

Argument-Box

Shortened English version of the Argument-Box developed for the workshop “What is this doing here?” by Julia Albrecht, Nora Landkammer, Karin Schneider

The Museum as a Site of Unlearning: Materials and Reflections on Museum Education at the Weltkulturen Museum. Stephanie Endter, Nora Landkammer, and Karin Schneider (eds.), 2018.
<http://www.traces.polimi.it/2018/10/08/issue-06-the-museum-as-a-site-of-unlearning/>

The future of collections of ethnographic objects in European Museums is subject to ongoing debates among activists, scientists and politicians internationally. The educational program “What’s that doing here?” wished to provide opportunities for young people to engage with questions around provenance, ownership and claims to cultural property in museum collections. The *Argument Box* provides proposals from the restitution debates that should help to develop the students’ discussions and enhance the complexity of their debate. The *Argument Box* includes arguments regarding the topic ‘restitution and ownership’ from a variety of sources and positions.

The *Argument Box* can be used in different ways: In our workshop we included some of the arguments for the plenary discussion in order to provide different perspectives, after the students had presented their research outcomes. It can also be used by the students themselves e.g. in the context of working groups or the educators/teachers might use the material to prepare the workshop.

The *Argument Box* is an open tool to be continuously extended and changed. As we first prepared the tool for a workshop in a German museum, most of our examples referred to cases from the German speaking countries. In this perspective we would appreciate also the English version of the *Argument Box* to grow with the help of colleagues who are invited to send us material on the way they perceive the debate in their context.



This publication ensues from the research project *Transmitting Contentious Cultural Heritages with the Arts. From Intervention to Co-Production*, which has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement No. 693857. For further information please visit www.tracesproject.eu

The views expressed here are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

ARGUMENT 01:

A plea for the return of an irreplaceable cultural heritage to those who created it (Amadou-Mahtar M’Bow, Director-General of Unesco, 1979)

»The vicissitudes of history have [...] robbed many peoples of a priceless portion of the inheritance in which their enduring identity finds its embodiment. Architectural features, statues and friezes, monoliths, mosaics, pottery, enamels, masks and objects of jade, ivory and chased gold - in fact everything which has been taken away, from monuments to handicrafts - were more than decorations or ornamentation. They bore witness to a history, the history of a culture and of a nation whose spirit they perpetuated and renewed.

The peoples who were victims of this plunder, sometimes for hundreds of years, have not only been despoiled of irreplaceable masterpieces but also robbed of a memory which would doubtless have helped them to greater self-knowledge and would certainly have enabled others to understand them better.

The men and women of these countries have the right to recover these cultural assets which are part of their being.«

M’Bow, Amadou-Mahtar: »A plea for the return of an irreplaceable cultural heritage to those who created it«. In: *Museum*, Vol. XXXI(1), 1979, 58.

ARGUMENT 02:

United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs.

»Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artefacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature, as well as the right to restitution of cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free and informed consent or in violation of their laws, traditions and customs; ... the right to use and control of ceremonial objects; and the right to repatriation of human remains.«

United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Part III, Article 12 & 13. https://www.obs-traffic.museum/sites/default/files/ressources/files/Skrydstrup_a_visionary_idea.pdf (accessed 15.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 03:

Restitution Claims get support

»The «bi-cultural» Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa in Wellington (est. 1998) and the National Museum of the American Indian in Washington DC (est. 2004) are two institutions, which have actively pursued international repatriation efforts benefiting indigenous communities. Within settler nations the aforementioned legislatures, and their broad institutional support, speak for themselves: Since the 1980s repatriation has become explicitly supported by the governments in the U.S., Canada, Australia and New Zealand.«

Skrydstrup, Martin: A Visionary Idea and a Pragmatic Tool. Making a case for a database listing resolutions to cultural property claims. ICME papers, 2004. https://www.obs-traffic.museum/sites/default/files/ressources/files/Skrydstrup_a_visionary_idea.pdf (accessed 15.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 04:

ICOM (International Council of Museums) ethic guidelines propose to react on restitutions claims

»6.3 Restitution of Cultural Property

When a country or people of origin seeks the restitution of an object or specimen that can be demonstrated to have been exported or otherwise transferred in violation of the principles of international and national conventions, and shown to be part of that country's or people's cultural or natural heritage, the museum concerned should, if legally free to do so, take prompt and responsible steps to co-operate in its return.«

ICOM Code of Professional Ethics, 2006. <http://archives.icom.museum/ethics.html#section6> (accessed 15.12.2018).

