initiatives et de partenariats concrets au profit de tous les publics, en particulier dans les régions où ces œuvres n'existent plus ou ne sont pas accessibles. J'ai donc fait de la protection et de la circulation des œuvres une priorité de notre politique culturelle internationale.

Depuis les engagements pris dans le discours de la Pnyx à Athènes à l'égard du patrimoine européen, en passant par Abou Dhabi et par Alger, jusqu'à l'Université de Ouagadougou le 28 novembre dernier, j'ai souhaité lancer une action déterminée en faveur de la circulation des œuvres et du partage de la connaissance collective des contextes dans lesquels ces œuvres ont été créées, mais aussi prises, parfois pillées, sauvées ou détruites. Cette circulation pourra prendre différentes formes, jusqu'à des modifications pérennes de nos inventaires nationaux et à des restitutions. Tout ne passe par ailleurs pas par les *musées* et par le *patrimoine*, qui sont des « intraduisibles » des langues européennes.

Pour cette raison, j'ai souhaité que cette action soit conduite dans le cadre d'une réflexion approfondie sur nos collections nationales, en lien étroit avec le Ministère de la culture, le Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères et le Ministère de l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche. Trois groupes de travail sont constitués pour aborder différents aspects de cette question complexe, portant sur la circulation des œuvres et sur les restitutions.

S'agissant plus spécifiquement de l'Afrique, je me suis engagé pour que d'ici cinq ans les conditions soient réunies pour des restitutions temporaires ou définitives du patrimoine africain en Afrique. Un des trois groupes de travail sera consacré à tracer le chemin vers cet objectif. Connaissant votre travail et votre engagement, je souhaite vous confier, aux côtés de Mme Bénédicte SAVOY, la direction de ce groupe.

Vous engagerez un dialogue transparent et participatif avec les différents acteurs les plus concernés par ces questions – musées, juristes, organisations internationales, marché de l'art, universitaires – tant en Europe, où vous chercherez à mobiliser nos principaux partenaires, que sur le continent africain.

Monsieur Felwine SARR

Vous me proposerez dans un premier temps la méthode de travail et les étapes principales de ce processus. Vous veillerez à constituer autour de vous et de Mme Savoy un groupe de personnalités de bonne volonté, issues des différentes parties prenantes de cette question (musées et conservation du patrimoine, droit international, recherche, organisations internationales, milieu associatif, politique et militant, marché de l'art, etc.), qui puissent exprimer des points de vue diversifiés et ouverts sur ces questions. Vous garantirez la composition intercontinentale et paritaire de ce groupe de travail. Vous prendrez en compte les résultats des travaux parlementaires et de recherche passés ou en cours sur ces sujets. Le dialogue et la participation devront accompagner toutes les étapes de ces travaux.


A l'issue de ce processus, vous me transmettez des propositions concrètes d'actions, réalisables à court, à moyen et à long terme, sous forme d'un rapport qui sera remis en novembre 2018.

Pour mener à bien cette mission, outre l'accompagnement de mon cabinet, vous pourrez vous appuyer sur le concours des services des trois ministères et sur l'appui d'un inspecteur général des affaires culturelles qui sera désigné pour cette mission.

Je compte sur votre engagement et vous remercie très sincèrement pour votre contribution décisive à cette nouvelle approche universelle des collections.

*J'ai pour ce travail,
très modestes,
Emmanuel Macron*

Emmanuel MACRON



Document 2. The juridical apparatus

L'élaboration du dispositif juridique proposé, permettant de lever les obstacles actuels opposés aux demandes de restitution a été effectuée sur la base des travaux de l'atelier juridique du 26 juin et des concertations assurées en juillet et septembre avec les services juridiques de la direction générale des patrimoines et du secrétariat général du Ministère de la Culture.

La difficulté première était bien sûr de donner une sécurité juridique au processus de restitution qui concernera une partie des objets des collections conservées en France, alors que la législation sur le patrimoine est globale et s'applique indistinctement à tous les éléments des collections.

Afin de ne pas remettre en cause la législation pluriséculaire qui protège le patrimoine national tout en faisant droit à l'exigence éthique des restitutions, une issue a été trouvée dans le recours à une procédure d'exception, élaborée *ad hoc*, pour ce besoin spécifique.

Les réunions de concertation et l'atelier ont permis de mettre en lumière un consensus sur les objectifs, mais ont fait apparaître différentes approches pour résoudre les difficultés auxquelles les restitutions sont confrontées dans notre droit actuel, qu'il semble utile d'évoquer en indiquant les choix faits par la mission.

Trois sujets ont retenu l'attention de la mission et font l'objet de propositions sur leur traitement juridique :

1°) **le choix de l'insertion au code du patrimoine des dispositions législatives, ou de l'élaboration d'un texte de loi autonome**, jugée plus symbolique du caractère d'exception du dispositif de restitution. Cette suggestion d'un texte de loi autonome est apparue tardivement dans la discussion et a conduit la mission à proposer les deux versions dans le tableau ci-après ;

2°) **les modalités de sortie du domaine public, concernant les objets à restituer** ; ces modalités découlent du jeu croisé du code général de la propriété des personnes publiques (CG3P) et du code du patrimoine, d'une part, et de la future procédure, d'autre part ;

3°) **le traitement des objets restituables dont la propriété publique résulte de dons ou legs.**

Ces deux derniers sujets ont fait l'objet d'analyses et de débats, qui ont guidé les choix de la mission (voir l'analyse détaillée dans les deux fiches thématiques jointes) :

Sur la sortie du domaine public

Les objets concernés par les restitutions sont, pour ce qui concerne les collections publiques, incorporés dans le domaine public, et sauf perte d'intérêt, ces objets n'ont pas vocation à être déclassés du domaine public pour permettre leur aliénation. Face à cette donnée et à la nécessité de ne pas remettre en cause le principe général d'inaliénabilité du domaine public, **deux pistes ont été explorées :**

- **L'élaboration d'une procédure *ad hoc*, pour les besoins de la restitution des objets africains**, dans laquelle le déclassement du domaine public apparaît comme un corollaire implicite de la décision de restitution, sans signification propre. Cette

piste met en avant l'objectif de restitution et de coopération, privilégie le partenariat scientifique dans le processus de restitution et ouvre la possibilité de rendre des objets dont les conditions d'acquisition resteront incertaines malgré les recherches de provenance, afin de constituer des ensembles scientifiquement cohérents d'objets restitués.

- **L'annulation de l'entrée des objets dans les collections et donc dans le domaine public**, pour laquelle une procédure est effectivement prévue au code du patrimoine, dans des cas précis d'acquisition frauduleuse reconnue par les conventions internationales. L'annulation de l'entrée dans les collections résout d'elle-même la question de l'inaliénabilité : n'étant plus domaine public, l'objet peut être aliéné.

Bien que tentante, cette dernière option de l'annulation de l'entrée dans les collections n'a pas été retenue par la mission, pour les raisons détaillées dans la fiche 1. Peu réaliste dans un contexte de restitutions concernant un nombre potentiellement important d'objets, elle ne permettrait, par sa radicalité même, que de rendre les objets dont on connaît avec certitude les conditions d'acquisition sans consentement, et fragilise le statut des objets non revendiqués qui resteront dans les collections. En outre, elle provoque un effacement de l'histoire de l'objet.

Pour toutes ces raisons, la mission a bâti le dispositif de procédure de restitution sur la première option, tel qu'il est décrit dans la partie 3 du rapport.

Sur les dons et legs :

Les dispositions du CG3P et du code civil (auquel renvoie le CG3P) ne semblent pas faire obstacle à une révision des conditions et charges des libéralités dans les conditions du droit commun, pouvant conduire à l'aliénation des biens concernés, dès lors que pour les besoins de la restitution il serait dérogé au code du patrimoine. Une des questions à traiter concerne alors la faculté de passer outre les clauses des dons et legs sans recours au juge, et sans devoir rechercher nécessairement l'accord préalable de l'auteur de la libéralité ou de ses ayants droits.

Le consensus s'est stabilisé sur l'idée que les objets initialement acquis sans consentement, de façon certaine ou fortement présumée, puis donnés ultérieurement aux collections publiques, pourraient être restitués à leur pays d'origine sur décision administrative en dépit de l'existence d'une libéralité.

Suivant ce principe, deux schémas ont été examinés :

Une piste suggérait qu'il ne pourrait être passé outre ces libéralités que s'il était avéré que le donateur avait connaissance des conditions d'acquisition éthiquement critiquables, l'essentiel des procédures du code civil restant applicables dans le cas contraire.

La mission n'a pas retenu cette piste, pour les raisons exposées en fiche 2.

La mission propose que le dispositif de restitution *ad hoc* déroge au code civil pour passer outre l'existence d'un don ou legs, quelle que soit son ancienneté et ses clauses,

pour les objets initialement acquis sans consentement (ou fortement présumés tels) et dont la restitution est demandée.

Pour les objets de la « zone grise », dont le retour au pays d'origine est demandé pour motifs scientifiques, la mission propose d'introduire un critère d'ancienneté : les conditions et charges des libéralités de plus de cinquante ans pourraient être passées outre pour les besoins de la restitution ; pour celles de moins de cinquante ans, une déclaration d'intention de restituer serait, selon les cas, notifiée ou publiée afin d'informer l'auteur de la libéralité ou ses ayants droits.

En l'absence d'opposition, la restitution pourrait être décidée, dans le cas contraire, l'objet pourrait être déposé ou prêté, en dépit des inconvénients de cette formule, mais en aucun cas une résiliation judiciaire de la libéralité ne pourrait être engagée par le donateur ou ses ayants droits pour ce motif.

Le tableau ci-après, présentant les deux versions (codifiée et loi autonome) ne concerne que le dispositif législatif permettant de rendre possible des restitutions définitives, traduisant en droit le résultat des concertations et réflexions de la mission. Les modifications de cohérence avec les autres dispositions du code du patrimoine, et s'ils s'avéraient nécessaires, du code général de la propriété des personnes publiques et du code civil seront à envisager dans le cadre du travail d'élaboration législative.

Enfin, la mission présente également à titre indicatif une trame d'accord bilatéral élaborée, parallèlement à la préparation de la proposition législative, en lien avec les services de la direction générale de la mondialisation (ministère de l'Europe et des affaires étrangères).

PROPOSITION DE PROCEDURE DE RESTITUTION

Renvoi au descriptif du rapport	Procédure proposée	Version codifiée	Observations
<p>Cette procédure est proposée selon les orientations qui se dégagent des discussions des ateliers présentées dans le corps du rapport.</p> <p>Elle peut concerner potentiellement tout bien culturel, d'où le positionnement en livre 1, même si le sujet concernera essentiellement les musées.</p> <p>Elle se caractérise par 4 éléments.</p>	<p>Proposition de texte de loi :</p> <p>Art 1 : Afin de permettre la restitution de biens culturels, relevant de la propriété publique, dont la présence sur le territoire national est la conséquence de la colonisation de l'Afrique par la France, la présente loi vise à définir les modalités d'une procédure particulière, fondée sur un partenariat scientifique entre l'État français et les États africains concernés. Ce partenariat scientifique associe des experts français et des experts de l'État africain concerné ; il accompagne la procédure de restitution et met en place une coopération accrue entre institutions culturelles françaises et africaines.</p>	<p>Proposition de modification du code du patrimoine :</p> <p>Il est créé une section 5 au chapitre 2 livre 1 du code du patrimoine, ainsi rédigée :</p> <p>« Section 5 : Restitution de biens culturels sur le fondement d'un accord bilatéral de coopération culturelle avec des pays anciennement colonies, protectorats ou gérés sur mandat français.</p>	<p>Article introductif</p>
<p>1°) Un socle sous forme de traité bilatéral entre la France et chaque État potentiellement intéressé, qui devra prévoir les principes de la démarche de restitutions : mention de la période coloniale visée, le travail d'expertise bilatérale pour établir si besoin la liste des biens et dans tous les cas, la provenance, la composition d'une commission d'experts bilatérale et la définition d'un programme de mesures d'accompagnement</p>	<p>Article 2 : Le partenariat scientifique est conclu sous la forme d'un accord bilatéral entre l'État français et chaque État africain concerné et prévoit, par exception au code général de la propriété des personnes publiques et au code du patrimoine, la restitution de biens culturels, et notamment d'objets des collections de musées, sortis de leur territoire d'origine pendant la période coloniale. Les demandes de restitutions présentées sur le fondement de cet accord sont instruites selon la procédure définie par la présente loi.</p>	<p>Article L.112-28. – Un accord bilatéral de coopération culturelle conclu entre l'État français et un État africain peut prévoir la restitution de biens culturels, et notamment d'objets des collections de musées, transférés hors de leur territoire d'origine pendant la période coloniale française. Les demandes de restitutions présentées sur le fondement de cet accord sont instruites selon la procédure définie par la présente section.</p>	<p>Un modèle type d'accord bilatéral est proposé ci-après.</p> <p>Les biens concernés peuvent être propriétés de l'État, de collectivités territoriales ou d'établissements publics (Universités, établissements hospitaliers). Pour cette raison on ne parle pas de « Musées de France », trop restrictif</p>

<p>2°) La procédure d'instruction :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - une demande d'État à État, 	<p>Article 3 : La demande de restitution est présentée par l'État d'origine culturelle du bien à l'État français et désigne précisément le ou les objets concernés.</p>	<p>Article L.112-29. – La demande de restitution est présentée par l'État d'origine du bien et désigne précisément les objets concernés.</p>	<p>La demande doit être formelle et précise. Elle supposera la plupart du temps un travail de recherche en amont, bilatéral, que le traité de coopération vise également à organiser.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - une instruction conjointe par les experts du pays demandeur et du musée détenteur du bien, <p>L'objectif est que la démarche de restitution permette l'établissement d'une collection scientifiquement cohérente constituée sur un partenariat scientifique, au-delà de la logique première de restitution de biens acquis sans consentement.</p>	<p>L'instruction de la demande vise à mettre en évidence, par des travaux de recherches associant les experts français et ceux de l'État africain concerné :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - les éléments de provenance du bien, notamment son origine géographique, les circonstances de sa première acquisition, les modalités de son entrée dans les collections publiques, - l'importance du bien pour le patrimoine de l'État d'origine culturelle ou pour les communautés qui le composent, 	<p>L'instruction de la demande vise à mettre en évidence, par des travaux de recherches associant les experts français et ceux de l'État concerné :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - les éléments de provenance du bien, notamment son origine géographique, les circonstances de sa première acquisition, les modalités de son entrée dans les collections du musée, - l'importance du bien pour le patrimoine de l'État d'origine culturelle ou pour les communautés qui le composent, 	<p>L'instruction visera à rechercher l'origine des biens, leur histoire, leur usage afin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - d'établir si l'acquisition première a été faite sans consentement ou non, - en l'absence d'information précise sur les circonstances de la première acquisition, établir son intérêt scientifique au regard des autres objets restitués.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - le cas échéant, la cohérence scientifique avec d'autres objets dont la restitution est demandée ou avec d'autres objets déjà restitués en application de l'accord bilatéral. <p>Le dossier d'instruction indiquera également la localisation, dans les collections françaises, des objets de nature similaire permettant d'assurer la</p>	<p>- le cas échéant, la cohérence scientifique avec d'autres objets dont la restitution est demandée ou avec d'autres objets déjà restitués en application de l'accord bilatéral.</p>	<p>- le cas échéant, la cohérence scientifique avec d'autres objets dont la restitution est demandée ou avec d'autres objets déjà restitués en application de l'accord bilatéral.</p>	<p>Il s'agit d'organiser la présentation des collections restantes dans les meilleures conditions, et le cas échéant de susciter des prêts ou échanges entre musées africains et français.</p>
<p>La commission scientifique sera constituée pays par pays. Son principe et modalités de désignation devront figurer à l'accord bilatéral.</p>	<p>Le dossier d'instruction indiquera également la localisation dans les collections françaises des objets de nature similaire permettant d'assurer la</p>	<p>La commission scientifique sera constituée pays par pays. Son principe et modalités de désignation devront figurer à l'accord bilatéral.</p>	<p>La commission scientifique sera constituée pays par pays. Son principe et modalités de désignation devront figurer à l'accord bilatéral.</p>

<p>3°) commission scientifique pour valider le sérieux de l'instruction et la reconnaissance de la provenance du bien et de la pertinence de la restitution, elle assure également le respect de la parité franco-africaine dans l'appréciation de l'opportunité du retour du bien,</p>	<p>continuité de la présentation sur le territoire national de la culture, des arts et de l'histoire de l'État bénéficiaire des restitutions.</p> <p>Article 4 : La demande de restitution et les éléments de l'instruction sont soumis pour avis à une commission scientifique créée pour la durée de l'accord bilatéral, qui en fixe la composition de façon à assurer une représentation équilibrée de personnalités scientifiques du pays d'origine et des institutions françaises concernées, ainsi que de personnalités qualifiées nommées à parts égales par les deux parties.</p>	<p>continuité de la présentation sur le territoire national de la culture, des arts et de l'histoire de l'État destinataire des restitutions.</p> <p>Article L.112-30. – La demande est soumise pour avis à une commission scientifique créée pour la durée de l'accord bilatéral qui en fixe la composition de façon à assurer une représentation équilibrée de personnalités scientifiques du pays d'origine et du ou des institutions françaises concernées, ainsi que de personnalités extérieures nommées à parts égales par les deux parties.</p>	<p>La formalisation d'un cadre commun pour la composition de ces commissions apparait une précaution propre à rassurer toutes les parties.</p> <p>Il apparait nécessaire de préciser les compétences de la commission dans les deux situations auxquelles elle sera confrontée : bien acquis sans consentement ou bien aux origines incertaines malgré recherches.</p>
	<p>Cette commission appréciera les éléments de l'instruction relatifs aux conditions d'acquisition du bien. Celui-ci pourra être restitué du seul fait du défaut avéré ou fortement présumé de consentement du propriétaire lors de l'acquisition initiale, quelle que soit la date d'entrée dans les collections et nonobstant l'existence éventuelle d'un don ou legs.</p> <p>Lorsque les recherches des experts bilatéraux n'auront pu établir les circonstances d'acquisition du bien soumis à son examen, la commission scientifique bilatérale appréciera la cohérence scientifique du bien avec d'autres objets faisant l'objet de la demande de restitution ou ayant été rendus précédemment en application de la présente procédure.</p>	<p>Cette commission appréciera les éléments de l'instruction relatifs aux conditions d'acquisition du bien. Celui-ci pourra être restitué du seul fait du défaut avéré ou fortement présumé de consentement du propriétaire lors de l'acquisition initiale, quelle que soit la date d'entrée dans les collections et nonobstant l'existence éventuelle d'un don ou legs.</p> <p>Lorsque les recherches des experts bilatéraux n'auront pu établir les circonstances d'acquisition du bien soumis à son examen, la commission scientifique bilatérale appréciera la cohérence scientifique du bien avec d'autres objets faisant l'objet de la demande de restitution ou ayant été rendus précédemment en application de la présente procédure.</p>	<p>Son examen se limitera à la vérification des conditions d'acquisition dans le premier cas, alors que dans le deuxième cas elle se prononcera en opportunité sur des critères scientifiques.</p>

<p>Il convient de traiter le cas des objets entrés dans les musées par dons ou legs, qui posent une difficulté spécifique.</p> <p>Là encore la proposition est de créer un dispositif d'exception, limité au besoin précis de restitution, organisé dans le cadre des accords bilatéraux.</p>	<p>Article 5 : La restitution des objets peut être décidée par le propriétaire de la collection dont est issu le bien en cause, nonobstant les clauses éventuelles de dons et legs, s'il est établi que ces biens ont fait l'objet de vol, pillages, accaparement forcés ou acquisition inéquitable pendant la période coloniale, ou que l'instruction scientifique de la demande conclut qu'il existe une forte présomption, validée par la commission d'experts bilatérale, que leur acquisition ait été faite dans des conditions incompatibles avec le consentement libre et éclairé du propriétaire d'origine.</p> <p>En l'absence d'information suffisante sur les conditions de leur acquisition initiale, et sur avis favorable de la commission d'experts bilatérale, le retour au pays d'origine des objets issus de dons et legs de moins de cinquante ans peut être décidé par la personne publique donataire ou légataire du bien après information des donateurs et testateurs ou de leurs héritiers directs.</p> <p>Ceux-ci disposent d'un délai d'un an pour faire connaître leur position. A défaut de réponse à l'issue de ce délai, leur contentement est réputé acquis.</p> <p>Si les donateurs et testateurs ou leurs héritiers directs ne peuvent être retrouvés, l'information est diffusée par insertion d'un communiqué dans deux journaux</p>	<p>L.112-31 – La restitution des objets est peut être décidée par le propriétaire de la collection dont est issu le bien en cause, nonobstant les clauses éventuelles de dons et legs, s'il est établi que ces biens ont fait l'objet de vol, pillages, accaparement forcés ou acquisition inéquitable pendant la période coloniale, ou que l'instruction scientifique de la demande conclut qu'il existe une forte présomption, validée par la commission d'experts bilatérale, que leur acquisition ait été faite dans des conditions incompatibles avec le consentement libre et éclairé du propriétaire d'origine.</p> <p>En l'absence d'information suffisante sur les conditions de la première acquisition, et sur avis favorable de la commission d'experts bilatérale, le retour au pays d'origine des objets issus de dons et legs de moins de cinquante ans peut être décidé par la personne publique donataire ou légataire du bien après information des donateurs et testateurs ou de leurs héritiers directs.</p> <p>Ceux-ci disposent d'un délai d'un an pour faire connaître leur position. A défaut de réponse à l'issue de ce délai, leur contentement est réputé acquis.</p> <p>Si les donateurs et testateurs ou leurs héritiers directs ne peuvent être retrouvés l'information est diffusée par insertion d'un communiqué dans deux journaux</p>	<p>Cette proposition devra être soumise à l'avis de la Chancellerie.</p> <p>La proposition est de lever le don ou legs, quel que soit sa date, lorsque il est avéré que l'objet a été acquis par pillage (ou autre acte cité), ou, si après avis de la commission d'experts scientifiques, il y a une forte présomption d'une acquisition sans consentement.</p> <p>Il est proposé, pour les objets de la zone grise, de conserver le principe du code civil de la consultation de l'auteur de la libéralité ou de ses ayants droit, mais sous condition de délai : les restitutions d'objets issus de libéralités de plus de cinquante ans d'ancienneté ne seraient pas soumises à cette obligation.</p>
---	--	--	---

