Oñati Socio-Legal Series (ISSN: 2079-5971)
Oñati International Institute for the Sociology of Law
Avenida Universidad, 8 – Apdo. 28
20560 Oñati – Gipuzkoa – Spain
Tel. (+34) 943 783064 / opo@iisj.net / https://opo.iisj.net

Capitalist Property as Epistemic Violence: Ethnographic Museums, Colonial Restitution and the Cosmopolitical Challenge

OÑATI SOCIO-LEGAL SERIES VOLUME 15, ISSUE 5 (2025), 1647-1666: DECOLONISING LEGAL PLURALISM, DECENTRING EPISTEMOLOGICAL PARADIGMS
DOI LINK: HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.35295/OSLS.IISL.2030
RECEIVED DD-MONTH-YEAR, ACCEPTED 5 MARCH 2025, FIRST-ONLINE PUBLISHED 17 MARCH 2025, VERSION OF RECORD PUBLISHED 1 OCTOBER 2025

JONAS BENS*

Abstract

Ethnographic museums around the world are embroiled in controversies about how to deal with the coloniality of their collections. The frame of contestation is most often property: Who should "own" ethnographic objects? Should they remain the property of Western museums, or should they (again) become the property of museums in the former colonies? As much as this debate rightly foregrounds the need to address and redress colonial violence, it still has a blind spot: capitalist property itself, one of the most powerful legacies of colonialism, is not questioned. As a result, a central aspect remains undertheorised: the fact that the ethnographic objects originate in indigenous cultural systems whose normative orders are based on sometimes radically different conceptions of what persons are, what things are, and how they relate to each other. This poses a cosmopolitical challenge to ethnographic museums: basic understandings of nature and culture are put up for debate. Therefore, any attempt to decolonise European museums must include a critique of the specific notions of property that underpin modern statehood.

The research on which this article is based was conducted as part of the research project "Contested Property" of the Collaborative Research Centre "Affective Societies" (DFG- 258523721) and the Heisenberg Grant "The Material Culture of Empire" (DFG- 511149495), both funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG). I am grateful to my colleagues Laibor Kalanga Moko, Paola Ivanov, and Iuri Portalegre, my fellow travellers in the "Contested Property" project, without whose work this text could never have been written. Many of the ideas that I discuss in this article have emerged from numerous conversations with Andrea Scholz. Particularly in the final stages, Bille Sachers' help was invaluable, as always. I would also like to thank Martin Ramstedt and Katrin Seidel for including me in this excellent special collection, Leire Kortabarria for her help in organising the peer review process, and three anonymous reviewers for their important suggestions on how to improve this text.
* Jonas Bens is Heisenberg Professor of Anthropology at the University of Hamburg. His research focuses on the intersection of colonialism, capitalism, and modern statehood. His recent books include *The Indigenous Paradox: Rights, Sovereignty, and Culture in the Americas* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020) and *The Sentimental Court: The Affective Life of International Criminal Justice* (Cambridge University Press, 2022). Email address: jonas.bens@uni-hamburg.de

Key words

Property; colonialism; legal pluralism; cosmopolitics; decolonization

Resumen

Los museos etnográficos de todo el mundo se ven envueltos en polémicas sobre cómo abordar la colonialidad de sus colecciones. El marco de la controversia suele ser la propiedad: ¿A quién deben "pertenecer" los objetos etnográficos? ¿Deben seguir siendo propiedad de los museos occidentales o deben (de nuevo) pasar a ser propiedad de los museos de las antiguas colonias? Por mucho que este debate destaque acertadamente la necesidad de abordar y reparar la violencia colonial, sigue teniendo un punto ciego: no se cuestiona la propia propiedad capitalista, uno de los legados más poderosos del colonialismo. En consecuencia, queda sin teorizar un aspecto central: el hecho de que los objetos etnográficos proceden de sistemas culturales indígenas cuyos órdenes normativos se basan en concepciones a veces radicalmente distintas de lo que son las personas, lo que son las cosas y cómo se relacionan entre sí. Eso plantea un reto cosmopolítico a los museos etnográficos: las concepciones básicas de la naturaleza y la cultura se ponen a debate. Cualquier intento de descolonizar los museos europeos debe incluir una crítica de las nociones específicas de propiedad que sustentan la estatalidad moderna.

Palabras clave

Propiedad; colonialismo; pluralismo jurídico; cosmopolítica; descolonización

Table of contents

1. Introduction

Ethnographic museums are coming under increasing criticism. Founded mostly in the nineteenth century across Europe and North America, their self-proclaimed mission is to collect, preserve, and exhibit artefacts that represent the diverse cultures and social practices of people from around the world (Kuper 2024). But the ethnographic collections housed in institutions such as the British Museum in London, the Musée du Quai Branly in Paris or the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin were largely acquired from indigenous communities under the violent conditions of colonial rule. A growing number of scholars, practitioners, and activists are demanding that ethnographic museums begin to systematically address these colonial origins of their collections and the various ways in which colonial logics of knowledge production about the world still permeate these institutions.

The main framework in which this discussion on the colonial entanglements of ethnographic museums is conducted today is what one could call "the property question". Because museum collectors acquired ethnographic objects under the violent conditions of colonial rule, critics argue that their acquisition was if not outright illegal, in any case morally reprehensible. In other words: museums are not, or at least should not be, the actual owners of the ethnographic collections. Consequently, critics are mobilizing the language of property crime and have characterized ethnographic museums as repositories of "stolen art", "loot", or "plunder" (Hicks 2020, Robertson 2020, Aly 2021, Philipps 2021, Savoy 2021). Both from a legal and a moral critical perspective, the ethnographic objects stored in the museum depots would still be the property of the communities from which they have been originally taken. As a result, the collections should be returned to them (Sarr and Savoy 2018).

Countering these critiques, defenders of the traditional policies of ethnographic museums argue that ethnographic collections should remain in European museums. They likewise take the property question to be the centre of the discussion, but come to different conclusions about who is the proper owner of the ethnographic objects. Some point out that many of the objects were not stolen but legally purchased (Parzinger, cited in Kuhn 2018), or they take a broader perspective, arguing that the collections are the property not of individual communities, but of humanity as a whole (Brown 2003, Cuno 2008).

