

Skulls and skeletons from Namibia in Berlin: results of the Charité Human Remains Project

Holger Stoecker Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

holger.stoecker@rz.hu-berlin.de

Andreas Winkelmann

Medizinische Hochschule Brandenburg – Theodor Fontane

andreas.winkelmann@mhb-fontane.de

Abstract

From 2010 to 2013 the Charité Human Remains Project researched the provenance of the remains of fifty-seven men and women from the then colony of German South West Africa. They were collected during German colonial rule, especially but not only during the colonial war 1904–8. The remains were identified in anthropological collections of academic institutions in Berlin. The article describes the history of these collections, the aims, methods and interdisciplinary format of provenance research as well as its results and finally the restitutions of the remains to Namibia in 2011 and 2014.

Key words: Namibia, Charité Berlin, provenance research, colonial contexts, restitution, remains of colonial war and genocide

Project development and objectives

In 2008, the Namibian Embassy made an official inquiry to Charité's administration as to whether it held bones in its existing anthropological collections that had been brought to Berlin from then German South West Africa during the colonial period. Public interest created pressure, especially after the television programme 'Colonial Legacy' aired in the ARD series *FAKT* in July 2008. The initial response to the Namibian Embassy was based on a rapid search through the catalogues of the anatomical collection and the collections of the Museum of Medical History. At least nine skulls could clearly be assigned such a provenance and belonged to the context of the colonial war of 1904–8, and the Charité was willing to repatriate them. At the same time, those responsible for overseeing the collection (Andreas Winkelmann and Thomas Schnalke) determined that deeper research was required to ascertain the provenance of the remains in question, as well as additional remains of Namibian origin. They therefore decided to apply for research support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft/German Research Foundation (DFG), which after some preliminary work was awarded at the end of 2009. The first direct talks between the Namibian Embassy, the Federal Foreign Office and Charité took place in parallel to this endeavour in October 2009 and June 2010.

The DFG funding enabled the Charité Human Remains Project to commence its work and to hire a physical anthropologist, an ethnologist and a historian in October 2010. The two academics in charge of the collection, both medically qualified and with additional qualifications in medical anthropology and the history of medicine, respectively, led the interdisciplinary team, while Beate Kunst provided additional support as curator of the museum's collections.

The Project's objective was comprehensive research into the provenance of holdings in the collections from Africa and Australia (which was the subject of an inquiry in 2008). Given the political urgency, it was quickly decided that the research on Africa would focus on Namibia. Over the course of the Project, there were additional related enquiries from New Zealand and Paraguay,¹ and the original plans to conduct 'proactive' research on the collections as opposed to performing it only in response to enquiries had to be set aside. The goal was not only to determine the provenance and the context in which these remains were acquired, but also to place them in the frameworks of scholarship and colonial history. Furthermore, the Project aimed to establish standards for interdisciplinary research on the provenance of human remains in colonial collections, because prior to that date there were none. Because the methods and vocabularies of the natural sciences and the humanities are so distinct, it was a great challenge to establish a common denominator. In principle, our provenance research began with a given item in the collection and the related extant documentation, which included inscriptions on a skull, attached labels and additional notes or records in surviving catalogues. In part, these records yielded information such as biological sex, communities of origin, who first made the acquisition, carriers and handlers, dates, locations and regions, and in rare cases the name of the person from whom the remains originated. This information has been handed down in varying combinations and to different degrees of thoroughness. One problem was that the documentation for the 'S Collection' (skulls collection) was almost entirely lost during the Second World War and that only fragments from the anatomical collection were preserved. A further challenge lay in the fact that it was often unclear who had recorded the information and when.

Additionally, the Project evaluated a variety of contemporary reports and accounts of collectors published in colonial newspapers, as well as historical academic publications. Such sources can provide further details pertaining to the ethnic origins of some remains and to their collectors and carriers, regions of origin and the circumstances under which the remains were obtained. Research in the German and Namibian archives focused particularly on collectors and handlers of the remains who could be identified by name.

The documents surviving in the archives primarily convey the perspective of the collectors and their milieus. Only rarely are the viewpoints of those affected conveyed, and when they do come to light it is indirectly. However, if one approaches the documents with attention to these hidden voices, they sometimes yield resoundingly clear statements. For instance, in 1908 the Imperial Colonial Office in Berlin responded to a formal request to transfer the bodies of several San from Windhoek to the Ethnological Museum of Berlin with the misgiving 'that a storm of

protest would break out among the natives if such remains were to be exhumed and taken away.²

Further research synthesised the physical-anthropological examination of the human remains with historical research pertaining to the acquisition of the item in the collection and the additional historical context. We compiled documentation on each item, at first keeping these three categories separate in order to develop a synopsis of congruencies and discrepancies, to analyse the reliability of the evidence and ultimately to reconstruct an 'object history' and to make a recommendation for possible restitution. In the case of human remains, the 'object history' that is customary in other branches of provenance research should become a 'subject history', of which the collector's historical objectification inevitably forms a part.

The methods of physical anthropology may be classified as invasive and non-invasive. Since the communities from which the remains originated (Namibia and Australia) strongly disapprove of invasive, that is, destructive methods, we abstained from these (DNA tests, strontium isotope analysis and histological examination of the bones). Non-invasive methods, i.e. simple observation and if necessary measurement of the bones, can be used to gauge the age and sex to a certain degree of likelihood and to diagnose certain illnesses and traumas (paleopathology). However, it is rarely possible to determine a certain cause of death, especially when only a skull remains. Finally, evidence of how the remains were stored after death (taphonomy) may be found, for example, in traces of earth and signs of weathering, which may suggest e.g. burial. In this regard, it is unusual for an anthropologist working in an archaeological context to ask whether the bones reveal signs of maceration, suggesting that the flesh was removed shortly after death to prepare an anatomical bone specimen. Cultural practices seldom leave behind direct traces on bones that allow them to be identified with a specific ethnic group. Rare examples are the deformities of the skullcap found in ancient Peruvian skulls, and in our case, alterations to the teeth that are typical of the Herero.

Finally, holes drilled for sampling, grinding marks and incisions on the bones serve as evidence of scientific analyses of the specimens in the collection, which also belong to the object biography of each anthropological specimen.

A wide-ranging published volume of conference proceedings is one of the major results of the Charité Human Remains Project, although it includes only a portion of the provenance research.³ This article serves as the first comprehensive report on our research on Namibian human remains.⁴

Provenance research findings

Over the course of the nineteenth century in Berlin, multiple anthropological collections were formed, and continued to grow until after the First World War. During the long period of their existence, they belonged to different institutions. Nevertheless, in terms of both general and collections history they are closely connected. This metropolitan network included collections, curators, collectors on location, scientists, museums, journals, universities and Charité, with the prominent Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory (BGAEU) at the

centre. Some of the Society's most active members are closely tied to the history of specific collections and collection materials: the pathologists and collectors Rudolf Virchow (1821–1902) and David von Hansemann (1858–1920), the anthropologists Felix von Luschan (1854–1924) and Eugen Fischer (1874–1967), as well as the anatomists Wilhelm Waldeyer (1836–1921), Robert Hartmann (1832–93), Gustav Fritsch (1838–1927) and Hans Virchow (1852–1940), the son of Rudolf Virchow. The Society was founded in 1869 and its heyday was in the decades before and after 1900, that is, during the German colonial period. The collections that will be described in further detail below all had similar intentions; they maintained exchange relationships with each other and with other collections. Moreover, their substantial holdings largely stemmed from the widespread collecting mania. Although this practice was not limited to the German colonies, it was often vigorously supported by the local colonial infrastructure.