<p>4°) décision formelle de restitution : le déclassement du bien du domaine public est de fait contenu dans la décision de restitution des biens, dont il est un effet induit, sans signification propre.</p>	<p>nationaux. Le même délai d'un an s'applique à compter de cette publication.</p> <p>L'intention de restituer n'est pas un motif de résiliation judiciaire de la libéralité.</p> <p>Un décret en Conseil d'État fixe les modalités d'application du présent article.</p> <p>Article 6 : La décision de restitution est prononcée par la personne publique propriétaire des collections dont le bien restitué est issu. La décision mentionne l'État bénéficiaire et précise les motifs de la restitution et la destination du bien.</p> <p>Article 7 : La restitution à l'État bénéficiaire est assurée dans les conditions fixées par l'accord bilatéral de coopération culturelle.</p> <p>Art 8 : Un décret en Conseil d'État détermine les modalités d'enregistrement des biens restitués ainsi que les conditions de transfert de la documentation afférente aux biens restitués et de sa numérisation.</p>	<p>nationaux. Le même délai d'un an s'applique à compter de cette publication.</p> <p>L'intention de restituer n'est pas un motif de résiliation judiciaire de la libéralité.</p> <p>Un décret en Conseil d'État fixe les modalités d'application du présent article.</p> <p>Article L.112-32. – La décision de restitution est prononcée par la personne publique propriétaire. La décision mentionne l'État bénéficiaire et précise les motifs de la restitution et la destination du bien.</p> <p>Article L.112-33. – La restitution à l'État bénéficiaire est assurée dans les conditions fixées par l'accord bilatéral de coopération culturelle.</p> <p>Article L.112-34. – Un décret en Conseil d'État détermine les modalités d'enregistrement des biens restitués ainsi que les conditions de transfert de la documentation afférente aux biens restitués et de sa numérisation.</p>	<p>L'intention de restituer ne pourrait ouvrir droit à une requête en résiliation de la libéralité, qui dépasserait la collection publique de l'objet légué.</p> <p>Décision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - du ministre de la culture pour les biens de l'État, - du maire de la commune ou du président de l'assemblée délibérante pour les biens des autres collectivités territoriales, après avis du conseil municipal ou de l'assemblée, - le cas échéant, du président de l'établissement public propriétaire, après avis du conseil d'administration de l'établissement. <p>Le rythme des restitutions dépendra aussi du niveau d'équipement du pays destinataire et des actions de coopération définies dans l'accord bilatéral.</p>
--	--	---	---

Proposition de modèle d'accord bilatéral

ACCORD

de coopération entre la République française et l'État du
en vue du retour de biens culturels issus de l'État du
et du développement des partenariats culturels

La République française et l'État du
ci-après appelés « les parties »

Proposition de préambule

Animés par le désir d'encourager les échanges culturels entre elles,

Souhaitant accompagner la restitution et le dépôt de longue durée d'objets conservés dans les collections des musées de France, notamment du fait de la présence coloniale française du date à date

Souhaitant développer les échanges scientifiques et la coopération culturelle entre les institutions culturelles et universitaires des deux pays,

Souhaitant améliorer la connaissance réciproque des publics des deux États parties sur l'art africain et la provenance des objets présentés dans leurs musées,

Soucieux de prévenir les trafics de biens culturels et de renforcer la coopération mutuelle dans la lutte contre ce fléau,

Article 1^{er}. – Objet

Les parties conviennent de mettre en œuvre un programme pour la durée de l'accord dans les domaines suivants :

- *établissement conjointe d'une liste d'objets africains figurant à l'inventaire des collections publiques françaises dont le retour pourra être demandé par l'État du... en application des dispositions de la loi XXXX / des articles L .. à L. ... du code du Patrimoine*
- *partage d'informations, de formation et d'expériences dans le domaine de la conservation, la restauration, la mise en valeur des collections,*
- *expositions temporaires dans les institutions et sites patrimoniaux des deux pays,*
- *mise en commun de leurs données sur le trafic des biens culturels*

(à compléter, en adaptant au cas d'espèce)

Pour atteindre ces objectifs, les parties conviennent notamment de :

- Mettre en place une commission bilatérale d'examen des demandes de retour d'objets présentées par l'État du ... composée des personnalités désignées pour leur expertise par les deux pays, selon les modalités déterminées en annexe,
- D'assurer l'instruction conjointe des demandes de restitution par des travaux communs de recherche par des experts désignés par les parties visant à établir la provenance des objets,
- De définir un programme de missions d'assistance technique, de coopération et d'expertise relevant de leurs domaines de compétences dans les domaines de la conservation, la restauration et la mise en valeur des biens culturels en fonction des objectifs du présent accord.

Article 2. – Programme

Les parties élaborent conjointement un programme d'actions pour trois ans annexé au présent accord.

Les parties établissent un bilan conjoint à l'issue des trois ans, qui servira de base à une éventuelle actualisation du programme d'actions pour une autre période de trois ans.

Article 3. – Moyens

Les parties s'efforcent de mobiliser les moyens financiers et autres nécessaires à la mise en œuvre des actions prévues par le présent accord dans le cadre et la limite de leurs ressources budgétaires.

Le budget de chaque programme d'action particulier et sa répartition entre les parties sont décidés d'un commun accord après définition de chaque programme. Ce budget et sa répartition entre les parties figure dans l'annexe définissant les programmes d'action.

Chaque partie s'engage à rechercher des aides et subventions pour le bon développement des actions du programme.

Les parties peuvent faire appel d'un commun accord à des partenaires extérieurs, publics ou privés, pour mener à bien les actions définies.

Article 4. – Suivi

Un comité de pilotage se réunit une fois par an pour suivre le bon déroulement des actions et leur correct phasage. Il rassemble des représentants du ministère chargé de la Culture du (État partie) et des ministères français chargés de la Culture et des Affaires étrangères ainsi que deux des membres du comité d'experts désignés par chaque partie.

Article 5. – Évaluation de la réalisation des actions

Les parties s'engagent à fournir un bilan des actions menées et des crédits consommés au cours d'une année 1 (2 ?) mois avant la date du Comité de pilotage. Le comité de pilotage établit le bilan des actions réalisées et définit les actions de l'année suivante.

Article 6. – Durée

Le présent accord est prévu pour une durée de 6 ans à compter de sa signature.

Il est reconductible une fois, par tacite reconduction.

Article 7. – Amendement

Le présent accord peut être amendé par accord écrit entre les Parties, après avis du comité de pilotage saisi deux mois avant la date de sa réunion.

Article 8. – Dénonciation


En cas de non-respect par l'une des parties des engagements prévus dans le cadre du présent arrangement, celui-ci peut être dénoncé par l'autre partie. La dénonciation prend alors effet dans un délai de deux mois.

Article 9. – Règlement des litiges

Tout différend lié à l'interprétation ou à l'application du présent accord est réglé à l'amiable, au moyen de négociations directes par voie de consultation ou de négociation entre les Parties.

Fait à ... le ... en deux exemplaires originaux.

Le schéma ci-dessous donne un aperçu visuel d'une procédure de restitution selon qu'il existe une liste d'objets revendiqués (à droite), ou que son élaboration nécessite une coopération bilatérale (à gauche). En grisé les étapes partenariales, en bleu, celles reposant sur les institutions françaises.



Fiche 1 : Comment sortir du domaine public les objets restituables ?

La solution proposée par la mission consiste à traiter la demande de restitution comme une exception réservée aux États, dont les territoires correspondent à d'anciennes colonies françaises, ayant conclu un accord bilatéral de restitution/coopération avec la France. Dans ces conditions, la restitution est un acte de relations internationales, opérée par conclusion d'un traité, et la restitution au pays d'origine fait sortir *de jure* l'objet des collections publiques et, en droit, du domaine public de la personne publique propriétaire ; la restitution actée par le traité international vaut déclassement du domaine public.

Ce déclassement, ainsi encadré, ne saurait être interprété comme une remise en cause du principe d'absolue inaliénabilité des collections des musées, principe consolidé depuis 2002 par l'élaboration croisée du CG3P, de la loi de 2010 et de la doctrine de la Commission scientifique nationale des collections.

Lors des concertations, une autre voie a été explorée : un dispositif qui aurait été inspiré de l'actuel article L.124-1 du code du patrimoine, créé par la loi LCAP du 7 juillet 2016, qui permet au propriétaire d'une collection publique d'agir par voie judiciaire en annulation d'une vente ou d'une libéralité portant sur un objet dont l'origine frauduleuse serait révélée postérieurement à l'acte d'acquisition par le musée.

L'extension de ce dispositif aux restitutions d'objets issus de l'histoire coloniale, en l'adaptant pour supprimer l'obligation de recours au juge, aurait alors permis à la personne publique propriétaire « d'annuler l'entrée dans les collections publiques » des objets reconnus comme acquis sans consentement du propriétaire initial pendant la période coloniale, à l'issue de l'instruction de la demande de restitution conforme à la procédure.

La fiction juridique de la « l'annulation de l'entrée dans les collections publiques » permettrait selon ce dispositif de restituer des objets à leur pays d'origine sans recourir à un déclassement du domaine public.

Cette voie, examinée par la mission, nous a semblé devoir être écartée pour les raisons suivantes :

1°) **La plus importante est qu'elle réduit la restitution aux seuls objets dont il sera établi qu'ils auront été acquis sans le consentement du propriétaire**, et ne permet pas la restitution pour des motifs scientifiques d'objets dont, malgré des recherches, il sera impossible de connaître avec certitude les circonstances d'acquisition.

Or, compte tenu de l'ancienneté des acquisitions, des mouvements des objets avant de parvenir au musée, de l'« écran » en termes d'information sur les origines, que peut constituer l'acquisition en bloc par don ou legs de tous les objets d'une collection privée (les cabinets de curiosité notamment, pouvant être composés de divers types d'objets parmi lesquels les objets africains peuvent ne pas avoir été la dominante), à des époques où la recherche de provenance n'avait pas cours, il est à prévoir que dans un grand nombre de cas, les circonstances d'acquisition soient bien difficiles à établir avec certitude, ni même sous forme de « présomptions graves et concordantes ».

Dans le dispositif proposé par la mission, la restitution d'objets à l'origine demeurant incertaine même après recherches (la « zone grise »), sera possible dès lors qu'un intérêt scientifique, reconnu par la commission d'experts bilatérale, s'attacherait à leur

restitution en même temps que des objets acquis sous contrainte avérée ou fortement présumée.

Une logique de cohérence scientifique des objets restitués, gage du dynamisme futur de la mise en valeur des collections, de la portée du message culturel au public et de la coopération muséale à venir viendrait s'ajouter à celle de la restitution pure et simple.

Le schéma proposé de l'annulation de l'entrée dans les collections, qui ne peut par nature concerner que des biens acquis sans consentement de façon certaine et, dans le cas de dons, en connaissance de cause de la part du donateur, reste en deçà de cette dynamique, et la perspective, avancée en réponse à cette objection, de multiplier les dépôts de longue durée pour les objets de la « zone grise » ne paraît pas non plus satisfaisante (v 4°).

2°) « L'annulation de l'entrée dans les collections » est une fiction juridique qui peut se justifier ponctuellement mais son extension aux objets en cause est à la fois inutile juridiquement et problématique politiquement.

Elle existe depuis la loi LCAP, pour des biens issus de trafics postérieurs à la ratification de la convention UNESCO par la France en 1997 et dont le caractère illicite se révélerait après leur acquisition par un musée français, postérieurement à 1997. Elle ne devrait en tout état de cause concerner qu'un très petit nombre d'objets compte tenu des précautions normalement prises pour les acquisitions destinées aux collections publiques. Cette possibilité, qui suppose l'intervention judiciaire, constitue avant tout une mesure dissuasive destinée aux trafiquants et receleurs.

En revanche, permettre au propriétaire public d'annuler de sa propre autorité l'entrée dans les collections publiques de tous les biens africains dont la restitution est demandée et dont l'acquisition sans consentement du propriétaire d'origine est établie, ne résout que partiellement la difficulté. En effet, selon l'interprétation constante du service des musées de France, la sortie d'un objet d'une collection de musée ne lui fait pas perdre son intérêt au regard de l'histoire, de l'art etc... qualité qui détermine son appartenance au domaine public selon la définition du CG3P.

Leur restitution nécessitera donc malgré tout un déclassement du domaine public national, à tout le moins implicite, tout comme la procédure proposée par la mission, ce qui prive quelque peu d'intérêt ce montage dont la motivation sous-jacente est d'entretenir intact le principe d'inaliénabilité des collections du domaine public.

Cette réticence est compréhensible, car ce principe, encore récemment rappelé en réponse à une QPC par le Conseil constitutionnel (QPCn°2018-743 du 26 octobre 2018) est fondateur de notre législation sur les biens culturels publics, et il n'est pas question ici de le remettre en cause.

Dans la proposition de la mission, le risque de « banalisation » est cependant écarté : la restitution ne serait possible que pendant la validité des traités de restitution et coopération, accessibles à un nombre limité de pays, pour des objets répondant à des critères précis, et sur une procédure spécifique offrant des garanties scientifiques. Le déclassement implicite du domaine public en fin de procédure qu'implique la restitution apparaît comme collatéral de cette décision, concluant un processus entrepris très en amont, et non comme une initiative *per se* du propriétaire public.

Enfin, que ces objets aient été présentés, étudiés, restaurés, mis en valeur et visités dans les musées français depuis des décennies, ou au contraire oubliés dans des réserves, il nous semble que la responsabilité des gestionnaires des musées publics à leur égard est entière et qu'une décision radicale « d'annulation de l'acquisition » serait peu respectueuse de leur travail et de l'importance de ces collections pour l'histoire des musées. Elle n'effacerait pas non plus le fait que le public et les créateurs français se sont culturellement appropriés ce patrimoine, alors qu'elle viendrait a posteriori symboliquement délégitimer en quelque sorte cette appropriation intellectuelle et nier plusieurs décennies de l'histoire de l'objet.

3°) Par ailleurs, « l'annulation de l'entrée dans les collections » ne concernerait que les objets dont la restitution est officiellement demandée, et fragiliserait le statut des objets restants.

La mission estime, d'après les échanges avec les responsables des musées africains, que le processus de restitution, même organisé sur plusieurs années par les traités bilatéraux, ne concernera qu'une partie des collections africaines des musées français.

Dès lors, comment justifier le maintien dans les collections publiques des objets non réclamés mais acquis dans les mêmes conditions que les objets rendus au pays d'origine après annulation de l'entrée dans les collections?

En bonne logique devrait être annulée l'entrée dans les collections de tous les objets acquis sans consentement pendant près de 200 ans d'histoire coloniale, mais quel serait leur sort si leur restitution n'est pas demandée ? S'ils ne font plus partie des collections, resteront ils domaine public alors que leur acquisition sera entachée de ce vice originel ? Si non, comment dissuader les propriétaires publics de les vendre et les convaincre au contraire de continuer d'assumer leur conservation et leur présentation au public ?

L'extension de l'annulation de l'entrée dans les collections, jusqu'ici réservée à des objets dont l'acquisition frauduleuse est régie par les conventions internationales nous paraît également très contestable. S'il peut être envisagé de recourir au même procédé pour les objets issus de spoliations nazies, suivant la Déclaration de Londres de 1943, ou des restes humains, en raison de leur nature spécifique, le recours à un procédé identique pour des objets dont les textes internationaux en vigueur ne condamnent pas les conditions d'acquisition est difficilement défendable.

De plus, le procédé serait paradoxalement moins sécurisé que pour les biens tombant sous le coup de la convention UNESCO de 1970, puisqu'il n'y aurait pas de recours au juge, alors que les biens concernés sont potentiellement beaucoup plus nombreux et que leur origine sera plus difficile à établir du fait de l'ancienneté de leur acquisition.

4°) Enfin, la perspective de développer en complément le dépôt de longue durée pour les objets issus de la « zone grise » ne paraît pas non plus très réaliste si un grand nombre d'objets devait être concerné.

Pratiqué dans quelques cas précédents pour ne pas déroger au principe d'inaliénabilité des collections publiques, le dépôt de longue durée est contestable dans son principe parce qu'il constitue en réalité un transfert de propriété déguisé, et il est perçu (lorsqu'il s'agit d'un dépôt de la France à l'étranger) comme un « faux semblant » ou un « entre deux », une mesure transitoire en attendant une possibilité de reconnaissance d'un transfert de propriété définitif.

Il met cependant à la charge des musées dépositaires des obligations précises de conservation du bien déposé, réputé rester dans le domaine public français, qui pourraient être perçues comme une ingérence dans la gestion des musées africains si elles devaient concerner un nombre significatif d'objets. De plus, gérer de façon homogène une collection juridiquement hétérogène mêlant objets « français » déposés et objets « africains » sera source de difficultés, notamment lorsque les objets déposés seront amenés à circuler entre pays africains ou à l'extérieur pour des expositions temporaires ou pour des travaux de recherche.

Si au contraire, pour éviter cet écueil, la convention de dépôt est peu contraignante, elle placera le propriétaire public qui consent le dépôt de longue durée dans une position délicate car il restera comptable de la conservation de biens sur lesquels il n'aura plus qu'un contrôle lointain et théorique.

Fiche 2 : Comment traiter les objets acquis par dons et legs ?

Inaliénabilité des biens et révision des conditions et charges.

Le code civil régit précisément les dons et legs entre personnes, sans faire toujours de distinction entre personnes publiques et privées, sauf peut-être sur les conditions d'exécution des libéralités et sur la question de l'inaliénabilité des biens donnés ou légués.

La clause d'inaliénabilité qui peut affecter certaines donations ou legs entre personnes physiques est une clause admise, mais qui doit rester cadrée dans le temps et doit être justifiée.

L'article L.900-1 du code civil nous indique que *« les clauses d'inaliénabilité affectant un bien donné ou légué ne sont valables que si elles sont temporaires et justifiées par un intérêt sérieux et légitime. Même dans ce cas, le donataire ou légataire peut être judiciairement autorisé à disposer du bien si l'intérêt qui a justifié la clause a disparu ou qu'il advient qu'un intérêt plus important l'exige »*.

L'article poursuit par un alinéa 2 plus spécifiquement consacré aux personnes morales (pour ce qui nous concerne, publiques) : le présent article *« ne préjudicie pas aux libéralités consenties à des personnes morales ou même à des personnes physiques, à charge de constituer des personnes morales »*.

Il en ressort que les dons et legs aux personnes publiques peuvent, plus facilement qu'entre personnes physiques, être assortis d'une obligation d'inaliénabilité. La jurisprudence montre toutefois une application quasi privatiste de cette règle (CE, 8 décembre 2000, n° 205000) qui reconnaît spécifiquement à la Fondation de France que *« ne constitue pas en soi, une illégalité »*, le fait de n'avoir accepté un legs grevé d'une telle clause sans limitation de temps qu'avec la mention d'une réserve fondée sur l'article 900-1 du code civil de la possibilité de demander l'autorisation judiciaire de disposer du bien.

La jurisprudence civile admet en outre que le juge est souverain pour apprécier l'existence d'un *« intérêt plus important »* pour le donataire qui exigerait que la condition d'inaliénabilité soit levée.

L'exécution des charges de la libéralité répond à la même logique. L'article 900-2 permet en effet au gratifié de demander en justice la révision des conditions ou charges lorsqu'il fait face à *« un changement de circonstances »* ayant pour conséquences de rendre *« soit extrêmement difficile soit sérieusement dommageable »* l'exécution de ces conditions.