Both sides of this debate on the restitution of ethnographic collections approach the public debate on the decolonisation of museums as a property conflict. Most participants in the discussion naturally assume that the pieces in these ethnographic collections are *things* that can be *owned*. Although this notion is fully in line with the global capitalist property regimes that govern Western museums today, the idea that ethnographic collection pieces can be property in a capitalist sense, is not universally shared, and in many cases fully rejected, by the indigenous communities from where these ethnographic collections were taken.

In fact, as ethnographic studies on encounters between museum practitioners and indigenous community activists, some of which I will review in this article, reveal, people sometimes radically disagree about the ontological status of the collection pieces. Are they inanimate things to be owned by individuals, museums, or maybe by indigenous communities? Or are they divine beings, ancestors, family members or

magical entities with agency of their own? Are they persons or are they things? Are they subjects or are they objects? Consequently, actors in these negotiations over ethnographic collections do not only disagree about who "owns these things", but they disagree on a much more fundamental level if they are "things" to be "owned" in the first place.

I therefore argue in this article that, in order to better understand what is at stake in the debates on the colonial entanglement of ethnological museums, we must acknowledge the cosmopolitical nature of these conflicts. In anthropology, the term "cosmopolitics" (De la Cadena 2010) has come to refer to those political conflicts in which fundamental ontologies become the centre of contestation. Modernist cosmologies which also govern capitalist notions of property are based on a strict dichotomy between nature and culture. Human subjects own non-human objects as property. This modernist ontology underlying capitalist property, which has been made globally hegemonic by colonial power relations, potentially clashes with indigenous cosmologies that follow different understandings of nature and culture; in which an "ethnographic object" rather appears as a living subject with a will of their own.

In order to fully appreciate the cosmopolitical dimension of these conflicts over ethnographic collections, it is necessary to highlight how they are situated in a context of plural normative orders – a perspective most thoroughly explored in legal anthropology (Griffiths 1986, Merry 1988, Benda-Beckmann 2002, Benda-Beckmann and Turner 2018, Tamanaha 2021). From this perspective, modern capitalist property regimes are only one of several possible systems for regulating the normative relationship between persons and things, subjects and objects (Hann 1998, Benda-Beckmann *et al.* 2006, Strang and Busse 2011, Busse 2012, Canfield 2020). The fact that capitalist notions of property are globally hegemonic does not indicate that they are universally seen as reasonable but results from the historical and ongoing colonisation of indigenous materialities (Chanock 1991, Klug 1995).

I therefore argue that in order to gain a deeper understanding of how ethnographic museums reproduce colonial logics, we must go beyond a superficial restitution debate which takes capitalist property logics for granted. Capitalist property law is a fundamental institutional principle of the ethnographic museum: the museum owns collections of things, uses them to explore their cultural meanings, and displays them to educate the public. When the colonial notions of property inscribed in its structure dominate indigenous notions of materiality and personhood, cosmopolitical conflict is inevitable in the ethnographic museum. In order to contribute to a project of decolonizing the museum (Sieg 2021, Knudsen *et al.* 2022), it is crucial to take seriously indigenous notions of materiality and personhood from whom the collections originate, and understand how capitalist notions of property have, to a greater or lesser degree, been imposed on indigenous peoples.

As a result, the indigenous interlocutors involved in these encounters experience the naturalisation of capitalist property as a framework for dealing with museum collections as epistemic violence: an indirect form of violence that occurs within the realms of producing, sharing, and acknowledging knowledge. Epistemic violence denies certain people or communities the ability to contribute to the production of knowledge and forcibly imposes a dominant viewpoint that results in subordination and hierarchy. As

Gayatri Spivak (1988) explains: "The clearest available example of such epistemic violence is the remotely orchestrated, far-flung, and heterogeneous project to constitute the colonial subject as Other" (280-281). As such, ethnographic museums have been analysed as sites of epistemic violence through the imposition of specific modernist forms of knowledge (Tolia-Kelly 2016, Moko 2023). I argue in this article that capitalist property, and the specific forms of materiality and personhood that underpin it, can therefore become a form of epistemic violence in the field of colonial restitution. As a first step in thinking through this complex entanglement of colonialism and capitalism manifested in these encounters, it is necessary to pay close attention to the fact that it is not only the ownership of "things" that is disputed between museum institutions and indigenous communities, but that there is also fundamental cosmopolitical disagreement over the ontological status of collection pieces.

2. Indigenous Materialities and the Cosmopolitical Challenge

In the summer of 2014, a group of Kotiria, a Wanano speaking Amazonian indigenous community from the upper Rio Negro region on the border between Brazil and Colombia, visited the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin. The visitors, which included teachers from an indigenous primary school, had come to Berlin as part of a collaborative anthropological research project (Kraus *et al.* 2018, Scholz 2021, Costa Oliveira and Scholz fc.). The aim of the project was to introduce indigenous perspectives into the production of knowledge about the museum's Amazonian collection as part of a workshop. As a first step in this visit, the community members entered the museum's storage to see the ethnographic objects with their own eyes. Upon entering the storage area, some group members found the atmosphere disturbing, they were even shocked.

As we know from the ethnographic literature on Amazonia, there are considerable differences between indigenous understandings of materiality and personhood and capitalist-modern ontological assumptions about the nature and distinction between people and things (Hugh-Jones 2009, Brightman *et al.* 2016). In many Upper Rio Negro societies, the larger kinship groups, clans, are composed both of human as well as non-human members. One of the collection pieces that participants focused on as such a non-human clan ancestor was a feather headdress, traditionally kept in a feather box. The German anthropologist Theodor Koch-Grünberg had collected a number of these at the beginning of the 20th century (Scholz 2020). Such feather headdresses which are used in rituals are not conceptualised as a passive material, but as an entity with its own subject quality and agency. The participants did not see the feather headdress as a thing that is owned by a kinship group, but rather as an independent member of the kinship group, a person rather than a thing. The participants perceived the collection items stored behind the glass walls of the storage area not just as things from the past, but as living beings in captivity (Costa Oliveira and Scholz fc.).

