

Goldsmiths Research Online

*Goldsmiths Research Online (GRO)
is the institutional research repository for
Goldsmiths, University of London*

Citation

Zetterstrom-Sharp, Johanna T and Wingfield, Chris. 2019. A 'safe space' to debate colonial legacy? The University of Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology and the campaign to return a looted Benin altarpiece to Nigeria. *Museum Worlds*, 7(1), pp. 1-22. ISSN 2049-6729 [Article]

Persistent URL

<https://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/27384/>

Versions

The version presented here may differ from the published, performed or presented work. Please go to the persistent GRO record above for more information.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Goldsmiths, University of London via the following email address: gro@gold.ac.uk.

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated. For more information, please contact the GRO team: gro@gold.ac.uk

A ‘safe space’ to debate colonial legacy? The University of Cambridge Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology and the campaign to return a looted Benin altarpiece to Nigeria

Johanna Zetterstrom-Sharp and Chris Wingfield

Abstract

In February 2016, students at the University of Cambridge voted unanimously to support the repatriation to Nigeria of a bronze cockerel looted during the violent British expedition into Benin City in 1897. Rather than initiating a restitution process, however, the college response saw the cockerel, known as Okukor, temporarily relocated to the University’s Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. This article outlines the discussions that took place during this process, exploring how the Museum was positioned as a safe space in which uncomfortable colonial legacies, including institutionalized racism and rights over cultural patrimony, could be debated. We explore how a stated commitment to post-colonial dialogue ultimately worked to circumvent a call for post-colonial action. Drawing on Stoler’s and Edwards’ discussions of colonial aphasia, this article argues that museums of anthropology risk enabling such circumvention despite, and perhaps as a result of, a commitment to confronting their own institutional colonial legacies.

Key words: repatriation, restitution, decolonization, aphasia, racism, colonial legacy, Benin, museum

On 18 February, 2016, following a debate of nearly two hours, members of the Jesus College Student Union (JCSU) at the University of Cambridge voted unanimously to support the repatriation to Nigeria of a bronze cockerel, known as Okukor, which at that time stood in the college dining hall (Figure 1). Cambridge's thirty-one colleges are self-governing institutions that are formally independent of the central University, responsible for the admission and tuition of undergraduate students, as well as the provision of accommodation and food. Okukor was presented to Jesus College in 1905 by George William Neville (1852-1929), while his son was studying there. Neville had accompanied the violent 1897 campaign to Benin City, returning with a considerable quantity of items looted from the royal palace, presumably including the cockerel. According to its own records, the college "agreed gratefully to accept" the "gift of the bronze figure of a cock which formed part of the spoil captured at Benin, West Africa and to thank Mr Neville for making this appropriate gift to the College" (Jesus College Archives 1905). Founded in 1496 on the site of a former Benedictine convent by John Alcock, then Bishop of Ely, the college's coat of arms features the heads of three cockerels, a reference to the surname of the college founder. It is presumably for this reason that Neville chose to present the cockerel, which is likely to have remained installed as a mascot in the dining hall ever since.

The student vote, which came in the immediate aftermath of the #RhodesMustFall¹ debate at the University of Oxford, highlighted how Okukor's status as a college mascot sat in tension with the colonial violence that brought the altar-piece to Cambridge. The vote was picked up by opinion pieces in both the *Telegraph* (Clarke-Billings 2016) and the *Guardian* (Jones 2016), Britain's mainstream right and left-wing newspapers. However, it was only after a meeting of the College Council—the governing body of college fellows - voted on 7 March to remove the cockerel from the dining hall that the real media outpouring began. A University press release on 8 March unleashed a barrage of criticism from elements of the national press

concerned that this was yet another overreaction to the demands of hypersensitive students. Alumni threatened to withdraw funding and some members of the academic community expressed concern over an attempt by the students to “eradicate the past” in order to express their “moral superiority in the present” (Harding 2016).

The press release acknowledged “the contribution made by students in raising the important but complex question of the rightful location of its Benin Bronze”, outlining a commitment “to discuss and determine the best future” for the altar-piece and to work with “museum authorities to discuss and determine the best future for the Okukor, including the question of repatriation”. It concluded by establishing that “the College strongly endorses the inclusion of students from all relevant communities in such discussion” (Harding 2016). What this press release did not mention was that the debate in Cambridge had become about more than the relocation of the altarpiece, but rather what its former location said about inadequate institutional recognition of historical injustice, and the structural racism that underlined this. Any future discussion would therefore need to engage with this increasingly complex field of colonial and racial tension.

This article engages with the College’s proposed relocation of Okukor to the University of Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA), where we were both employed at the time.² The willingness of the College to send the altar-piece to an institution well-rehearsed in engaging in dialogue with its own complex colonial history, and the museum’s preparedness to receive it, were not unexpected. Such transference of responsibility over post-colonial archives to ethnographic institutions is discussed by Edwards (2016) in relation to colonial photographic archives. She highlights how anthropology, “as a discipline or category of museum collecting”, has become a space “in which problematic categories of action and objects”, associated with difficult colonial pasts, “can safely be sequestered” (2016: 59). Arguably, in this instance, MAA offered a safe space in which the College’s commitment

to “discuss and determine” Okukor’s future could be met. As it transpired, however, despite a series of discussions initiated by the student vote to return Okukor, not one of these engaged with the campaign directly. Okukor has quietly and un-controversially returned to Jesus College, where it is no longer on display. Its future, and the accusations of institutional racism that brought this into question, remain unresolved.

In what follows, we use the campaign to return Okukor as a case-study to explore how a stated commitment to post-colonial dialogue can work to circumvent a call for post-colonial action. Writing in 2019, following the publication of President Macron’s commissioned report on repatriation by Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy (2018), it is increasingly clear that it is action, rather than words, that is demanded of Europe’s museums in response to their colonial pasts and presents. We are interested in how statements of intent concerning the desire to resolve a moment of post-colonial reckoning through serious discussion and debate, ultimately led to inaction. We seek to understand what this says about the difficulties institutions encounter in facing up to their colonial pasts, in particular in recognizing that these pasts create and frame experiences of racism in the present. We are also interested in the moments where these difficulties are circumvented, renamed, or disregarded. The idea of ethnographic museums as “safe spaces” within the field of post-colonial tension is key, both in terms of how such safety is perceived and enacted, but also through the ways in which this role can disable effective engagement with tensions that ultimately overspill these spaces.³

Public dialog begins: the student campaign

Bequeathed to the college in 1905, Okukor was presumably one of the items looted from the royal compound in Benin City by Neville in early 1897. An article in the *Lagos Weekly Record*, published on March 20th of that year, included an interview with Neville, who had returned in

advance of the main body of troops. As well as noting the commercial opportunities offered by the forest “abounding in rubber, gum and magnificent timber” surrounding Benin City, the newspaper noted that Neville had returned with “some valuable specimens of antique carvings and bronze sculptures” (Anon. 1897). Indeed, it noted that when Neville left Benin he was given a guard of twenty men by the Commandant, Colonel Hamilton, who advised him to “push off as quickly as possible, as the fact of so many ancient heirlooms leaving the city may attract attention and possibly lead to molestation” (Anon. 1897). Neville’s extensive collection was displayed at the Royal Colonial Institute in London later in 1897. This was one of the first exhibitions of Benin material outside of Africa, arguably prompting the wider interest subsequently shown by other collectors and institutions. A photograph donated to MAA appears to show the fireplace in Neville’s home in Weybridge, Surrey, surrounded by a number of identifiable examples of Benin bronzes (Figure 2). Following Neville’s death, much of his remaining collection was sold at J. C. Stevens Auction house in May 1930, where it was purchased by both private and public collectors (Coombes 1994: 31).