Sur cette question de l'exécution des charges, le cas des personnes publiques est traité par le CG3P, qui renvoie largement au code civil. L'article L.2222-12 du CG3P prévoit expressément le cas où il peut être procédé à la révision des conditions ou charges ou à la restitution des libéralités, pour des raisons reprenant mot pour mot les termes du 900-2 du code civil.

En ce cas, le jeu croisé des dispositions des deux codes permet de conclure que pour ce qui concerne la révision des charges, un accord amiable avec le donateur permet de mettre en œuvre des mesures prévues par l'article 900-4 du code civil, sur autorisation de l'autorité administrative (et non du juge) allant de la *« réduction en quantité et quotité des prestations liées à la libéralité »* à *« l'aliénation de tout ou partie des biens faisant »*

l'objet de la libéralité dès lors que le prix sera employé à des fins en rapport avec la volonté du disposant ».

Aucune disposition spécifique n'est prévue en ce cas pour les biens culturels entrés dans le domaine public par dons ou legs¹⁰⁰.

C'est sans doute dans l'intention de pallier cette lacune que le code du patrimoine, indique à son article L.451-5 d'une part que « *les biens constituant les collections des musées de France appartenant à une personne publique font partie du domaine public et sont à ce titre inaliénables* », leur déclassement ne pouvant intervenir « *qu'après avis conforme d'une commission scientifique nationale...* » et d'autre part, à l'article L.451-7, que « *les biens incorporés dans les collections publiques par dons ou legs ou.... ne peuvent être déclassés* ».

Ce faisant, il ne déroge pas spécifiquement au code civil ni surtout au CG3P qui, s'il reconnaît aux biens culturels une appartenance quasi naturelle au domaine public mobilier « *sans préjudice des dispositions applicables en matière de protection des biens culturels* » ne prend pas du tout la même précaution quand il s'agit de traiter de l'inaliénabilité ou des révisions de dons ou legs aux personnes publiques.

Il est donc permis de conclure que les révisions des dons et legs de biens culturels suivent les règles du droit commun des dons et legs faits aux personnes publiques, et il en a d'ailleurs été fait, très ponctuellement, application.

Ainsi, restituer des biens des collections africaines des musées sur simple procédure administrative pourrait être envisagé en adoptant les principes suivants :

- la volonté politique de restituer (formalisée par une loi et une procédure nouvelle) et l'existence d'une demande de restitution formelle fondée sur cette procédure sont constitutifs d'un « *changement de circonstances* » mettant en question la poursuite du maintien dans les collections de biens issus de dons et legs comportant une telle charge dont l'exécution deviendrait de fait « *extrêmement difficile* », voire « *dommageable* » pour l'image de l'institution. On peut également invoquer l'apparition d'un « *intérêt plus important* » sur le fondement de l'article L.900-1 du code civil, autorisant l'aliénation ;

- dans ces conditions, peut être mise en œuvre l'aliénation de tout ou partie des biens de la donation ou du legs (article L.900-4 du code civil), le prix de vente devant être consacré « *à des fins en rapport avec l'intention du disposant* ».

Le propriétaire public restituant les objets demandés du fait du « *changement de circonstances* » concrétisé par la demande de restitution procède à une aliénation certes gratuite, mais qui a contrario légitime le maintien dans la collection du musée des objets non revendiqués.

En conclusion, cette aliénation gratuite présente l'avantage de consolider le fonds restant, et si toute la collection d'un musée devait être restituée, l'effet de légitimation a contrario concernerait les autres collections des musées de France.

¹⁰⁰ absence d'autant plus frappante que pour la restitution au donateur il est prévu une possibilité d'exception pour certaines catégories : les objets classés et immeubles classés ou inscrits au titre des MH pourraient ne pas être restitués, mais le CG3P ne fait aucunement mention des collections de musées

La procédure de restitution telle que nous l'envisageons ne serait donc pas contraire aux principes du code civil et du CG3P régissant les dons et legs aux personnes publiques.

Toutefois, ces principes ainsi décrits supposent un accord du donateur ou testateur ou leurs héritiers, dans le cas contraire, une procédure judiciaire doit être engagée. Une dérogation à cette obligation, trop lourde pour s'appliquer aux dons et legs des objets restituables en vertu de la nouvelle procédure mise en place, doit être introduite.

Quant à ses modalités, les échanges ont fait apparaître une piste que n'a pas retenue la mission, mais qu'il est apparu utile de présenter, et qui se situait dans la continuité de la piste de « l'annulation de l'entrée dans les collections » (fiche 1)

Celle-ci partiellement fondée sur le code civil, se divisait en plusieurs branches, distinguant en premier lieu deux hypothèses, fondées sur le degré d'information ou de conscience du donateur.

Dans la première, le donateur ou testateur de la libéralité avait connaissance du caractère non consenti de l'acquisition de l'objet donné. En ce cas, « l'annulation de l'entrée dans les collections » serait possible sans formalité à l'égard des auteurs de la libéralité ou de leurs héritiers). Dans le second cas, la libéralité aurait été faite de « bonne foi » par un propriétaire privé convaincu d'avoir acquis légitimement les biens qu'il cède à la personne publique (cas évidemment majoritaire), trois situations en découleraient:

- si le donateur est encore vivant, il lui est demandé de révoquer la libéralité et de rendre lui-même l'objet au pays demandeur (cas des plaques Qing) s'il refuse, et si le propriétaire public ne souhaite pas conserver l'objet, celui-ci est rendu au donateur,
- si le donateur ou testateur est décédé et aucun héritier n'est identifié : la libéralité peut être annulée par voie judiciaire, et l'objet, restitué au pays demandeur,
- si les ayants droits du donateur ou testateur décédé sont identifiés : leur accord serait requis pour permettre la restitution, en cas de refus, si la personne publique ne souhaite pas conserver l'objet, celui-ci leur serait rendu.

La mission n'a pas retenu cette proposition.

La solution doit certes tenir compte des circonstances d'acquisition de l'objet, mais le critère premier de la « bonne foi » du donateur quant aux conditions de première acquisition des biens objets du don ou legs ne nous paraît pas devoir être retenu, car il sera invérifiable en réalité, et n'a guère de sens lorsque la libéralité a été faite à une époque où les d'acquisitions non consenties n'étaient pas considérées comme répréhensibles.

Par ailleurs, les dons et legs qui ont constitué les collections africaines des musées de France sont intervenus sur plus de cent cinquante ans, ce qui rend assez irréaliste la recherche d'un consentement des héritiers à la révision des charges de ces libéralités et à l'aliénation que constitue la restitution des objets.

Enfin, en cas de refus, ces hypothèses conduisent potentiellement à des situations d'impasse, contraires aux objectifs recherchés, lorsque l'intention de restitution au pays d'origine pourrait se solder en définitive par un retour des biens en cause au donateur ou ses ayants droits.

La mission préconise donc de s'écarter de la législation applicable pour le droit commun des dons et legs et de privilégier une solution d'exception pragmatique, dont l'économie se fonde sur les circonstances d'acquisition et sur l'ancienneté de la libéralité:

La restitution d'un objet issu de dons et legs serait effectuée par voie administrative, sans recherche de l'accord des ayants droit, quelle que soit la date de cette libéralité, dès lors qu'il est établi, ou qu'il existe un faisceau de présomptions graves et concordantes, que l'objet a été acquis sans consentement du propriétaire initial.

En revanche, pour les objets de la « zone grise », dont la provenance reste incertaine, et dont la restitution serait fondée par des motifs de cohérence scientifique, la mission propose que la recherche de l'accord des ayants droits soit requise si la libéralité a été effectuée moins de cinquante ans avant la demande de restitution et qu'elle contient des clauses explicites contraires à la restitution éventuelle du bien au pays d'origine.

Ce délai glissant laisse en effet une chance de pouvoir consulter l'auteur de la libéralité s'il est encore vivant, ou du moins des ayants droits encore facilement identifiables. La décision de restitution serait précédée d'une période de publication de l'intention de restituer, permettant aux auteurs de la libéralité ou leurs ayants droits d'en être informés conformément au CG3P (article L.2222-13 du CG3P, renvoyant aux articles 900-2 à 900-8 du code civil, et article R.2222-21 et suivants du CG3P), et le cas échéant de contester la décision de restitution, sans que cette contestation ne puisse déboucher sur une annulation de la libéralité, ni sur un retour du bien entre les mains du donateur.

L'hypothèse d'une impossibilité de restituer n'est donc pas exclue dans notre proposition, toutefois, elle serait réduite aux objets de la « zone grise » ayant fait l'objet de libéralités récentes.

Diverses solutions pourraient alors s'envisager : recherche d'un autre objet de nature similaire dans une autre collection, remise d'une copie, dépôt de longue durée, (en dépit des inconvénients de cette solution).

Document 3. The “Atelier juridique”




COLLÈGE
DE FRANCE
—1530—



Atelier juridique sur le retour du patrimoine africain en Afrique

organisé par l'Institut des Sciences sociales du Politique (UMR 7220) & le Ministère de la Culture
avec le concours du Collège de France



Collège de France

26 juin 2018



Mots d'accueil, présentation de la mission et introduction (9h-9h20)

- Accueil des participants et présentation de la mission : *Bénédicte Savoy* et *Felwine Sarr*
- Introduction à l'atelier : *Isabelle Maréchal* et *Vincent Négri*

Session 1 (9h20-11h15) – L'état du droit sur le sujet des restitutions : droit international, droit comparé et sources normatives africaines

- La formation et les évolutions du droit à restitution en droit international
Xavier Perrot (Université de Limoges)
- La question des restitutions dans le droit français
Isabelle Maréchal (Ministère de la Culture)
- Commentaires du *Leitfaden Sammlungsgut aus kolonialen* [Guide sur le traitement des objets de collection provenant de contextes coloniaux], publié en Allemagne
Kwame Opoku (retraité du bureau des Nations unies à Vienne)
- Les sources normatives africaines sur les restitutions
Vincent Négri (CNRS/Institut des Sciences sociales du Politique)

Discussions

(Pause)

Session 2 (11h30-13h) – Des précédents : études de cas de biens culturels restitués

- La restitution des têtes maories à la Nouvelle-Zélande
Sébastien Minchin (Muséum d'histoire naturelle de Bourges)
- Le retour des archives coréennes, remises par la France à la Corée du Sud
Stéphane Duroy (Faculté Jean Monnet – Université Paris-Sud Paris Saclay)
- Les accords de restitution entre le ministère italien de la Culture et des musées étrangers
Manlio Frigo (Université de Milan & Cabinet BonelliErede Milan)

Discussions

Session 3 (14h30-16h00) – Etudes de cas sur la provenance à partir de trois objets africains conservés au musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac

- Tête d'ancêtre royal, Edo Inv. 73.1997.4.3.
[Origine : Bénin City 1897 ; entrée au musée en 1997 par achat auprès de Jean-Paul et Monique Barbier-Mueller (ancienne collection Musée Barbier-Mueller)]
- Objet cultuel composite Inv. 71.1931.74.1091.1.
[Origine : Mali / Mission Dakar-Djibouti 1931]
- Statue de Ghezo Inv. 71.1893.45.1.
[Origine : Abomey, don du général Dodds]

Présentation des objets et de leur provenance par Hélène Joubert (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac)

Intervention de Gaëlle Beaujean (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac) et des membres du comité scientifique de l'agence nationale du patrimoine au Bénin [interventions par skype depuis le Bénin]

Discussions

(Pause)

Session 4 (16h30-18h00) – Réflexion prospective sur les modes opératoires et les modèles juridiques vers la construction d'une législation *ad hoc*

Réflexions et discussions sur les modes opératoires et les modèles juridiques vers la construction d'un ou de modèle(s) *ad hoc* pour « un objectif de restitutions temporaires ou définitives du patrimoine africain en Afrique ».

Avec :

- Laurence Auer (Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères)
- Claire Chastanier (Direction générale des patrimoines – ministère de la Culture)
- Marie Cornu (CNRS/Institut des Sciences sociales du Politique)
- Emmanuel Kasarherou (Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac)
- Kwame Opoku (retraité du bureau des Nations unies à Vienne)
- Juliette Raoul-Duval (Comité français du Conseil international des musées)

et en présence de l'ensemble des intervenants.

Discussions animées par Isabelle Maréchal et Vincent Négri.

Conclusions

Bénédicte Savoy et Felwine Sarr



Intervenants

Laurence Auer	Directrice de la culture, de l'enseignement, de la recherche et du réseau (ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères)
Gaëlle Beaujean	Responsable de collections Afrique au musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac
Claire Chastanier	Adjointe au sous-directeur des collections, Service des musées de France (Direction générale des patrimoines – ministère de la Culture)
Marie Cornu	Directrice de recherche CNRS – Institut des Sciences sociales du Politique (ISP/UMR 7220)
Stéphane Duroy	Professeur de droit public à la Faculté Jean Monnet – Université Paris-Sud Paris Saclay
Manlio Frigo	Professeur de droit international à l'Université de Milan, avocat au cabinet BonelliErede Milan
Hélène Joubert	Responsable de l'unité patrimoniale des collections d'Afrique du musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac
Emmanuel Kasarherou	Adjoint au directeur du département du patrimoine et des collections (musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac)
Isabelle Maréchal	Inspectrice générale des affaires culturelles – ministère de la Culture
Sébastien Minchin	Directeur du muséum d'histoire naturelle de Bourges
Vincent Négri	Chercheur à l'Institut des Sciences sociales du Politique (ISP/UMR 7220)
Kwame Opoku	Ancien conseiller juridique, retraité du bureau des Nations unies à Vienne
Xavier Perrot	Professeur d'histoire du droit à l'Université de Limoges
Juliette Raoul-Duval	Présidente du Comité français du Conseil international des musées
Felwine Sarr	Professeur d'économie à l'Université Gaston Berger de Saint-Louis (Sénégal), écrivain et essayiste
Bénédicte Savoy	Professeure d'histoire de l'art à la <i>Technische Universität</i> de Berlin, titulaire de la chaire internationale « Histoire culturelle des patrimoines artistiques en Europe, XVIIIe-XXe siècle » au Collège de France

Personnalités invitées

Aurore Bassy	Administratrice au Sénat, Commission de la culture, de l'éducation et de la communication
Lucile Bordet	Chargée de mission Patrimoine (Direction de la culture, de l'enseignement, de la recherche et du réseau – ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères)
Blandine Chavanne	Sous-directrice de la politique des musées, service des musées de France (Direction générale des patrimoines – ministère de la Culture)
André Delpuech	Directeur du musée de l'Homme, administrateur au Comité français du Conseil international des musées
Bruno Favel	Chef du Département des affaires européennes et internationales (Direction générale des patrimoines – ministère de la Culture)
Caroline Gaultier-Kurhan	Chargée de mission pour les musées et patrimoines africains au Département des affaires européennes et internationales (Direction générale des patrimoines – ministère de la Culture)
Geneviève Koubi	Professeur de droit public à l'Université Paris 8 Vincennes Saint-Denis
François Laurent	Sous-directeur des affaires européennes et internationales (Secrétariat général du ministère de la Culture)
Vincent Lefevre	Sous-directeur des collections, service des musées de France (Direction générale des patrimoines – ministère de la Culture)
Stéphane L'host	Adjoint du sous-directeur des affaires juridiques, service des affaires juridiques et internationales (Secrétariat général du ministère de la Culture)
François Mairesse	Professeur à l'Université Paris 3 Sorbonne nouvelle, expert en muséologie
Alexis Mocio-Mathieu	Chargé de mission Patrimoine (Direction de la culture, de l'enseignement, de la recherche et du réseau – ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères)
Paulina Restrepo	Attachée au bureau des affaires juridiques à la Direction générale des patrimoines (ministère de la Culture)
Nathan Schlanger	Professeur d'archéologie à l'Ecole nationale des chartes
Maëlle Sergheraert	Responsable du pôle SHS, archéologie et patrimoine (Direction de la culture, de l'enseignement, de la recherche et du réseau – ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères)
Didier Touzelin	Chef du bureau des affaires juridiques à la Direction générale des patrimoines (ministère de la Culture)
David Zivie	Chargé de mission auprès du Secrétaire général du ministère de la Culture

Mémo pour la table-ronde de la session 4

Réflexion prospective sur les modes opératoires et les modèles juridiques vers la construction d'une législation *ad hoc*

Position liminaire

- 0) *Restitutions ou circulations ? (Bénédicte Savoy et Felwine Sarr)*

Provenance et arguments


- 1°) Quelle place donner à la provenance des objets lors de l'instruction d'une demande de restitution ? Doit-on traiter différemment les objets issus de « pillages » ou de transferts non-consentis et les autres objets ?
- 2°) Quelle place donner, dans l'examen de la demande, à l'argument scientifique du musée demandeur ? Le simple fait d'être un objet « pillé » ou transféré sans consentement suffit-il à fonder la demande de restitution ?
- 3°) Quelle place donner aux actions de coopération/ formation des conservateurs des musées d'accueil ?
- 4°) L'objet peut-il être rendu à sa communauté d'origine, et donc ne pas être conservé dans un musée ?

Procédures

- 5°) Instruit-on les demandes de restitution, objet par objet, ou admet-on des demandes pour des ensembles d'objets ? Un musée '*restituant*' peut-il de sa propre initiative élargir le champ de la restitution à d'autres objets, non réclamés initialement, dont il dispose et qui forment un tout cohérent ou un ensemble complémentaire ?
- 6°) La demande de restitution s'instruit-elle de musée à musée, ou y a-t-il une commission nationale ou un service centralisant ces actions ?
- 7°) Quelles seraient l'(es) instance(s) à consulter avant déclassement pour restitution ?
- 8°) L'UNESCO, l'Union africaine, l'ICOM ou l'ICCROM doivent-ils jouer un rôle dans ce processus ? et, si oui, lequel ? (inventaire, tenue d'un registre international des restitutions, avec photos et moyens d'identifier chaque objet, ...)

Figures

Fig. 1




Map: Léa Saint-Raymond, 2018

Museum Institutions in sub-Saharan Africa.

Source: Répertoire of the West African Museum Program (WAMP), completed thanks to data provided by Andrea Meyer (Technische Universität Berlin)

Fig. 2



Map: Léa Saint-Raymond, 2018

An estimation of the number of objects originating from sub-Saharan Africa housed in the museum institution collections and French universities, according to the available inventory (October 2018). The sites specifically marked by a dot indicate the possible conservation of rather significant collections, but whose inventory is still for the moment, unavailable.


Fig. 3

Pays	...-1884	1885-1960	1961-...	Ind.	Total
Afrique du Sud	23	125	310		458
Angola		414	43		457
Bénin	14	2284	596	263	3157
Botswana	12	56			68
Burkina Faso		733	302	53	1 088
Burundi	3	11	14		28
Cameroun	3	6 968	713	154	7 838
Cap-Vert		2			2
Comores		93	78	4	175
Côte d'Ivoire		1 463	2 292	196	3 951
Djibouti	50	589	15	68	722
Érythrée		57	44	1	102
Éthiopie	29	1 691	1 329	32	3 081
Gabon	149	1 543	687	69	2 448
Gambie	15	18	2		35
Ghana	5	376	1 258	17	1 656
Guinée	21	1 861	267	61	2 210
Guinée équatoriale	2	43	49		94
Guinée-Bissau	1	46	23	55	125
Kenya		101	80		181
Lesotho		24	75		99
Libéria		25	19	2	46
Madagascar	76	3 083	4 196	426	7 781
Malawi		37	1		38
Mali	89	5 863	795	163	6 910
Maurice			2		2
Mauritanie	9	880	522	14	1 425
Mozambique		167	4		171
Namibie		7			7
Niger	9	998	592	16	1 615
Nigéria	41	257	840	10	1 148
Ouganda	5	180	24	1	210
République Centrafricaine		1 505	382	56	1 943
République démocratique du Congo	5	697	551	173	1 426
République du Congo	7	1 801	723	62	2 593
Rwanda	3	9	32	3	47
Sao Tomé-et-Principe		9			9
Sénégal	66	675	1 522	13	2 276

Seychelles			2		2
Sierra Leone	1	32	41	1	75
Somalie	53	251	62	57	423
Soudan	72	502	92	29	695
Soudan du Sud	3	31	4		38
Tanzanie	13	334	23	2	372
Tchad	1	8 557	627	111	9 296
Togo		99	138	3	240
Zambie	4	126	8	1	139
Zimbabwe	1	68	9		78
Total	785	44 691	19 388	2 379	66 980
Pays	...-1884	1885-1960	1961-...	Ind.	Total

The numbers of objects housed at the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac at the core of the “Africa” Cultural Heritage Collection, according to the period of their registration into the inventory records. The column marked “undetermined” included pieces where the year of registration is not included in their inventory number.

Fig. 4



Map: Léa Saint-Raymond, 2018

The number of objects in the “Africa” Cultural Heritage Collection included in the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (Paris) recorded as part of the inventory of the national collections between 1878 and 2018, by their geographical provenance, according to the current national borders. The former French colonies (AOF, AEF, and Madagascar) are marked in grey.