Further Information

Full text:

»6. Museums work in close collaboration with the communities from which their collections originate as well as those they serve

Principle: Museum collections reflect the cultural and natural heritage of the communities from which they have been derived. As such they have a character beyond that of ordinary property which may include strong affinities with national, regional, local, ethnic, religious or political identity. It is important therefore that museum policy is responsive to this possibility.

6.1 Co-operation

Museums should promote the sharing of knowledge, documentation and collections with museums and cultural organisations in the countries and communities of origin. The pos-

sibility of developing partnerships with museums in countries or areas that have lost a significant part of their heritage should be explored.

6.2 Return of Cultural Property

Museums should be prepared to initiate dialogues for the return of cultural property to a country or people of origin. This should be undertaken in an impartial manner, based on scientific, professional and humanitarian principles as well as applicable local, national and international legislation, in preference to action at a governmental or political level.

6.3 Restitution of Cultural Property

When a country or people of origin seeks the restitution of an object or specimen that can be demonstrated to have been exported or otherwise transferred in violation of the principles of international and national conventions, and shown to be part of that country's or people's cultural or natural heritage, the museum concerned should, if legally free to do so, take prompt and responsible steps to co-operate in its return.

6.4 Cultural Objects From an Occupied Country

Museums should abstain from purchasing or acquiring cultural objects from an occupied territory and respect fully all laws and conventions that regulate the import, export and transfer of cultural or natural materials.«

ICOM Code of Professional Ethics, 2006. <http://archives.icom.museum/ethics.html#section6> (accessed 15.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 05:

International Indigenous Groups proposed a joint Declaration

»2.12 All human remains and burial objects of indigenous peoples held by museums

and other institutions must be returned to their traditional areas in a culturally appropriate manner.

2.13 Museums and other institutions must provide, to the country and indigenous peoples concerned, an inventory of any indigenous cultural objects still held in their possession.

2.14 Indigenous cultural objects held in museums and other institutions must be offered back to their traditional owners.«

WIPO World Intellectual Property Organization, Commission on Human Rights, Sub-Commission of Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, Working Group on Indigenous Populations, 19-30 July 1993: The Mataatua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples. http://www.wipo.int/tk/en/databases/creative_heritage/indigenous/link0002.html (accessed 11.8.2018).

ARGUMENT 06:

UNESCO documents are around for a while and they do matter

»The first text on the protection of cultural goods dates from 1954, but the real tipping point was the Unesco convention framed in November 1970. It introduced a series of non-retroactive obligations regarding »the means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit import, export and transfer of ownership of cultural property«. The convention underlines that »it is essential for every state to become increasingly alive to the moral obligations to respect its own cultural heritage and that of all nations«, and that »as cultural institutions, museums, libraries and archives should ensure that their collections are built up in accordance with universally recognised moral principles«.

The episode of the Tetaki reliefs illustrates the importance of this text. In 2009 Egypt demanded that the Louvre return five fragments of a wall painting from the tomb of Tetaki, an 18th-dynasty noble. To get round the Unesco convention, the French authorities initially claimed that the artefacts had left Egypt before the text was ratified. However, it emerged that they had been stolen at a later date, and France was obliged to return them to Egypt.«

»French museums face a cultural change over restitution of colonial objects«. The Guardian, Nov 03, 2014. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/nov/03/france-museums-restitution-colonial-objects> (accessed 19.12.2018)

ARGUMENT 07:

It's not only about returning the objects, but about recreating links between the people and the objects

»**Otobong Nkanga:** A lot of people are not so much interested in old cultural artefacts or consider cultural objects important anymore in their development and their idea of advancing or going forward in the world. Most people just want to have a normal life with water, food, shelter and education for their kids. Now, where does this play a role in the development of people, when most of their objects and artifacts are found in Western museums to which they do not have access to? It's a very hard thing, because the answer is not only the returning of the objects to the people or geographies that the objects originally come from, but it is also the creating of a symbiotic and the synchronization of the people to the objects that belong to their geographies, so that the objects can be part and parcel of the everyday reflections and development.«

Barrois, Beatrice: Ways of humanity. An interview with Otobong Nkanga, 2016. http://www.academia.edu/35075331/Ways_of_Humanity._A_talk_with_Otobong_Nkanga (accessed 19.12.2018).