Sitting on a plinth in the main hall of Jesus College, looking down upon the long wooden dining tables towards a grand portrait of Queen Elizabeth I, Okukor was engaged in a very different set of rituals to those it was initially created to serve. As was highlighted by the campaign for its return, neither Okukor’s religious and cultural significance for the Benin Royal Court, nor the violence that resulted in its location at Jesus College, were revealed by its display. Rather, a Latin inscription on a metal plaque attached to the wooden plinth memorialized Neville through his gift to the college, referring to Okukor’s “capture” by the “British Army” from the “Ancient town of Benin”. In this context, the bronze was framed as a valuable college mascot; a reference to the generously plumed rooster that sits on the College coat of arms, and an addition to the College’s extensive collection of similar emblems displayed around the grounds. The College rooster is said to be that which in the Bible brought

Peter to his knees; the rooster's crow reminding him of the truth of Jesus Christ, turning denial into repentance. This transformation of a non-Christian altarpiece into mascot has a symbolic resonance beyond the display of stolen goods, a feature only heightened by the relative obliviousness to its presence in the dining hall before it became embroiled in the debate over its rightful place.

The silences that surrounded Okukor were not lost on the undergraduate students who initially raised the question of repatriation through the establishment of the Benin Bronze Appreciation Committee (BBAC) in late 2015. An 11-page draft proposal was created by the committee and circulated to the Nigerian Minister of Culture and Information, Alhaji Lai Mohammed; the Cambridge Black, Minority, and Ethnic (BME) campaign; and the JCSU for comment. The document focused on the "moral case" for repatriation, outlining the history of its seizure, and arguing that a return was considered to be "both intrinsically and instrumentally good" (Robinson 2016). Crucial to the proposal, and its subsequent debate, was the attempt to make a "positive case for repatriation" to encourage action by the college. The document highlighted how repatriation would position the college as a forerunner in wider debates surrounding "colonialism and social justice," fostering a mutually productive relationship with Nigerian cultural institutions and contributing to a university wide global agenda.

Underlying this politically careful proposal was a broader agenda targeting the public memory of Britain's colonial past. As the JCSU congregated in February 2016 to debate the proposed vote to return Okukor, a number of students from both within and outside of the College raised concerns about the neo-colonial language of the proposal (Figure 3). In particular, they addressed how statements of moral duty placed an emphasis on the ethical standing of the College and University, rather than unequivocal cultural rights to post-colonial reparation for Nigeria. The proposed return was understood in this context as a de-colonial act for both Nigeria and Cambridge, the success of which depended on the adoption of a de-

colonial rhetoric. Establishing consensus over what amounted to such rhetoric was, however, also contested with regard to who had the legitimacy to speak on behalf of the proposed return. While the BBAC had sought legitimacy through Ministerial channels in Nigeria, other students felt this was an issue to be sanctioned through the wider BME community at the University, while others foregrounded voices of people with Nigerian or Edo descent (JCSU 2016; Robinson 2016). The BBAC were accused of silencing some Black British voices by failing to consult effectively on both the act of repatriation and the way in which it was represented.

Concerns over representation, erasure, and legitimacy have been taken up through a well-established student-campaign seeking to voice and challenge experiences of institutional racism and to support people of color at the University. This provided a platform which situated the campaign for the return of Okukor to Nigeria within wider activism targeting the decolonization of university spaces, recruitment strategies and the curriculum. In particular, the campaign was linked by both the University and the national press to the #RhodesMustFall campaign at the University of Oxford a year earlier. As highlighted by Amit Chaudhuri, while most of the media attention generated by the movement focused on Rhodes himself, at issue was the broader “ethos that gives space and even pre-eminence to such a figure” (Chaudhuri 2016). For supporters of the #RhodesMustFall campaign, the continued monumentalization of Rhodes, and others like him, was an indication of the wider institutional embeddedness of this ethos. Likewise, the continued retention and display of Okukor became emblematic of both the College and the University’s failure to acknowledge institutional engagement in, and support for, colonial violence. As the campaign gained traction, discussions over Okukor’s fate absorbed existing frustration and anger about the University’s inability to face up to, let alone recognize, a history of racism and its contemporary manifestations. As articulated by one student in the university press:

Erasure is situating the Benin Bronze Okukor in Jesus College's hall with an irrelevant Latin inscription and no identification that it was raided in the Benin Expedition of 1897, which resulted in the murder of thousands of my ancestors and the exile of Oba Ovonramwen. Erasure is African diaspora studying in a college that has a 'Rustat Conference Room' with scarce public information to identify that Tobias Rustat was a slaver, and eating in a hall with a portrait of Jan Smuts with no recognition that he oppressed Africans with skin like theirs. (Okundaye 2016)

The response by the Jesus College Council, its governing body of academics, was to permanently remove Okukor from the dining hall in March 2016. A subsequent press release noted their commitment to "strongly [endorsing] the inclusion of students from all relevant communities" in the process of moving forward on this "important and complex question", pledging "resources to new initiatives with Nigerian heritage and museum authorities" and committing to "discuss and determine the best future for the Okukor" (Harding 2016; Weale 2016). Despite the conciliatory language of this statement, the removal received criticism in both the press and academic circles. This criticism included a debate over the legitimacy of accusations of structural racism levied at the University, as well as whether Okukor's future had a role to play in confronting such accusations. Alumni threatened to withdraw donations should Okukor be repatriated as a result of a campaign led by a group of "silly undergraduates" (Bown 2016). Public outrage found a home in the right-wing press where the removal was associated with oversensitive political correctness, at both the financial and moral expense of a well-respected institution.