Fig. 4a. The number of objects in the “Africa” Cultural Heritage Collection included in the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (Paris) recorded as part of the inventory **before 1885**, by their geographical provenance, according to current national borders. The former French colonies (AOF, AEF, and Madagascar) are marked in grey.




Fig. 4b. The number of objects in the “Africa” Cultural Heritage Collection included in the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (Paris) recorded as part of the inventory **between 1885 and 1960**, by their geographical provenance, according to current national borders. The former French colonies (AOF, AEF, and Madagascar) are marked in grey.




Fig. 4c. The number of objects in the “Africa” Cultural Heritage Collection included in the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac (Paris) recorded as part of the inventory **after independence**, by their geographical provenance, according to current national borders. The former French colonies (AOF, AEF, and Madagascar) are marked in grey.




Fig. 5a. The record of the entire inventory of cultural heritage objects in the “Africa” collection at the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac

- in green: before 1885
- in blue: between 1885 and 1960
- in yellow: after the independence of African nations




Fig. 5b. The record of the inventory of cultural heritage objects from present-day Cameroon housed in the collection at the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac

- in green: before 1885
- in blue: between 1885 and 1960
- in yellow: after the independence of African nations




Fig. 5c. The record of the inventory of cultural heritage objects from present-day Ghana housed in the collection at the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac

- in green: before 1885
- in blue: between 1885 and 1960
- in yellow: after the independence of African nations




Fig. 5d. The record of the inventory of cultural heritage objects from present-day Nigeria housed in the collection at the musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac

- in green: before 1885
- in blue: between 1885 and 1960
- in yellow: after the independence of African nations

Fig. 6



Appellation ou titre :

Statue *bochio* à l'image du roi Ghézo

Auteurs :

Bokossa Donvide, Sossa Dede, Ekplékendo Akati (pour les lames)

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1893.45.1

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois, fer, pigments

Dimensions :

214 × 82 × 45 cm, 22 kg

Toponyme :

Abomey < Zou < Bénin < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

XIX^e siècle

Description :

Statue en bois représentant un homme debout, le bras droit levé, l'avant-bras gauche plié. Ceinture en métal supportant peut-être autrefois un cache-sexe (?). Lames de fer sur les épaules et à la taille. Caleçon rayé noir et jaune. Main gauche abimée.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Alfred Amédée Dodds*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1893**

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Alfred Amédée Dodds (1842, Saint-Louis-du-Sénégal-1922, Paris) est un général français, métis par ses deux parents, commandant supérieur des troupes françaises au Sénégal à partir de 1890. Entre 1892 et 1894, il mène la conquête du Dahomey (actuel Bénin) sur le roi Béhanzin.

** Prise de guerre du colonel Alfred Amédée Dodds à Abomey (actuel Bénin) en 1892.

Fig. 7



Appellation ou titre :

Statue royale anthropo-zoomorphe

Auteur :

Sossa Dede

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1893.45.2

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois polychrome, cuir

Dimensions :

179 × 77 × 110 cm, 56 kg

Toponyme :

Abomey < Zou < Bénin < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Entre 1858 et 1889

Description :

Statue évoquant le règne du roi Glélé (1858-1889) représenté sous la forme d'un personnage à tête de lion. Tête, torse et bras peints en rouge de la taille aux jarrets, cuisses jusqu'aux genoux peintes en vert (figuration d'un pantalon ?), mollets et pieds rouges. Poils et crinière indiqués par gravure sur la tête et le torse. Queue rouge. Avant bras levés, poings fermés, cache-sexe en cuir.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Alfred Amédée Dodds*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1893**

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Alfred Amédée Dodds (1842, Saint-Louis-du-Sénégal-1922, Paris) est un général français, métis par ses deux parents, commandant supérieur des troupes françaises au Sénégal à partir de 1890. Entre 1892 et 1894, il mène la conquête du Dahomey (actuel Bénin) sur le roi Béhanzin.

** Prise de guerre du colonel Alfred Amédée Dodds à Abomey (actuel Bénin) en 1892

Fig. 8



Appellation ou titre :

Statue royale anthropo-zoomorphe

Auteur :

Sossa Dede

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1893.45.3

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois polychrome, métal

Dimensions :

168 × 102 × 92 cm, 55 kg

Toponyme :

Abomey < Zou < Bénin < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Entre 1889 et 1892

Description :

Statue d'homme debout dont la tête et le torse évoquent un requin. Quatre ailerons sont figurés au niveau du torse. Bras droit levé, bras gauche tendu, poings fermés, écailles indiquées sur le torse.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Alfred Amédée Dodds*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1893**

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Alfred Amédée Dodds (1842, Saint-Louis-du-Sénégal-1922, Paris) est un général français, métis par ses deux parents, commandant supérieur des troupes françaises au Sénégal à partir de 1890. Entre 1892 et 1894, il mène la conquête du Dahomey (actuel Bénin) sur le roi Béhanzin.

** Prise de guerre du colonel Alfred Amédée Dodds à Abomey (actuel Bénin) en 1892.

Fig. 9



Appellation ou titre :

Portes du palais royal d'Abomey

Auteur :

Sossa Dede

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéros d'inventaire :

71.1893.45.4 – 71.1893.45.5

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois polychrome, pigments, métal

Dimensions :

173× 109 × 7 cm, 25 kg

Toponyme :

Abomey < Zou < Bénin < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Vers 1889

Description :

Décor en bas-relief organisé en deux registres. Une grenouille est représentée dans les quatre coins de chaque registre. Registre supérieur, de gauche à droite : récade, éléphant, couteau, oiseau, cheval, couteau du migan de Kpengla (cf. 71.1936.21.54) Registre inférieur, de gauche à droite : animal assis, récade, yeux et nez humains, fusil. En dessous, antilope tachetée (joto de Glèlè).

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Alfred Amédée Dodds*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1893**

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Alfred Amédée Dodds (1842, Saint-Louis-du-Sénégal-1922, Paris) est un général français, métis par ses deux parents, commandant supérieur des troupes françaises au Sénégal à partir de 1890. Entre 1892 et 1894, il mène la conquête du Dahomey (actuel Bénin) sur le roi Béhanzin.

** Portes trouvées dans des caches souterraines par la colonne expéditionnaire française à Abomey en 1892.

Fig. 10



Appellation ou titre :

Portes du palais royal d'Abomey

Auteur :

Sossa Dede

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéros d'inventaire :

71.1893.45.6 – 71.1893.45.7

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois polychrome, pigments, métal

Dimensions :

168 × 97,5 × 7 cm, 25 kg – 168,5 × 94 × 5 cm, 23 kg

Toponyme :

Abomey < Zou < Bénin < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Vers 1889

Description :

Décor en bas-relief organisé en deux registres. Registre supérieur : un caméléon marchant sur un fil entre la lune et le soleil au dessus d'un sabre et d'une récade. Le caméléon est le symbole de la divinité Lisa, dieu suprême du panthéon dahoméen, unique, tout puissant, mais lointain, ni bon, ni mauvais, inaccessible aux prières des hommes. Le culte de Mahou et Lisa fut importé à Abomey par Na Wangélé, mère du roi Tegbessou (1728-1775). Lisa, principe masculin, représente l'Orient et le soleil, Mahou, principe féminin, représente l'Occident et la lune. Lisa est représenté par le caméléon qui rappelle les diverses colorations que prend chaque matin l'horizon à l'Est. (P. Verger, 1954).

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Alfred Amédée Dodds*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1893**

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Alfred Amédée Dodds (1842, Saint-Louis-du-Sénégal-1922, Paris) est un général français, métis par ses deux parents, commandant supérieur des troupes françaises au Sénégal à partir de 1890. Entre 1892 et 1894, il mène la conquête du Dahomey (actuel Bénin) sur le roi Béhanzin.

** Portes trouvées dans des caches souterraines par la colonne expéditionnaire française à Abomey en 1892.

Fig. 11



Appellation ou titre :

Siège royal

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1893.45.8

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois, pigments

Dimensions :

94 × 72 × 32 cm, 26 kg

Toponyme :

Cana < Bohicon < Zou < Bénin < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Avant 1893

Description :

Siège en bois, rectangulaire à quatre pieds. Deux étages de personnages sculptés et peint soutiennent le plateau incurvé formant le siège. Niveau inférieur : 11 personnages dont 2 soldats au centre coiffés d'un bonnet et tenant un fusil et 9 prisonniers entravés au niveau du cou. Niveau supérieur : 11 personnages dont au centre le roi, assis sous un parasol, entouré de 10 femmes, traitées de façon individualisée. Elles sont figurées vêtues d'un pagne, le buste nu. Ce siège prestigieux à deux étages a été collecté dans la ville de Cana, en progressant vers Abomey, par le colonel, futur général, Dodds au cours de la campagne du Danhomè.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Alfred Amédée Dodds*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1893**

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Alfred Amédée Dodds (1842, Saint-Louis-du-Sénégal-1922, Paris) est un général français, métis par ses deux parents, commandant supérieur des troupes françaises au Sénégal à partir de 1890. Entre 1892 et 1894, il mène la conquête du Dahomey (actuel Bénin) sur le roi Béhanzin.

** Saisi après la prise de Cana au sud d'Abomey (actuel Bénin) en novembre 1892.

Fig. 12



Appellation ou titre :

Sculpture dédiée à Gou

Auteur :

Akati Ekplékendo

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1894.32.1

Matériaux et techniques :

Fer martelé, bois

Dimensions :

178,5 × 53 × 60 cm, entre 100 et 150 kg.

Toponyme :

Abomey < Zou < Bénin < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Vers 1858

Description :

Statue entièrement fabriquée à partir de ferrailles d'origine européenne. Les pieds en fer forgé sont rivés au socle formé d'une plaque en tôle d'acier. Les jambes, barres de fer martelées, sont pourvues de prolongements s'enfonçant dans les pieds auxquels les fixent des rivets. Elles sont reliées au corps par rivetage sur un axe horizontal qui traverse le haut des cuisses. Le corps lui-même est fait d'une forte barre de fer à section rectangulaire. Au niveau des épaules une barre horizontale (percée au milieu pour le passage du cou) s'adapte au corps sur lequel elle est fixée par un énorme clou. Vers le haut, le corps devient un cylindre muni d'un boulon au sommet et destiné à recevoir le cou, tube de tôle qu'entoure un collet et qui supporte la tête. Celle-ci, boule creuse sur laquelle le visage est attaché comme un masque, est coiffée d'un chapeau surmonté par un écrou vissé sur le boulon. Les bras tubes adaptés aux épaules, enveloppent les barres de fer traités plus bas en avant-bras et en mains. Des épaules jusqu'au milieu des cuisses, le corps est revêtu d'une tunique sans manches en tôle mince dont les feuilles, découpées au ciseau, récréent l'ampleur des tuniques de guerre dahoméennes. Sous la tunique, Gou porte un pagne fait d'une épaisse barre de fer aplatie et courbée. La main gauche tenait autrefois une clochette et la main droite un grand sabre au fer ajouré.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Eugène Fonssagrives*

Précédente collection : Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1894**

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Eugène-Jean-Paul-Marie Fonssagrives (1858-1937), colonel d'infanterie coloniale.

** Objet pris à Ouidah (ville côtière du royaume du Dahomey, actuel Bénin) par l'armée française à la suite d'une bataille contre les troupes danhoméennes.

Fig. 13



Appellation ou titre :

Trône du roi Glèlè

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1895.16.7

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois, pigments, métal

Dimensions :

188 × 97 × 75 cm, 136 kg

Toponyme :

Abomey < Zou < Bénin < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Entre 1858 et 1889

Description :

Très haut siège rectangulaire en bois ; partie supérieure incurvée. Deux étages : étage inférieur à décor géométrique (palmes) sculpté et peint en bleu et jaune. Étage supérieur ; les quatre montants seuls soutiennent le siège. Lion sculpté et peint en jaune de chaque côté. Large trou rectangulaire, avec place pour un coussin au milieu du siège. Chaîne ajourée, sculptée sur les quatre montants. Trois éminences circulaires jaunes sous les côtés relevés du siège. « Fabriqué par assemblage de plusieurs panneaux et lamelles de bois travaillés. Différentes procédures semblent avoir été utilisées pour faire tenir les parties ensemble, sans doute des mortaises et des tenons, mais aussi, pour faire tenir la partie incurvée avec le fût des "agraffes" » (Alexandre Adandé, thèse de 3^e cycle, octobre 1984).

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Alfred Amédée Dodds*

Précédente collection : Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1895**

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Alfred Amédée Dodds (1842, Saint-Louis-du-Sénégal-1922, Paris) est un général français, métis par ses deux parents, commandant supérieur des troupes françaises au Sénégal à partir de 1890. Entre 1892 et 1894, il mène la conquête du Dahomey (actuel Bénin) sur le roi Béhanzin.

** Prise de guerre du colonel Alfred Amédée Dodds à Abomey (actuel Bénin) en 1892.

Fig. 14



Appellation ou titre :

Trône du roi Ghézo

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1895.16.8

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois, pigments, métal

Dimensions :

199 × 122 × 88 cm, 130 kg

Toponyme :

Abomey < Zou < Bénin < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

1818-1848

Description :

Très haut siège rectangulaire, en bois, entièrement sculpté. Partie supérieure incurvée. Décor géométrique sur l'avant et l'arrière. Chaîne ajourée, sculptée, sur les quatre angles.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Alfred Amédée Dodds*

Précédente collection : Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1895**

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Alfred Amédée Dodds (1842, Saint-Louis-du-Sénégal-1922, Paris) est un général français, métis par ses deux parents, commandant supérieur des troupes françaises au Sénégal à partir de 1890. Entre 1892 et 1894, il mène la conquête du Dahomey (actuel Bénin) sur le roi Béhanzin.

** Prise de guerre du colonel Alfred Amédée Dodds à Abomey (actuel Bénin) en 1892.

Fig. 15



Appellation ou titre :

Sabre ayant appartenu à El Hadj Omar*

Lieu de conservation :

Musée de l'Armée, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

6995

Matériaux et techniques :

Métal, laiton, cuivre, cuir

Dimensions :

Longueur : 81 cm

Datation :

?

Description :

Lame courbe à un seul tranchant, à un évidement, et une gorge. Sur le dos on lit « Manufacture de Klingenthal... et Cie ». Sur un côté, près du talon, deux poinçons, poignée en cuivre ciselé, forte croisière, pommeau en forme de bec d'oiseau terminé par un petit anneau, fusée garnie d'un filigrane en fil de fer. Fourreau en cuir avec cordonnet de suspension, garnitures en cuivre. Le sabre a été réuni au fourreau par une tresse de cuir que le donateur a coupé.

Source : fiche d'objet de l'inventaire des collections du musée de l'Armée

* Saisi lors de la prise de Ségou (actuel Mali) par le colonel Louis Archinard (1850-1932) en 1890, donné par ce dernier au musée de l'Armée en 1909.

Fig. 16



Appellation ou titre :

Colliers, pendentifs, perles, médaillons*

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris ; déposant : musée de l'Armée, Paris

Numéros d'inventaire :

75.8142, 75.8148, 75.8159.1-2, 75.8160, 75.8162, 75.8164

Matériaux et techniques :

Or, cuir

Toponyme :

Ségou < Ségou (région) < Mali < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

XIX^e siècle

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Déposant : musée de l'Armée

Collecte : Louis Archinard**

Précédente collection : Musée national des arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie (Afrique)

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Objets du « trésor » du palais royal de Ségou.

** Trésor saisi lors de la prise de Ségou (actuel Mali) par le colonel Louis Archinard (1850-1932) en 1890, en dépôt au musée de l'Armée dès 1910, récupéré par l'office colonial pour être déposé au musée des Colonies (où une partie a été dérobée en 1937).

Fig. 17



Appellation ou titre :

Plaque figurative

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1931.49.19

Matériaux et techniques :

Laiton, fonte à la cire perdue

Dimensions :

52× 37× 9 cm, 16,25 kg

Toponyme :

Benin City < Nigeria < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

XVI-XVII^e siècles

Description :

Cinq personnages en haut relief se détachent sur un fond gravé de feuilles d'eau. Au centre, l'Oba est entouré de deux guerriers et de deux musiciens. Il porte les attributs de sa dignité : une coiffure et des colliers en perles de corail, un baudrier composé de plusieurs rangs de perles barre le torse, un collier en dents de léopard, ainsi que des bracelets, des chevillères et des jambières. Son pagne drapé est noué sur le côté et est fixé par un masque de ceinture anthropomorphe. Il brandit l'ében, son épée cérémonielle. Les deux guerriers casqués sont armés d'une lance et d'un bouclier. Une cloche tronconique est accrochée à leur collier en dents de léopard. Les deux musiciens, un joueur de trompe traversière et un joueur de cloche double, sont figurés conventionnellement de proportion plus petite.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Georges Henri Rivière*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1931

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Georges Henri Rivière (1897-1985, alors assistant de Paul Rivet au musée d'Ethnographie au Trocadéro) fit l'acquisition de cette plaque sur le marché londonien en juillet 1931, à une période consécutive à la crise de 1929 où les ayants droits des membres de l'expédition « punitive » britannique de 1897 à Benin City vendaient les butins en leur possession. Des plaques similaires, initialement destinées à la décoration du palais royal de Benin City et saisies à la suite du sac de la ville, ont été transférées en Europe et dispersées sur le marché de l'art.

Fig. 18



Appellation ou titre :

Défense sculptée

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

73.1962.7.1

Matériaux et techniques :

Ivoire

Dimensions :

148,1 × 11,8 × 11,8 cm, 18,12 kg.

Toponyme :

Nigeria < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Premier quart du XIX^e siècle

Description :

Relief sculpté, successivement de bas en haut :

- motif d'entrelacs
- panthère debout de face entre soldats portugais avec manilles et fusils, l'un porteur d'une croix pectorale
- Oba dont les jambes se terminent en double queues de poisson, portant une tête d'ennemi à la ceinture. Il est entouré de dignitaires, dont certains sont revêtus d'une cotte de maille.
- portugais à cheval
- Oba soutenu par des dignitaires, l'un en cotte de maille, l'autre sur une panthère de profil
- au sommet homme qui tient une panthère par la queue (animal représenté la tête en bas)

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Vendeur : Charles Ratton

Ancienne collection : Jacob Epstein

Précédente collection : Musée national des arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie (Afrique)

Ancienne collection : Charles Ratton

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1962

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Des pièces en ivoire similaires ont été dispersées sur le marché international après le sac de Benin City par les troupes britanniques en 1897.

Fig. 19



Appellation ou titre :

Tête anthropomorphe

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

73.1969.3.1 bis

Matériaux et techniques :

Laiton

Dimensions :

40,5 × 24,5 × 26 cm, 27,52 kg.

Toponyme :

Nigeria < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Fin XVIII^e siècle

Description :

Figuration d'un collier à plusieurs rangs de perles, dans lequel le cou est engoncé, ainsi que d'une coiffure perlée à longs filets ; de scarifications frontales, et d'animaux s/la base circulaire. Trou au sommet de la tête pour fixation d'une défense sculptée, manquante ici.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Acquisition indéterminée : Personne inconnue*

Ancienne affectation : Musée d'archéologie nationale

Précédente collection : Musée national des arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1969

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Pièce acquise par le musée de Marine du Louvre en 1899 pour 650 francs auprès de la maison Schilling et C^e, déplacée vers 1908 au Musée d'archéologie nationale de Saint-Germain-en-Laye, puis au Musée national d'arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie. Voir, aux Archives nationales de Pierrefitte-sur-Seine, le dossier 20144780/13 comprenant l'arrêté d'acquisition daté du 8 août 1899.

Fig. 20



Appellation ou titre :

Plaque

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

73.1997.4.1

Matériaux et techniques :

Alliage de cuivre

Dimensions :

40 × 33,5 × 10,5 cm

Toponyme :

Nigeria < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

XVI^e-XVII^e siècles

Description :

Plaque figurant deux guerriers identiques en haut relief sur un fond décoré de fleurs quadrilobées. Les visages sont stylisés. Les deux personnages sont très parés, sous un collier en dents de léopard ils portent des clochettes carrées sur la poitrine partiellement cachées par des colliers de perles entortillés. Ils tiennent tous deux le sabre « eben » et un bouclier. Lacune dans le coin supérieur gauche et en bas de la plaque. Le pied droit du guerrier de droite a disparu.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Vendeur : Jean Paul Barbier-Mueller

Ancienne collection : Louis Carré

Ancienne collection : Musée Barbier-Mueller

Précédente collection : Musée national des arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1997

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Des plaques similaires, initialement destinées à la décoration du palais royal de Benin City et saisies à la suite du sac de la ville par les troupes britanniques en 1897, ont été transférées en Europe et dispersées sur le marché de l'art.