This disagreement on the nature of the feather headdress goes beyond a difference in classification, calling the feather headdress either "ethnographic object" or "ancestor". From a Kotiria perspective, there is no difference in substance between the human bodies of the participants and the collection pieces such as the feather headdress (Hugh-Jones 2009, Costa Oliveira 2017). If a clan misses some of their members, it cannot reproduce in the same way as before and the social equilibrium of the kinship group is severely disturbed. A simple transfer of property title would drastically underestimate what is

necessary to repair the broken social relationships that result from separating the non-human clan members from the kinship group. From the perspective of the indigenous interlocutors, discussing all this in the language of property was in itself felt as an act of epistemic violence.

Between 2021 and 2022, Laibor Kalanga Moko (2023) undertook a long-term ethnographic fieldwork project in a Maasai community in northern Tanzania, taking the Maasai collection at the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin as his starting point. Among the many objects Moko discussed with his interlocutors was a medicine horn from the museum collection. Such medicine horns, which are still in use today, have an important function in healing practices and are used by a medical specialist, an *oloiboni* (Berntsen 1976, Galaty 1982). When Moko showed his interlocutors a photograph of the medicine horn, people were incredulous. It was inconceivable that such a medicine horn could be outside of the Maasai community, not least in a museum in Berlin.

In his study of Maasai concepts of materiality and personhood, Moko describes that items such as the medicine horn are seen as inextricably linked to the human body. The medicine horn becomes ritually entangled with the body of the *oloiboni* in the course of his initiation into the profession. After the *oloiboni* and the medicine horn have become entangled, they cannot be separated without doing permanent damage to both. Such entities which are, in effect, non-human body parts, are called *imasaa*, which Moko translates as "belongings". As such, a medicine horn should never be separated from the person to whom it belongs; in legal terms, it is considered inalienable (Moko 2021).

Moko's interlocutors described the horn itself as not a passive material. Rather, it is seen as having its own life force, which gives the horn the power to act. In order to keep this powerful object under control, the *oloiboni* has to subject it to certain rituals on a regular basis. Because the medicine horn kept in Berlin had not undergone these rituals for many years, some of Moko's interlocutors in Tanzania were convinced that this medicine horn and other similar objects continued to bring misfortune to both the Maasai community and the wider German society (Ivanov *et al.* 2024). Only after a complicated legal process involving both reparations and cleansing rituals would restitution to the Maasai community be secure (Moko 2023, Bens fc.).

These two brief examples from very different ethnographic contexts show that the indigenous materialities that interlocutors bring into the debate over ethnographic collections, present a moment of cosmopolitics. The different groups of actors involved do not only disagree on which "persons" should own which "things" stored in ethnographic museums. The disagreements go much deeper and concern the ontological status of the museum collection itself.

Traditionally, anthropologists have placed great emphasis on the methodological dimension of the fact that in transcultural encounters it cannot simply be assumed that counterparts (in this case museum professionals and indigenous community activists) share the same ontological assumptions about, for example, who is a person and who is a thing, who counts as a subject and what counts as an object. These ontological disagreements have increasingly come to the fore in the last twenty years, as part of what has been called the "ontological turn" in social and cultural anthropology (Holbraad and Pedersen 2017). The study of colonial restitution must also consider what this means for the universalisation of the property framework in the context of this plurality of property

regimes with different understandings of subjectivity, objectivity, materiality, and personhood. The implication is that the question of museum collections is first and foremost a property conflict in which (human) persons struggle for possession of (non-human) things, can silence and render invisible indigenous ontologies, and as such violently impose colonial epistemologies.

3. Capitalist Property as a Colonial Imposition

Property can be broadly defined as the normative concept by which societies organise the relationship between people and things. There is a myriad of ways in which these relationships can be structured, and as anthropological studies have shown, property regimes vary significantly from one cultural context to another (Turner 2017, Canfield 2020).

Property defines the boundary between persons and things by regulating who counts as a subject and what counts as an object of property (Hirsch 2010, Blomley 2016). Who counts as a person and what counts as a thing can therefore only be answered in relation to specific normative orders (Strathern 1999, Pottage 2004, Bens 2018). In capitalist property regimes, the individual human being serves as the prototype of a person. The human individual is not only capable of subjugating all other kinds of entities as property, but also "possesses" itself in this sense (Macpherson 1962, Redecker 2020). As anthropologists have shown, this kind of individualism inherent in property emerges as an "ideology of modernity" (Dumont 1983), but other societies make very different distinctions between persons and things (Strathern 1988, Gell 1998, Viveiros de Castro 1998, Descola 2005). Particularly when it comes to land dispossession as a central aspect of the colonial implementation of capitalist property, anthropologists have shown that indigenous conceptions of land ownership are very different from capitalist understandings, because land itself is not seen as a thing to be possessed, but as a person to be taken seriously as an actor in its own right (Verran 1998, Daes 2001, Bens 2020). Such studies have been taken up in law and legal theory, especially in global environmental law, when it comes to the question of "more than human legalities" (Braverman 2018). Instead of recognising only humans and entities created by humans (such as corporations) as subjects with rights, scholars begin to ask whether entities classified as "things" and "nature", such as mountains, rivers, landmarks, and animals, should also be recognised as legal "persons" with rights to defend themselves against the ecological destruction caused by extractivist economies (De la Cadena 2015, Blaser 2016).

Through the institutionalisation of a global capitalist economy - most notably with the colonial dispossession of indigenous territories and the introduction of the transatlantic slave trade - capitalist property regimes imposed their logic on indigenous property regimes, thereby colonising them (Mattei and Nader 2008). Colonisers implanted capitalist notions of property in indigenous contexts, either simply ignoring indigenous regimes of materiality and personhood or establishing complex structures of recognition of "customary law" designed to ensure that indigenous property systems were accommodated on the colonisers' terms (Chanock 1991, Klug 1995). In this context, the introduction of modern legal forms, especially complex registration procedures, played an important role (Pottage 1995). At the same time, colonial processes of implementing capitalist notions of property were never absolute. Indigenous notions of materiality and

personhood have not been completely eradicated and replaced, and their continued existence creates ongoing "paradoxical conjunctions" with capitalist property (Turner and Wiber 2009).