Further Information

Otobong Nkanga (*1974, Kano, Nigéria) is a visual artist who lives in Antwerp. She works with a range of mediums from drawing and painting to performance and installation. In preparation for the exhibition »OBJECT ATLAS - Fieldwork in the Museum« at the Weltkulturen Museum in 2012, she was invited for an Artist in Residency program. In 2013 she was a participant in two Think Tanks which were organized in preparation of the exhibition »FOREIGN EXCHANGE (or the stories you wouldn't tell a stranger)«.

ARGUMENT 08:

Activist demands: The Feather Crown should be brought back to Mexico

»My name is Xokonoschtletl Gomora. I was born on 17 February 1951 in Mexico. Since 1986, I've been coming to Europe on a regular basis to travel around the world to achieve one goal: bringing the sacred plume of our Lord Montezuma back to Mexico, which has been in the Vienna Museum of Ethnology since 1524. This crown is of the highest spiritual and idealistic importance for the Mexican aborigines! This sacred crown is designed to help ensure that the peoples of Mexico preserve their own culture and identity. So it was proclaimed in a message from the Council of Elders on August 12, 1521. The day after, August 13, 1521, the last ruler of the Aztecs, KUAUHTEMOK, opened the gates of the capital of the Aztecs, MEXICO-TENOCHTITLAN, after 93 days of siege by the Spaniards.«

Gomora, Xokonoschtletl, auf <http://www.xoko.org/> (accessed 15.12.2018)



Aztec Feather Crown, early 16th century, Weltmuseum Wien. ©khm-museumsverband, online unter <https://derstandard.at/2000066466165/Weltmuseum-Wiedereroeffnung-Voelkerverbindung-bei-Licht-und-Schatten> (accessed 11.8.2018).

ARGUMENT 09:

In the »Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums«, 2003, directors of international collections in Europe and the USA argue that the objects acquired »have become part of the museums that have cared for them, and by extension part of the heritage of the nations which house them«.

»The international museum community shares the conviction that illegal traffic in archaeological, artistic, and ethnic objects must be firmly discouraged. We should, however, recognize that objects acquired in earlier times must be viewed in the light of different sensitivities and values, reflective of that earlier era. The objects and monumental works that were installed decades and even centuries ago in museums throughout Europe and America were acquired under conditions that are not comparable with current ones.

Over time, objects so acquired – whether by purchase, gift, or partage – have become part of the museums that have cared for them, and by extension part of the heritage of the nations which house them. Today we are especially sensitive to the subject of a work’s original context, but we should not lose sight of the fact that museums too provide a valid and valuable context for objects that were long ago displaced from their original source.«

»Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums«, 2004; online unter http://archives.icom.museum/pdf/E_news2004/p4_2004-1.pdf (accessed 17.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 10:

In the »Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums«, 2003, directors of international collections in Europe and the USA argue that »universal admiration for ancient civilizations would not be so deeply established today were it not for the influence exercised by the artifacts of these cultures, widely available to an international public in major museums«.

»The universal admiration for ancient civilizations would not be so deeply established today were it not for the influence exercised by the artifacts of these cultures, widely available to an international public in major museums. (...) Calls to repatriate objects that have belonged to museum collections for many years have become an important issue for museums. Although each case has to be judged individually, we should acknowledge that museums serve not just the citizens of one nation but the people of every nation. Museums are agents in the development of culture, whose mission is to foster knowledge by a con-

tinuous process of reinterpretation. Each object contributes to that process. To narrow the focus of museums whose collections are diverse and multifaceted would therefore be a disservice to all visitors.«

»Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums«, 2004; online unter http://archives.icom.museum/pdf/E_news2004/p4_2004-1.pdf (accessed 17.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 11:

In her text »Who Owns Africa's Cultural Patrimony?« Sylvester Okwunodu Ogbecchie argues that the so called universal Western museum is not universal, as Africans can not easily travel and get access to their heritage in Europe and USA.