Fig. 21



Appellation ou titre :

Tête d'autel royal

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

73.1997.4.3

Matériaux et techniques :

Alliage cuivreux

Dimensions :

52 × 34 × 34 cm

Toponyme :

Nigeria < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Première moitié du XIX^e siècle

Description :

Tête au visage stylisé. La coiffure est composée d'une calotte en résille avec deux ailettes latérale, le tout en perles de corail. Le cou est engoncé dans plusieurs colliers de perles superposés recouvrant le menton jusqu'à la lèvre inférieure. Scarifications sur le front. L'embase est décorée de motifs figuratifs (hache, bras, léopards, poisson, main, tête de vache) en haut relief symbolisant le pouvoir royal.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Précédente collection : Musée national des arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie (Afrique)

Vendeur : Jean Paul Barbier-Mueller

Ancienne collection : Musée Barbier-Mueller

Ancienne collection : Josef Mueller

Ancienne collection : Louis Carré

Ancienne collection : Arthur Speyer

Ancienne collection : Ethnologisches Museum (Berlin)

Ancienne collection : Eduard Schmidt

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1997

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Pièce transférée en Allemagne via Hambourg par le consul allemand à Lagos Eduard Schmidt vers 1898, vendue par l'Ethnologisches Museum de Berlin au marchand Arthur Speyer entre 1923 et 1929.

Fig. 22



Appellation ou titre :

Peintures de l'église d'Abbā Antonios

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1931.74.3584 – 71.1931.74.3595

Matériaux et techniques :

Peintures marouflées sur toiles

Dimensions :

De 70 × 49 cm à 233 × 367 cm

Toponyme :

Gondar < Gonder (région) < Amara (état) < Éthiopie < Afrique orientale < Afrique

Datation :

Fin du XVII^e siècle

Description :

Les quatre rois et les prophètes ; deux personnages de fenêtres (mur Est) ; sainte ; la Nativité ; deux Pères de l'Église ; neuf saints d'Éthiopie ; saint Antoine ; saint Filatewos ; cavalier ; cavaliers et martyrs ; Dieu le père et le Pacte de grâce

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Mission : Mission Dakar-Djibouti*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1931

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Peintures démarouflées de l'église d'Abbā Antonios à Gondär (Éthiopie) par Marcel Griaule et Gaston-Louis Roux lors de la mission Dakar-Djibouti.

Fig. 23



Appellation ou titre :

Masque zoomorphe

Titre vernaculaire :

Ciwara kun

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1930.26.3

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois, coton, fibres végétales, ficelle

Dimensions :

50,3 × 20 × 25 cm, 503 g.

Toponyme :

Bamako < Bamako (district) < Mali < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Avant 1930

Description :

Masque cimier. Calotte en vannerie à bords spiralés surmontée d'une sculpture en bois figurant schématiquement une antilope reposant sur un quadrupède.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Donateur : Henri Labouret*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1930

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Henri Labouret (1878-1959), militaire et administrateur colonial en Afrique occidentale française ; se tourne vers l'ethnologie et devient directeur de l'Institut international africain en 1927, et professeur de civilisation africaine à l'École coloniale à Paris de 1926 à 1945.

Fig. 24



Appellation ou titre :

Masque et poitrine postiche de jeune fille

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1930.31.22.1-2

Matériaux et techniques :

Fibres végétales, cauris, fruits de baobab

Dimensions :

110 × 50 × 14,5 cm, 20,44 kg.

Toponyme :

Sanga (village) < Mopti (région) < Mali < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Début du XX^e siècle

Description :

Masque cagoule en fibres végétales dont le visage est évoqué par la présence de deux ouvertures circulaires figurant les yeux, entourés de rangées concentriques de cauris et se prolongeant à la partie inférieure par une sorte de bavette de cauris. Le visage est surmonté d'une coiffure en fibres figurant la chevelure formant un cimier central souligné de cauris. Ce masque cagoule se complète d'un "soutien-gorge" en fibres et cauris où sont attachées deux demi-coques de fruits de baobab qui figurent les seins féminins.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Acquisition indéterminée : Personne inconnue

Mission : Henri Labouret*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1930

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Henri Labouret (1878-1959), militaire et administrateur colonial en Afrique occidentale française ; se tourne vers l'ethnologie et devient directeur de l'Institut international africain en 1927, et professeur de civilisation africaine à l'École coloniale à Paris de 1926 à 1945.

Fig. 25



Appellation ou titre :

Masque anthropomorphe

Nom vernaculaire :

Satimbe

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1931.74.1948

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois de kapokier, pigments, fibres végétales

Dimensions :

138× 33,5 × 21,5 cm, 31,18 kg.

Toponyme :

Sanga (village) < Mopti (région) < Mali < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Avant 1931

Description :

Masque constitué d'un visage de bois rectangulaire surmonté de deux courtes oreilles verticales et d'une figure féminine en pied dont les bras articulés sont repliés et dressés. Le visage du masque est marqué par une arête nasale centrale qui sépare deux cavités rectangulaires à l'intérieur desquelles se situent les orbites triangulaires, pointes vers le bas, des yeux. L'ensemble est couvert de motifs géométriques polychromes (noirs et blancs) et se complète d'une coiffure de fibres rouges et d'un couvre-nuque en vannerie. Le personnage féminin porte une ceinture de fibres au niveau de la taille et des bracelets de fibres au niveau des coudes, des avant-bras et des poignets.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Acquisition indéterminée : Personne inconnue

Mission : Mission Dakar-Djibouti

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1931

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

Fig. 26



Appellation ou titre :

Mère des masques

Nom vernaculaire :

Imina na

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1931.74.2002

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois, pigments

Dimensions :

1020 × 35 × 8 cm, 38 kg.

Toponyme :

Sanga donu < Sanga (environs de) < Mopti (région) < Mali < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Avant 1931

Description :

Visage schématique surmonté d'une longue lame de bois.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Acquisition indéterminée : Personne inconnue

Mission : Mission Dakar-Djibouti

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1931

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

Fig. 27



Appellation ou titre :

Objet culturel composite

Nom vernaculaire :

Boli

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1931.74.1091.1

Matériaux et techniques :

Terre mêlée à de la cire d'abeille, sang coagulé, bois

Dimensions :

44 × 59 × 24 cm, 20,25 kg.

Toponyme :

Dyabougou < Ségou (région) < Mali < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Entre le milieu du XIX^e siècle et 1930

Description :

Cet objet était conservé dans un sanctuaire de la société initiatique dite Kono. L'animal représenté serait un hippopotame ou un cheval.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Acquisition indéterminée : Personne inconnue

Mission : Mission Dakar-Djibouti

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1931

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

Fig. 28



Appellation ou titre :

Masque

Nom vernaculaire :

Sim

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1935.60.169

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois, fibre végétale, pigments

Dimensions :

243 × 69 × 18,5 cm

Toponyme :

Mopti (région) < Mali < Afrique occidentale < Afrique

Datation :

Entre la fin du XIX^e siècle et le début du XX^e

Description :

Tête humaine très stylisée surmontée d'une immense croix de Lorraine.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Acquisition indéterminée : Personne inconnue

Mission : Mission Sahara-Soudan

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1935

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

Fig. 29



Appellation :

Masque Sim Kalama Nāngala

Lieu de conservation :

Institut d'ethnologie de l'université de Strasbourg

Numéro d'inventaire :

2002.0.241

Matériaux :

Palmier, cuir, métal

Dimensions :

17,5 × 64 cm, 2,5 kg.

Lieu de provenance:

Afrique, Mali (Dogon)

Description :

Masque Sim ou Kalama Nāngala constitué essentiellement de bois de palmier rônier, sculpté et entaillé, de lanières de cuir et de fibres végétales. La tête du masque représente l'antilope. Elle est teintée de blanc et suit une forme rectangulaire avec de longues fosses oculaires, surmontées d'un front bombé triangulaire et deux petits appendices se découpant aux coins extérieurs, évoquant des petites oreilles. Cette tête est surmontée d'un haut cimier prenant la forme d'une double croix composée d'étroites planchettes verticales, toutes pointées vers le haut, partant de deux branches transversales. L'axe médian prend naissance dans un losange évidé. Des liens en cuir fixent entre eux les différents éléments. Les extrémités des planchettes verticales sont taillées en pointes et entaillées sur 2 à 3 cm. Des motifs de chevrons, alternativement blancs et noirs, parcourent ces différentes planchettes. Les surfaces d'intersection sont uniformément noires. Cette croix à double branches représente un génie d'apparence humaine. A l'arrière du masque, on découvre un cache-nuque (longueur : moins de 20 cm) en fibres végétales cordées, tressées et nouées, glissées dans des orifices du pourtour arrière de la tête du masque. Sur les flancs du masque on aperçoit deux trous servant à y glisser le mors permettant au danseur de maintenir le masque.

Collection :

Collection initiale : collection Lebaudy-Griaule

Date de collecte : 1938-1939

Mission de collecte : mission scientifique Niger-Lac Iro

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections ethnographiques de l'université de Strasbourg

Fig. 30



Appellation ou titre :

Trône

Lieu de conservation :

Musée du quai Branly-Jacques Chirac, Paris

Numéro d'inventaire :

71.1934.171.1

Matériaux et techniques :

Bois sculpté

Dimensions :

180× 100 × 100 cm

Toponyme :

Foumban < Noun (département) < Ouest < Cameroun < Afrique centrale < Afrique

Datation :

Avant 1934

Description :

Deux sculptures anthropomorphes forment le dossier d'un trône de roi ou de sultan Bamoun. Représentation de l'élément masculin d'un couple. Très mauvais état. Restauré en 1987.

Personne(s) et institution(s) :

Acquisition indéterminée : Personne inconnue

Mission : Henri Labouret*

Précédente collection : musée de l'Homme (Afrique)

Année d'enregistrement à l'inventaire :

1934

Source : fiche d'objet de la base de données des collections du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac

* Henri Labouret (1878-1959), militaire et administrateur colonial en Afrique occidentale française ; se tourne vers l'ethnologie et devient directeur de l'Institut international africain en 1927, et professeur de civilisation africaine à l'École coloniale à Paris de 1926 à 1945.

Inventories of the Quai Branly-Jacques Chirac Museum

The following pages give an overview of the inventories of the “Africa” collections Quai Branly-Jacques Chirac Museum by country (current borders). These complete inventories are attached to this report in digital format (approximately 8,300 pages for nearly 70,000 objects).


Afrique du Sud

(page 1 sur 58, 7 objets sur 458)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1881.59.30	Couteau	avant 1881	2 x 20 x 2,5 cm, 38 g	Bois, métal	Afrique > Afrique australe > Afrique du sud	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Emil Holub	3	non	
71.1884.54.1	Massue	avant 1884	46 x 8,8 x 8,5 cm, 745 g	Bois grossièrement poli, métal	Afrique > Afrique australe > Afrique du sud Zoulou	Donateur Mr Boucart Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1884.54.2	Massue	avant 1884	62,7 x 8,1 x 7,7 cm, 624 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique australe > Afrique du sud Zoulou	Donateur Mr Boucart Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1884.54.3	Massue	avant 1884	53,5 x 6,6 x 6,6 cm, 446 g	Bois lourd	Afrique > Afrique australe > Afrique du sud Zoulou	Donateur Mr Boucart Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1884.54.4	Massue	avant 1884	42 x 5,8 x 5,9 cm, 387 g	Bois lourd	Afrique > Afrique australe > Afrique du sud Zoulou	Donateur Mr Boucart Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1884.54.5	Massue	avant 1884	44,6 x 7,2 x 7,4 cm, 429 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique australe > Afrique du sud Zoulou	Donateur Mr Boucart Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1884.54.6	Massue	avant 1884	46 x 5,5 x 5,5 cm, 288 g	Bois très grossièrement poli.	Afrique > Afrique australe > Afrique du sud Zoulou	Donateur Mr Boucart Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	









Angola

(page 1 sur 59, 8 objets sur 457)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1887.8.4.1-2	Paire de bracelets	avant 1887	7,7 x 8,2 x 0,7 cm, 1,4 g	Fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Angola	Donateur R. P. Campana Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1888.17.2	Canne de chef	avant 1888	60,3 x 9 x 7,6 cm, 396 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique Afrique > Afrique centrale > Angola Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo > Loango Tshokwe	Donateur Prince Roland Bonaparte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1888.17.3	Canne de chef	avant 1888	48,7 x 9,1 x 6,9 cm, 195 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Angola Tshokwe	Donateur Prince Roland Bonaparte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.52.15	Louche zoomorphe	avant 1895	43,9 x 9,8 x 9 cm, 199 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Angola > Cabinda Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique	Donateur Charles Jeannest Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.52.16	Louche	avant 1895	40,4 x 10,3 x 7,8 cm, 169 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Angola > Cabinda Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique	Donateur Charles Jeannest Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.52.17	Louche à manche anthropomorphe	avant 1895	37 x 10 x 8,5 cm, 188 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Angola > Cabinda Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique	Donateur Charles Jeannest Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.52.18	Fourneau de pipe	avant 1895	6 x 7,5 cm	Terre cuite	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Angola > Cabinda	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Charles Jeannest	3	non	
71.1895.52.19	Fourneau de pipe	avant 1895	4,7 x 7,1 x 3,4 cm, 42 g	Terre cuite	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Angola > Cabinda Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique	Donateur Charles Jeannest Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	









Bénin

(page 1 sur 398, 8 objets sur 3157)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1878.16.2	Coussin	c.1870	41 x 67 x 5 cm, 321 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Bénin > Atlantique > Abomey-Calavi	Donateur Louis Cavaroc Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.16.3	Canne	c.1870	77,5 x 7,6 x 2,8 cm, 189 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Bénin > Atlantique > Abomey-Calavi Fon	Donateur Louis Cavaroc Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.16.4	Canne	c.1870	77,5 x 5,1 x 7,9 cm, 207 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Bénin > Atlantique > Abomey-Calavi Fon	Donateur Louis Cavaroc Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.16.5	Canne figurative	c.1870	77,5 x 7,2 x 3,9 cm, 183 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Bénin > Zou > Abomey Fon	Donateur Louis Cavaroc Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.16.6	Cartouchière	c.1870	22 x 53 x 7,8 cm, 392 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Bénin > Atlantique > Abomey-Calavi Fon	Donateur Louis Cavaroc Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.16.8	Hamac	c.1870	128,5 x 246 x 1,6 cm, 715 g	Colon	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Bénin Fon	Donateur Louis Cavaroc Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.16.9	Récade Kpo	c.1870	49 x 20 x 3,3 cm, 346 g	Bois, fer	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Bénin > Zou > Abomey Fon	Donateur Louis Cavaroc Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.16.10	Récade Kpo	c.1870	44 x 21 x 16 cm, 408 g	Bois, fer	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Bénin > Zou > Abomey Fon	Donateur Louis Cavaroc Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	








Botswana

(page 1 sur 8, 8 objets sur 68)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1881.57.1	Pot	avant 1881	11 x 14,5 x 14,5 cm, 535 g	Terre cuite Modelage à la main par les femmes	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Ma-Subia	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1881.57.2	Pot	avant 1881	25,5 x 25,7 x 25,7 cm, 2218 g	Terre cuite Modelage par les femmes, tracé des lignes au moyen d'un coquillage du fleuve, (sorte de moule).	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Ma-Subia	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1881.57.3	Lamellophone	avant 1881	26 x 24 x 16 cm, 662 g	Métal (fer), cucurbitacée, fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Ma-Subia	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.57.4	Cuiller	avant 1881	25,5 x 4,5 x 3 cm, 28 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Ngwato	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1881.57.5	Cuiller	avant 1881	21,2 x 3,5 x 3 cm, 22 g	Bois, cuir	Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Ngwato	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1881.57.7	Calebasse dans un filet	avant 1881	19 x 22,7 x 22,7 cm, 269 g	Calebasse, fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Ngwato	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1881.57.12	Corne à poudre	avant 1881	15,7 x 28,6 x 8 cm, 225 g	Corne, cuir, bois	Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Ngwato	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1881.59.8	Bracelet avec spatule	avant 1881	23,8 x 4,5 x 1,2 cm, 28 g	Fer, cuir, perles et cuivre	Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Bamangwato	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	











Burkina Faso

(page 1 sur 129, 7 objets sur 1088)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1908.8.6	Flèche	avant 1908	41,8 x 2,8 x 1,7 cm, 123 g	Fer, bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Burkina Faso	Donateur Mr Brot Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1908.8.16	Lance	avant 1908	166,5 x 3,6 x 2,2 cm, 443 g	Métal, bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Burkina Faso	Donateur Mr Brot Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1908.11.1 Af	Masque cimier zoomorphe	avant 1908	19 x 24 x 13,2 cm, 466 g	Bois peint, graines	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Burkina Faso Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Kouroumba	Donateur J. Decorse Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1908.11.2 Af	Masque cimier zoomorphe	avant 1908	17,5 x 22,6 x 10,8 cm, 303 g	Bois peint, graines	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Burkina Faso Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Kouroumba	Donateur J. Decorse Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1908.11.3 Af	Masque cimier zoomorphe	avant 1908	51 x 8,8 x 28 cm, 509 g	Bois peint, graines	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Burkina Faso Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Kouroumba	Donateur J. Decorse Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1908.11.4 Af	Masque cimier zoomorphe	avant 1908	47 x 10 x 26,6 cm, 425 g	Bois, pigments, graines	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Burkina Faso Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Kouroumba	Donateur J. Decorse Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1908.11.5 Af	Masque cimier anthropomorphe (?)	avant 1908	29 x 11 x 12 cm, 315 g	Bois peint	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Burkina Faso Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Kouroumba	Donateur J. Decorse Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	

Burundi

(page 1 sur 4, 10 objets sur 28)

N ^o d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1881.54.9	Trompe latérale (perce conique)	avant 1881	15,6 x 55,5 x 14,5 cm, 476 g	Come.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Ethnomusicologie)	3	non	
71.1881.54.45	Ecuelle	avant 1881	10 x 20 x 20 cm, 161 g	Calebasse	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.54.48	Carquois	avant 1881	72,5 x 5 x 5 cm, 333 g	Bois, fibres, cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Mr Ledoux	3	non	
71.1950.61.3.1-2	Panier à couvercle	avant 1950	23,2 x 10,1 x 10,1 cm, 67 g	Vannerie spiralée	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.4.1-2	Panier à couvercle	avant 1950	10 x 4 x 4 cm, 12 g	Vannerie spiralée	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.5	Couvercle	avant 1950	21,3 x 23 x 23 cm, 175 g	Vannerie spiralée	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.6	Corbeille	avant 1950	5,5 x 17,5 x 18,5 cm, 19 g	Vannerie double	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.7	Anneau	avant 1950	1 x 7,5 x 8 cm, 5 g	Vannerie	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.8	Anneau	avant 1950	1 x 7 x 7,5 cm, 5 g	Vannerie	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.9	Anneau	avant 1950	1 x 9 x 9 cm, 3 g	Vannerie	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	



Cameroun

(page 1 sur 1039, 7 objets sur 7838)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1878.19.4	Fourreau	avant 1878	31,5 x 11,5 x 1,5 cm, 153 g 11,9 x 1,3 x 1,7 cm, 24 g	Bois, laiton (?)	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Cameroun Afrique > Afrique centrale > Guinée équatoriale Afrique > Rio Campo Fang	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue Ancienne collection Bibliothèque nationale de France Ancienne collection Schoelcher	3	non	
71.1878.19.5	Couteau	avant 1878	47 x 8,6 x 4,8 cm, 339 g	Fer, bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Cameroun Afrique > Afrique centrale > Guinée équatoriale Afrique > Rio Campo Fang Pahouin	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue Ancienne collection Bibliothèque nationale de France Ancienne collection Schoelcher	3	non	
71.1884.20.25	Console Proue de pirogue	avant 1884	89 x 24,5 x 3 cm, 917 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Cameroun > Littoral > Wouri (département) > Douala Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Mr Pene	3	non	
71.1886.9.31	Lance	avant 1886	214,3 x 4,7 x 2 cm, 514 g	Bois, métal	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Tchad Afrique > Afrique centrale > Cameroun Bomou	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Victor Schoelcher	3	non	
71.1887.160.2 Af	Fourreau	avant 1887	16,5 x 5,2 x 2,1 cm, 22 g	Bois, peau de varan, laiton	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Cameroun Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon Fang Pahouin	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Vendeur Mr Laglaize	3	non	
71.1889.48.3.1-2	Couteau et son fourreau	avant 1889	47,5 x 10,6 x 4,4 cm, 362 g	bois + métal	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Cameroun > Sud Afrique > Rio Campo Fang Pahouin	Donateur Victor Schoelcher Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Dépositaire Musée départemental Victor Schoelcher (Pointe-à-Pitre)	2	non	
71.1889.131.106	Fouet	avant 1889	36,5 x 9,5 x 1,9 cm, 109 g	Bois, cuir, fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Cameroun > Extrême-Nord > Gaza	Donateur Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Attilio Pecile	3	non	








Cap-Vert

(page 1 sur 1, 2 objets)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1901.9.25	Plat	avant 1901	8,3 x 70 x 24 cm, 1187 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Sao Tomé-et-Principe Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Cap-Vert	Donateur António Lobo de Almada Negreiros Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1901.9.41	Coussin de selle	avant 1901	8,4 x 52 x 33,5 cm, 1083 g	Fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Cap-Vert	Donateur António Lobo de Almada Negreiros Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	