This colonisation of indigenous property regimes continues. Indigenous communities are increasingly framing many of their practices in terms of "cultural property", mostly to defend them against the encroachments of their nation-states (Brown 2003, Murphy 2004, Simpson 2007, Coombe 2009, Anderson and Geismar 2017). It is telling that the Inter-American Court of Human Rights has dogmatically built its entire jurisprudence on indigenous rights on the human right to property (Bens 2020, 150-160). Paradoxically, the mobilisation of cultural property leads to a reification of cultural identity (Mezey 2007, French 2009), while at the same time opening up space for action (Geismar 2013). In the course of the "dematerialisation" of capitalist property regimes in the late 20th century (Hardt and Negri 2017), the notion of immaterial (or "intangible") cultural property has become common. Under this umbrella term, all kinds of cultural practices have the potential to become a form of protected "property". At the same time, however, some key assumptions inherent in claims to immaterial cultural property, such as the idea of individual authors, represent a specifically Euro-American perspective that is unfamiliar in many Indigenous contexts (Myers 2002).

The colonial enterprise does not simply replace indigenous forms of property with ready-made concepts of capitalist property. The modern legal forms in which capitalist property appears were not developed in Europe and then transplanted to the rest of the world; rather, they took shape in and through the colonial encounter (Hussain 2003, Anghie 2005), with the colonies serving as laboratories of modernity (Rabinow 1989, Stoler 1995, Mitchell 2002). Both colonial and indigenous cultural formations can only be understood as relationally co-constitutive of each other, and they become manifest in the conflicts and disjunctures that come to the fore when different normative orders collide. Modern ideas of property, then, emerged in no small part from the dispossession of indigenous lands and took the form of "racial regimes of property" (Bhandar 2018) that denigrated in racial terms certain forms of land use that deviated from European-style agriculture. Colonialism did not simply dispossess indigenous peoples; the colonial imposition of capitalist property regimes created fundamentally racialised frameworks for deciding what belonged to whom in the first place (Harris 1993, Nichols 2019). As Black Studies scholars have argued, colonialism and capitalism are constitutively linked as "racial capitalism" (Bhattacharyya 2018, Jenkins and Leroy 2021, Murakawa and Gilmore 2022). The transatlantic system of slavery shows how racial capitalism not only arranges persons and things but creates the very categories of who counts as a person and what counts as a thing — for example, turning Black bodies into things in order to accumulate them as capital (Robinson 1983). This means that the specific divisions into persons and things that underpin capitalist notions of property must themselves be interrogated. Studying indigenous forms of materiality and personhood therefore helps us not only to understand these property systems, but also to understand capitalist notions of property and the ontological assumptions underpinning it.

This state of the art in the study of property and colonialism points to three aspects. First, the global implementation of capitalist property is a key element of colonialism and the creation of the modern state and its institutions. Second, capitalist property remains in

constant competition with indigenous notions of materiality and personhood and the alternative notions of nature and culture that underlie them. Third, to understand property in general, it is necessary to understand property in the plural. This means taking stock of the clashes between capitalist and indigenous materialities to understand their co-constitution. When it comes to the current discussion of the coloniality of ethnographic museums, it is important to systematically address how competing notions of materiality and personhood structure the workings of ethnographic museums and the interactions between museum practitioners and indigenous actors from the communities from which the ethnographic objects come. This is only possible through the lens of normative pluralism and by acknowledging the cosmopolitical dimension of these conflicts: that actors differ on normative assumption about the ontological status of the "objects", "subjects", "things", and "persons" in question.

4. Decolonizing European Museums and the Critique of Capitalist Property

In the debate on the decolonisation of museums, ethnographic museums have not only been at the centre of critique but have also often been pioneering projects that have helped to address their colonial make-up. Since the expansion of anthropology as a discipline after World War II and the formal political decolonisation of Africa in the 1950s and 1960s, anthropologists have reflected on the constitutive role of colonialism in the formation of the discipline and, in turn, the role of anthropology in the colonial endeavour (Gough 1968, Asad 1973, Wagner 1981, Fabian 1983). This led to a crisis of ethnographic representation as anthropologists questioned the epistemic and colonial violence inherent not only in ethnographic writing about other cultures (Clifford and Marcus 1986), but also in the representation of non-Western material culture in ethnographic museum exhibitions (Price 1989, Karp and Levine 1991). Museums in the post-colonial era can become spaces for reproducing colonial ways of seeing, evaluating, and classifying non-European cultures (Simpson 1996). Increasingly, indigenous communities are critical of museum displays and demand to be involved in decisions about how they are represented in museums (Hendry 2005).

Since the 1990s, the debate on ethnographic representation has included increasingly strong calls for the return of ethnographic collections to indigenous communities. Perhaps the most important precursor to the European restitution debate described in the introduction to this section was the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), which requires anthropological museums in the United States to return human remains of indigenous people to their communities, and the controversies surrounding it (Haas 1996, Fine-Dare 2002, Nash and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2010, Collison *et al.* 2019). More recently, the debate has broadened to include not only human remains, but also non-human objects in ethnographic collections. But the immediate challenges posed by objects in collections go beyond physical restitution. In the wake of digitisation and the emergence of concepts such as immaterial cultural property, museums have begun to engage in digital restitution projects (Alivizatou 2019, Vapnarski and Nôus 2021, Ogbechie 2022). Museums are digitising their catalogues and providing open access to their databases, sometimes in addition to, and sometimes as a substitute for, physical restitution. This raises many legal issues in regard to capitalist property (Lixinski 2020), as well as related legal conflicts

over different notions of materiality and personhood (Hogsden and Poulter 2012, Scholz and Guzmán Ocampo 2021).