It is worth noting the direct racism published in the online comment sections beneath these critical articles. Zoe O'Brien (2016), writing for the *Express*, noted how students had "forced a Cambridge University College to remove a statue of cockerel...because they claim

it's racist." Beneath it, Cheryl from London is "sickened" by the decision, and asks "how many white British students were not given places so that this lot could be given places?" Gez51 suggests a student leading the campaign, a "guest," should be "put on a plane, at his own expense" and "sent home," adding that "his lik [sic] make me a racist due to their attitudes towards us, their host country." Breitbart (Hallet 2016) provided a platform for abusive and violent language which in any other public context would amount to incitement of racial hatred. While the internet at large provides an open forum for racist hate-speech, the media interest in the JSCU vote created a focus for personal attacks on those students leading the campaign.

Public dialogue is shifted: Okukor becomes a University issue

Aware that removing Okukor from the dining hall had not resolved the issue, and sensitive to negative portrayal in the press, the central University stepped in and established a working group on 23 March, 2016. The group was chaired by the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Institutional and International Relations and included representatives from Jesus College, the University Museums, the University Communications Office, and the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research. It did not include the students who had initiated the campaign.

From the outset, the specific case of Okukor was linked in the remit of what became known as the Benin Bronze Working Group to "general questions that were expected to arise around repatriation." With this in mind, representatives of Jesus College emphasized that while officially open-minded about the future of the cockerel, they felt there was a strong argument for public display and engagement which they suggested would be difficult within the institutional setting of the college. It was in this context that MAA was brought into the discussion as the possible location of such engagement, with the initial meeting of the group concluding that "MAA was a clear home for continuing dialogue around the issue." MAA

ultimately agreed to the temporary display of the cockerel with an agreed aim that this would foster further debate.

Although the College did not officially dismiss repatriation as a potential outcome of anticipated dialogue, it is worth emphasizing that by nominating MAA as the appropriate location for display and potentially long-term loan, the College was keen to situate Okukor within the more established debates around the return of objects from public collections. It was argued within this broader context that any decision on Okukor was dependent upon decisions made by other institutions with Benin collections, notably those at the British Museum, with a concern expressed that there was a potential for the College's decision to impact on these other entities. In light of this concern, an existing international museum-led working group, the Benin Dialogue Group (BDG),⁴ was foregrounded as the relevant decision-making body, and the college agreed to host a future meeting at Cambridge.

While students were not invited to meetings of the Benin Bronze Working Group, the Pro-Vice Chancellor organized a series of separate meetings with one of the initiators of the campaign who had subsequently been elected as President of the Cambridge University Student Union. It should be noted that during these meetings the importance of consulting the students involved in the campaign was repeatedly stressed, as was the need to address the broader discussion about the decolonization of British academia, and its implications for contemporary racism. The students raised concerns about the increasing reliance on museums and the BDG as providing an appropriate forum for responding to the vote, recognizing that such institutions may have entrenched positions on repatriation, and that the University should aspire to challenge these positions and lead an intellectual debate. Despite these concerns, Okukor was collected in early December 2016 for conservation treatment prior to its proposed display at MAA, a position defended by the Pro-Vice Chancellor as associated with the museum's "particular expertise" on issues of repatriation.

Difficulties in comprehension? Searching for a safe space to talk about colonial legacy

The movement of Okukor from dining hall to museum space was not without tensions of its own. There was a sense at MAA that this act of sequestration was an attempt by the College to shift responsibility for an uncomfortable and unpredictable problem, and an acknowledgment that the Museum would have to tread extremely carefully when intervening in what was ultimately a conversation between the College and its students. The fact that the Museum provisionally accepted Okukor on loan and planned a series of events to coincide with its display, however, suggests that there was a degree of optimism that the MAA had a role to play in resolving the tensions now surrounding it. The concept of the museum as “safe space” was, arguably, a position implicitly assumed by both the College and the Museum. We will explore further the disciplinary engagements that have enabled this institutional optimism surrounding the confrontation of post-colonial tensions within ethnographic museums, but we begin by exploring why such making-safe was thought necessary. Jesus College is a large and wealthy institution, perfectly capable of taking a position on the return, or engaging in open and transparent debate as it publicly claimed it was committed to doing, despite threats from a small number of alumni. Rather than doing so, however, what transpired during the moment of proposed transfer and in its aftermath was ultimately an avoidance of discussion. While it was acknowledged that ongoing debate about both Okukor’s future and the wider claims of the campaign was required, actual engagement in discussion was limited.

Given the violent context of Okukor’s acquisition and the rhetoric of colonial erasure and structural racism that underscored the campaign for its return, it is worth considering academic writing that has sought to understand difficulties that can arise around engagements with colonial histories and their legacies in the present. Ann Stoler’s use of “aphasia” is

important here as a concept used to describe the difficulties faced by European academic and political spheres in articulating the issues that surround colonial pasts and presences (Stoler 2011). Borrowed from clinical psychology, aphasia refers to an impairment of language that affects the comprehension and production of speech: a recognition that something exists, but an inability to generate “a vocabulary that associates appropriate words and concepts with appropriate things,” resulting ultimately in a form of circumvention (2011: 125). The term, Stoler (2011: 125) notes, “describes a difficulty retrieving both conceptual and lexical vocabularies and, most important, a difficulty comprehending what is spoken.” As a concept centered on the difficulty of responding directly to something that is evidently present, aphasia maps well onto engagements with material archives. Elizabeth Edwards (2016) has applied the concept to photographic archives in British colonial contexts. The fact that such archives exist is not something unknown or denied by institutions that hold them; rather, the difficulty lies in knowing how to discuss them and in finding the right terms or narratives with which to interpret and display them. Edwards’ central premise is that “the ethnographic” is perceived of as a more appropriate or adept space within which the colonial can be discussed, due in part to its evocation of distance: events occurring “elsewhere,” a long time ago, and best addressed from a different disciplinary perspective.

Edwards’ (2016) use of aphasia focuses far more on the difficulties of articulation than the inability “to comprehend what is spoken,” which is central to Stoler’s (2011: 125) use of the term. With it, Stoler acknowledges that, just as politicians and academics struggle to address colonial pasts in appropriate ways, those who continue to be marginalized and oppressed as a result of these legacies repeatedly speak, or make known, their own recognition of a colonial present. Of concern is the way in which this speaking of the colonial present is sidelined: how such “knowing is disabled, attention is redirected, things are renamed, and disregard is revived and sustained” (Stoler 2011: 153).

This lack of comprehension of the colonial present seems central to the tensions surrounding Okukor. Not only was the College unable to engage openly in a conversation about this, suggested by its stated intention to, but subsequent decision not to, but this inability also arguably stemmed from a difficulty in publicly acknowledging what was being said. The campaign to return Okukor began as an acknowledgement of the Nigerian claim to an unspoken object of past colonial dispossession, but it transformed through student action and public response into a debate about the far less comfortable issue of continuing structural racism at the University, representing a wider legacy of such unspeaking. The removal of Okukor from the dining hall singularly failed to address this issue, and in many ways symbolized an inability to comprehend and recognize forms of structural racism as a reality in which the College itself continues to be implicated. Difficulty of comprehension in this context was not about direct understanding—it was privately understood that this predicament had become a debate about racism—but rather highlighted an inability to articulate a direct response that terms such as “inclusion,” “discussion,” and “debate,” suggested should be possible.