The oldest Berlin collection of human specimens, which goes back to the eighteenth century, is held at the Center of Anatomy at the Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin. After the founding of the University in Berlin in 1810, what was then the Anatomical-Zootomical Museum expanded to several thousand specimens under the direction of anatomy professors Karl Asmund Rudolphi (1771–1832), Johannes Müller (1801–58) and Karl Bogislaus Reichert (1811–83). For the most part the specimens came from Germany and Europe, and to a lesser extent from outside Europe on all the other continents. In 1884, after the closure of the museum and the transfer of its animal specimens to the newly founded Natural History Museum in Berlin, the *human* specimens came, under Wilhelm Waldeyer's direction, to the Anatomical Institute at Berlin University, known today as the Center of Anatomy at the Charité. Around the time of the First World War, the skulls from this collection became part of the so-called 'Racial Skull Collection', which included more than 800 specimens, overwhelmingly from non-European regions.⁵

Over the course of the provenance research, twenty-eight skulls in the Charité's Anatomical Collection were identified as having been brought from what is today Namibia to Berlin between 1904 and 1914. The ethnic classifications made by the original acquirers or overseers of the collection indicate that they comprised the remains of thirteen Nama, eleven Herero, two Ovambo and two San. Most of these were the remains of victims of the German colonial Herero Wars of 1904–8, among them twenty Nama and Herero who died in the concentration camp on Shark Island and whose remains were returned to Namibia in 2011,⁶ as well as four additional Herero whose remains were transferred to Germany during the Herero Wars. These human remains were sent to Berlin in the form of both skull specimens and preserved heads. The majority of the human remains of the prisoners and casualties of the colonial wars of 1904–8 that came to Berlin became part of the collection of the Berlin Anatomical Institute. The background for this deliberate 'supply' was that the Institute's Director, Geheimrat (Privy Councillor) Wilhelm Waldeyer, had had many students who went on to work as medical doctors in the Imperial *Schutztruppe* (the German colonial army in Africa) and in the internment camps and who willingly sent him this 'research material'. By the same token, Waldeyer used his privileged network of institutions and agents of the

German colonial administration in German South West Africa in order to acquire the human remains of indigenous peoples during the colonial war. For example, in 1905–6, Waldeyer ordered and received ‘brains of natives from German South West Africa’ from the Schutztruppe command.⁷

Another Berlin anthropological collection was the so-called ‘S Collection’, in which the ‘S’ stands for skull. Felix von Luschan founded and oversaw it at the Royal Museum for Ethnology in Berlin. The anthropologist, doctor and ethnographer was Director of the Museum’s African and Oceanic department from 1904, and from 1909 he served as Director of the anthropological department. Additionally, since 1889 he had taught at Berlin University, which appointed him to Associate Professor in 1900 and to full Professor of Physical Anthropology in 1909.⁸ After Luschan’s death in 1924, the S Collection was transferred to Berlin University. Thereafter, at the behest of Eugen Fischer, who succeeded Luschan as the Berlin Chair of Anthropology and was then one of the leading German anthropologists and eugenicists, it went to the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics in Berlin-Dahlem. In the early 1940s, the plan was for the collection to be given to a new Institute for Racial Biology at the University of Berlin, but the Institute was never completed. After the Second World War the S Collection, for which most of the collection records had been lost, was moved to the Anthropology Department at the Humboldt University of Berlin, which was then under the direction of Hans Grimm (1910–95), where it has been cared for and studied since 1955. In 1964 a new inventory was begun. The collection encompasses remains from more than 5,300 individuals from around the globe, most of which were collected between 1890 and 1923.⁹ For conservation reasons, at the end of 2011 the S Collection and most of the Anatomy Department’s ‘Racial Skull Collection’ were given to the Museum of Prehistory and Early History, one of the Berlin State Museums of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation. Since then, they have been curated as the ‘Luschan Collection’.

Provenance research revealed that there were skulls, skeletons and skeletal parts from twenty-nine individuals in the S Collection, which were brought from German South West Africa to Berlin between 1896 and 1912. According to the historical classifications, these were the remains of nine San, eight Herero, eight Nama, two Damara and one Ovambo. It is highly likely that four of the Herero skeletons are from victims of the colonial war of 1904–8. Another skeleton, which had been recovered in 1909 from one of the mines owned by the Otavi Mining Company, was dated as prehistoric and can therefore not be assigned to an ethnic group.

Documentation pertaining to the arrival of the S Collection in the archive of the Ethnological Museum in Berlin reveals that some items were lost, the reasons for which are no longer clear. The same goes for the Racial Skull Collection at the Institute of Anatomy. Contemporary publications also document items from the collection that are now lost, including a set of fifty-three larynxes from Nama and Herero individuals from the concentration camp on Shark Island.¹⁰ It may therefore be assumed that the holdings of human remains in both collections were originally far more extensive.

The third Berlin collection is known as the Rudolf Virchow Collection ('RV Collection') and encompasses human skulls and skeletons collected by the Berlin pathologist Rudolf Virchow. Like Luschan, Virchow also encouraged naval officers, travelling researchers, missionaries, colonial administrators and military doctors to collect anthropological objects. In 1902, Virchow bequeathed the collection to the BGAEU, which inventoried it for the first time. Since the interwar years, the RV Collection and the S Collection have been stored – since 1999 as a long-term loan at the Charité – and curated together, and have been used for medical-anthropological research. While Germany was divided, the largely preserved collection records were held in West Berlin and were not accessible to the curators of the RV Collection in East Berlin. To that end, a new inventory was begun in 1964. Since German reunification, the RV Collection has been in the possession of the BGAEU, and since 2010 it has been held in the repository of the Museum of Prehistory and Early History of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation.¹¹ The RV Collection currently contains about 3,500 objects.

Shortly after the Charité Human Remains Project began, the BGAEU indicated that it did not wish to have the RV Collection included in the provenance research as had been planned originally. Thus, eleven sets of remains, which likely originated in what is today Namibia, have not been the subject of further research.¹² Nevertheless, the remains in the RV Collection became subject to a claim for restitution from Namibia.