Recent studies have shown that not all such collaborations are success stories. The focus on material objects in collaborations can actually strengthen ethnographic authority, as objects can easily be ascribed specific cultural meanings without being able to talk back to the anthropologist as a human interlocutor would (Fowles 2016). Collaboration can serve as an alibi for an institution, immunising the institution against activist critics (Ivanov and Bens 2021). They can become "neo-colonial collaborations" (Boast 2011) when the institution so strongly defines the framework for collaboration that indigenous voices cannot actually be heard, making it seem impossible to "smash the colonial frameworks" that structure the museum (Weber-Sinn and Ivanov 2020).

It is revealing that when such collaborations fail, it is often precisely because the actors underestimate the extent to which the capitalist notions of property inherent in the institutional structure of Euro-American academia, and the specifically modern notions of materiality and personhood that underlie them, fundamentally structure collaborations of all kinds. The two collaborative research projects I have briefly introduced at the beginning of this article are a case in point.

Lessons can be learned from examples such as the long-term collaborative research project that Andrea Scholz (2021) and others has undertaken with several Amazonian partners of the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin. She began by developing a collaborative online database that included object descriptions that indigenous interlocutors could add in their own languages (Scholz and Guzmán Ocampo 2021). During the project, it became clear that the research design would not be successful. Indigenous interlocutors had such different conceptions of the objects in the Amazonia collection that the structure of the database, which was based on the data architecture of the museum's internal database, made no sense to them. To address this problem, Scholz abandoned her research design. Instead, she engaged in a series of open sessions to explore how knowledge production about the Amazonia collection could be transformed. A major outcome of the project was not a database that the museum could use to refine its object-based knowledge production, but the collaborative construction of a *maloka*, a traditional Amazonian community house, in which traditional cultural practices could be taught to young people in the community (Hugh-Jones 1979, 69-102). This was a form of knowledge production that went far beyond the comfort zone of the museum. At the same time, it stretched the institutional constraints of its funding agency to the limit, as it was very difficult to take funds earmarked for one purpose and use them for another purpose that had not yet been envisaged as an outcome of collaborative research (Scholz 2021).

Moko (2023) has described similar tensions in his ethnographic collaboration between the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin and indigenous Maasai communities in northern Tanzania. In preparation for face-to-face discussions, Moko organised online discussion groups via Facebook and WhatsApp but found that museum copyright restrictions prevented him from sharing the digital photographs of the Maasai objects. This initial problem directly focused to the inherent tensions between the property regime that governed the institutional structure of the museum and the relationships between humans and non-humans in what Moko calls "the Maasai order of things" (2023, 22-23).

During his fieldwork, he observed numerous instances where colonial violence and capitalist property systems intersected. For example, the uneven distribution of electrical outlets made it challenging for people to collaborate remotely, as they had to pause workshops to charge their phones (Moko 2023, 66). Additionally, during the severe drought of 2021/22, rising prices for wheat and rice were aggravated by global food price fluctuations following the Russian invasion of Ukraine (Moko 2023, 221). He also noted increased land grabs in Maasai regions driven by international tourism companies, with support from the Tanzanian government, which sparked protests and police violence (Moko and Bens 2022, Moko 2023, 209-211). These conflicts highlight the broader connections between ongoing colonialism and capitalist exploitation, legitimized within capitalist property systems (Ivanov *et al.* 2024, Bens fc.).

In late 2023, Laibor Kalanga Moko, Paola Ivanov, the East Africa curator of the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin, and I attended a workshop with Maasai representatives in northern Tanzania. During this meeting, which was held as a traditional elder's meeting, an *enkiguana*, our conversation partners were very explicit about what is at stake in these negotiations over ethnographic collections. Now that people knew that *imasaa* were held in the Ethnologisches Museum in Berlin, it became clear how many of the misfortunes that plagued the Maasai community today— the land grabs, the droughts as a result of climate change, the food prices — were connected to this kind of colonial violence committed by the Germans. The *imasaa* spread misfortune that materializes in these problems. Towards the end of the meeting, a senior elder even brought up the ongoing war in Ukraine and intimated that this might be one of the problems that materialize in Europe because of the unaddressed colonial violence that was at the centre of this meeting.

In these two brief examples that I have focused on in this article, the cosmopolitics inherent in the museum debate becomes evident. Basic understandings of modernity are at stake here: Are the items in ethnographic museum collections passive things or can they enact revenge on those that hurt them with colonial violence? Is this conflict about the restitution of property or the reparation of social relationships? Is colonialism a thing of the past, or of the present, or does it transcend time and space? However one addresses these questions, treating the debate on ethnographic collections mainly as a property dispute, does not only drastically underestimate what is at stake in these debates, but one also endangers reproducing exactly what is perpetuating ongoing colonialism: capitalist property regimes.

Any project that seeks to give space to indigenous materialities must pay close attention to the epistemological positions and ontological assumptions that the participants occupy within their own institutional structures, including their data management and funding systems (Arif 2021), and the power dynamics that this positionality entails. This means, first and foremost, "critically (re)examining naturalised ontologies developed in the global North" (Kaur and Klinkert 2021, 246). Capitalist property and the specific assumptions of materiality and personhood that underpin it are a fundamental aspect of such naturalised ontologies of the global North.

5. Conclusions

So far, the ongoing controversies over the coloniality of collections in ethnographic museums in Europe and North America have remained within the unquestioned framework of a property dispute. In this article, I have proposed an analytical perspective of normative pluralism that takes into account a plurality of regimes of indigenous materialities that entail different conceptions of subject and object, person and thing. As such, the conflict over ethnographic collections becomes visible as a cosmopolitical conflict in which basic divisions of nature and culture become the centre of contestation.

The failure to interrogate the underlying capitalist property paradigm, which is one of the enduring legacies of colonialism, presents significant blind spots. While a focus on questioning colonial power relations within and beyond museum infrastructures is undoubtedly crucial, any meaningful effort to decolonise European museums must include a robust critique of the modern state's specific notions of property, which often serve to reinforce colonial power structures and perpetuate marginalisation.