Journalist Reni Eddo-Lodge’s (2017) now widely read book, *Why I’m no longer talking to White people about race*, is centered on these failures of comprehension and recognition. The work explores how liberal anxieties surrounding self-implication in contemporary British racism (being labelled a “racist”) emerge as a form of denial, a claim to “color-blindness” which fails to recognize the presence of race as a force of “power and privilege” in society (2017: 83, see also Wekker 2016, DiAngelo 2018). “Not talking about race,” a provocative response to this paradox, highlights Eddo-Lodge’s experience that “talking” rarely involves listening but instead represents a preoccupation with a form of “post-racist” self-preservation that disables any real dialogue. This imagining of a post-racist society also emerges in work by Paul Gilroy (2004), although here it is more directly associated with the difficulties present in grappling with the colonial pasts and presences that concern both Edwards (2016) and Stoler

(2011). “Questions about ‘race,’ identity, and differentiation,” he argues, “...sometimes feel anachronistic” because they “return contemporary discussion to a moral ground that we feel we should have left behind long ago” (Gilroy 2004: 15).

By this, Gilroy refers in particular to the fixed bio-politics that framed colonial legitimization, for example the kind that provided public justification for the expedition to Benin City in 1897. Gilroy highlights how the therapeutic crystallization of Britain’s 20th century history within the moral certainties of the end of WWII enabled the continuation of racial violence to be overlooked, both in the colonies and at home. He explores this as a form of rupture: an ethical void in the public memory of the end of empire, situated between the moral safety of a heroic anti-racist past—the defeat of Nazism—and the liberal certainties of the present (see also Schwarz 2005, 2001; Gilmour and Schwarz 2011: 1-38). It is arguably this search for safety in moral certainty that underlies what Eddo-Lodge describes as “color-blindness”: an impatience for absolution that transpires as denial, in a context where embedded forms of white privilege continue to operate in contemporary Britain.

At a national level, Gilroy highlights the need to disrupt imaginings of an ethical nationalism by exposing “fragments of brutal colonial history” in order to “unsettle the remembrance of the imperial project by undermining its moral legitimacy and damaging the national self-esteem” (Gilroy 2004: 100). The refocusing of ethnographic museum work over the last 30 years, through increasingly reflexive and critical confrontation of colonial pasts, arguably contributes precisely to such public “unsettling.” Ruth Phillips has optimistically referred to this as the “second museum age” (2005); a comprehensive shift in the priorities of Western museums that care for culturally and spiritually significant objects acquired under contexts of inequality or coercion. Focusing on the Canadian settler context, Phillips highlighted the rising commitment to forms of collaborative and multi-vocal research, re-thinking museum spaces as “repositories” of cultural artefacts for First Nations communities.

Her article highlighted two key foci of this work, the first being a focus on archival research in order to better understand the historical nuances of collections, and the second a drive to contextualize this research within post-imperial or settler contexts of the present.

Phillips did not focus explicitly on uncovering “brutal colonial histories,” referring to a much softer process of “traditional techniques of connoisseurship and archival research” (2005: 94). This accords with a sense of historical and archival integrity which centers scholarly collections research, focusing on an archive-out approach to establishing provenance within largely 19th and early 20th century ethnographic collections. Nicholas Thomas’ *Entangled Objects* (1991) and *Colonialism’s Culture* (1994) may be understood as foundational texts in this regard, cautioning against making sweeping statements about colonial brutality, and instead focusing on an approach that draws out smaller everyday encounters or “entanglements” between people to bring nuance to broader imperial processes (see also Thomas 2016; Henare 2005; Jacobs et al 2015; Schildkrout and Keim 1998). An important arm of this work has been to critically reflect on the discords between the nuances of the field, and the regimes of ordering placed upon objects following their deposition in public collections. It is perhaps within this context of ordering that “brutal colonial histories” have been most clearly engaged with through collections-based research. While archival research has highlighted the importance of recognizing indigenous agency in the making, trading, or gifting of objects that ended up in museum collections, work focusing on the systems of knowledge these objects subsequently became absorbed into demonstrates how such agency was disregarded. This perspective has focused on the imposition of often overtly racist organizational principles developed along evolutionary lines, constituting a scholarly and public legitimization of the imperial project (e.g. Bennett et al 2017; Gosden and Larson 2007).

Phillips’ (2005) notion of the museum as “repository” draws on work in response to this history, seeking the restitution of indigenous agency through collaborative work in the

present (see also Peers and Brown 2003; McCarthy 2011). Responding to the idea that ethnographic museums bear an ethical responsibility toward communities with contemporary claims to cultural patrimony is now common practice across former colonial nations. Cambridge's MAA has been active in pursuing this agenda through its Pacific and North American collections since the mid-1990s (e.g. Herle 2008; Raymond and Salmond 2008). This practice has underpinned recent research through *Pacific Presences*, a substantial cross-European collections research grant based at MAA running from 2013-2018, which has involved collaborative work with elders and community members in the Pacific Islands, as well as contemporary artists, to provide new perspectives on historical collections (Thomas 2016; Carreau et al 2018). Underlying these projects is a commitment to a form of dialogue, often spoken about as a desire to “decenter” the authority traditionally held by curators, by re-centering previously excluded voices from communities who have ancestral or historical claims over collections. Opening up archives and their histories in this way exposes museums to critique, contestation, and debate, which has increasingly been celebrated as fundamental to the new role emerging for ethnographic museums in a messy post-colonial climate of continued inequality (Clifford 1997, 2013). Phillips explores this approach as “museum-as-theatre,” posing a microcosm in which “real political dynamics” (2005: 104) are played out offering “valuable opportunities for research into these performative and public dimensions of professional practice” (2005: 88). Phillips optimistically suggests that the public nature of museums means that such contestation has wider ramifications, inspiring moments of activism which over time may cause “shifts in public opinion and changes in institutions, laws, and professional practices” (2005: 88).

Returning to Okukor's temporary sequestration at MAA, it is arguably the combination of archival integrity and apparent openness to critical exposure and debate, emerging from existing collaborative work, that encouraged confidence in the institution's ability to navigate

the complex post-colonial terrain that surrounded the Benin altarpiece. It is worth highlighting the centrality of conversational terms such as “dialogue,” “discussion,” and “debate” to this approach, acknowledging how they mirror both statements of intent concerning the resolution of post-colonial tensions by institutions, such as Jesus College, and areas of inadequacy highlighted by those seeking to understand these tensions.