The network of anthropological collections in the metropolis of the German empire also encompassed the so-called teaching collection. Felix von Luschan established it as a private collection with the intention of eventually presenting it to a future Department of Anthropology at Berlin University, although this did not come to pass after his appointment as full Professor of Anthropology. For the teaching collection, the wealthy anthropologist primarily acquired new additions for which the senders required compensation, which he paid with his own funds. By contrast, Luschan gave to the underfunded anthropological collection of the Museum of Ethnology (which later became the S Collection) 'all the donated skulls, skeletons, soft tissues etc. [...] The main thing is that such anthropological material is concentrated somewhere and that it is handed down to posterity safely and securely.'¹³ After Luschan's death in February 1924, the teaching collection itself became a valuable commodity. That same year, Luschan's widow sold it to the American Museum of Natural History in New York for \$41,500.¹⁴ The collection, which was compiled from the 1870s to 1923, now encompasses more than 5,600 skulls and skeletons collected from across the globe; it was the largest among the Berlin anthropological collections. Among other things, it includes the remains of eight individuals from former German South West Africa.¹⁵ Luschan's inscriptions on the objects reference ethnic classifications such as 'Damara', 'Ovatjimba/Herero' and 'Hottentot woman', as well as their local origins, including 'Walfisch Bay', 'Windhook' and 'Lüderitz Bay'.¹⁶ The Charité Project did not include objects from this collection in its research, but like the RV Collection it was nevertheless taken into account as part of the wider historical context.¹⁷

It may therefore be assumed that around the period of the First World War, the Berlin anthropological collections together held more than 15,000 skulls and skeletons of the most varied origins. In the collections, seventy-two sets of remains have been identified as from former German South West Africa. There is evidence in the indexes of additional remains, now lost. Collectors, senders and transporters of human remains from German South West Africa to the Berlin collections were in equal measure officers in the Imperial Schutztruppe (Konradin von Perbandt, Philalthes Kuhn, Otto Eggers, Richard Volkmann), colonial administrators (Berengar von Zastrow, Ralph Zürn), Stabsärzte (staff surgeons), government doctors and veterinarians (Albert Schöpwinkel, Anton Lübbert, Franz Goldammer, Karl Borchmann, Hugo Bofinger, Hugo Zöllner, Joseph Seibert) as well as directors of mining companies (Heinrich Lotz, Paul Heimann). Likewise, German, Austrian and Swiss travellers and explorers (Waldemar Belck, Hans Schinz, Ludwig Sander, Franz Seiner, Eduard Moritz, Leonhard Schultze(-Jena), Hermann von Wissmann) took part in the transfer of skulls to Berlin. The Director of Deutsche Bank and patron of natural history collections, Arthur von Gwinner, may also be counted among those who delivered human skulls.

Phases of collection

Human remains from modern-day Namibia were acquired and brought to Berlin in three phases. The first phase, from 1884/85 to about 1903, was characterised by the nominal beginning of German colonial rule over South West Africa. In the context of their research on the botanist Hans Schinz (1858–1941), who travelled in South West Africa from 1884 to 1887, Dag Henrichsen and Gesine Krüger observe that in the early phase of the colonial occupation there were often more ‘researchers [. . .] in German South West Africa than colonial officers and soldiers’.¹⁸ Schinz, who ‘in the slipstream of the imperial ambitions of the German Empire’¹⁹ took part in the Bremen merchant Adolf Lüderitz’s (1834–86) expedition to investigate the economic resources of South West Africa from 1884 to 1885, also sent three skulls back to the BGAEU. Waldemar Belck (1862–1932) had already sent two Nama skeletons. From the 1890s, military surgeons in the Imperial Schutztruppe and Navy increasingly began to participate in the collection and transfer of bones and human remains. The attributions of such remains to the local ethnic groups of the San, Herero, Nama and Ovambo are almost entirely based on the information passed on by the collectors. Accordingly, they should be regarded critically.

The second phase of the acquisition of anthropological specimens from German South West Africa for the Berlin collections spans the years of the genocidal colonial war that the German colonial power waged against the Herero and Nama from 1904 to 1908. Characterised by extreme colonial violence, this period of German colonial history in South West Africa brought about innumerable casualties. The wartime context in which these acquirers operated is reflected in the fact that the ‘skull collectors’ seem to have been primarily colonial and medical officers (see below).

The third and final collection phase lasted until 1914. It was characterised by the growing economic, administrative and infrastructural development of German South West Africa. During this period, almost all of the ‘skull collectors’ were

administrators, government doctors and geologists, or cartographers and land surveyors working in an official capacity, although there were some employees of private mining companies as well.

Skulls from the victims of the colonial war: Shark Island

When the German Commander-in-Chief Lieutenant General Lothar von Trotha's genocidal 'extermination order' against the Herero was rescinded, the imperial government ordered the establishment of 'concentration camps for the provisional accommodation & maintenance of the rest of the Herero people' at the end of 1904.²⁰ Although the ostensible purpose of the internment was the pacification of the occupied regions of the Herero and shortly thereafter the Nama federations, in reality the camps represented a continuation of the policy of extermination. The inhumane conditions in the German concentration camps caused a high rate of mortality among the Herero and Nama prisoners of war. In the notorious prisoners' camp on Shark Island, in Lüderitz Bay, where the interned men, women and children were housed in tents despite the extreme climate, given meagre, vitamin-poor rations and subjected to forced labour building railroads, there were just under 4,000 deaths. This amounted to 70 per cent of the Herero and Nama who were interned there between 1905 and 1908. In view of the prevailing conditions on the 'Island of Death', it seems justifiable to speak of an extermination of human life through negligence.²¹ One of the consequences of such poor conditions was scurvy (a vitamin C deficiency), which can be detected in many of the skulls from Shark Island.

In field hospital XII of the camp on Shark Island, the interns overseen by Stabsarzt (medical officer) Hugo Bofinger (1876–c. 1946) performed autopsies on the accumulating corpses of the prisoners. It is estimated that the heads of several dozen dead were removed, preserved in formalin and sent to the Anatomical Institute in Berlin in soldered metal canisters,²² thus fulfilling demands from the capital for anatomical specimens from the colony of German South West Africa. In Berlin, the number of human remains and specimens from what is now Namibia increased most significantly during the colonial war. Many of the skulls restituted by the *Charité* to Namibia in September 2011 were acquired during this period in circumstances that can be unambiguously defined as unjust.²³

Once they had arrived in Berlin, Waldeyer, the Director of the Institute, gave the heads to the anatomist and anthropologist Paul Bartels (1874–1914), who was then Assistant at the Anatomical Institute. Bartels himself carried out anatomical analyses of the facial musculature of twenty-five of the skulls, and made some of them available to his doctoral students Werner Grabert (b. 1890), Christian Fetzter (1883–1955) and Heinrich Zeidler (b. 1889) for 'racial anthropological' research.²⁴ As expected, their studies argued that the anatomical attributes 'of Hottentots [...] [bespeak] a lower level of development of the human race'²⁵ and that they 'justify the position that with respect to facial musculature, the Herero was subordinate to the European.'²⁶ At the time, these studies were explicitly criticised, primarily on account of their methodology. For example, in his review of Zeidler's dissertation, Luschan lamented that he had not been able to reconcile the contradiction 'that

many “Africans” have a highly developed “facial expression”, although their mimetic musculature is apparently inferior to and less developed than the European.²⁷ However, the underlying comparative approach of ‘racial research’ and the hierarchical conclusions of the studies were not called into question.²⁸ After the First World War, Hans Virchow also used the skulls, which had been macerated in the interim, for anatomical research.²⁹

An exemplary object biography

Two partially preserved skeletons found in the S Collection, with the collection numbers S 1322 and S 1323, underwent some typical transformations and changes in significance. Their acquisition and collection history includes a series of incisive moments in the object biographies of the holdings investigated here. In this case, initial information was provided by typical inscriptions on the skulls: ‘Naidaus Bushman // Omatjenne/ Outjo // G[erman] South West Africa // Imp[erial] Gov[ernment] // 1908.’ [*Naidaus Buschmann // Omatjenne /Outjo // D[eutsch] Süd-West-Afrika // Kaiserl[iches] Gouv[ernement] // 1908.*] The term ‘Naidaus Bushman’ refers to the ethnic attribution of the bones to a member of a San group from the region surrounding Naidaus, a location not far from the settlement and veterinary border in the north of the colony known as the ‘red line.’³⁰ ‘Omatjenne’ refers to a ranch situated between Outjo and Otjiwarongo. It is, however, unusual that no specific person is registered as the deliverer but, rather, an institution: the imperial government of German South West Africa. Over the course of the research, it became clear that Omatjenne and the skeletons were connected to a trial before the High Court of Appeals in Windhoek.³¹ Indeed, the National Archives in Windhoek hold a file on the proceedings. The contemporary South West African colonial press also covered the trial thoroughly.³² These sources made it possible to reconstruct the background and previous events.