The perspective on plural normative orders and cosmopolitics proposed in this article demonstrates the need to recognise the complex interplay between colonialism, capitalism and indigenous knowledge systems. Only by challenging the hegemony of capitalist property norms and the ontological assumptions underlying them and by embracing a more inclusive and pluralistic approach to ownership can we truly begin the process of decolonising European museums and promoting meaningful restitution.

References

Alivizatou, M., 2019. Digital Intangible Heritage: Inventories, Virtual Learning and Participation. *Heritage & Society* [online], 12(2–3), 116–35. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/2159032X.2021.1883950

Aly, G., 2021. *Das Prachtboot: Wie Deutsche die Kunstschätze der Südsee raubten*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Anderson, J.L., and Geismar H., eds., 2017. *The Routledge Companion to Cultural Property* [online]. London: Routledge. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315641034

Anghie, A., 2005. *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law* [online]. Cambridge University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614262

Arif, Y., 2021. The Reluctant Native: Or, Decolonial Ontologies and Epistemic Disobedience'. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* [online], 11(1), 256–63. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/713723

Asad, T., 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press.

Benda-Beckmann, F.v., 2002. Who's Afraid of Legal Pluralism? *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law* [online], 34(47). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2002.10756563

Benda-Beckmann, F.v. Benda-Beckmann, K.v., and Wiber, M.G., 2006. *Changing Properties of Property* [online]. New York: Berghahn. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3167/9781845451394

Benda-Beckmann, K.v., and Turner, B., 2018. Legal Pluralism, Social Theory, and the State. *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law* [online], 50(3), 255–74. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2018.1532674

Bens, J., forthcoming. Contesting Property Law: Colonial Museum Collections and Restitution in Maasai Legal Thought. *Law in Africa*.

Bens, J., 2020. *The Indigenous Paradox: Sovereignty, Culture, and Rights in the Americas* [online]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812297188

Bens, J., 2018. Sentimentalising Persons and Things: Creating Normative Arrangements of Bodies Through Courtroom Talk. *Journal of Legal Anthropology* [online], 2(1), 72–91. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3167/jla.2018.020105

Berntsen, J.L., 1976. The Maasai and Their Neighbors: Variables of Interaction. *African Economic History* [online], 2, 1–11. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/3601509

Bhandar, B., 2018. *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership* [online]. Durham: Duke University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822371571

Bhattacharyya, G., 2018. *Rethinking Racial Capitalism: Questions of Reproduction and Survival*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.

Blaser, M., 2016. Is Another Cosmopolitics Possible? *Cultural Anthropology* [online], 31(4), 545–70. Available at: https://doi.org/10.14506/ca31.4.05

Blomley, N., 2016. The Boundaries of Property: Complexity, Relationality, and Spatiality. *Law & Society Review* [online], 50(1), 224–55. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12182.

Boast, R., 2011. Neocolonial Collaboration: Museum as Contact Zone Revisited. *Museum Anthropology* [online], 34(1), 56–70. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1379.2010.01107.x

Braverman, I., 2018. Law's Underdog: A Call for More-than-Human Legalities. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* [online], 14(1), 127–44. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-101317-030820

Brightman, M., Fausto, C., and Grotti, V., eds., 2016. *Ownership and Nurture: Studies in Native Amazonian Property Relations* [online]. New York: Berghahn. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvpj7h8p

Brown, M.F., 2003. *Who Owns Native Culture?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Busse, M., 2012. Property. *In:* J.G. Carrier, ed., *The Handbook of Economic Anthropology* [online]. Camberly Surrey: Edward Elgar, 110–24. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4337/9781849809290.00015

Canfield, M., 2020. Property Regimes. *In:* M.C. Foblets *et al*., eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Law and Anthropology* [online]. Oxford University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198840534.013.23

Chanock, M., 1991. A Peculiar Sharpness: An Essay on Property in the History of Customary Law in Colonial Africa. *The Journal of African History* [online], 32(01), 65. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021853700025342

Clifford, J., and Marcus, G.E., 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography: A School of American Research Advanced Seminar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Collison, J.N., Sdaahl K'awaas, L.B., and Neel, L.A., eds., 2019. *Indigenous Repatriation Handbook* [online]. Victoria: Royal BC Museum. Available at: https://www.royalbcmuseum.bc.ca/indigenous/repatriation-handbook

Coombe, R.J., 2009. The Expanding Purview of Cultural Properties and Their Politics. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* [online], 5(1), 393–412. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.093008.131448

Costa Oliveira, T., and Scholz, A., forthcoming. Questions of Ownership, Property and Translocation Through an Amazonian Gaze. *In:* B. Savoy, M. Lagatz and F. Bodenstein, eds., *Translocations: Histories of Dislocated Cultural Assets*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Costa Oliveira, T.L., 2017. Corpos Partidos: adornos cerimoniais, benzimentos rituais e a estética da produção no alto Rio Negro. *Mana* [online], 23(1), 37–76. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-49442017v23n1p037

Cuno, J.B., 2008. *Who Owns Antiquity? Museums and the Battle OIer Our Ancient Heritage*. Princeton University Press.

Daes, E.I.A., 2001. *Indigenous Peoples and Their Relationship to Land. Final Working Paper U.N. Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/21.* Geneva: United Nations Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights.

De la Cadena, M., 2010. Indigenous Cosmopolitics in the Andes: Conceptual Reflections beyond "Politics". *Cultural Anthropology* [online], 25(2), 334–70. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1360.2010.01061.x

De la Cadena, M., 2015. *Earth Beings: Ecologies of Practice Across Andean Worlds* [online]. Durham: Duke University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1515/9781478093626

Descola, P., 2005. *Par-Delà Nature et Culture*. Paris: Gallimard.

Dumont, L., 1983. *Essais Sur l'individualisme: Une Perspective Anthropologique Sur l'ideologie Du Moderne*. Paris: Seuil.