Institutionalizing dialogue: Okukor and the Benin Plan for Action

In her discussion of the tensions that surrounded the #RhodesMustFall campaign at Oxford University, Eddo-Lodge draws attention to what she terms the “hypocrisy of free speech” (2017: 130-134). She questions the dynamics at play where a campaign to bring attention to and debate around the overt celebration of a man deeply implicated in South African racial segregation was closed down through institutional accusations of undemocratic action. She rightly highlights how the campaign was characterized as historical erasure and the suppression of debate by a white liberal opposition, yet the direct result of this moral outrage transpired as its own form of silence, “the kind of strained peace that simmers with resentment, the kind that requires some to suffer so that others are comfortable” (2017: 131). Her analysis highlights how calls for debate can play a role in circumventing difficult action: the monument to Rhodes remains, yet the public debate around his monumentalization has lost its steam. It is worth bearing this in mind when considering the paramountcy of ongoing “dialogue” and “discussion” to both the College’s public commitment to resolving Okukor’s fate, and the events that surrounded the altar-piece once it arrived at MAA. As with Rhodes, an emphasis on the importance of debate did not determine the terms of that debate.

By January 2017, MAA had consolidated its plans for furthering the debate around Okukor. These included hosting a meeting of the international Benin Dialogue Group (BDG),

which included inviting the Nigerian delegates to Cambridge through funds pledged by the University with support from Jesus College. The meeting was planned to coincide with a separate European Commission (EC)-funded workshop at which the majority of European museum members of the BDG would already be present. The EC workshop was one of a series within a cross-institutional network of European museums with ethnographic collections called “Sharing a World of Inclusion, Creativity and Heritage” (SWICH). The SWICH research agenda may be understood within the context of historically reflexive museum work outlined above, but it was specifically tailored towards refining the vocabularies for this kind of work in a post-imperial European context, rather than the Northern American and Pacific settler contexts in which it developed. The March 2017 workshop at MAA had the title “Historic Collections, Contemporary Lives,” and focused on the excavation of colonial histories through collections and archives, and their exposure through contemporary exhibition and collaboration. The Nigerian delegates included the Director of NCMM, Abdullah Yusef Usman; the Director of Museums for NCMM, Peter Odey; uncle of the recently crowned Oba Ewuare II, Prince Gregory Iduorobo Akenzua; and Folarin Shyllon, a Professor of Law from the University of Ibadan. It is important to note that both SWICH and the BDG were closed events. The planned MAA exhibition around Okukor offered the possibility of a more public intervention, with the intention that the exhibition would extend the conversation through interpretation specifically referring to the student campaign.

As plans for events in March 2017 advanced and despite initial enthusiasm, expressed publicly, to engage in open debate around Okukor’s future, there were signs of a significant shift in the College’s position. Whether as a result primarily of the museum declaring that a temporary loan could not become a long-term solution, a realization that the piece was worth a considerable amount of money (prompted by a seven-figure insurance valuation undertaken as part of the proposed loan), or by a sense that the heat had gone out of the student campaign,

was not clear. Either way, at a meeting of the Benin Bronze Working Group on February 2, 2017, it quickly became apparent that there was no longer any enthusiasm from the College, either to host or participate in the formal discussions planned to take place in March. While earlier discussions had recognized the need to respond to the student campaign, it was now suggested that student engagement with the Nigerian delegates should take place separately to the planned discussions of the BDG. When asked about the proposed MAA exhibition, College representatives made it clear that they no longer felt it appropriate for the cockerel to be displayed at all.

Ultimately, a compromise enabled the Nigerian delegation to briefly see the cockerel in MAA's conservation laboratory, on condition that a representative from Jesus College and the University's Director of Communications were in attendance. The University Communications Office continued to play a role in containing "rhetoric over the repatriation of objects", expressing a desire to refocus discussion on capacity building and the digitization of Benin collections in Europe, projects that were both included in the wider Plan of Action developed by the BDG. Furthermore, the University's Benin Working Group February meeting emphasized that public communication around the BDG meeting should be handled through an agreed upon statement drafted by the Communications Office. Indeed, prior to the BDG March meeting an email was sent to members of staff at MAA underlining expectations that "should discussion turn to the specific matter of the Jesus College bronze," in either the BDG meeting itself or more generally over the course of the visit, that they would reinforce the agreed upon position of the University working group. The statement, prepared in consultation with the Communications office, now consolidated earlier attempts to engage the debate around Okukor within the broader question of the repatriation of Benin material in public collections:

We believe that the best way of addressing disputes over cultural collections such as the Benin Bronzes is at international levels. Given the scale of the collection worldwide, we believe that collective discussion and engagement will achieve more than independent action. Any future decisions on the display of the Bronze will await further progress with the international Benin Plan of Action.

The email concluded that it was “particularly important that any suggestion that the Jesus bronze should be treated as a separate case should be countered firmly on this basis”. Okukor’s planned sequestration within MAA thus enmeshed an existing request for post-colonial recognition, led by the student BME campaign, within three other forms of post-colonial dialogue: a public exhibition, a much wider Nigerian repatriation campaign, and a curatorially-driven research agenda through SWICH. Although each of these strategies involved conversations that related to the student campaign in some form, a series of restrictions on open dialogue put in place by the University and the College meant that none of them engaged directly with it.

Without permission to display the cockerel, the modest MAA display titled *Benin: Metals in Africa*, drew on collections research, bringing together archival excavation and X-ray fluorescence analysis to shed light on material composition and provenance of a relatively unknown collection of Royal Court bronzes. While it presented a University collection, much of which shares its provenance with Okukor in the looting of Benin City in 1897, the exhibit did not address the specific question of Okukor’s repatriation.⁵ Nor did it comment on the campaign’s association between Okukor’s violent provenance, the College’s failure to recognize this provenance, and the implications of this for the way in which the College, and by extension the University, fail to address the brutal colonial histories in which they are implicated. Although the exhibition featured other University holdings of looted material,

Okukor's absence meant that public debate about repatriation and racism was ultimately circumvented. Despite Okukor's absence in the display, Okukor was presented to the Nigerian delegates as pristine and well-cared for, in the conservation lab where its treatment had been funded by Jesus College (Figure 4), despite a conservation report which outlined evidence of rather less respectful historical treatment in the college dining hall.⁶

It is worth focusing briefly on the meeting of the BDG itself, which occurred on the final day of the visit, by which time it had become clear that staff at MAA did not hold authority over Okukor, and that the opportunity to discuss the issue directly with representatives of Jesus College would not present itself. The meeting focused on reigniting attempts to resolve broader tensions surrounding requests from the Royal Court and NCMM for the return of material looted in 1897, and the difficulties European curators faced in convincing their institutions to respond positively to these requests. By the end of the meeting, a desire to reach a resolution that might lead to action favored a suggestion of a rotating loan in Benin City, put forward by a senior fellow of the University's Department of Archaeology. This arrangement, which has now been ratified by the BDG,⁷ would involve working towards a permanent display at Benin city featuring rotating loans of material from European museums. This compromise, which was not uncontentious, has not resolved the underlying issues surrounding long-term ownership.