Comores

(page 1 sur 19, 8 objets sur 175)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1906.10.1	Portefeuille	avant 1906	1,5 x 7,5 x 7,5 cm, 20 g	Cuir jaune foncé.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Comores Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar	Donateur Mr Ardouin Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien)	3	non	
71.1906.10.2	Portefeuille Porte-monnaie	avant 1906	1,5 x 7,5 x 7,5 cm, 25 g	Feuille de cuir teint en rouge foncé sur la face externe.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Comores Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar	Donateur Mr Ardouin Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien)	3	non	
71.1906.21.130.1.	Sabre avec fourreau	avant 1906	105,5 x 14 x 6,3 cm, 1080 g	Fer, cuivre, bois.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Comores	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien) Donateur Guillaume Grandidier	3	non	
71.1906.21.131.1.	Sabre avec fourreau	avant 1906	110,5 x 11,5 x 6 cm, 1175 g	Fer, cuivre, bois.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Comores	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien) Donateur Guillaume Grandidier	3	non	
71.1931.85.27.1-3	Lampadaire	avant 1931	72 x 30,4 x 24,5 cm, 2545 g	Bois sculpté, écorce "hafotra"	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Comores	Collecte Commissariat de Madagascar, Exposition coloniale de 1931 Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	
71.1931.85.28	Lampadaire	avant 1931	68 x 29,7 x 23,5 cm, 2467 g	Bois sculpté, fibre de sisal (fourcroya gigantea)	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Comores	Collecte Commissariat de Madagascar, Exposition coloniale de 1931 Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	
71.1937.0.0 X					Afrique > Afrique orientale > Comores	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien)	0	non	
71.1937.17.1	Poupée	avant 1937	35 x 22 x 6 cm, 217 g	Bois, textile, perle de verre, papier	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Comores > Anjouan Afrique > Afrique orientale > Comores Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar	Donateur Raymond Decary Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien)	3	non	








Congo

(page 1 sur 326, 7 objets sur 2593)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
70.2017.64.21	Fouet	Fin du 19e - début du 20e siècle	73X2X1 cm	Peau d'hippopotame	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon	Donateur Philippe Le Port Ancienne collection Georges Thomann	2	non	
71.1877.1.18	Cuiller	avant 1877	48,2 x 7,4 x 4 cm, 75 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Alfred Marche	2	non	
71.1878.1.6.1-2 Af	Poignard, fourreau et ceinture	Première moitié du 19e siècle	51,5 x 13,2 x 4,8 cm, 242 g	Bois, fer, cuir	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo Afrique > Haute Sangha Kota	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Raphaël Bischoffsheim	3	non	
71.1878.1.7.1 Af	Couteau	avant 1878	21,7 x 5,3 x 1,1 cm, 67 g	Bois, fer	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo Afrique > Haute Sangha Kota	Donateur Raphaël Bischoffsheim Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.1.7.2 Af	Etui	avant 1878	16,7 x 8,6 x 1,3 cm, 48 g	Bois, peau, cordelette	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo Afrique > Haute Sangha Kota	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Raphaël Bischoffsheim	3	non	
71.1878.1.8.1-2 Af	Couteau et son fourreau	avant 1878	26,5 x 9,1 x 3,1 cm, 179 g	Fer, bois, cuir	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo Afrique > Haute Sangha Kota	Donateur Raphaël Bischoffsheim Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1883.47.2	Flèches	avant 1883	42,5 x 2 x 2 cm, 48 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon > Haut-Ogoué Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo	Donateur Léon Guiral Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	









République démocratique du Congo

(page 1 sur 187, 7 objets sur 1426)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1881.54.11	Hache	avant 1881	131 x 29,5 x 3,9 cm, 515 g	Métal, bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique Manyanne	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.54.12	Hache	avant 1881	48 x 22 x 3,5 cm, 295 g	Métal, bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.59.11	Couteau	avant 1886	20,4 x 2,4 x 1,7 cm, 24 g	métal, bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo > Loango Bakamba Fouilla	Donateur Joseph Cholet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1886.59.13.1-2	Couteau et fourreau	avant 1886	31 x 5,2 x 2,8 cm, 55 g	métal, bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo > Loango	Donateur Joseph Cholet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1886.79.11	Statuette magique Nkisi	avant 1886	38,5 x 17,5 x 13 cm, 1672 g	Bois, miroir, argile (kaolin, ocre rouge), résine, matières animales, végétales et minérales, pigments	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique > Bas-Congo (province) Kongo	Donateur Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Jacques Savorgnan de Brazza Donateur Attilio Pecile	2	non	
71.1886.80.9	Statuette féminine	fin 19e siècle	30 x 10,1 x 7,8 cm, 519 g	Bois, pigments, verre.	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique > Bas-Congo (province) Yombe	Donateur Joseph Cholet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1886.83.1	Lance	avant 1886	192 x 8,6 x 2,6 cm, 1077 g	Bois, métal	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique Yanzi	Donateur Mr de Chavannes Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Mr Thollon	3	non	










Côte d'Ivoire

(page 1 sur 475, 8 objets sur 3951)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1892.72.12	Poids à peser l'or (figuratif)	avant 1892	5,6 x 1 x 0,8 cm, 14 g	Laiton Fonte à cire perdue	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Côte d'Ivoire > Lagunes (région des) > Grand Bassam Agni	Donateur Mr Bricard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1892.72.13	Poids à peser l'or (figuratif)	avant 1892	5,8 x 3,3 x 0,6 cm ; 17 g	laiton Fonte à cire perdue	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Côte d'Ivoire > Lagunes (région des) > Grand Bassam Agni	Donateur Mr Bricard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	1	non	
71.1892.72.14	Poids à peser l'or (figuratif)	avant 1892	1 x 4,1 x 5,1 cm, 27 g	Laiton Fonte à cire perdue	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Côte d'Ivoire > Lagunes (région des) > Grand Bassam Agni	Donateur Mr Bricard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1892.72.15	Poids à peser l'or (figuratif)	avant 1892	1,5 x 2,7 x 1,4 cm, 27,8 g	Laiton Fonte à cire perdue	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Côte d'Ivoire > Lagunes (région des) > Grand Bassam Agni	Donateur Mr Bricard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1892.72.16	Poids à peser l'or (figuratif)	avant 1892	2,5 x 4,8 x 1,1 cm, 24 g	Laiton Fonte à cire perdue	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Côte d'Ivoire > Lagunes (région des) > Grand Bassam Agni	Donateur Mr Bricard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1892.72.17	Poids à peser l'or (figuratif)	avant 1892	2,8 x 2,3 x 5,8 cm, 47 g	Laiton Fonte à cire perdue	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Côte d'Ivoire > Lagunes (région des) > Grand Bassam Agni	Donateur Mr Bricard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1892.72.18	Poids à peser l'or (figuratif)	avant 1892	4,5 x 5,4 x 2,9 cm, 53 g	Laiton Fonte à cire perdue	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Côte d'Ivoire > Lagunes (région des) > Grand Bassam Agni	Donateur Mr Bricard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1892.72.20	Poids à peser l'or (anthropomorphe)	avant 1892	5,2 x 2,5 x 1,4 cm, 45 g	Laiton Fonte à cire perdue	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Côte d'Ivoire > Lagunes (région des) > Grand Bassam	Donateur Mr Bricard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	









Djibouti

(page 1 sur 88, 9 objets sur 722)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1878.15.7.1-6	Éléments de harnachement Licou, croupière, mors avec tête	avant 1878	57 x 220 x 11 cm, 2387 g	Cuir, fer	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.8.1-2	Boucliers	avant 1878	33,5 x 64,5 x 12 cm, 1863 g	Cuir de rhinocéros	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.9	Bouclier	avant 1878	12 x 33 x 33 cm, 479 g	Cuir de rhinocéros	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.10	Panier	avant 1878	22 x 20 x 20 cm, 710 g	Fibres végétales, cauris	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.11	Panier	avant 1878	20 x 18 x 17 cm, 434 g	Fibres végétales, cauris	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.12.1	Panier	avant 1878	19,5 x 21 x 21 cm, 649 g	Fibres végétales, cauris	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.12.2	Couvercle (du panier 71.1878.15.12.1)	avant 1878	2,3 x 19,3 x 18,7 cm, 184 g	Fibres végétales et cauris	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Somali	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte	3	non	
71.1878.15.13.1-2	Panier à couvercle	avant 1878	24,5 x 20,4 x 20,4 cm, 340 g	Fibres végétales, cauris	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Éthiopie > Afar (état) Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Afar Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.14.1-2	Paire de sandales	avant 1878	26 x 21,5 x 2,7 cm, 294 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	









Erythrée

(page 1 sur 14, 9 objets sur 102)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1896.14.1 Af	Couteau et fourreau			Bois, cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Erythrée > Maakel > Asmara Beni Amer	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Louis Lapicque Mission La Sémiramis	0	non	
71.1903.33.93	Pièce de monnaie Thaler	1891	4 x 4 x 0,2 cm, 28 g	Argent	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Erythrée Europe > Europe méridionale > Italie	Mission Robert Du Bourg de Bozas Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1903.33.94	Pièce de monnaie 4/10 de thaler	avant 1903	2,7 x 2,7 x 0,2 cm, 10 g	Argent	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Erythrée	Mission Robert Du Bourg de Bozas Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1903.33.95	Pièce de monnaie 2/10 de thaler	avant 1903	2,3 x 2,3 x 0,1 cm, 5 g	Argent	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Erythrée	Mission Robert Du Bourg de Bozas Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1931.74.3133,1	Sandales Selot medawor sir solariki	avant 1931	28,6 x 26 x 8 cm, 715 g	Peau de boeuf pour la semelle, de veau pour la languette.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Erythrée > Gash-Barka > Om Hajer (ville)	Mission Mission Dakar-Djibouti Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1931.74.3134	Lance Qoonat	avant 1931	154 x 4,4 x 2,2 cm, 802 g	Lance en fer.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Erythrée > Gash-Barka > Om Hajer (ville) Beni Amer	Mission Mission Dakar-Djibouti Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1931.74.3135	Peigne Qalal	avant 1931	31,6 x 1,8 x 0,5 cm, 9 g	Peigne - épingle à cheveux en bois de ogam.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Erythrée > Gash-Barka > Om Hajer (ville) Beni Amer	Mission Mission Dakar-Djibouti Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1931.74.3136	Tasse Derif	avant 1931	7,1 x 4,7 x 4,7 cm, 18 g	Bois de kesela.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Erythrée > Gash-Barka > Om Hajer (ville) Beni Amer	Mission Mission Dakar-Djibouti Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1931.74.3137	Appui-tête Materes	avant 1931	38,3 x 19,5 x 6,7 cm, 195 g	Bois de keog	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Erythrée > Gash-Barka > Om Hajer (ville) Beni Amer	Mission Mission Dakar-Djibouti Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	







Éthiopie

(page 1 sur 387, 8 objets sur 3081)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1878.15.3.2.1-4	Éléments de harnachement Yafaras mataber (am.) Têtière, bride, licou, martingale et croupière	avant 1878	105 x 72 x 9,5 cm, 2465 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie > Adis Abeba (administration) Amhara	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.3.4	Longe	avant 1878	42 x 41 x 7 cm, 250 g	Cuir tressé rouge	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie > Adis Abeba (administration) Amhara	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte	3	non	
71.1878.15.4	Eventail	avant 1878	41 x 21 x 1 cm, 32 g	Bois, fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie > Afar (état) Afar	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.6	Eventail	avant 1878	44,5 x 22 x 1,4 cm, 47 g	Bois, fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie > Afar (état) Afar	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.13.1-2	Panier à couvercle	avant 1878	24,5 x 20,4 x 20,4 cm, 340 g	Fibres végétales, cauris	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie > Afar (état) Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Afar Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.16	Récipient zemsemmia	avant 1878	40 x 14 x 12,5 cm, 732 g	Cuir, ivoire	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie Arabe	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.18	Selle	19e siècle	82 x 44 x 58 cm	Cuir, métal, bois, textile Métal : argent Textile : drap de laine	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.40	Lance	avant 1878	185,5 x 6 x 1,5 cm, 521 g	Métal, bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie Afar	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Égypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	









Gabon

(page 1 sur 305, 8 objets sur 2448)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1877.1.3.1-2	Couteau et sa gaine	avant 1877	57,5 x 17,7 x 3,4 cm, 496 g	Fer, bois, peau de varan, laiton	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Alfred Marche	3	non	
71.1877.1.3 bis	Cuiller	avant 1877		Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Alfred Marche	0	non	
71.1877.1.4	Couteau	avant 1877			Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Alfred Marche	0	non	
71.1877.1.5	Couteau	avant 1877	37 x 7,5 x 3,5 cm	Fer, bois, cuivre	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon Ondumbo	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Alfred Marche	2	non	
71.1877.1.6	Couteau	avant 1877	41,7 x 6 x 3 cm, 139 g	Métal, bois, laiton	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon Fang Pahouin	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Alfred Marche	2	non	
71.1877.1.7	Couteau	avant 1877	60,5 x 12,4 x 3,9 cm, 749 g	Métal, bois, cuivre	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Alfred Marche	2	non	
71.1877.1.8	Couteau	avant 1877	61,5 x 10,6 cm	Métal, bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Alfred Marche	2	non	
71.1877.1.9	Sabre d'abattis	avant 1877	72,58 x 6 x 6 cm, 427 g	Bois, fer, laiton, cuir	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon Fang Teke	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Alfred Marche	2	non	










Gambie

(page 1 sur 5, 9 objets sur 35)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1878.31.3	Modèle de fusil	avant 1878	32 x 5,6 x 4,7 cm, 154 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Gambie	Donateur Albert Merie Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.31.31	Jouet	avant 1878	44 x 6,4 x 4 cm, 225 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Gambie	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Albert Merie	3	non	
71.1880.70.1.1-2	Couteau et fourreau	avant 1880	44,9 x 24 x 4 cm, 490 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Gambie	Donateur Victor Barrère Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1880.70.2	Ornement de sabre	avant 1880	131 x 7 x 3 cm, 101 g	Laine	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Gambie	Donateur Victor Barrère Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1880.70.3	Sac	avant 1880	57 x 16 x 3,7 cm, 98 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Gambie	Donateur Victor Barrère Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1880.70.4	Sac	avant 1880	65,5 x 29 x 5,5 cm, 260 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Gambie	Donateur Victor Barrère Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1880.70.5	Boubou Robe d'homme			Coton	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Gambie	Donateur Victor Barrère Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1880.70.6	Sac Porte Coran	avant 1880	29 x 17 x 5 cm, 76 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Gambie	Donateur Victor Barrère Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1880.70.7	Outre Sac	avant 1880	80 x 34,2 x 4,5 cm, 647 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Gambie	Donateur Victor Barrère Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	








Ghana

(page 1 sur 178, 9 objets sur 1656)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
70.2018.5.2	Pagne masculin	Début du 20e siècle	305 x 197 cm	Coton	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Ghana Éwé	Vendeur Duncan Clarke	1	non	
71.1883.11.1.1-2	Xylophone	avant 1883	24,3 x 84 x 49,2 cm, 4456 g	Bois,alebasse	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Ghana Ashanti	Ancienne collection Mme Brun Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Ethnomusicologie) Donateur Société de géographie commerciale	3	non	
71.1883.11.2.1-2	Pipe	avant 1883	24 x 6,4 x 3,5 cm, 34 g	Terre cuite, bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Ghana Ashanti	Ancienne collection Mme Brun Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Société de géographie commerciale	3	non	
71.1883.11.2 Em	Manchette à grelots	avant 1883	10 x 9,8 x 2,5 cm, 97,7 g	Cuir, métal	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Ghana Ashanti	Ancienne collection Mme Brun Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Ethnomusicologie) Donateur Société de géographie commerciale	3	non	
71.1883.11.3	Collier amulette	avant 1883	6 x 6 x 0,7 cm, 8 g	Bois, fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Ghana Ashanti	Ancienne collection Mme Brun Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Société de géographie commerciale	3	non	
71.1883.11.4	Fourreau de poignard	avant 1883	19 x 3 x 2,5 cm, 15 g	Peau de panthère	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Ghana Ashanti	Ancienne collection Mme Brun Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Société de géographie commerciale	3	non	
71.1886.145.1	Plat	avant 1886	10 x 28,5 x 28,5 cm, 1960 g	Terre cuite noire	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Ghana Ashanti	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.145.2	Fourreau de pipe	avant 1886	5,3 x 4,6 x 6,3 cm, 90 g	Terre cuite	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Ghana Ashanti	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.145.3	Fourreau de pipe zoomorphe	avant 1886	5,7 x 11,7 x 5,9 cm, 213 g	Terre cuite	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Ghana Ashanti	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	








Guinée

(page 1 sur 177, 7 objets sur 181)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
70.2018.19.2	Monnaie guinzé	19e siècle	62,5 x 11,2 x 3 cm	Fer martelé et torsadé	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée Toma	Donateur anonyme	0	non	
70.2018.19.3	Monnaies Ensemble de monnaies guinzé	20e siècle			Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée Toma	Donateur anonyme	0	non	
71.1878.17.2	Modèle de pirogue	avant 1878	16 x 118 x 16 cm, 1096 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée > Boké > Rio Nunez	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	
71.1878.49.1	Siège à cariatide ?	1751 - 1800	47,5 x 20,6 x 22,5 cm, 2109 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée Baga	Ancienne collection Bibliothèque nationale de France Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	
71.1880.71.2	Statuette féminine	avant 1880	47,5 x 15,5 x 13,5 cm, 1314 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée Baga	Donateur Mr Goldhammer Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.97.4	Lance	avant 1881	186,5 x 5,1 x 5,4 cm, 1297 g	Métal ?	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée	Donateur Xavier Charnes Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.97.18	Lance	avant 1881	113,2 x 5,3 x 5,6 cm, 1005 g	Bois, cuir et fer	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Xavier Charnes	3	non	









Guinée équatoriale

(page 1 sur 14, 8 objets sur 94)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
70.2017.66.16	Gardien de reliquaire eyema-byeri	19e siècle	H: 49cm; l:21 cm; P : 12 cm	Bois, laiton	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon Afrique > Afrique centrale > Guinée équatoriale Fang	Donateur Marc Ladreit de Lacharrière	0	non	
71.1878.19.4	Fourreau	avant 1878	31,5 x 11,5 x 1,5 cm, 153 g 11,9 x 1,3 x 1,7 cm, 24 g	Bois, laiton (?)	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Cameroun Afrique > Afrique centrale > Guinée équatoriale Afrique > Rio Campo Fang	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue Ancienne collection Bibliothèque nationale de France Ancienne collection Schoelcher	3	non	
71.1878.19.5	Couteau	avant 1878	47 x 8,6 x 4,8 cm, 339 g	Fer, bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Cameroun Afrique > Afrique centrale > Guinée équatoriale Afrique > Rio Campo Fang Pahouin	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue Ancienne collection Bibliothèque nationale de France Ancienne collection Schoelcher	3	non	
71.1885.124.20 D	Sac	avant 1885	91,5 x 16,8 x 16,8 cm, 130 g	Fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Guinée équatoriale	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Dépositaire Musée d'archéologie nationale Ancienne collection Ludovic Napoléon Lepic	3	non	
71.1894.7.6	Jupe	avant 1896	30 x 37 x 2 cm, 126 g	Fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Guinée équatoriale Fang	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Mr Blaise	3	non	
71.1898.1.1.1-5	Statue de gardien de reliquaire Eyima byeri	milieu du 19e siècle	62 x 16,5 x 19 cm	Bois, perles, cire Parures : perles, fibres végétales, graines, métal	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Gabon Afrique > Afrique centrale > Guinée équatoriale Fang	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Muséum national d'histoire naturelle Vendeur Personne inconnue	3	oui	
71.1937.0.44 X	Trompe terminale (perce conique)	avant 1937	52,5 x 23 x 8,8 cm, 645 g	Corne, fil.	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Guinée équatoriale	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Ethnomusicologie) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	
71.1951.73.246.1-	Couteau avec fourreau	avant 1951	61,5 x 17,6 x 4,6 cm, 1022 g	Métal, bois, peau	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Guinée équatoriale	Donateur Charles Henri Olivier Pobéguin Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	