»African artworks in Western Museums also do not circulate to Africa and exhibitions of African art usually circulate only among other Western museums and cultural institutions. Through this processes, Africans are denied and opportunity for significant intersection with the cultural products of their ancestors, and the discourse of African art largely proceeds as if the intentions and cultural concerns of the African producers of these artworks do not matter to an understanding of their forms, symbolism and meaning. To compound this already injurious situation Western countries also routinely deny Africans access to these art works through enforced localization and denial of international access: Africans require transit visa merely to pass through all Western metropolitan airline hubs (which means essentially paying for the privilege of embarking on a plane in a European airport) and no Western country will grant an African visa merely to visit any museum in Europe and America (...). «

Ogbecchie, Sylvester Okwunodu: „Who Owns Africa's Cultural Patrimony? » In: *Critical Interventions* 4/2, 2010, S. 2-3; online unter <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19301944.2010.10781383> (accessed 17.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 12:

Restitution Claims are based on Nationalist Agendas

»(...) Defenders of museums believe that their diverse and cosmopolitan collections are under attack from governments and groups with narrow, nationalist agendas. Critics of western museums accuse them of complicity in the illicit trade, and at a more general level, of perpetuating the gross inequalities between the west and the rest of the world. (...)

(...) James Cuno, CEO of the Getty Trust, fears that universal museums in the west face a deeper challenge from nationalists around the world. Governments

and their deputised national museums often couch their demands for repatriation in terms of »repairing the integrity of the nation«. Cuno argues that these claims are more theatrical than moral, making cultural property »about politics and the political agenda of ruling elites.«

Taroor, Kanishk: Museums and looted art: the ethical dilemma of preserving world cultures. The Guardian, 29 Jun 2015, <https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2015/jun/29/museums-looting-art-artefacts-world-culture> (accessed 17.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 13:

Not knowing that something was stolen property means that no one wanted to know

»Tess Davis, a lawyer with the Antiquities Coalition, praised the Cleveland Museum of Art for voluntarily returning the Hanuman statue, but argued that it should never have been allowed to enter the collection in the first place. »The Hanuman first surfaced on the market while Cambodia was in the midst of a war and facing genocide,« she said. »How could anyone not know this was stolen property? The only answer is that no one wanted to know.««

Taroor, Kanishk: Museums and looted art: the ethical dilemma of preserving world cultures. The Guardian, 29 Jun 2015, <https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2015/jun/29/museums-looting-art-artefacts-world-culture> (accessed 17.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 14:

Only institutions in the west can preserve the world's cultural heritage

»The ongoing destruction of ancient sites in the Middle East by the Islamic State has galvanised the case for the universal museum, with advocates like Gary Vikan, the former director of the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore, arguing that only institutions in the west can preserve the world's cultural heritage. Isis's cultural atrocities »will put an end to the excess piety in favour of the repatriation model«, he told the New York Times.«

Taroor, Kanishk: Museums and looted art: the ethical dilemma of preserving world cultures. The Guardian, 29 Jun 2015, <https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2015/jun/29/museums-looting-art-artefacts-world-culture> (accessed 17.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 15:

Exhibition »Repatriated Objects: 2014-2015« at the Egyptian Museum: The practice of repatriation - damage to the objects is done by looters and smugglers and not by the countries the objects belong to.

»You might expect to see foreign Ambassadors and cultural Attachés at exhibit openings in Cairo, and indeed many were present when Dr. Mamdouh Eldamaty, Minister of Antiquities opened the temporary exhibit entitled, »Repatriated Objects: 2014-2015« at the Egyptian Museum last month. (...) Antiquities Minister Dr. Mamdouh Eldamaty, opened the exhibit flanked by Ambassadors and dignitaries representing the countries from which objects had been repatriated: France, Austria, Belgium, Germany, the United Kingdom, Denmark, the United States, and South Africa. He explained that many exhibit objects had been stolen or illegally excavated in recent years and that even those whose documentation seemed to be in order may be put up for sale by famous auction houses like Christie's, Sotheby's or Bonham erroneously. »These objects are very difficult to repatriate, especially if they have false documents certifying they left Egypt before 1970, the date of the UNESCO Convention requiring repatriation of objects illegally removed from the country,« according to Dr. Ali Ahmad, Director of the MOA Repatriation Department. (...) A repatriation ceremony was held at the National Geographic Society in Washington, DC in March 2015. During the ceremony, the 145 items were turned over to the Egyptian government. Then Egyptian Ambassador to the US, Mohamed Tawfik and ICE Director Sarah Saldaña signed the repatriation agreement and 72 hours later the items were encased in specially crafted shipping crates and placed on an Egyptair flight home to Cairo. Referring to the damage that looters and smugglers have done to Egyptian cultural heritage, Ambassador Tawfik thanked the people involved in the five-year investigation that resulted in the repatriation, saying that their »tireless work, while often unseen, is nothing short of vital for the preservation of ancient cultures around the world.««