Dialogue contained and redirected: Saying the right things while doing very little

The students who led the initial campaign to repatriate Okukor were reunited with what had by then become a much broader institutional issue at a public reception following the SWICH workshop and BDG meeting, expecting to hear the outcome of their campaign. Here Prince Akenzua presented the conclusions of the BDG, reading from a document that had been officially sanctioned by the group. Given the campaign's focus on the return of Okukor as a

de-colonial act for the University, foregrounding both the physical return and the vocal recognition of historical wrong-doing that should frame that return, the student reaction was understandably one of frustration and disappointment. That reaction was picked up in the student press; one article, for example, argued that the “MAA’s conduct is transparent and insulting to Nigerians and Cambridge students of the African diaspora.” The author concluded that:

A refusal to treat this issue as seriously and respectfully as returning Nazi-stolen paintings is only a testament to the systemic racism still rife within Britain and at institutions such as Cambridge. As a student of color, however, this narrative is only reflective of Cambridge’s treatment of racial issues within the University, and how the solutions provided are either insulting or insufficient. (Okundaye 2017)

The student reaction, now directed at MAA, is a reminder that while the museum was prepared to take on the post-colonial tensions that surrounded Okukor, the terms in which it was able to address these tensions meant that it was ultimately unable to resolve them. Okukor was eventually returned to Jesus College, where it is now locked away in a cupboard.

MAA was presumably approached by the College as an institution that defines itself through its willingness to recognize and engage with the contested colonial legacies surrounding its collections, through public discussion, debate and dialogue. The temporary sequestration of Okukor at MAA may be understood, then, as expressing a desire by the College to re-situate a discussion in which its representatives found it impossible to engage. This was partly due to the volatility of public responses, apparent in reactions by the press (Clarke-Billings 2016; Jones 2016; Brian 2016; Hallet 2016) and College alumni (Harding 2016), that emerged in relation to an association that was made by the campaign between the

silencing of colonial histories and the ongoing impacts of structural racism. Arguably, the college's actions should also be understood in relation to the wider political challenge of aligning a rejection of historical racism with the reality that race continues to mediate the distribution of power and privilege in society today (Gilroy 2004; Schwarz 2005, 2001; Eddo-Lodge 2017).

Openly addressing ongoing structural racism and the question of Okukor's future in the same conversation would acknowledge that the two issues were connected, thus implying that the College had failed to address both its colonial past and its colonial present; a charge we suggest college representatives were unprepared to recognize. Because ideas of colonial "silence" occupy such a central place in discussions of contemporary colonial legacies (Stoler 2011; Edwards 2016; Edwards and Mead 2013), including within the Okukor campaign itself, the need for open and public dialogue has become a fairly routine operational response. Paradoxically, we argue that although MAA was chosen as the appropriate space in which such discussions could unfold, the museum was not only unable to engage in the conversation directly, but also played a role in ensuring that the conversation which had begun was "disabled", attention "redirected", things "renamed", and disregard "revived and sustained" (Stoler 2011: 153). Indeed, a dialogue did happen, but not the one that the student campaign had asked for.

It is important to recognize that this outcome was partially a result of institutional politics at the University of Cambridge. As a public institution, MAA was selected as an appropriate space, distant enough for the College to excuse itself from the conversation, yet institutionally close enough to host a discussion. Having agreed to enable debate about an independently owned object that rested on two seemingly straightforward outcomes - to concede to the student vote or not—MAA was ultimately not given the power to enable a conversation that proceeded in these terms. This compromised position enabled Okukor's fate

to become buried within the much wider and far more complex question of historical restitution to Nigeria of Benin material held in European museums. As a result, an issue of present significance, not least because the students involved would soon move on, became enmeshed within a long-term debate beset with deep institutional particularities, that overlap with but also diverge from the issues raised by the student campaign.

Two years on, the public conversation around restitution has shifted considerably, in particular with regard to African colonial-era collections in European museums. This may partially be attributed to the initiation of the first BDG meeting in four years at Cambridge in 2017, which fostered debates about long term-loans in response to repatriation claims in both museum circles and the wider media. Of particular significance has been the report compiled by Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy (2018), commissioned by French President Macron and published in November 2018, which has demanded a colonial reckoning in relation to France's collections from Africa. The report's recommendation that all colonial-era collections should be considered for restitution, and the wider public activism that has been given a platform as a result, has been met by a wave of anxiety within European museums.⁸ This has resulted in a series of statements and opinion pieces on repatriation authored by museum directors published in the European press.⁹ These statements, including from MAA's Nicholas Thomas and V&A's Tristram Hunt, have crafted a united response to the 2018 report's call for fundamental changes in understandings of ethical ownership and professional practice. Rather than reflecting on what individual institutional changes might be made, these responses have overwhelmingly reasserted embedded and existing cross-institutional values of shared access, cross-cultural appreciation and exchange, and the integrity of research. It is important to note that whilst these values aspire towards an equitable cosmopolitanism based on mutual recognition and respect, who has access to collections, who directs flows of exchange and who creates knowledge through research remain deeply structured by forms of privilege, including race, that means

reaching true equity remains a very distant goal.

The 2018 report must be understood in the context of international diplomacy, commissioned as France seeks to reimagine its post-colonial relationship with its former African territories. The case of Okukor reminds us, however, that issues around restorative justice reverberate within former colonial nations, as much as they do between such nations and their former territories. Whilst the report has intensified the gaze upon Europe's ethnographic museums as possible agents of global repair, they are also places that can become a focus for articulations of post-colonial tensions at home. We argue that despite acknowledging this, museums like MAA have only partially recovered from their colonial aphasia, less proficient in adequately "comprehending what is spoken" than they are in initiating or welcoming debate (Stoler 2011: 125). This is partly associated with the deep reliance upon models of archival excavation and authoritative decentering. While such work seeks to address the colonial politics of the present, it often does so from a privileged academic space that relies heavily on the historical archive for its vocabularies of post-colonial unsettling or subversion (See Boast 2011 for a similar discussion). This archival integrity brings historical accuracy and evidential authority that are important within calls for more informed public recognition of colonial pasts. Nevertheless, as this case underscores, this mode of engagement can also overlook wider tensions that attach themselves to archives, without necessarily emerging from them. It is interesting to note that a central thread in the positions taken by European museum directors has been to highlight the 2018 report's inadequate representation of the deeply complex field of colonial engagements that resulted in the dispersal of objects across former empires. Whilst in the past such archival work has been regarded as a critical ally of decolonial activism, it has been deployed here to more conservative ends. By centering the broader ethical possibilities afforded by collections through scholarly research, the positions adopted by museum directors have deflected specific calls for action by embedding them in a wider

framework that simultaneously acknowledges a history of colonial violence while avoiding an obligation to engage in reparative repatriation.