They reveal that the German farmer Paul Wiehager took over Omatjenne ranch in the Outjo region in June 1905 at the age of twenty-three. The region north of Waterberg was considered unsafe even after the final battle against the Herero at Waterberg in August 1904. Attempts by the German administration and settlers to assert control over the nomadic populations, and especially over the San, and to integrate them into the colonial system led to tensions and incidents that the Germans summed up with expressions such as ‘Bushman plague’ or ‘Bushman problem.’³³ The imperial district authority of Outjo therefore granted Wiehager ‘police powers over the natives’, whereby he was permitted ‘to impose light punishment.’³⁴ After taking over the ranch, Wiehager felt ‘repeatedly disturbed and troubled by natives, especially by Bushpeople, on his property’; he accused them of stealing livestock and setting grass fires. On 8 November 1905, he and his local servant (‘Bambusen’) Fritz ‘patrolled the Omatjenne district and in the process captured 2 Bushmen’. Wiehager shot one of them right away and then took the second one to the farm to interrogate him ‘on the location of the *Buschmannwerft* [Bushman settlement]’. After the interrogation, Wiehager gave one of his employees, the mason Hannemann, the task of ‘also eliminating this Bushman’. Hannemann fulfilled this order by taking the man ‘into the field’ away from the farm the following morning

Holger Stoecker and Andreas Winkelmann

and shooting him. On 9 November 1905, Wiehager undertook another 'patrol' with his 'Bambusen' and the two mounted police Göbel and Schubert, who had been sent to Omatjenne 'as ranch protection', in order 'to destroy the Bushman settlement they had discovered and allegedly to settle them in Omatjenne'. They encountered some women and four men at the *Werft*,³⁵ which was four hours away by horse. After an ostensible attempt to flee, which the court found implausible, Wiehager shot one of the men himself and wounded two others. At Wiehager's order, Schubert put one of the wounded 'over the edge'. The other wounded man escaped, as did the fourth man.

Wiehager unabashedly described the events of 8 and 9 November, to which four San men fell victim, in detail in a 'private letter' of 10 November 1905 to the Deputy District Chief of Outjo, Captain von Wangenheim, as 'insignificant bushman matters'. Consequently, Wangenheim began an inquiry, during which time Wiehager attempted to recover his letter.

However, the investigation into Wiehager did not gain momentum until a year later, after further murders had come to pass. The two Damara women Uikabis (also: Nikabis) and Nabnas (also: Nabuis, Namans), 'an older woman and her child', were farm workers at Omatjenne. Around 23 or 25 October 1906, they had 'run away' from the ranch and were brought back shortly thereafter. To 'spoil [the idea of] running away for the natives once and for all', Wiehager ordered 'the women to be tied up behind the kraal, and to make sure they did not get anything to eat or drink'. The next morning, 'the younger one was already dead, the older still had some life in her'. Wiehager ostensibly 'ordered the woman strung up upon a tree to hang'. Afterwards, the witness Kunkudama fled with her daughter Khongas to Outjo, where she gave an account of the incidents in Omatjenne, at which point District Office Secretary Belzeck launched an investigation. The findings thereof are recounted in the verdict of the final court of appeal:

During the inspection of the first site of recovery in the cliffs by Oberarzt (senior medical officer) Dr. Schroeder and Belzeck on 30 October 1906, two skulls and two incomplete skeletons were found. The bones were still fatty and exhibited a red colour. The [ligaments] of the spine, the pelvis, and the joints were frayed and there were remains of muscular appendages still attached to the bones. A stone near one of the corpses was covered in fat. At the site, the smell of corpses was strong, and it remained when District Judge Blumhagen returned for an inspection on 5 November 1906. Based on these indications, Oberarzt Dr. Schroeder determined that the deaths must have taken place about five to six days before. After examining the body parts, the experts Dr. Jakobs and Dr. Nägele agreed with or at least did not contradict him. According to the experts' reports, the body parts originated from 2 female members of the Damara race, an older woman and a child. The experts were no longer able to detect traces of violence. However, the skeleton of the older woman has an intensely reddened area on the right joint surface between the 1st and 2nd cervical vertebrae, which could be the consequence of a severe strain or dislocation at the top of the cervical spine while the woman was alive. Further, most of the first cervical vertebra was missing, possibly due to a fracture, or because it was bitten off by wild animals.

These indications and reports clearly demonstrate that the body parts did not belong to women who had been buried by local people before the accused took over the ranch and later dug up by animals of prey, but rather from a woman and a small girl who died at approximately the same time at the site of recovery, where according to the accused the women had disappeared.

Over the course of the investigation in Omatjenne, the experts came across another victim of Wiehager's. The Herero woman Sarotte (also: Charlotte, Sarotti) had been employed as a cow herder since Wiehager had acquired the ranch. When one of the calves went missing in March 1906, she fled 'out of fear of harsh punishment'. After she was brought back by other farm labourers, Wiehager had her 'hands bound behind her back' with ox reins and 'had his Bambusen Fritz take her to the cliffs behind the farm. There he brought her down with a shot in the back.' Schroeder and Belzeck discovered the remains of her corpse on 30 October 1906:

a skull, pieces of bone and the remains of some clothing. The bones were bleached and some of them had been crushed by the teeth of wild animals. In the skull cavity, there were the remains of a dried-out, but still fatty brain mass. On the left petrous bone there was still a fatty sheen. The point where the 7th cranial nerve emerges was blocked by a dried-out mass. In both eye sockets there was a thin layer of dried-out muscle mass.

It was further determined that the

skull came from a person who died around March/April 1906. The shape of the skull suggests that it came from an adult Herero woman. In the beginning, the experts had assumed that the skull must have come from a man on account of its abnormal size, however Stabsarzt Dr. Nägele's later measurements of skulls of deceased Herero women were about the same size, which led to the experts' postulation that the skull could also have been from a Herero woman.

It is noteworthy that craniometry functioned here as a forensic method for reconstructing a homicide.

There were three court cases against Wiehager for the murders of four San men, a Herero woman and the two Damara women, in addition to the attempted bribing of an official. In the historiography of the colonial history of South West Africa, the case of Wiehager has repeatedly served as an example of the German settlers' excessive violence against the indigenous population.³⁶ The Wiehager case was in its brutality by no means an exception, although it is apparently the only one that has left a trace in an anthropological collection in Germany. The trial was heard by three different courts, with interim partial acquittals between December 1906 and May 1907, and closed with Wiehager's conviction and a concurrent sentence of nine years in prison. After six years' imprisonment in Herford Prison (Westfalen), including prolonged periods of parole, he was pardoned by Kaiser Wilhelm II in 1913.³⁷

The bodies of the murdered Damara women found in Omatjenne were taken as *corpus delicti* to the High Court of Appeals in Windhoek. The bodies were clearly macerated for the court proceedings and provisionally preserved for conservation. It is probable that in this context the remains of the Damara women were reclassified as ‘Bushman skeletons’.