Fabian, J., 1983. *Time and The Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fine-Dare, K.S., 2002. *Grave Injustice: The American Indian Repatriation Movement and NAGPRA*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Fowles, S., 2016. The Perfect Subject (Postcolonial Object Studies). *Journal of Material Culture* [online], 21(1), 9–27. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183515623818

French, J.H., 2009. *Legalizing Identities: Becoming Black or Indian in Brazil's Northeast* [online]. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5149/9780807889886_french

Galaty, J.G., 1982. Being "Maasai"; Being "People-Of-Cattle": Ethnic Shifters in East Africa. *American Ethnologist* [online], 9(1), 1–20. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1982.9.1.02a00010

Geismar, H., 2013. *Treasured Possessions: Indigenous Interventions into Cultural and Intellectual Property* [online]. Durham: Duke University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822399704

Gell, A., 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory* [online]. Oxford: Clarendon. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198280132.001.0001

Gough, K., 1968. Anthropology and Imperialism. *Monthly Review* [online], 19(11), 12–27. Available at: https://doi.org/10.14452/MR-019-11-1968-04_2

Griffiths, J., 1986. What Is Legal Pluralism? *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law* [online], 18(24), 1–55. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.1986.10756387

Haas, J., 1996. Power, Objects, and a Voice for Anthropology. *Current Anthropology* [online], 37(S1), S1–22. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/204460

Hann, C.M., 1998. *Property Relations: Renewing the Anthropological Tradition*. Cambridge University Press.

Hardt, M., and Negri, A., 2017. *Assembly*. Oxford University Press.

Harris, C.I., 1993. Whiteness as Property. *Harvard Law Review* [online], 106(8), 1707–91. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/1341787

Hendry, J., 2005. *Reclaiming Culture: Indigenous People and Self-Representation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hicks, D., 2020. *The Brutish Museums: The Benin Bronzes, Colonial Violence and Cultural Restitution* [online]. London: Pluto. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv18msmcr

Hirsch, E., 2010. Property and Persons: New Forms and Contests in the Era of Neoliberalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* [online], 39(1), 347–60. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.012809.105036

Hogsden, C., and Poulter, E.K., 2012. The Real Other? Museum Objects in Digital Contact Networks. *Journal of Material Culture* [online], 17(3), 265–86. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183512453809

Holbraad, M., and Pedersen, M.A., 2017. *The Ontological Turn: An Anthropological Exposition* [online]. Cambridge University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316218907

Hugh-Jones, S., 2009. The Fabricated Body: Objects and Ancestors in Northwest Amazonia. *In:* F. Santos-Granero, ed., *The Occult Life of Things: Native Amazonian Theories of Materiality and Personhood* [online]. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 33–59. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1prss0p

Hugh-Jones, S., 1979. *The Palm and the Pleiades: Initiation and Cosmology in Northwest Amazonia*. Cambridge University Press.

Hussain, N., 2003. *The Jurisprudence of Emergency: Colonialism and the Rule of Law* [online]. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.17774

Ivanov, P., Moko, L.K., and Bens, J., 2024. Unhappy Objects: Colonial Violence, Maasai Materialities, and the Affective Publics of Ethnographic Museums. *In:* M. Lünenborg and B. Röttger-Rössler, eds., *Affective Formation of Publics: Places, Networks, and Media* [online]. London: Routledge, 33–49. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003365426-4

Ivanov, P., and Bens, J., 2021. Koloniale Diversität: Die Affektiven Regierungsmodi Des Liberalismus Am Beispiel Des Humboldt Forums. *In:* H. Dilger and M. Warstatt, eds., *Umkämpfte Vielfalt: Affektive Dynamiken Institutioneller Diversifizierung*. Berlin: Campus, 164–85.

Jenkins, D., and Leroy, J., eds., 2021. *Histories of Racial Capitalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Karp, I., and Levine, S.D., 1991. *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Kaur, R., and Klinkert, V.L., 2021. Decolonizing Ethnographies. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* [online], 11(1), 246–55. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/713966

Klug, H., 1995. Defining the Property Rights of Others: Political Power, Indigenous Tenure and the Construction of Customary Land Law. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law* [online], 27(35), 119–48. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.1995.10756461

Knudsen, B.T., *et al*., eds., 2022. *Decolonizing Colonial Heritage; New Agendas, Actors and Practices in and beyond Europe* [online]. London: Routledge. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003100102

Kuper, A., 2024. *The Museum of Other People: From Colonial Acquisitions to Cosmopolitan Exhibitions*. London: Pantheon.

Kraus, M., Halbmayer, E., and Kummels, I., eds., 2018. *Objetos como testigos del contacto cultural: Perspectivas interculturales de la historia y del presente de las poblaciones indígenas del Alto Río Negro (Brasil/Colombia)*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.

Lixinski, L., 2020. Digital Heritage Surrogates, Decolonization, and International Law: Restitution, Control, and the Creation of Value as Reparations and Emancipation. *Santander Art and Culture Law Review* [online], 2(6), 65–86. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4467/2450050XSNR.20.011.13014

Macpherson, C.B., 1962. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke*. Oxford University Press.

Mattei, U., and Nader, L., 2008. *Plunder: When the Rule of Law Is Illegal* [online]. Malden: Blackwell. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470696552

Merry, S.E., 1988. Legal Pluralism. *Law and Society Review* [online], 22(5), 869–96. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/3053638

Mezey, N., 2007. The Paradoxes of Cultural Property. *Columbia Law Review*, 107(2007), 2004–46.

Mitchell, T., 2002. *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity* [online]. Berkeley: University of California Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520928251

Moko, L.K., 2021. The (In)Alienability of Objects and Colonial Acquisition: The Case of Maasai Ethnographic Collections at the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin. *Baessler Archiv*, 67(1), 97–140.

Moko, L.K., and Bens, J., 2022. Colonial Conservationism: Wildlife, Tourism, and Land Expropriation in Africa. *Review of African Political Economy Blog* [online], 7 July. Available at: https://roape.net/2022/07/07/colonial-conservationism-wildlife-tourism-and-land-expropriation-in-africa/

Moko, L.K., 2023. Sensing the Colonial Order of Things: Maasai Materialities and Ethnographic Museums. PhD Thesis. Freie Universität Berlin.