It is perhaps this condition that underlies the real assumption of “safe space” in the ethnographic museum: a safety that emerges from saying the right things while being able to do very little. This is partly to do with the restrictive organizational structures in which museums are located, such as MAA’s relationship to the University of Cambridge, but it is also associated with embedded institutional practices. Arguably by focusing on the integrity of archival research within museums, directors, curators and scholars have been seeking to rebuild the illusion of safety that has offered increasing direction and purpose in a climate of uncertainty around what it is that ethnographic museums are and have the capacity to do. However, in a context where action, instead of words, is demanded by contemporary political realities, modes of archival engagement with colonial pasts that have dominated in ethnographic museums are no longer a sufficient response.

References

AFP. 2016. "Nigerian Royals applaud Cambridge move on cockerel statue." *Mail Online*, 21 March. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/afp/article-3502482/Nigerian-royals-applaud-Cambridge-cockerel-statue.html> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Anon. 1897. "Benin City and its Environment; Commercial and Political Outlook", *Lagos Weekly Record*, 20 March 1897.

Bennett, Tony, Fiona Cameron, Nelia Dias, Ben Dibley, Rodney Harrison, Ira Jacknis, and Conal McCarthy. 2017. *Collecting, Ordering, Governing: Anthropology, Museums, and Liberal Government*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Boast, Robin. 2011. "Neocolonial Collaboration: Museum as contact zone revisited." *Museum Anthropology* 34 (1): 56-70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1379.2010.01107.x> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Bown, Francis. 2016. "'Student Appeasement', letter to Editor." *The Telegraph*, 15 March. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/letters/12193689/Letters-How-can-the-leader-of-the-free-world-want-us-to-capitulate-to-the-EU.html> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Chaudhuri, Amit. 2016. "The real meaning of Rhodes Must Fall". *The Guardian* website, 16 March. <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/mar/16/the-real-meaning-of-rhodes-must-fall> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Jesus College Archives. 1905. "Conclusions Book". 22 May, 1905.

Carreau, Lucie, Alison Clark, Alana Jelinik, Erna Lilje and Nicholas Thomas. 2018. *Pacific Presences – Volume 1 & 2: Oceanic Art and European Museums*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.

Coombes, Annie E. 1994. *Reinventing Africa: Museums, material culture and popular imagination in late Victorian and Edwardian England*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Clarke-Billings, Lucy. 2016. "Cambridge students call for African bronze cockerel statue to fall in latest colonial row." *The Telegraph* website, 21 February. Accessed October 2, 2017. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/12167156/Cambridge-students-call-for-African-bronze-cockerel-statue-to-fall-in-latest-colonial-row.html> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Clifford, James. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, James. 2013. *Returns: Becoming Indigenous in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

DiAngelo, Robin. 2018. *White Fragility: Why It's So Hard for White People to Talk About Racism*. London: Penguin.

Eddo-Lodge, Reni. 2017. *Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People About Race*. London: Bloomsbury.

Edwards, Elizabeth. 2016. 'The colonial archival imaginaire at home.' *Social Anthropology* 24 (1): 52-66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12283> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Edwards, Elizabeth and Matt Mead. 2013. 'Absent Histories and Absent Images: Photographs, Museums and the Colonial Past.' *Museums and Society* 11 (1): 19-38.

Freeman, Colin. 2016. "Cambridge under pressure to return looted Benin bronze cockerel - but won't return it in case it gets stolen again." *The Telegraph*, 10 August. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/10/08/cambridge-under-pressure-to-return-looted-benin-bronze/> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Gilmour, Rachel and Bill Schwarz. 2011. *End of Empire and the English Novel since 1945*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Gilroy, Paul. 2004. *After empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture?*. London: Routledge.

Gosden, Chris and Frances Larson. 2007. *Knowing Things: Exploring the Collections at the Pitt Rivers Museum 1884-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gurian, Elaine Heumann. 1995. Offering Safer Public Spaces. *The Journal of Museum Education* 20(3): 14-16.

Hallet, Nick. 2016. "Cambridge college removes 'racist' bronze cock after student demands." *Breitbart* website, 3 March. <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2016/03/09/cambridge-college> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Harding, Eleanor. 2016. "Cambridge University agrees to remove Benin Bronze cockerel from the dining hall at Jesus College after students complained about its links to Britain's colonial past." *The Daily Mail* 8 March. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3482654/Cambridge> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Henare, Amiria. 2005. *Museums, anthropology and imperial exchange*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herle, Anita. 2008. "Relational Objects: Connecting People and Things through *Pasifika Styles*." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 15 (2): 159-179.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0940739108080090>

Jacobs, Karen, Chantal Knowles, and Chris Wingfield. 2015. *Trophies, Relics and Curios?: Missionary Heritage from Africa and the Pacific*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.

Jesus College Students Union (JCSU). 2016. JCSU ordinary general meeting minutes, 18 February 2016. Unpublished meeting minutes.

Jones, Jonathan. 2016. "The Cambridge cockerel is no Cecil Rhodes statue – it should be treated as a masterpiece." *The Guardian* 22 February.

<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/jonathanjonesblog/2016/feb/22/cambridge-cockerel-jesus-college-cecil-rhodes-nigeria>

McCarthy, Conal. 2011. *Museums and Māori: Heritage Professionals, Indigenous Collections and Contemporary Practice*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

O'Brien, Zoe. 2016. "'Racist' Cambridge cockerel taken down after university bows to pressure from students." *Express* 9 March. <http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/651198/Racist-Cambridge-university-cockerel-taken-down-bows-to-pressure-students> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Okundaye, Jason. 2016. "What 'erasure of history' really looks like." *The Cambridge Student* 24 April. <http://www.tcs.cam.ac.uk/comment/0035380-what> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Okundaye, Jason. 2017. "Cambridge must return its Benin bronzes, without condition." *Varsity* 15 April. <https://www.varsity.co.uk/comment/12723> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Peers, Laura and Alison K. Brown (eds). 2003. *Museums and Source Communities: A Routledge Reader*. London: Routledge.

Phillips, Ruth B., 2005. "Re-placing objects: Historical practices for the second museum age". *The Canadian Historical Review* 86(1): 83-110. [10.1353/can.2005.0086](https://doi.org/10.1353/can.2005.0086) (accessed 15 August 2019).

Plankensteiner, Barbara. 2007. *Benin—Kings and Rituals: Court Arts from Nigeria*. Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago.

Raymond, Rosanna and Amiria M. Salmond. 2008. *Pasifika Styles: Artists inside the Museum*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.