After the close of the trial both skeletons became disputed objects. The government school in Windhoek and the state museum that was then being built in Windhoek both made claims. However, it was Felix von Luschan in Berlin who ultimately obtained them. Heinrich Lotz, then government geologist in German South West Africa and a fervent collector of geological and ethnological specimens and human skulls, told Luschan that in the Imperial District Court of Windhoek ‘there were 5 or 7 Bushman bodies preserved in alcohol, that were originally from Omatjenne near Outjo and had been used for the now settled Wiehager trial.’³⁸

The Imperial Colonial Office in Berlin, however, raised concerns over a transfer to Berlin. Friedrich von Lindequist, who had recently returned from his position as Governor of German South West Africa and was then Undersecretary in the Imperial Colonial Office in Berlin, argued: ‘The native belief regarding the nature of the dead body is extraordinarily sensitive and one must keep this belief in mind if one does not want to provoke disagreeable complications.’³⁹ The governor in Windhoek was advised to fulfil Luschan’s request only if ‘taking away the remains would not have any political consequences for the natives.’⁴⁰ Here, as in other cases, reservations about transferring skulls were more pronounced in the colonial administration in the metropolis than in the local administration. Shortly thereafter, Luschan sent his thanks for the remittance of two skulls and incomplete skeletons of those ‘Bushmen’ who had been killed in Omatjenne near Outjo.⁴¹

At the beginning of the 1920s, the anthropologist Hans Weinert (1887–1967) used the skulls S 1322 and S 1323 for comparative anatomical studies of sinuses, and probably also for a further comparative anthropological study of skulls.⁴² Weinert achieved his postdoctoral qualification in Berlin in 1926, in part on account of his sinus study. From 1927, he was custodian of the S Collection at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics; during the Third Reich he served as an expert on racial hygiene. It remains unclear whether the transection and apparent sampling of the left humerus of one of the women (S 1322) are Weinert’s doing or whether they happened later.

In this case, the provenance research led to the correct attribution of ethnicity, as well as the reconstruction of the circumstances of death and individual names. The biological-anthropological analysis revealed the sex and age of death (30–50 and c. 12 years). Thus, at least a minimum of individuality has been returned to the remains that colonial scientific processes rendered anonymous.

The fate of the skulls and skeletons in Berlin

The remains brought to Berlin were considered as valuable ‘research material’ and accordingly were handled with care. Thus, despite two world wars and, in some cases, multiple moves, they have remained remarkably well preserved apart from the aforementioned losses, which were especially marked in the collections of soft

tissues. Given that the bones in question were brought to and stored in Berlin for research purposes, surprisingly few traces of such research can be found. While there are publications from the 1910s pertaining to most of the pieces of the Anatomical Collection discussed here, Felix Luschan was clearly too busy collecting to perform much research on his S Collection. Later use by other anthropologists remained cursory. In the 1920s, Hans Virchow was the only one to publish further on the items in the Anatomical Collection;⁴³ and only Weinert published on the S Collection.⁴⁴ Around 1940 the Croatian anthropologist Franjo Ivaniček apparently took several bone samples from the S Collection for comparative measurements of skull thickness, including the skulls numbered S 840 and S 841, but he did not address any African skulls in his single publication on the subject.⁴⁵ Despite the fact that the S Collection was stored in the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics, it was not possible to establish a direct relationship to the 'racial research' of the Nazi period. This is surely because Director Eugen Fischer did not put much stock in the traditional 'skull measuring' school of anthropology. Since the 1960s and 1970s, that is, during the period of the German Democratic Republic, the Berlin anthropological collections were used for investigations on the state of dentition of indigenous populations as well as the migratory movements and diets of pre-industrial populations. They were also used to train students of anthropology and ethnography.⁴⁶ More recent anthropological studies omitted the parts of the collection from Namibia.⁴⁷

The restitutions of 2011 and 2014

Due to political pressure, it was not possible to follow our original plan to organise restitution after we had completed our research, which we estimated would take two years. Hence, at the beginning of 2011, plans were made to hand over twenty skulls (eleven from Herero and nine from Nama individuals) in the summer of 2011. Planning for such an occasion was a challenge, because neither party had prior experience. Negotiations were carried out between the two Project directors, alongside representatives from Charité's management and press office, and the Namibian Embassy, with the cooperation of the Federal Foreign Office. There was no direct contact with Namibia. From our perspective, it was especially important to clarify how the transfer should take place, whether the Namibian delegation would inspect the remains and if they wanted to be informed of the historical details, whether the remains would be visible in any way during the transfer and, finally, how they should be packed and transported. An important question of protocol arose, namely who should hand the remains over to whom. Considering the political significance of the handover, the Namibian representatives expected that a German governmental representative would hand over the remains to a Namibian counterpart. However, the German government neither wanted to present itself as the consignor of the remains, nor could it formally do so, because the government itself was never 'in possession' thereof. Moreover, it was not authorised to instruct the Charité, as the current academic 'owner' of the remains, to do so. The Federal Foreign Office's refusal to play an active role in the handover almost ended in a row and

the early departure of the delegation. In the end, the Charité officially handed over the remains to the Namibian National Heritage Council.

The Namibian party quickly accepted our recommendation to pack the skulls in question in sturdy, discreet museum boxes along with documentation of the results of our research. The documentation for each set of remains was handed over in the form of an 80-page booklet and in digital form (the length is due to the inclusion of copies of historical documents and publications).⁴⁸ Since the names and exact dates of birth and death were not known, it did not seem feasible to transport the remains as if in a normal repatriation of mortal remains, i.e. in a coffin or an urn with the relevant personal documents. This question of transport was resolved when the Namibian delegation brought the remains aboard their plane as 'diplomatic cargo'.

The representatives of the Namibian Embassy neither ruled out nor required that all twenty of the skulls be presented visibly at the handover ceremony. Since presenting them in the open seemed improper, and because it was logistically difficult to present each of the twenty skulls under glass, we arrived at an agreement with the Namibian Ambassador that one Nama and one Herero skull would be presented under a bell jar as a representative display.

The turbulent week of the restitution, for which a delegation of more than seventy travelled from Namibia, began with a press conference on Monday, 26 September 2011. During the preceding week, we had shown the remains to a Namibian delegation including experts from the National Museum in Windhoek and shared our findings with them. On Tuesday, we as project collaborators met the delegation for the first time in a lecture hall at the Charité. During this 'familiarisation' meeting, the twenty skulls were displayed in open boxes. We presented our limited knowledge of the origins of the skulls and the fate of these persons, which was received with much criticism.⁴⁹ Some members of the delegation thought we were trying to deny colonial violence because we had not been able to determine the causes of death by means of the skulls (apart from the assumed effects of scurvy) and could not ascertain any signs of physical violence. Since oral tradition in Namibia tells of research on brains to prove lesser intelligence,⁵⁰ which indeed had taken place in other cases in Berlin,⁵¹ our inconclusive results on the fate of the brains also provoked mistrust. On Thursday of that week, Zephania Kameeta, Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia, led a memorial service at St Matthew church with the support of Dr Volker Faigle, Plenipotentiary of the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany. The research project collaborators brought the twenty skulls to St Matthew church for the service. At the behest of the Namibian delegation, two of the skulls were shown there under glass as well, and the rest were in their boxes, which were shrouded with Namibian flags. Lastly, that Friday the remains were displayed in the same way on the stage of a large lecture hall in the Charité for the solemn ceremonial transfer. During the speech by Cornelia Pieper, Minister of State at the Federal Foreign Office, it became clear that the expectation that she would apologise in the name of the German government was in vain. There were loud protests, especially from the local supporters of the Namibian delegation, and tumultuous scenes that led Pieper to exit the auditorium without hearing the speeches of the Namibian representatives.