Guinée-Bissau

(page 1 sur 16, 8 objets sur 125)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1895.47.2	Echantillon de tissu	avant 1895	12 x 163 x 0,1 cm, 67 g	Coton Armure toile quadrillée.	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée-Bissau > Oio (région) > Farim	Donateur Gabriel Bonvalet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.47.7	Cuiller double	avant 1895	38,5 x 4,7 x 2,2 cm, 26 g	Bois Gravure	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée-Bissau > Oio (région) > Farim	Donateur Gabriel Bonvalet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.47.8	Calebasse	avant 1895	9,7 x 17,7 x 20,3 cm, 47 g	Calebasse	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée-Bissau > Oio (région) > Farim	Donateur Gabriel Bonvalet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.47.9	Calebasse	avant 1895	9,5 x 9,5 x 4,5 cm, 8 g	Calebasse	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée-Bissau > Oio (région) > Farim	Donateur Gabriel Bonvalet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.47.10	Calebasse	avant 1895	10 x 20 x 20 cm, 47 g	Calebasse	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée-Bissau > Oio (région) > Farim	Donateur Gabriel Bonvalet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.47.11	Cuiller	avant 1895	34,6 x 10,4 x 2,5 cm, 91 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée-Bissau > Oio (région) > Farim	Donateur Gabriel Bonvalet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.47.12	Cuiller	avant 1895	22,8 x 4,4 x 3 cm, 17 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée-Bissau > Oio (région) > Farim	Donateur Gabriel Bonvalet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1895.47.13	Cuiller	avant 1895	32 x 4,3 x 2 cm, 13 g	Bois Pyrogravure	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée-Bissau > Oio (région) > Farim	Donateur Gabriel Bonvalet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	










Kenya

(page 1 sur 22, 9 objets sur 181)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
70.2007.39.1.1-2	Gourde et gobelet	début du 20e siècle	40 x 65 cm gourde 61 x 21 x 20 cm encombrem ent 30 cm de haut gobelet	Calebasse, bois, cuir, perles de verre, fibre végétale, polychromie	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Kenya Massaï	Donateur Nicole Oerthel-Blanc	2	non	
71.1896.61.1 Af	Bouclier	avant 1896	11 x 39 x 39 cm, 1388 g	Cuir de rhinocéros	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Djibouti Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie Afrique > Afrique orientale > Kenya Somali	Légateur Mr Servaux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1899.33.6	Bracelet	avant 1899	5,8 x 1 x 5,5 cm ; 16 g	Métal	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Kenya Afrique > région des Grands Lacs	Donateur Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1899.33.7	Bracelet	avant 1899	5,4 x 1,2 x 5,3 cm ; 15 g	Métal	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Kenya Afrique > région des Grands Lacs	Donateur Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1903.33.185	Lance Lance - niakura (puma) - perr (mursu)	avant 1903	74,5 x 3,5 x 1,5 cm, 425 g	Fer	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Kenya Hamer Puma Bukri Mursu	Mission Robert Du Bourg de Bozas Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1903.33.189	Tablier ou cape	avant 1903	78 x 77 x 5 cm, 806 g	Cuir, fer, coquille d'oeuf, bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Kenya Turkana	Mission Robert Du Bourg de Bozas Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	1	non	
71.1903.33.238	Porte-bébé Porte-bébé - nakoko (tur.) - sarra (galabi) -	avant 1903	39 x 31 cm	Peau	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Kenya Turkana	Mission Robert Du Bourg de Bozas Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1903.33.239	Cape Cape - abua (fur.) - Niabua (galabi) - aizi (karo)	avant 1903	78 x 87 x 7,5 cm, 1297 g	Peau, fer	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Kenya Turkana	Mission Robert Du Bourg de Bozas Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1903.33.243	Réceptient Pot - niahutan	avant 1903	27,5 x 33,5 x 33 cm, 1069 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Kenya Turkana	Mission Robert Du Bourg de Bozas Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	









Lesotho

(page 1 sur 11, 9 objets sur 99)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
70.2016.49.2	Cape Kaross	19e siècle	126 x 140 cm	Peau de mouton, laine, perles de verre de Venise bleues et rouges à points blancs, petits anneaux en alliage cuivreux	Afrique > Afrique australe > Lesotho Sotho	Vendeur Alan Marcuson	0	non	
71.1910.6.1	Figurine zoomorphe	avant 1910	2,6 x 7,6 x 4,5 cm ; 66,1 g	Terre glaise	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique australe > Lesotho	Donateur Frédéric Christol Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1910.6.2	Cuiller	avant 1910	42,7 x 3,9 x 8 cm, 66 g	Bois	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique australe > Lesotho	Donateur Frédéric Christol Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1910.6.3	Dessous de plat	avant 1910	0,7 x 20,1 x 20,1 cm, 110 g	Fibres végétales Vannerie	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique australe > Lesotho	Donateur Frédéric Christol Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1910.6.4	Appui-tête	avant 1910	16,4 x 5,85 x 4,6 cm, 266 g	Bois	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique australe > Lesotho	Donateur Frédéric Christol Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1910.6.5	Statuette féminine	avant 1910	27 x 7,3 x 6,5 cm, 250 g	Bois	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique australe > Lesotho	Donateur Frédéric Christol Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1910.6.6	Gousse et graines	avant 1910	7 x 19 x 0,9 cm, 46 g	fruit	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique australe > Lesotho	Donateur Frédéric Christol Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1910.6.7	Bâton (élément de cordophone)	avant 1910	91 x 2 x 2 cm, 144 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique australe > Lesotho	Donateur Frédéric Christol Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Ethnomusicologie)	3	non	
71.1910.6.8	Brosse	avant 1910	6,2 x 22 x 7,8 cm, 124 g	Bois	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique australe > Lesotho	Donateur Frédéric Christol Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	






Libéria

(page 1 sur 7, 8 objets sur 46)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1886.145.7	Arc	avant 1886	152,5 x 15 x 3 cm, 563 g	Bois et cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Libéria	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.145.12	Sac	avant 1886	27 x 16,2 x 2 cm, 121 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Libéria Mandé	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.145.15	Calebasse	avant 1886	11 x 22,3 x 22,3 cm, 128 g	Calebasse	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Libéria	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.145.16	Calebasse	avant 1886	9,4 x 21,3 x 21,3 cm, 77 g	Calebasse	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Libéria	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.145.18	Flèche	avant 1886	80 x 0,5 x 0,5 cm, 23 g	Fer, bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Libéria	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller	3	non	
71.1891.22.138	Pagale	avant 1891	121 x 14,6 x 3,1 cm, 716 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Libéria	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1891.22.140	Plat	avant 1891	6,5 x 24 x 24 cm, 186 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Libéria	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1891.22.152	Harpe fourchue	c. 1885	45 x 50 x 22 cm, 307 g	Cucurbitacée, bois, fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Libéria	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	





Madagascar

(page 1 sur 910, 9 objets sur 7781)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1880.44.6.1-2	Modèle réduit de pirogue à balancier	avant 1880	62 x 22 x 8,5 cm, 244 g	Pièce de bois taillée	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar > Antsiranana (province) > Nosy Bé (île) Sakalava	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien) Donateur Colonie de Nosy Bé	3	non	
71.1880.44.7.1-2	Modèle de pirogue à balancier	avant 1880	69 x 15 x 8 cm, 147 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar > Antsiranana (province) > Nosy Bé (île) Sakalava	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien) Donateur Colonie de Nosy Bé	3	non	
71.1880.44.8	Balancier de pirogue (réduction)	avant 1880	60 x 3 x 4 cm, 128 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien) Donateur Colonie de Nosy Bé	3	non	
71.1880.79.1	Fragment d'un arc musical bobu	avant 1880	153 x 2 x 2 cm, 351 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar	Donateur Musée des Colonies Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Ethnomusicologie)	3	non	
71.1881.54.25	Lance	avant 1881	176 x 5 x 1,5 cm, 576 g	Bois, cuir.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar Sakalava	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien)	3	non	
71.1882.60.1	Chapeau	avant 1882	10 x 37 x 37 cm, 87 g	Vannerie, paille de riz croisé en marqueterie	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar Mérina	Donateur Colonie de Sainte-Marie de Madagascar Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien)	3	non	
71.1882.60.2	Chapeau	avant 1882	10 x 31,5 x 31,5 cm, 105 g	Vannerie, paille de riz croisé en marqueterie	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar Mérina	Donateur Colonie de Sainte-Marie de Madagascar Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien)	3	non	
71.1882.60.3	Chapeau				Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar Mérina	Donateur Colonie de Sainte-Marie de Madagascar Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien)	0	non	
71.1882.60.4	Cuiller	avant 1882	17,5 x 5,8 x 4,6 cm, 14 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Madagascar > Antsiranana (province) > Nosy Bé (île) Antankarana	Donateur Colonie de Sainte-Marie de Madagascar Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Madagascar - Océan Indien)	3	non	










Malawi

(page 1 sur 6, 7 objets sur 38)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
70.2014.7.3	Ceinture	fin 19e siècle	73 x 11 cm	Perles de verre, coton	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Malawi Yao	Vendeur Alan Marcuson Ancienne collection Bernice Pethica	1	non	
71.1897.48.10 bis	Corbeille	avant 1897	10 x 22 x 22 cm, 141 g	Fibres végétales, bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Malawi	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Edouard Foa	2	non	
71.1897.49.3	Flèche	avant 1897	101 x 2 x 2 cm, 35 g	Bambou, rotin, poison	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Malawi Azimba	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1897.49.4	Flèche	avant 1897	101 x 2 x 2 cm, 35 g	Bambou, rotin, poison	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Malawi Azimba	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1897.49.5	Flèche	avant 1897	101 x 2 x 2 cm, 35 g	Bambou, rotin, poison	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Malawi Azimba	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1897.49.6	Flèche	avant 1897	101 x 2 x 2 cm, 35 g	Bambou, rotin, poison	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Malawi Azimba	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1897.49.7	Flèche	avant 1897	101 x 2 x 2 cm, 35 g	Bambou, rotin, poison	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Malawi Azimba	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	



Mali

(page 1 sur 864, 9 objets sur 6910)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1878.31.2.2	Socque	avant 1878	5,5 x 9,5 x 28 cm, 233 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Bamana	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Albert Merle	3	non	
71.1878.31.4.1-3	Serrure, pêne et clef	avant 1878	5 x 24 x 25,5 cm	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Bamana	Donateur Albert Merle Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.31.12.1-2	Arc	avant 1878	127 x 2,5 x 10 cm, 395 g	Bois, fibre végétale ?	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Bamana	Donateur Albert Merle Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.31.15	Em Trompe ou Tape-cuisse	avant 1878	82 x 16 x 8,5 cm, 167 g	Courge	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Peul	Donateur Albert Merle Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Ethnomusicologie)	3	non	
71.1878.31.16	Trompe ou tape-cuisse	avant 1878	89,5 x 7 x 7 cm, 141 g	Courge	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Peul	Donateur Albert Merle Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.31.17	Trompe ou tape-cuisse	avant 1878	69 x 7 x 7 cm, 109 g	Courge	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali	Donateur Albert Merle Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.31.18	Trompe ou tape-cuisse	avant 1878	64 x 7 x 6,5 cm, 97 g	Courge	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali	Donateur Albert Merle Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.63.1	Tambour cylindrique	avant 1878	55,5 x 34 x 34 cm, 3402 g	Bois, peau, fibres textiles	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali Malinke	Donateur Martin Dupont Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Ethnomusicologie)	3	non	
71.1880.69.1	Bonnet	avant 1879	19,5 x 24,5 x 1,5 cm, 23 g	Coton, teinture à l'indigo. Armure toile.	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mali > Ségou (région) > Segou	Donateur Paul Soleillet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Mission Paul Soleillet	2	non	







Maurice

(page 1 sur 1, 2 objets)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
73.2012.0.71	Tambour sur cadre Ravane	19e-20e siècle	34 x 5,3 x 35 cm ; 503 g	Bois (?), peau, métal	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Maurice	Précédente collection Musée national des arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	
73.2012.0.72	Tambour sur cadre	19e-20e siècle	58 x 58 x 6 cm ; 963 g	Bois, métal, peau	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Maurice	Précédente collection Musée national des arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	










Mauritanie

(page 1 sur 173, 9 objets sur 1425)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1878.19.7 Anpx	Blague à tabac	19e siècle	22 x 6,3 x 4,4 cm, 62 g	Cuir incisé	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mauritanie > Trarza (région) Maures	Ancienne collection Bibliothèque nationale de France Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	
71.1878.19.8	Blague à tabac	19e siècle	31,5 x 5,6 x 3 cm, 34 g	Cuir incisé	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mauritanie > Trarza (région) Maures	Ancienne collection Bibliothèque nationale de France Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	
71.1878.34.1	Poire à poudre				Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mauritanie > Trarza (région) Maures	Donateur Mr Goldhammer Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1878.34.2	Poire à poudre				Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mauritanie Maures	Donateur Mr Goldhammer Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1880.69.22	Etui	avant 1879	20,7 x 11,5 x 4,7 cm, 81 g	Cuir, pigments	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mauritanie Maure	Donateur Paul Soleillet Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient) Mission Paul Soleillet	3	non	
71.1885.10.31	Sac de selle Tassoufra	19e siècle	126 x 48 x 7 cm, 863 g	Cuir, pigments Fabriquée par les femmes d'artisans locaux.	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mauritanie > Trarza (région) > Boutlimit Maures	Donateur Victor Schoelcher Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient)	3	non	
71.1885.10.32	Poignard				Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mauritanie	Donateur Victor Schoelcher Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient)	0	non	
71.1885.10.33	Collier	19e siècle	18,3 x 7,8 x 4,3 cm, 127 g	Ambre, argent, corail, verre	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mauritanie Peul	Donateur Victor Schoelcher Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient) Dépositaire Musée départemental Victor Schoelcher (Pointe-à-Pitre)	3	non	
71.1907.2.28 Anpx	Poignard		27,4 x 2,5 x 1,6 cm, 78 g	Bois, fer, laiton	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Mauritanie Maures	Donateur Paul-Jean de L'Orza de Mont-Orso de Reichenberg Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient)	3	non	








Mozambique

(page 1 sur 22, 9 objets sur 171)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1886.145.9	Appui-tête	avant 1886	14 x 14,7 x 8,1 cm, 118 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Mozambique > Sofala (province) > Chiloane	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.145.10	Appui-tête	avant 1886	13,5 x 14,7 x 8,8 cm, 121,5 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Mozambique > Inhambane (province)	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.145.14.1-	Couteau et fourreau	avant 1886	20,8 x 2,8 x 2,4 cm, 60 g	Bois, métal	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Mozambique > Tete (province) > Zumbo (ville)	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.145.17	Tabouret	avant 1886	9,3 x 9,2 x 9,2 cm, 118 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Mozambique > Tete (province) > Zumbo (ville)	Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1886.145.19.1-	Chaussures	avant 1950	28 x 9,3 x 12 cm, 309 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Mozambique > Sofala (province) > Chiloane	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Asie) Donateur Hendrik Pieter Nicolaas Muller Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1890.65.11	Appui-tête	fin 19e siècle	16,5 x 14,5 x 7 cm, 452 g	Bois	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique orientale > Mozambique Tsonga	Donateur Alfred Lombard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	1	oui	
71.1890.65.51	Ornement phallique	avant 1890	3,4 x 5,3 x 5,3 cm, 9 g	Ficelle, feuilles et écorce palmier	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Mozambique > Inhambane (province)	Donateur Alfred Lombard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1890.65.65	Tabatière	avant 1890	4,5 x 3,7 x 20,8 cm, 33 g	Bois, perles, fil	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique orientale > Mozambique Shona	Donateur Alfred Lombard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	1	oui	
71.1890.65.79	Lamellophone	avant 1890	17 x 13,5 x 4 cm, 226 g	Fer, bois, bambou	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique orientale > Mozambique	Donateur Alfred Lombard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	









Namibie

(page 1 sur 1, 7 objets)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1929.14.242	Couteau	avant 1929	34,7 x 4,9 x 3,5 cm, 378 g	Os, fer	Afrique > Afrique australe > Namibie > Kunene	Donateur Louis Capitan Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1929.14.248	Flèche	avant 1929	79 x 4,5 x 1 cm, 49 g	Bois, fer, plumes et fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique australe > Namibie > Kunene	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée) Donateur Louis Capitan	3	non	
71.1929.14.250	Flèche ?	avant 1929	76 x 85 x 1 cm, 41 g	Bambou, métal	Afrique > Afrique australe > Namibie > Kunene	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Louis Capitan	3	non	
71.1929.14.252	Flèche ?	avant 1929	66,5 x 4,6 x 2,6 cm, 41 g	Bambou, bois, fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique australe > Namibie > Kunene	Donateur Louis Capitan Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Océanie)	3	non	
71.1929.14.253	Flèche (?)	avant 1929	73,4 x 4,8 x 2 cm, 52 g	Bambou, fer, fibres végétales, plumes	Afrique > Afrique australe > Namibie > Kunene	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Asie) Donateur Louis Capitan	3	non	
71.1929.14.254	Flèche ?	avant 1929	68 x 5 x 2 cm, 38 g	Bois, fer	Afrique > Afrique australe > Namibie > Kunene	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Louis Capitan	3	non	
71.1929.14.931	Flèche ?	avant 1929	38 x 5 x 2 cm, 42 g	Bambou, métal, cordelette de fil	Afrique > Afrique australe > Namibie > Kunene	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée) Donateur Louis Capitan	3	non	








Niger

(page 1 sur 209, 8 objets sur 1615)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1878.20.1	Portefeuille	avant 1878	14 x 9,5 x 0,8 cm, 19 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Niger Touareg	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue Ancienne collection Bibliothèque nationale de France	3	non	
71.1884.41.3	Anneau de bras lwuki (Air), ahbeg (Hoggar)	19e siècle	11,1 x 11 x 1,8 cm, 216 g	Pierre dure Fabrication en schiste, localisée en Air.	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Niger > Agadez (département) > Agadès Haoussa Touareg de l'Air	Donateur Henri Duveyrier Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient)	3	non	
71.1884.41.4	Turban	fin 19e siècle	577 x 56,5 x 0,2 cm, 248 g	Laine Armure toile barrée	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Niger > Agadez (département) > Air Afrique > Sahara Touareg de l'Air	Donateur Henri Duveyrier Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient)	3	non	
71.1884.41.5	Voile Litham	19e siècle	84 x 360 x 0,2 cm, 520 g	Coton, teinture à l'indigo Armure toile, calandrage	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Niger > Agadez (département) > Air Afrique > Sahara Touareg de l'Air	Donateur Henri Duveyrier Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient)	3	non	
71.1884.41.15	Boubou	Vers 1880	138 x 248 x 0,6 cm, 1293 g	Textile	Afrique > Sahara Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Niger Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Maghreb > Algérie Haoussa Touareg	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Henri Duveyrier	3	non	
71.1886.9.8	Sac à bandoulière et a franges	avant 1886	3 x 62 x 42 cm, 126 g	Raphia	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Niger	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Victor Schoelcher	3	non	
71.1886.10.1.1-2	Sandalet	19e siècle	2,8 x 26,23 x 29,5 cm, 512 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Nigéria > Kano (état) Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Niger > Agadez (département) > Agadès Afrique > Sahara Kel Ajjer	Donateur Henri Duveyrier Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient)	3	non	
71.1886.33.3	Cuiller	fin 19e siècle	26,5 x 5,5 x 6 cm, 31 g	Bois Décor pyrogravé- Travail des hommes	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Niger > Agadez (département) > Agadès Afrique > Sahara Touareg	Donateur Henri Duveyrier Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique du Nord et Proche-Orient)	3	non	









Nigeria

(page 1 sur 149, 7 objets sur 1148)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1883.39.4.1-2	Paire de bracelets	avant 1883	9,3 x 9,3 x 5,2 cm, 228 g	Ivoire	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Nigéria	Donateur Mr Mattei Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1883.39.5	Lampe	avant 1883	52,5 x 37,5 x 38 cm, 1587 g	Métal	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Nigéria > Kogi (état) > Lokoja	Donateur Mr Mattei Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1883.39.6	Cafetière	avant 1883	25 x 15,2 x 15,2 cm, 278 g	Cuivre repoussé	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Nigéria > Bida	Donateur Mr Mattei Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1883.39.7	Collier (ou ceinture ?)	avant 1883	0,6 x 10,9 x 35 cm, 20,5 g	bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Nigéria	Donateur Mr Mattei Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1883.39.7.1-2	Colliers ou ceintures	avant 1883	41,2 x 12,5 x 0,6 cm, 54 g	bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Nigéria	Donateur Mr Mattei Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1883.39.8	Pot	avant 1883	17 x 10,5 x 10,5 cm, 439 g	Terre cuite	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Nigéria > Bida	Donateur Mr Mattei Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1883.39.9	Pot	avant 1883	19,8 x 12,3 x 12,3 cm, 504 g	Poterie, peinture	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Nigéria > Bida	Donateur Mr Mattei Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	









Ouganda

(page 1 sur 26, 8 objets sur 210)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
70.2017.27.1.1-2	Pot rituel Ensumbi	Fin du 19e - début du 20e siècle	Hauteur : 42 cm	Terre cuite, fibres végétales, graphite	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ouganda Ganda Nyoro	Vendeur Alan Marcuson	1	non	
71.1881.54.21	Lance	avant 1881	139,6 x 3,1 x 2,3 cm, 626 g	Métal, bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ouganda	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.54.22	Lance	avant 1881	163,4 x 2,9 x 2,2 cm, 648 g	Métal, bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ouganda	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.54.26.1-2	Panier avec couverture	avant 1881	15,5 x 17 x 17 cm, 200 g	Vannerie, cuir.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ouganda	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.54.33	Bouclier	avant 1881	102,5 x 43 x 33,5 cm, 2147 g	Vannerie de rotin, bois, cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ouganda Ganda	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	1	oui	
71.1881.54.44.1-2	Panier	avant 1881	14,5 x 16,8 x 16,8 cm, 299 g	Fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ouganda	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1885.93.1	Lance	avant 1885	271 x 5 x 3 cm, 1403 g	Bois, fer	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ouganda	Mission Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1885.93.2	Lance	avant 1885	267,5 x 5,5 x 2,5 cm, 1393 g	Bois, fer	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ouganda	Mission Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	