Robinson, Joe. 2016. "Jesus votes in cockerel row." *Varsity* 18 February.
<https://www.varsity.co.uk/news/9877> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Sarr, Felwine and Bénédicte Savoy. 2018. Rapport sur la restitution du patrimoine culturel africain. Vers une nouvelle éthique relationnelle. <https://restitutionreport2018.com> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Schildkrout, Enid and Curtis Keim. 1998. *The Scramble for art in Central Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schwarz, Bill. 2005. *The Expansion of England: race, ethnicity and cultural history*. London: Routledge.

Schwarz, Bill. 2011. *The White Man's World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shyllon, Folarin. 1998. "One Hundred Years of Looting of Nigerian Art Treasures 1897-1996." *Art Antiquity and Law* 3(2): 253-66.

Shyllon, Folarin. 2000. "The Recovery of Cultural Objects by African States through the UNESCO and UNIDROIT Conventions and the Role of Arbitration." *Uniform Law Review* 5(2): 219-41.

Stoler, Ann L. 2011. "Colonial aphasia: Race and disabled histories in France." *Public Culture* 23(1): 121-56. <https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-2010-018> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Thomas, Nicholas. 1994. *Colonialism's culture: anthropology, travel and government*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Thomas, Nicholas. 2009. *Entangled objects: exchange, material culture, and colonialism in the Pacific*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Thomas, Nicholas, Julei Adams, Billie Lythberg, Maia Nuku and Amiria Salmond, eds. 2016. *Artefacts of Encounter: Cooks Voyages, Colonial Collecting and Museum Histories*. Dunedin: Otago University Press.

Vanguard. 2016. "Benin royals applaud Cambridge move on 'Okukor' cockerel statue." *Vanguard* 21 March. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2016/03/nigerian-royals> (accessed 15 August 2019).

Weale, Sally. 2016. "Benin bronze row: Cambridge college removes cockerel." *The Guardian* 8 March. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2016/mar/08/benin-bronze-row-cambridge-college-removes-cockerel>,

Wekker, Gloria. 2016. *White Innocence: paradoxes of colonialism and race*. Duke University Press.

Figures

Figure 1: Okukor shortly after being removed from the Jesus College dining Hall in March 2016. Courtesy Chris Wingfield.

Figure 2. Photograph of a fireplace in George William Neville's home in Weybridge, Surrey, surrounded by a number of identifiable examples of Benin bronzes. Courtesy Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge.

Figure 3: The Jesus College Student Union, February 2016, where students voted unanimously in favour of a proposal to repatriate Okukor to Nigeria. The vote took place after a debate about the language of this proposal and a series of changes were made.

Courtesy *Varsity Newspaper* – www.varsity.co.uk

Figure 4. The Okukor after conservation treatment, including the removal of the wooden plinth, a surface clean, and the removal of wax and a note from its cavity. Courtesy Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge.

Notes

¹ #RhodesMustFall was the social media tag established in connection with the 2016 student-led campaign to remove a memorial statue of white supremacist, Cecil Rhodes, at the University of Cape Town in South Africa, later spreading to Oriel College at Oxford

University. Both campaigns became synonymous with moves to decolonize the University curriculum and to acknowledge institutional colonial histories and their legacies, including structural racism.

² At the time of the events described, both authors were members of staff at the museum and participated in many of the meetings described; Wingfield as a curator and Zetterstrom-Sharp as a post-doctoral research fellow.

³ The term ‘safe space’ has become politicised in the context of “culture wars”—in 2015, the then British Prime Minister criticised UK Universities for implementing “safe space” policies that stifle free speech. In the context of museums, the idea that Museums can be safe spaces for the discussion of unsafe ideas, associated with Elaine Gurian (1995), has been widespread since the 1990s. See: Andrea Witcomb, Book Reviews: Civilising the Museum,

Recollections: Journal of the National Museum of Australia 1(2) 2006:

https://recollections.nma.gov.au/issues/vol_1_no_2/book_reviews/civilizing_the_museum#endnote%201 (accessed 15 August 2019).

⁴ The BDG was first formed in 2007, consisting of representatives of European museums with significant Benin collections, colleagues from the Nigerian Commission of Museums and Monuments (NCMM), and representatives of the Benin Royal Court and the University of Ibadan. It had its roots in a major touring exhibition of Benin material, *Benin: kings and rituals*, curated by Barbara Plankensteiner. *Benin* brought together material from some of the world’s most significant ethnographic collections, including those in Vienna’s Museum für Völkerkunde, the Ethnologisches Museum in Berlin and the British Museum in London. Crucially, it also collaborated with NCMM and gathered support from the reigning King, Omo N’Oba Erediauwa, who granted loans from the Royal Palace. The focus of the group is the development of a “Benin Plan of Action,” paving the way towards a permanent relocation of Benin material in public collections to Nigeria.

⁵ In relation to Benin, the Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology (MAA) has 415 database records relating to objects associated with Benin City and its immediate environs. 254 are associated with Northcote Thomas, who was appointed as a government anthropologist in Nigeria in 1909, and these objects postdate the sacking of Benin City by British forces in 1897. Of the remainder, 49 records are associated with objects acquired from the dealer W.D. Webster between 1900 and 1905, including a carved tusk and two royal heads, and these were almost certainly looted from the palace. A further 22 objects were purchased from a sale at the auction house Stevens in June 1902, at which 500 pieces deriving from the 1897 expedition were sold. Other material arrived at the museum in smaller numbers throughout the twentieth century, by way of a number of private collections.

⁶ The conservation report noted the removal of glitter during a surface clean, but also recorded the discovery of a note dating from the mid-1990s, written on the Master's place card and bearing the college crest, which had been inserted into the casting cavity of the bronze, no doubt as a student prank. On the morning of the delegation's visit, the note, which had been put out alongside Okukor by conservation staff, was removed from sight.

⁷ The BDG met in Leiden in October 2018 and in Benin City in July 2019 where members agreed to move forwards with plans for a series of long-term loans. This agreement runs in tandem with plans to support the development of a new museum in Benin City under management of the Royal Court of Benin by some of the BDG members, including the British Museum.

⁸ At least part of the wider public engagement around these issues was arguably crystallized as a consequence of the 2018 Marvel film *Black Panther*, in which the British Museum's treatment of African material, acquired during the colonial period, was parodied.

⁹ See for example response from Tristram Hunt (V&A), Nicholas Thomas (MAA) and Hartmut Dorgerloh (Humboldt Forum) in *The Art Newspaper*, November 2018:

<https://www.theartnewspaper.com/comment/restitution-report-museums-directors-respond>,

opinion piece by Thomas in *The Financial Times*, December 2018:

<https://www.ft.com/content/6c61c6e6-f7ed-11e8-af46-2022a0b02a6c>, and by Hunt in *The*

Guardian, June 2019: <https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2019/jun/29/should-museums-return-their-colonial-artefacts> (accessed 15 August 2019).