Table 1 An overview of the findings from the provenance research, sorted by collector/researcher/deliverer

Collection no.	Remains	Collector/researcher	Time	Place	Sex/age	Ethnic attribution	Restituted
S 4708	incomplete skeleton	?	?	Walfishbay area	m 30–60	Nama	2018
A 787	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	m 16–20	Nama	2011
A 788	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	m 3–4	Nama	2011
A 789	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	m 40–50	Nama	2011
A 790	skull	Bartels	1905/07	Shark Island	f 30–40	Nama	2014
A 792	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	f 19–20	Nama	2011
A 793	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	m 45–50	Nama	2011
A 794	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	m 30–35	Nama	2011
A 796	skull	Bartels	1905/06	Shark Island	m 20–25	Herero	2011
A 798	skull	Bartels	1905/07	Shark Island	f 25–40	Nama	2018
A 801	skull	Bartels	1905–7	Shark Island	f 25–30	Herero	2011
A 802	skull	Bartels	1905–7	Shark Island	m 35–40	Herero	2011
A 803	skull	Bartels	1905–7	Shark Island	m 25–30	Herero	2011
A 807	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	m 40–45	Nama	2011
A 808	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	m 17–20	Nama	2011
A 809	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	f 45–55	Nama	2011
A 810	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	f 23–30	Nama	2011
A 813	skull	Bartels	1905–7	Shark Island	m 20–25	Herero	2011
A 817	skull	Bartels	1904–8	Shark Island	f 20–25	Nama	2011
A 833	skull	Bartels	1905–7	Shark Island	m 20–35	Herero	2011
A 834	skull	Bartels	1905–7	Shark Island	m 30–40	Herero	2011
O Cha V63	left scapula	Borchmann	1896	Gobabis	adult	Nama	2018

Table 1 Continued

Collection no.	Remains	Collector/researcher	Time	Place	Sex/age	Ethnic attribution	Restituted
S 4539	skull	Goldammer, Hansemann	1904/05	German South West Africa	m 25–35	Herero	2018
S 4540	skull	Goldammer Hansemann	1904/05	German South West Africa	f 30–50	Nama	2018
S 4567	skull	Hansemann	After 1905	German South West Africa	? 30–40	Herero	2018
S 4568	skull	Hansemann	After 1905	German South West Africa	f 20	Herero	2018
S 1322	incomplete skeleton	Kaiserl. Gouvern.	1906	Outjo	f 30–50	Damara	2014
S 1323	incomplete skeleton	Kaiserl. Gouvern.	1906	Outjo	f 12	Damara	2014
S 840	skull	Kuhn/ Eggers	c. 1900	Ojituo	f 20–30	San	2014
S 841	skull	Kuhn/ Eggers	c. 1900	Ojituo	f 18–20	San	2018
A 805	skull	Lotz	1909/10	Buntfeldschuh (Sperrgebiet)	m 6	San	2014
A 811	skull	Lotz	1909/10	Buntfeldschuh (Sperrgebiet)	m 30–40	San	2014
A 819	skull	Lotz	1910	Zillertal / Kolmannskuppe	m 30–35	Ovambo	2014
S 865	skeleton	Lübbert	1899/1900	Grootfontein	f 13–17	San	2018
S 866	skeleton	Lübbert	1899/1900	Grootfontein	f 16–18	San	2018
S 4016	+mandible ⁸⁶⁵ skeleton	Moritz	1911/12	South Namibia, Aurus mountains	f 30–55	San	2014/ 2018
S 4017	skull	Moritz	1911/12	South Namibia	m 18–20	Nama	2014
S 591	skull	Perbandt	1898	near Waldfish Bay	f 20–30	Nama	2014
S 592	skull	Perbandt	1898	near Waldfish Bay	foetus	Nama	2014
La 6702	skull	Schultze-Jena	1903–5	Zachas (near Gobabis)	f 12–18	San	2018
La 7209	skull	Schultze-Jena	1903 or 1905	Swakopmund	m 45–55	Herero	2018
A 1914/83	skull/mask	Seibert	1912	Windhoek	m 17–20	Ovambo	2014

Table 1 Continued

Collection no.	Remains	Collector/researcher	Time	Place	Sex/age	Ethnic attribution	Restituted
S 4010	skeleton	Seiner	1911/12	Kavango area		Ovambo	2018
S 4011	skeleton	Seiner	1911	Epata or Grootfontein	m 18–20	San	2014
S 4012	skull	Seiner	1911	Epata or Grootfontein	? 7–9	San	2014
S 4013	skull	Seiner	1911/12	Kalahari/ Omaheke	f 20–24	Herero	2014
S 4014	skull	Seiner	1911/12	Kalahari/ Omaheke	f 18–19	Herero	2014
S 4015	skull	Seiner	1911/12	Kalahari/ Omaheke	f 18–20	Herero	2018
A 299	skull	v. Gwinner, H. Virchow	1904–8	?	m 15–17	Herero	2011
A 299	skull	v. Gwinner, H. Virchow	1904–8	?	m 18–22	Herero	2011
S 4179	skull	v. Zastrow	1913(?)	near Grootfontein	m 20–30	San	2014
La 5771	skull	Volkmann, Krantz	1894–1906	German South West Africa	? 20–30	Nama	2018
S 593	skull	Wissmann	1898	Okahandja	f 10–15	Nama	2014
A 50	skull	Zöllner	1904/05	Epukiro, Omaheke	f 35–40	Herero	2014
A 51	skull	Zöllner	1904/05	Ovumbo (Okahandja)	f 25–40	Herero	2014
S 1105	skull	Zürn	1901/04	Okahandja	f 50–69	Herero	2018
S 1338	incomplete skeleton	Heimann	1909	Tsumeb	f > 60	(prehistoric)	2018

Note: Numbers with prefix A belong to the anatomical collection, and all others to the S collection.⁵²

Since our research was drawn out longer than expected, not least because of the extensive preparations for the restitutions to Namibia and Australia, it was still not possible to return all of the Namibian human remains during the second transfer on 5 March 2014, which included the remains of twenty-one individuals (see Table 1). The scale of the restitution was considerably reduced, and the Namibian delegation had fewer than ten members. The events took place on a single day: the presentation and discussion of the remains with Namibian representatives and the project collaborators,⁵³ and then in the afternoon the ceremonial handover, during which the remains were not on view. The restitution was officially made by the Charité to the National Heritage Council. The attempt by the Charité and the Federal Foreign Office to restrict admission to the ceremony to prevent protests against the German policy led to accusations of racism and fierce protests in front of the Anatomy building. Ultimately, the Namibian Ambassador arranged for free admittance to the ceremony just before it began, and the ceremony itself remained peaceful.