République centrafricaine

(page 1 sur 248, 8 objets sur 1943)

Número d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1889.106.1	Couteau de jet Bagna	avant 1889	42,5 x 32,5 x 1,5 cm, 424 g	Fer forgé	Afrique > Afrique centrale > République centrafricaine	Donateur Joseph Michaud Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1889.115.16	Pagne	avant 1889	30 x 65 x 47 cm, 1366 g	Fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique centrale > République centrafricaine Bondjo	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Mr Thillon	3	non	
71.1889.131.76.1	Founeau de pipe	avant 1889	52,5 x 2,9 x 6,7 cm, 290 g	Cuivre, laiton	Afrique > Afrique centrale > République centrafricaine > Ombella-Mpoko (préfecture) > Bangui	Donateur Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Attilio Pecile	2	non	
71.1889.131.76.2	Tuyau de pipe	avant 1889	52 x 2,9 x 6,7 cm, 290 g	Bois, alliage cuivreux	Afrique > Afrique centrale > République centrafricaine > Ombella-Mpoko (préfecture) > Bangui	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza Donateur Attilio Pecile	3	non	
71.1889.131.95	Lance	avant 1889	27 x 5,7 x 1,3 cm, 105 g	Fer	Afrique > Afrique centrale > République centrafricaine > Ombella-Mpoko (préfecture) > Bangui	Donateur Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Attilio Pecile	2	non	
71.1891.31.15	Appui-tête	avant 1891	15,3 x 12 x 9,8 cm, 134 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique centrale > République centrafricaine > Ombella-Mpoko (préfecture) > Bangui	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Attilio Pecile Donateur Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza	2	non	
71.1891.31.17.1-4	Tuyaux de pipe	avant 1891	64 x 6 x 3,2 cm, 229 g 57,5 x 3 x 3 cm, 125 g	Bois, laiton ou cuivre (?)	Afrique > Afrique centrale > République centrafricaine Yanzi	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza Donateur Attilio Pecile	3	non	
71.1891.31.18.1-2	Tuyaux de pipes	avant 1891	75 x 3,3 x 2,4 cm, 55 g	Bois, cuivre	Afrique > Afrique centrale > République centrafricaine Yanzi	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Attilio Pecile Donateur Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza	2	non	









Rwanda

(page 1 sur 6, 9 objets sur 47)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1881.54.7	Bois d'arc	avant 1881	141,5 x 13,5 x 2,1 cm, 319 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique centrale > Congo, république démocratique	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Mr Ledoux	3	non	
71.1881.54.45	Ecuelle	avant 1881	10 x 20 x 20 cm, 161 g	Calebasse	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.54.48	Carquois	avant 1881	72,5 x 5 x 5 cm, 333 g	Bois, fibres, cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Mr Ledoux	3	non	
71.1950.61.3.1-2	Panier à couvercle	avant 1950	23,2 x 10,1 x 10,1 cm, 67 g	Vannerie spiralée	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.4.1-2	Panier à couvercle	avant 1950	10 x 4 x 4 cm, 12 g	Vannerie spiralée	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.5	Couvercle	avant 1950	21,3 x 23 x 23 cm, 175 g	Vannerie spiralée	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.6	Corbelle	avant 1950	5,5 x 17,5 x 18,5 cm, 19 g	Vannerie double	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.7	Anneau	avant 1950	1 x 7,5 x 8 cm, 5 g	Vannerie	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	
71.1950.61.8	Anneau	avant 1950	1 x 7 x 7,5 cm, 5 g	Vannerie	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Rwanda Afrique > Afrique orientale > Burundi	Donateur University of Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	3	non	



Sénégal

(page 1 sur 275, 9 objets sur 2276)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1878.19.7 Af	Chapeau	avant 1878	11,5 x 50,5 x 51,3 cm, 382 g	Cuir, fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sénégal	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue Ancienne collection Schoelcher	3	non	
71.1878.20.3.1-2	Paire de sandales	avant 1878	33 x 21,1 x 5 cm, 768 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sénégal	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue Ancienne collection Bibliothèque Nationale, cabinet des Antiques, fonds des émigrés Ancienne collection Mr Tessé	3	non	
71.1878.20.3.3	Bracelet de cheville	avant 1878	0,7 x 7,7 x 6,6 cm, 5,4 g	Cuir, fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sénégal Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Soudan	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Bibliothèque nationale de France Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	
71.1878.20.5	Panier	avant 1878	11,8 x 17,8 x 17,8 cm, 198 g	Vannerie	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sénégal	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue Ancienne collection Bibliothèque nationale de France	3	non	
71.1878.31.5	Pilon	avant 1878	89 x 6,2 x 6,2 cm, 1369 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sénégal Wolof	Donateur Albert Merle Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.31.26	Calebasse	avant 1878	22,5 x 34,7 x 32 cm, 261 g	Calebasse	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sénégal Wolof	Donateur Albert Merle Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.31.27	Calebasse	avant 1878	23,7 x 18,3 x 7,5 cm, 85 g	Calebasse	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sénégal Wolof	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Albert Merle	3	non	
71.1878.31.28	Calebasse gravée	avant 1878	14,5 x 33 x 34 cm, 264 g	Calebasse	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sénégal Wolof	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Albert Merle	3	non	
71.1878.31.29	Hache	avant 1878	44 x 22,5 x 4 cm, 184 g	Fer, bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sénégal	Donateur Albert Merle Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	











Seychelles

(page 1 sur 1, 2 objets)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1961.42.8	Echantillon de fruit	milieu du 20e siècle	2 x 10 x 4 cm, 58 g	Noix des Seychelles.	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Seychelles	Légateur Mme Bineau Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Asie)	3	non	
71.1979.108.1	Chapeau	avant 1979	36,5 x 35 x 22,2 cm, 121 g	Vannerie	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Seychelles	Donateur Robert Gessain Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Technologie comparée)	2	non	









Sierra Leone

(page 1 sur 10, 10 objets sur 75)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1891.22.116	Chapeau	avant 1891			Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sierra Leone	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1891.22.150 Af	Bonnet	avant 1891	14 x 18 x 18 cm, 35 g	Raphia	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sierra Leone	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1891.22.168	Plateau	avant 1891		Fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sierra Leone	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1891.22.169	Plateau	avant 1891		Paille	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sierra Leone	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1891.22.170	Plateau	avant 1891		Paille	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sierra Leone	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1891.22.171	Plateau	avant 1891		Paille	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sierra Leone	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1891.22.172	Plateau	avant 1891		Paille	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sierra Leone	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1891.22.173	Plateau	avant 1891		Paille, pigments	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sierra Leone	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1891.22.176	Plateau	c. 1885	1,5 x 19 x 18,2 cm, 70 g	Paille, pigments	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sierra Leone	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1901.53.27	Hamac	avant 1901	170 x 58 x 8 cm, 1740 g	Fibres végétales, bois	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sénégal Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Sierra Leone Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Guinée Soussou	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Robert Normand	3	non	











Somalie

(page 1 sur 52, 8 objets sur 423)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1878.15.44	Appui-tête	avant 1878	17,5 x 21,9 x 11,8 cm, 283 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Somalie Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.56	Cuiller	avant 1878	57,2 x 6,5 x 4,5 cm, 186 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Somalie Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.63.1-2	Bouteille à eau en fil d'écorce Récipient obbo	avant 1878	85 x 40 x 40 cm, 1982 g	Vannerie	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Somalie Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	1	oui	
71.1878.15.66	Récipient	avant 1878	13,2 x 35,3 x 35,3 cm, 1074 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Somalie Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie Somali	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.67	Selle	avant 1878	34,5 x 43 x 51 cm, 2617 g	Cuir, fer	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Somalie Afrique > Afrique orientale > Ethiopie Somali	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte	3	non	
71.1878.15.70	Bâton	avant 1878	80 x 11,5 x 1,5 cm, 56 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Somalie	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.54.1	Peigne	avant 1881	22,7 x 9,4 x 0,6 cm, 67 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Somalie Somali	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.54.2	Peigne	avant 1881	22,6 x 8 x 0,9 cm, 75 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Somalie Somali	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	








Soudan du Sud

(page 1 sur 5, 10 objets sur 38)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1903.33.625	Coiffe	avant 1903	12 x 22 x 25 cm, 160 g	Fibres végétales crochetées, plumes	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Soudan du Sud > Sharq al Istiwa'yah > Mongalla (environs de) Turkana	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Mission Robert Du Bourg de Bozas Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	3	non	
71.1930.54.348 D	Bouclier	avant 1930	7 x 15 x 15 cm, 145 g	Peau	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Soudan du Sud Bari	Déposant Musée d'archéologie nationale Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Musée de Marine du Louvre	3	non	
71.1930.54.349 D	Bouclier	avant 1930	10 x 20 x 16 cm, 133 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Soudan du Sud Bari	Déposant Musée d'archéologie nationale Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Musée de Marine du Louvre	3	non	
71.1930.54.360 D	Bracelet	avant 1930	6,3 x 7,4 x 1,6 cm, 35,3 g	Fer	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Soudan du Sud Bari	Déposant Musée d'archéologie nationale Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Musée de Marine du Louvre	3	non	
71.1930.54.381 D	Diadème	avant 1930	21 x 4 x 5 cm, 14 g	Ivoire	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Soudan du Sud Bari	Déposant Musée d'archéologie nationale Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Musée de Marine du Louvre	3	non	
71.1930.54.383 D	Bracelet	avant 1930	12,8 x 11,5 x 0,9 cm, 21,5 g	Cuir, fer	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Soudan du Sud Shilluk	Déposant Musée d'archéologie nationale Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Musée de Marine du Louvre	3	non	
71.1930.54.384 D	Bracelet-amulette	avant 1930	1,5 x 12 x 7,5 cm, 112 g	Fer, ivoire	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Soudan du Sud Bari	Déposant Musée d'archéologie nationale Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Musée de Marine du Louvre	3	non	
71.1930.54.385 D	Bracelet-amulette	avant 1930	12,3 x 11 x 7,3 cm, 116 g	Fer, ivoire	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Soudan du Sud Bari	Déposant Musée d'archéologie nationale Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Musée de Marine du Louvre	3	non	
71.1930.54.389.1-	Bracelet	avant 1930	8,6 x 7,7 x 2,5 cm, 24,3 g	Fer, verre	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Soudan du Sud Bari	Déposant Musée d'archéologie nationale Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Musée de Marine du Louvre	3	non	
71.1930.54.424 D	Amulette	avant 1930	24,2 x 12 x 2 cm, 37 g	Ivoire, cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Soudan du Sud Bari	Déposant Musée d'archéologie nationale Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Ancienne collection Musée de Marine du Louvre	3	non	









Soudan

(page 1 sur 89, 9 objets sur 695)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
70.2007.23.1	Bouclier	milieu du 19e siècle	101 x 32 x 12 cm	Cuir, bois, traces de pigments	Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Soudan Bongo	Vendeur Galerie L'impasse Saint-Jacques	1	oui	
71.1878.15.19	Plateau avec couvercle	avant 1878		Fibres végétales	Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Soudan	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Echange sortant Musée du Bardo (Alger)	0	non	
71.1878.15.20	Couteau de jet	avant 1878	44,3 x 39 x 1,5 cm, 402 g	Fer, corde	Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Soudan Zandé	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.35	Bracelet	avant 1878	4,1 x 7,9 x 7,9 cm, 56 g	Ivoire	Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Soudan > Al Khartoum > Khartoum	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.36	Lance Javeline	avant 1878	166,5 x 1,6 x 1,6 cm, 389 g	Bois, fer	Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Soudan Bongo	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte	3	non	
71.1878.15.37	Lance	avant 1878	181,8 x 2,3 x 2 cm, 425 g	Bois, fer	Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Soudan Bongo	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.38	Lance	avant 1878	167,8 x 2 x 1,9 cm, 360 g	Fer, bois	Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Soudan Niambura	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1878.15.39@	Sagaie	avant 1878			Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Soudan	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1878.15.45	Bracelet	avant 1878	5,8 x 9,1 x 8,6 cm, 56 g	Ivoire	Afrique > Afrique septentrionale > Soudan	Donateur Gouvernement de l'Egypte Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	








Tanzanie

(page 1 sur 48, 8 objets sur 372)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1881.54.49	Tabouret	avant 1881	24,5 x 33,5 x 33 cm, 2293 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Tanzanie Nyamwezi	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Mr Ledoux	3	non	
71.1882.10.21	Cithare sur cuvette Bobre	avant 1882	18,5 x 51,5 x 29 cm, 426 g	Bois, cucurbitacée, fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Tanzanie > Pwani > Zanzibar	Donateur Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Ethnomusicologie)	3	non	
71.1882.10.36	Tapis	avant 1882	218 x 92 x 1 cm, 680 g	Fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Tanzanie > Pwani > Zanzibar	Donateur Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1882.10.37	Tapis	avant 1882	235 x 88 x 1 cm, 700 g	Fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Tanzanie > Pwani > Zanzibar	Donateur Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1882.10.38	Tapis	avant 1882	235 x 87 x 2 cm, 725 g	Fibre végétale	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Tanzanie > Pwani > Zanzibar	Donateur Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1884.149.32	Lance	avant 1884	156,9 x 2,6 x 2,3 cm, 425 g	Métal, bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Tanzanie	Donateur Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1885.93.3	Coiffe	avant 1885	58 x 44 x 2,7 cm, 242 g	cuir, plumes d'autruche	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Tanzanie > Kilimanjaro Massaï	Mission Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	
71.1885.93.4	Manteau	avant 1885	156 x 60 x 6 cm, 405 g	Fourrure de singe colobe, perles de verre	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Tanzanie > Kilimanjaro Massaï	Mission Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Acquisition indéterminée Personne inconnue	2	non	






Tchad

(page 1 sur 1120, 8 objets sur 9296)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1882.10.20	Lance	avant 1882			Afrique > Afrique centrale > Tchad Gourane	Donateur Georges Révoil Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1886.9.31	Lance	avant 1886	214,3 x 4,7 x 2 cm, 514 g	Bois, métal	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Tchad Afrique > Afrique centrale > Cameroun Bornou	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Victor Schoelcher	3	non	
71.1893.46.1.1-2	Boîte à couvercle	avant 1893	41,5 x 19,4 x 18 cm, 933 g	Ecorce	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Tchad	Donateur Jean Dybowski Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1893.46.2.1-2	Boîte à couvercle	avant 1893	39 x 19 x 20 cm, 836 g	Ecorce	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Tchad	Donateur Jean Dybowski Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1893.46.3	Corne	avant 1893	17,5 x 9 x 3,5 cm, 72 g	Corne de bouc	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Tchad	Donateur Jean Dybowski Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1893.46.4 Af	Turban	avant 1893	80 x 160 x 0,3 cm, 174 g	Etamine	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Tchad	Donateur Jean Dybowski Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1893.46.5	Pot	avant 1893	12,5 x 21,5 x 12,5 cm ; 720 g	Terre cuite	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Tchad	Donateur Jean Dybowski Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1893.46.6.1-8 / Sac		avant 1893	31 x 20,5 x 6 cm, 201 g	Cuir	Afrique > Afrique centrale > Tchad	Donateur Jean Dybowski Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	




Togo

(page 1 sur 28, 5 objets sur 240)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1932.78.3	Amulette azokoiiki	avant 1932	20 x 16 x 16 cm, 241 g	Calebasse recouverte d'étoffe ; cauris, pattes d'oiseaux, écaille de tortue etc . écaille de crocodile, coquille de cardium, 4 cornes de céphalaphao, mandibules de Thryonomys (grand rongeur), 1 écaille de tortue terrestre, 2 crânes de poule 1 numéris ou fémur de tortue, 1 vertèbre de poisson (lates ?), 1 patte (de poule ?).	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Togo > Maritime (région) > Lomé	Donateur Agence économique des Territoires africains sous mandat Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1932.78.3.2	Éléments d'amulette	avant 1932	6,7 x 6,5 x 2 cm, 24 g	Patte de poule et entrave en fer	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Togo > Maritime (région) > Lomé	Donateur Agence économique des Territoires africains sous mandat Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1932.78.4	Amulette	avant 1932	30 x 12,5 x 12,5 cm, 289 g	Calebasse entière, recouverte d'étoffe ; branchettes, débris de plumes, etc . lignes de cauris, fragments de peau d'animal, perles ; poudre noire dans la calebasse.	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Togo > Maritime (région) > Lomé	Donateur Agence économique des Territoires africains sous mandat Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1932.78.5	golovi-golokpe Amulette	avant 1932	38 x 15 x 4,5 cm, 155 g	Bois, herbes sèches, cauris, toile... fragments d'os. ...	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Togo > Maritime (région) > Lomé	Donateur Agence économique des Territoires africains sous mandat Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1932.78.6	Amulette gavoen	avant 1932	17,5 x 15,5 x 6 cm, 154 g	Anneau de lianes enveloppé d'étoffe. Cauris et trois pattes de poulet	Afrique > Afrique occidentale > Togo > Maritime (région) > Lomé	Donateur Agence économique des Territoires africains sous mandat Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	








Zambie

(page 1 sur 18, 8 objets sur 139)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1881.54.8	Arc	avant 1881	152 x 2,6 x 15,5 cm, 492 g	Bois, cuir.	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zimbabwe	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1881.57.1	Pot	avant 1881	11 x 14,5 x 14,5 cm, 535 g	Terre cuite Modelage à la main par les femmes	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Ma-Subia	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1881.57.2	Pot	avant 1881	25,5 x 25,7 x 25,7 cm, 2218 g	Terre cuite Modelage par les femmes, tracé des lignes au moyen d'un coquillage du fleuve, (sorte de moule).	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Ma-Subia	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1881.59.19	Cuiller	avant 1881	34,5 x 3,8 x 5,5 cm, 25,6 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Haut Zambèze Barotse	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1890.65.152	Appui-tête	deuxième moitié du 19e siècle	12 x 13,7 x 6,4 cm, 18,5 g	Bois	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Tsonga	Donateur Alfred Lombard Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	1	oui	
71.1894.67.5.1-2	Lamellophone avec résonateur Mbira ou Kanombyo	deuxième moitié du 19e siècle	5,2 x 25 x 24 cm, 389 g Dimensions muséo : 10 x 11 x 16,5 cm	Bois, métal, coton	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Afrique australe > Botswana Lozi Tswana	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Ethnomusicologie) Donateur Emil Holub	1	non	
71.1894.68.1	Pot Marmite-piza (si-kololo) sikiso	avant 1894	19,2 x 25 x 25 cm, 1417 g	Argile	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Toka	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1894.68.2	Pot Vase : ndondo	avant 1894	23 x 20,2 x 20,2 cm, 1539 g	Argile	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Haut Zambèze Lozi	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	

Zimbabwe

(page 1 sur 10, 9 objets sur 278)

Numéro d'inventaire	Appellation	Date	Dimensions	Matériaux et techniques	Provenance	Personnes et institutions	PPRI	Exposé	
71.1881.54.8	Arc	avant 1881	152 x 2,6 x 15,5 cm, 492 g	Bois, cuir.	Afrique > Zambèze Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zimbabwe	Donateur Mr Ledoux Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	3	non	
71.1890.65.157	Appui-tête	avant 1890	16,7 x 20,4 x 7,4 cm, 322 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zimbabwe Somali	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Alfred Lombard	2	non	
71.1894.67.2.1-2	Pot à couvercle	avant 1894	18,2 x 13,4 x 13,4 cm, 439 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zimbabwe Marutse	Donateur Emil Holub Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1897.48.1	Modèle de pot Piza (dénomination sékololo)	avant 1897	11 x 13,3 x 13,3 cm, 790 g	Terre cuite	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zimbabwe Afrique > Haut Zambèze	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1897.48.2	Modèle de pot Piza (dénomination sékololo)	avant 1897	8,7 x 12 x 12 cm, 435 g	Terre cuite	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zimbabwe Afrique > Haut Zambèze	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1897.48.3	Modèle de pot	avant 1897	6,7 x 10 x 10 cm, 242 g	Terre cuite	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zimbabwe Afrique > Haut Zambèze	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	
71.1897.48.21	Piquet			Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zimbabwe Atchicounda	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	0	non	
71.1897.48.38	Métier à tisser (élément)	avant 1897	3,9 x 49 x 3,9 cm, 171 g	Bois	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zambie Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zimbabwe Atchicounda	Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique) Donateur Edouard Foa	3	non	
71.1897.49.1	Arc	avant 1897	153 x 11 x 2,5 cm, 532 g	Bois, cuir	Afrique > Afrique orientale > Zimbabwe Agoa Azimba	Donateur Edouard Foa Précédente collection Musée de l'Homme (Afrique)	2	non	