ARCE, The American Research Center in Egypt: Behind the scenes. The repatriation of stolen objects, n.d, <http://archive.arce.org/news/u170> (accessed 17.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 16:

The objects »had meaning to us. That's why we say, when the British removed those things, they took chapters of our history« (Video)

Interview with prince Edun Akenzua, Enogie (Earl) of Obazuwa, the brother of the Oba (king) of Benin, today Nigeria.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3HSheQrdcvI>

The Benin Invasion of 1897 was a »punitive invasion« by a United Kingdom force under Admiral Sir Harry Rawson in response to the ambush of a previous British-led party. Rawson's troops captured, burned, and looted Benin City, bringing to an end the west African Kingdom of Benin. As a result, much of the country's stolen art, including the Benin Bronzes, were relocated to Britain.



Relief, Benin, 16th to 17th Century. British Museum (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0), online at http://www.britishmuseum.org/collectionimages/AN00020/AN00020716_001_l.jpg?width=304 (accessed 11.8.2018)

Channels Television

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3HSheQrdcvI> (accessed 18.12.2018)

ARGUMENT 17:

Cultural attitudes in Europe seem to be shifting

»During a visit to Burkina Faso in November (2018), French President **Emmanuel Macron** declared that returning artifacts to countries in Africa was a top priority for him.

»I cannot accept that a large part of cultural heritage from several African countries is in France,« he said during a speech in the capital, Ouagadougou. »In the next five years, I want the conditions to be met for the temporary or permanent restitution of African heritage to Africa.«

In May (2018), Germany's culture minister and the association of German museums released a »code of conduct« for museums that included guidelines for how to research where their artifacts actually came from and how to return objects that were taken from other countries during the colonial era. Germany has also put aside more than \$3 million to assist museums in determining the origin of objects taken in an illegal or illegitimate way.«

Underwood, Alexia: European museums may »loan« stolen artifacts back to countries in Africa. Vox, 17 Aug 2018, <https://www.vox.com/2018/8/17/17716834/stolen-artifacts-africa-europe-museums> (accessed 18.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 18:

Loan instead of restitution

»In the UK, the Victoria and Albert Museum in London is considering returning thousands of objects, including gold artifacts, to Ethiopia »on a long term loan.« The artifacts were taken from the country by the British army in the 1800s, the Post reports, and Ethiopia filed a claim for their return in 2007. The Benin Dialogue Group, a consortium of European museums, also has plans to loan a series of objects to Nigeria and Benin that were taken by the British army during an expedition in West Africa in the 1800s. Restitution, or permanently returning the artifacts, however, is not part of the current plan.«

Underwood, Alexia: European museums may »loan« stolen artifacts back to countries in Africa. Vox, 17 Aug 2018, <https://www.vox.com/2018/8/17/17716834/stolen-artifacts-africa-europe-museums> (accessed 18.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 19:

The Africa Accessioned Project – Collections make Connections between Africa and Europe