During the final stages of proofreading for this article, a third handover of human remains to a Namibian delegation took place in Berlin on 28–29 August 2018. The related events are therefore not described here, but we have updated the numbers and the information in Table 1. The handover included remains from Charité of 16 individuals and in addition skeletal parts related to a skull returned in 2014 (S4016).

Concluding remarks

During the second restitution in March 2014, the skeletons of the two women whose murders have been described at length above were also returned. A photograph of their remains in an open box taken during the restitution ceremony was used to illustrate a report in the popular Namibian newspaper *Namibian Sun* about a planned exhibition on the Herero and Nama genocide at the Dresden Museum of Armed Forces.⁵⁴ The question as to what extent the bones of these Damara women can actually serve as evidence for the genocide of the Herero and Nama was clearly secondary for this newspaper report. However, it exemplifies the way that the erstwhile anthropological specimens have been transformed into icons of the political debate surrounding Namibian–German colonial history.

In the end, decisions about restitution are always political. However, they rely on provenance research to determine where the remains originated and to shed light on the historical context and assess it ethically. Restitution without thoroughly evaluating the historical context is like dispensing with one's own history. In our experience, the anthropological assessment of human remains is an important part of provenance research, but the historical research yields more in terms of making the necessary assignments to historical, regional and ethnic contexts. This is also because a historical and political concern underlies the whole process of provenance research and restitution: to make possible a befitting appraisal of the legacy of colonial history.

Notes

Translated from German by Cadenza Academic Translations

- 1 Research on remains from New Zealand is ongoing. Repatriations to Australia were made in 2013, 2014 and 2017 and to Paraguay in 2012. See K. Koel-Abt and A. Winkelmann, 'The Identification and Restitution of Human Remains from an Aché girl Named "Damiana": An Interdisciplinary Approach', *Annals of Anatomy* 195 (2013), 393–400; A. Winkelmann and B. Teßmann, 'Identification and Return of a Skull from Tasmania in the Berlin Anatomical Collection', *Anthropologischer Anzeiger* 75:1 (2018), 39–47.
- 2 National Archives of Namibia (Windhoek), Central Bureau (ZBU), J.XII.E.2, Bl. 48: Friedrich Lindequist (Imperial Colonial Office) to Felix von Luschan, 1 June 1908.
- 3 H. Stoecker, T. Schnalke and A. Winkelmann (eds), *Sammeln, Erforschen, Zurückgeben? Menschliche Gebeine aus der Kolonialzeit in akademischen und musealen Sammlungen* (Berlin, Ch. Links, 2013).
- 4 Publications from the Project may be found under the heading 'Forschungsschwerpunkt "Human Remains in kolonialen Sammlungen [Research Focus: Human Remains in Colonial Collections]"' at the following link: www.mhb-fontane.de/institut-fuer-anatomie.html.
- 5 A. Winkelmann, 'Die Anatomische Sammlung der Berliner Universität und ihre anthropologischen Bestände', in Stoecker et al. (eds), *Sammeln, Erforschen, Zurückgeben?*, pp. 84–105.
- 6 National Archives of Namibia Windhoek (NAN), Accession A.0981: Repatriation of human remains, No. 1: Documentation recording the results of examinations carried out on twenty skulls from Namibia to determine their provenance [compiled by the Human Remains Project at the Charité, Berlin].
- 7 W. Waldeyer, 'Gehirne südwestafrikanischer Völker', in *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1906*, Berlin 1906, 3.
- 8 P. Ruggendorfer and H. D. Szemethy (eds), *Felix von Luschan (1854–1924). Leben und Wirken eines Universalgelehrten* (Vienna, Böhlau, 2009), pp. 17–19.
- 9 B. Kunst and U. Creutz, 'Geschichte der Berliner anthropologischen Sammlungen von Rudolf Virchow und Felix von Luschan', in Stoecker et al. (eds), *Sammeln, Erforschen, Zurückgeben?* pp. 69–83.
- 10 W. Grabert, 'Anthropologische Untersuchungen an Herero- und Hottentotten-Kehlköpfen', *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie*, 16 (1914), 65–93.
- 11 Kunst and Creutz, 'Geschichte'.
- 12 See the article by Hans Axasi †Eichab, Larissa Förster, Dag Henrichsen and Holger Stoecker in this issue.
- 13 State Museums of Berlin – Prussian Cultural Heritage, Museum of Ethnology Berlin, Archive (SMB-PK, EM), IB 39, Vol. 2, E 1708/1906, Luschan to Schoolmaster Quantz, 13 October 1906; see Kunst and Creutz, 'Geschichte', pp. 91–2.

- 14 American Museum of Natural History New York (AMNH), Anthropological Department, Archives, Luschan Collection, folder 1 of 2: American Museum of Natural History, Accession Record 25102, 5. and 14.5.1924.
- 15 AMNH, Division of Anthropology, Archives, Online Finding Aid, Luschan papers.
- 16 AMNH, Division of Anthropology, Luschan Collection.
- 17 D. A. Gross, 'The Troubling Origins of the Skeletons in a New York Museum. Thousands of Herero People Died in a Genocide. Why are Herero skulls in the American Museum of Natural History?', *New Yorker*, 24 January 2018.
- 18 D. Henrichsen and G. Krüger, 'Darf man alles sammeln? "Kreuz- und Querzüge in Afrika"', in G. Beckmann (ed.), *Man muss eben alles sammeln! Der Zürcher Botaniker und Forschungsreisende Hans Schinz und seine ethnographische Sammlung Südwestafrika* (Zürich, Verlag Neue Zürcher Zeitung/Völkerkundemuseum der Universität Zürich, 2012), p. 134.
- 19 *Ibid.*, p. 133.
- 20 Imperial Chancellor von Bülow to General von Trotha, 11 November 1904, cited after J. Kreienbaum, "'Vernichtungslager' in Deutsch-Südwestafrika? Zur Funktion der Konzentrationslager im Herero- und Namakrieg (1904–1908)', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 58:12 (2010), 1014. Cf. J. Zimmerer, 'Krieg, KZ und Völkermord in Südwestafrika. Der erste deutsche Genozid', in J. Zimmerer and J. Zeller (eds), *Völkermord in Deutsch-Südwestafrika. Der Kolonialkrieg in Namibia (1904–1908) und seine Folgen* (Berlin, Ch. Links, 2004), pp. 45–63 (published in English translation as *Genocide in German South-West Africa: The Colonial War (1904–1908) and its Aftermath* (Monmouth, Merlin Press, 2008); C. W. Erichsen, *The Angel of Death had Descended Violently among Them: Concentration Camps and Prisoners-of-War in Namibia, 1904–08* (Leiden, African Studies Centre, 2005), pp. 65–144.
- 21 C. W. Erichsen, 'Forced Labour in the Concentration Camp on Shark Island', in Zimmerer and Zeller (eds), *Genocide in German South-West Africa*, pp. 84–99.
- 22 Cf. H. F. Zeidler, 'Beiträge zur Anthropologie der Herero', *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie*, 17 (1915), 185.
- 23 A. Winkelmann, 'Zeugen zweier Geschichten – Die Charité gab Schädel aus der Kolonialzeit nach Namibia zurück', *Deutsches Ärzteblatt*, 109:15 (2012), A754–5.
- 24 Grabert, 'Anthropologische Untersuchungen', pp. 66–94; C. Fetzer, 'Rassenanatomische Untersuchungen an 17 Hottentottenköpfen', *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie*, 16 (1914), 95–156; H. F. Zeidler, 'Beiträge zur Anthropologie der Herero', *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie*, 17 (1915), 185–246; H. F. Zeidler, 'Beiträge zur Anthropologie der Gesichtswichteile der Neger', *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie*, 21 (1919), 153–84.
- 25 Fetzer, 'Rassenanatomische Untersuchungen an 17 Hottentottenköpfen', pp. 149f.
- 26 Zeidler, 'Beiträge zur Anthropologie der Herero', p. 244.
- 27 Review by Felix von Luschan at Humboldt University in Berlin, University Archive, Phil. Fak. Promotionen, 549, pp. 331f. Virchow was also critical, 'Zeidler, Heinrich F.B.: Beiträge zur Anthropologie der Herero' [Review], pp. 197–9. Fetzer was not awarded a doctorate for this study.