Murakawa, N., and Gilmore, R.W., 2022. *Change Everything: Racial Capitalism and the Case for Abolition*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Murphy, T., 2004. Legal Fabrications and the Case of "Cultural Property". *In:* A. Pottage and M. Mundy, eds., *Law, Anthropology, and the Constitution of the Social: Making Persons and Things* [online]. Cambridge University Press, 115–41. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511493751.004

Myers, F.R., 2002. *Painting Culture: The Making of an Aboriginal High Art* [online]. Durham: Duke University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv120qtgk

Nash, S.E., and Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C., 2010. NAGPRA After Two Decades. *Museum Anthropology* [online], 33(2), 99–104. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1379.2010.01089.x

Nichols, R., 2019. *Theft Is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory* [online]. Durham: Duke University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11smqjz

Ogbechie, S.O., 2022. African Cultural Heritage: Erasure, Restitution, and Digital Image Regimes. *In:* C. Paquette, K. Kleinfelder and C. Miles, eds., *In and Out of View: Art and the Dynamics of Circulation, Suppression, and Censorship*. Oxford: Bloomsbury Visual Arts, 235–46.

Kuhn, N., 2018. Hermann Parzinger: „Es muss neue Erzählungen geben". *Der Tagesspiegel* [online], February 12. Available at: https://www.tagesspiegel.de/kultur/hermann-parzinger-es-muss-neue-erzahlungen-geben-4957705.html

Philipps, B., 2021. *Loot: Britain and the Benin Bronzes*. London: Oneworld.

Pottage, A., 1995. The Originality of Registration. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* [online], 15(3), 371–401. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/15.3.371

Pottage, A., 2004. The Fabrication of Persons and Things. *In:* A. Pottage and M. Mundy, eds., *Law, Anthropology, and the Constitution of the Social: Making Persons and Things* [online]. Cambridge University Press, 1–39. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511493751.001

Price, S., 1989. *Primitive Art in Civilized Places*. Chicago University Press.

Rabinow, P., 1989. *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*. The University of Chicago Press.

Redecker, E.v., 2020. Ownership's Shadow: Neoauthoritarianism as Defense of Phantom Possession. *Critical Times* [online], 3(1), 33–67. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1215/26410478-8189849

Robertson, G., 2020. *Who Owns History?: Elgin's Loot and the Case for Returning Plundered Treasure*. London: Biteback.

Robinson, C.J., 1983. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. London: Zed Books.

Sarr, F., and Savoy, B., 2018. *Restituer le patrimoine Africain*. Paris: Seuil.

Savoy, B., 2021. *Afrikas Kampf um seine Kunst: Geschichte einer postkolonialen Niederlage* [online]. Munich: C.H. Beck. Available at: https://doi.org/10.17104/9783406766985

Scholz, A., 2020. Gabe und Gegengabe: Epistemologische und ethische Herausforderungen der Kooperation zwischen Museum und „Herkunftsgesellschaften". *Mitteilungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte* [online], 41(March), 187–98. Available at: https://doi.org/10.30819/mbgaeu.41.17

Scholz, A., 2021. Learning to Listen: From a Babylon of Misunderstood Voices to Collaborations Between Ethnographic Museums and Amazonian Indigenous Communities. *Bulletin de la Société Suisse des Américanistes,* 81(1), 45–56.

Scholz, A., and Guzmán Ocampo, M.D., 2021. Desafíos de la colaboración digital entre museos etnológicos y comunidades indígenas: dos perspectivas, una conclusión. *Journal de la société des américanistes* [online], 107(107–1), 187–204. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4000/jsa.19610

Sieg, K., 2021. Postcolonial Activists and European Museums. *In:* D.D. Kim, ed., *Reframing Postcolonial Studies* [online]. Cham: Springer International, 215–47. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52726-6_9

Simpson, A., 2007. On the Logic of Discernment. *American Quarterly* 59(2), 479–91. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2007.0051

Simpson, M.G., 1996. *Making Representations: Museums in the Post-Colonial Era*. New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G.C., 1988. Can the Subaltern Speak? *In:* C. Nelson and L. Grossberg, eds., *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* [online]. London: Macmillan. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-19059-1

Stoler, A., 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* [online]. Durham: Duke University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1515/9780822377719

Strang, V., and Busse, M., eds., 2011. *Ownership and Appropriation*. Oxford: Berg.

Strathern, M., 1988. *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia* [online]. Berkeley: University of California Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1525/california/9780520064232.001.0001

Strathern, M., 1999. *Property, Substance and Effect: Anthropological Essays on Persons and Things*. London: Athlone Press.

Tamanaha, B.Z., 2021. *Legal Pluralism Explained: History, Theory, Consequences* [online]. Oxford University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190861551.001.0001

Tolia-Kelly, D.P., 2016. Feeling and Being at the (Postcolonial) Museum: Presencing the Affective Politics of "Race" and Culture. *Sociology* [online], 50(5), 896–912. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038516649554

Turner, B., 2017. The Anthropology of Property. *In:* M. Graziadei and L.D. Smith, eds., *Comparative Property Law: Global Perspectives*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 26–47.

Turner, B., and Wiber, M.G., 2009. Paradoxical Conjunctions: Rural Property and Access to Rural Resources in a Transnational Environment. *Anthropologica*, 51(1), 3–14.

Vapnarsky, V., and Noûs, C., 2021. Digital Repatriation, Amerindian Reappropriations: Introduction to Part Two. *Journal de La Société Des Américanistes* [online], 107(107–1), 303–15. Available at : https://doi.org/10.4000/jsa.19794

Verran, H., 1998. Re-Imagining Land Ownership in Australia. *Postcolonial Studies* [online], 1(2), 237–54. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13688799890165

Viveiros de Castro, E., 1998. Cosmological Deixis and Amerindian Perspectivism. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* [online], 4(3), 469–88. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/3034157

Wagner, R., 1981. *The Invention of Culture*. The University of Chicago Press.

Weber-Sinn, K., and Ivanov, P., 2020. 'Collaborative' Provenance Research: About the (Im)Possibility of Smashing Colonial Frameworks. *Museum and Society* [online], 18(1), 66–81. Available at: https://doi.org/10.29311/mas.v18i1.3295