»The Project »Africa Accessioned« was initiated by the museums in Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to research their heritage in European museums: «In Namibia it is difficult today to locate many historical artefacts that embody the cultural identity of communities. Yet these objects have been collected and, often, archived (rather than displayed) in museums beyond the continent. The internet gives access to a disparate ›virtual museum‹ of Namibian cultural heritage. The Africa Accessioned project aims to locate and list African ethnographic collections held in European museums as a tool to generate dialogue and collaborative projects (so in the spirit of dialogue we also have an interest in European objects displayed in African museums). The project is a pilot, and operates with limited financial resources ie. currently none. Four African countries provided the initial focus for the project: Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The project initially, mapped relevant collections held in Finland, Germany, Sweden and the UK. A secondary exercise has documented Namibian collections in Finnish museums and will be used to demonstrate the project's potential to develop the notion of the ›museum as process‹. The project recognises the contextual framework of the circulation of material culture along colonial trade routes. The project seeks to position museums as mediums for global dialogue. Conversations enable source communities to provide greater historical depth regarding the intangible cultural heritage and places which provide a more complete biography of an object in a collection. The project is not a campaign for the repatriation of all African artefacts to the continent, but it will initiate debate about the provenance and significance of

some artefacts. The willingness to review collections to address the past can increase cultural dialogue and positive co-operation. European museums need to engage with this legacy, but should see dialogue as an opportunity, rather than a threat. Collections can generate connections. Museums can build bridges, rather than barriers, between communities.«

Project description and conference »Museum cooperation between Africa and Europe: Opportunities, Challenges and Modalities«, Zurich 2016; online <http://www.musethno.uzh.ch/dam/jcr:7343112a-2e6c-4968-8481-2ca35a66da09/Museum%20cooperation%20conference%20booklet.pdf> (accessed 11.8.2018).

ARGUMENT 20:

Unlike with the victims of World War Two atrocities, Germany has also refused to pay reparations to (Herero and Nama) victims, saying it pays millions of dollars of development aid to the country instead

»Representatives of two indigenous groups in Namibia, the Herero and Nama peoples, have filed a class-action lawsuit against Germany in New York.

They are seeking reparations for what former colonial power Germany acknowledges was genocide.

The plaintiffs are seeking reparations and the right to representation at talks between Germany and Namibia.

Some 100,000 people are believed to have been killed when Germany crushed an uprising, beginning in 1904.

Namibia and Germany have been in talks about a joint declaration on the massacres, which Germany has recently admitted were genocide, but Herero and Nama descendants have been excluded from the talks.

Unlike with the victims of World War Two atrocities, Germany has also refused to pay reparations to victims, saying it pays millions of dollars of development aid to the country instead.«

Herero and Nama groups sue Germany over Namibia genocide, BBC, 6 Jan 2017, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-38530594> (accessed 17.12.2018).

ARGUMENT 21:

Grada Kilomba: Decolonizing Knowledge

"When they speak, it is scientific;
 when we speak, it is unscientific.
 When they speak, it is universal;
 when we speak, it is specific.
 When they speak, it is objective;
 when we speak, it is subjective.
 When they speak, it is neutral;
 when we speak, it is personal.
 When they speak, it is rational;
 when we speak, it is emotional.
 When they speak, it is impartial;
 when we speak, it is partial.
 They have facts, we have opinions.
 They have knowledges, we have experiences.
 We are not dealing here with a 'peaceful
 coexistence of words,' but rather with a
 violent hierarchy, which defines *Who Can
 Speak, and What We Can Speak About.*"
 - Grada Kilomba, in "Decolonizing
 Knowledge" (2016)

Kilomba, Grada: »Decolonizing knowledge«, lecture performance, 2016. Public facebook page of Grada Kilomba, <https://www.facebook.com/563019127061093/photos/a.563029377060068.133326.5630191%2027061093/1332791586750506/?type=3&theater> (accessed 11.8.2018).

ARGUMENT 22:

Productive guilt (Video)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7gQ5m_KC1Hg

Wayne Modest (Anthropologist and Director of the Research Center for Material Culture at the Tropenmuseum Amsterdam) states that museums and cultural institutions cannot escape their history.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7gQ5m_KC1Hg (accessed 17.12.2018)

Reference

Albrecht, Julia/Landkammer, Nora/Schneider, Karin: «Argument-Box». In: Endter, Stephanie; Landkammer, Nora; and Schneider, Karin (eds.): *The Museum as a Site of Unlearning: Materials and Reflections on Museum Education at the Weltkulturen Museum*, 2018, available at: <http://www.traces.polimi.it/2018/10/08/issue-06-the-museum-as-a-site-of-unlearning/>.