- 28 T. Schnalke, ‘“Normale” Wissenschaft – Ein Berliner Beitrag zur “Anthropologie der Herero” von 1914’, in Stoecker et al. (eds), *Sammeln, Erforschen, Zurückgeben?*, pp. 170–81.
- 29 H. Virchow, ‘Muskelmarken am Schädel’, *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 42 (1910), 638–54; H. Virchow, ‘Zur Anthropologie der Nase’, *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 56 (1924), 94–111.
- 30 G. Miescher, *Die Rote Linie. Geschichte der Veterinär- und Siedlungsgrenze in Namibia, 1890er–1960er Jahre* (Basel, Basler Afrika-Bibliographien, 2013), p. 35. Published in English as G. Miescher, *Namibia’s Red Line. The History of a Veterinary and Settlement Border* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
- 31 National Archives of Namibia (NAN), Obergericht [High Court of Appeals] Windhuk (OGW), H28/07, Strafprozess-Sache gegen den Farmer Paul Wiehager. Mord und Anderes [Criminal proceedings against the farmer Paul Wiehager. Murder and other charges]. Special thanks to Werner Hillebrecht, the former Director of the NAN, for making these files available.
- 32 *Südwestafrikanische Zeitung* (Swakopmund) and *Windhuker Nachrichten* (Windhoek).
- 33 ‘Buschmann-Plage’ and ‘Buschmann-Problem’, respectively. U. Dieckmann, *Hai||om in the Etosha Region: A History of Colonial Settlement, Ethnicity and Nature Conservation* (Basel, Basler Afrika-Bibliographien, 2007), p. 9.
- 34 Unless otherwise noted, the account is taken from: NAN, OGW, H28/07: Kaiserliches Obergericht zu Windhuk Urteil(e) gegen den Farmer Paul Wiehager [Imperial High Court of Appeals in Windhuk: Verdict(s) against the Farmer Paul Wiehager], 11–12 May 1907.
- 35 In North German and Dutch in the eighteenth century, the term ‘Werff’ indicated a ‘place in which one busily moves to and fro’ (W. Pfeifer et al., ‘Werff’, in W. Pfeifer et al., *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*, vol. 3 (Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1989), p. 1964). Around 1900, the colonial settlers in German South West Africa used it to refer to both larger and smaller, permanent and temporary settlements of the indigenous peoples (cf. K. Dove, ‘Werften’, in Schnee (ed.), *Deutsches Kolonial-Lexikon*, vol. III, p. 702).
- 36 L. Engel, *Kolonialismus und Nationalismus im deutschen Protestantismus in Namibia 1907 bis 1945* (Bern/Frankfurt a.M., Lang, 1976), p. 133; R. J. Gordon and S. D. Douglas, *The Bushman Myth. The Making of a Namibian Underclass* (Boulder CO, Westview Press, 2000), pp. 52–3; R. J. Gordon, ‘The Making of the “Bushman”’, *Anthropologica*, 34 (1992), 183–202.
- 37 Bundesarchiv (BArch) Berlin, R 1001–4852, 215: Wilhelm II., Begnadigung für die Reststrafe [Pardon for remaining sentence], 28 May 1913.
- 38 SMB-PK, EM, I. B. Africa, Vol. 44, E 1054/08: Lotz to Luschan, 5 April 1908.
- 39 NAN, ZBU, J.XII.E.2, 48: Lindequist to Luschan, 1 June 1908.
- 40 NAN, ZBU, J.XII.E.2, 47: Imperial Colonial Office to the Government in Windhoek, 1 June 1908.
- 41 BArch Berlin, R 151, F J.XII.E.2, 52: Luschan to the Imperial Governor in Windhoek, 5 January 1909.

- 42 H. Weinert, 'Die Ausbildung der Stirnhöhlen als stammesgeschichtliches Merkmal. Eine vergleichend-anatomische Studie mit einem Atlas der Stirnhöhlen und einem neuen Meßzirkel zur Ermittlung der inneren Schädelmaße', *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie*, 25:2 (1925), 336; H. Weinert., 'Die kleinste Interorbitalbreite als stammesgeschichtliches Merkmal', *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie*, 26:3 (1927), 481.
- 43 H. Virchow, 'Zur Anthropologie der Nase'.
- 44 H. Weinert, 'Die Ausbildung der Stirnhöhlen als stammesgeschichtliches Merkmal' (including skulls S 840, S 841, S 865, S 866, S 1322, S 1323).
- 45 F. Ivaniček, 'Osobliwosci budowy sklepienia czaszki Australczykow', *Przegląd antropologiczny* [Anthropological Review], 13:2-4 (1939), 251-62.
- 46 H. Grimm, 'Zur Geschichte und zur aktuellen Bedeutung von Schädel- und Skelettsammlungen', *Abhandlungen und Berichte des Staatlichen Museums für Völkerkunde Dresden*, 39 (1982), 269ff.
- 47 S. Exner et al., 'Cribra Orbitalia Visualized in Computed Tomography', *Annals of Anatomy*, 186:2 (2004), 169-72; P. A. Reichart et al., 'Dental Mutilations and Associated Alveolar Bone Pathology in African Skulls of the Anthropological Skull Collection, Charité, Berlin', *Journal of Oral Pathology and Medicine*, 37 (2008), 50-5.
- 48 The documentation pertaining to the twenty skulls restituted in 2011 is now available online: http://theongi.org/?page_id=644 (accessed 12 June 2018).
- 49 <http://allafrica.com/stories/201109290542.html> (accessed 14 August 2018).
- 50 Festus Muundjua, Namibian historian, activist for the OvaHerero Genocide Foundation and member of the Namibian delegation to Berlin in 2011, personal communication of 27 September 2011.
- 51 Waldeyer, 'Gehirne südwestafrikanischer Völker'.
- 52 Katrin Koel-Abt and Barbara Teßmann carried out the anthropological portion of the provenance research, while Holger Stoecker researched the historical context.
- 53 Esther Moombolah-/Goagoses, Head of the National Museum of Namibia and Chairperson of the National Heritage Council of Namibia, and additional staff members of the National Museum.
- 54 E. Muraranganda, 'German Museum Could Show OvaHerero-Nama Genocide', *Namibian Sun*, 8 May 2015.