

20 *Missing persons and stolen bodies: the repatriation of 'El Negro' to Botswana*¹

NEIL PARSONS AND ALINAH KELO SEGOBYE

On 4 October 2000, the human remains of a man who had become known as 'El Negro' were flown into Sir Seretse Khama airport in Botswana. They arrived in a small plane accompanied by the Spanish ambassador to Namibia and a museum official from Spain. The plane was greeted by crowds of people who had travelled to witness the arrival of 'El Negro', who was to be buried the following day in Tsholofelo Park in the city of Gaborone. The remains arrived amidst great controversy which was only to increase in the course of the week which followed.

WHO WAS 'EL NEGRO'?

'El Negro' is the popular name given to the stuffed body of an African man which had been the central exhibit of a small municipal museum (the Darder Museum) in the town of Banyoles, Catalonia, Spain since 1916.

He stands about 130 cm high, wears a flat leather apron and carries a small spear. Some parts of him appear to be naturally desiccated, others seem to have been filled or reconstituted with wire and plaster. His large glass eyes concentrate fiercely on some invisible prey. There is no explanatory legend.

(Robertson 1993: 3)

The man's skin had been blackened using boot-black. A CAT-scan conducted in 1993 found that the body consisted of mummified flesh, with only the skull and leg and arm bones intact inside; the rest consisted of iron support rods and grass or hay stuffing.²

The body had been collected at some time between 1829 and 1831 by Jules (1807–73) and Edouard Verreaux (1810–68), French natural scientists in the Cape Colony. Jules Verreaux worked as a taxidermist supplying a Paris shop run by his father and brothers. The Parisian shop, 'Maison Verreaux', supplied numerous exhibits to museums.

The two brothers travelled to an area later described as being between the Orange and Vaal Rivers on the border of the Kalahari in what is now South Africa. Around this time there were small groups of BaTlhaping (the mostly southerly Tswana or 'Bechuana') living on the lower Vaal near its junction with the Orange. Since about 1800 the area had come under the general sovereignty of the Griqua republic, which lay to the north of the Cape Colony frontier along the Orange River. To the north of the Griqua republic lay independent BaTlhaping and BaRolong kingdoms. The area of the Orange–Vaal junction seems to have been a major centre for the sale and processing of wild animal skins.

The brothers dug up the body of a 'Betjouana' man the night after its burial, and took it back to Cape Town, where the body was stuffed. By 15 November 1831 the body was forming part of an exhibition of taxidermia by the Verreaux brothers at the Paris emporium of 'le baron Benjamin Delessert'. A French newspaper reported the lifelike body of a 'Betjouana' man, who wore antelope fur clothing, carried a spear and had a leather bag with glass beads in it.³

Jules Verreaux appears to have started auctioning the contents of Maison Verreaux after the deaths of his brothers Edouard and Alexis in 1868.⁴ Francesc Darder, a Catalan naturalist, bought the remains of the collection including the body of the 'Betjouana' in 1880, and exhibited his new acquisition at the Barcelona Universal Exposition in 1888. Judging from the drawing of 'El Betjouanas' in the catalogue, the antelope fur in which he had presumably been buried had disappeared, as had the little leather bag with its beads. But he is shown standing erect, carrying an hourglass-shaped shield and a very long, barbed spear. Bird feathers adorned his head.⁵ These accoutrements would have been characteristic of a Tswana warrior c. 1830. The barbs on the spear, making it into a kind of harpoon, are unusual; but a harpoon would have been necessary for the extremely dangerous sport of hunting hippo (*kubu*, 'sea-cow') along the Orange and Vaal Rivers. A famous sketch by Thomas Baines portrays the young chief of such 'Bechuana' as were living on the Vaal around 1850, surrounded by his mates and elders, all sewing *karosses* (furs) while they conversed in the *kgotla* courtyard (Parsons 1983: 42–4, 80–9; see also Willcox 1986).

In 1916, the whole of Darder's collection was bequeathed to the town of Banyoles and the collection became known as the Darder Museum.

HOW 'EL NEGRO' BECAME CONTROVERSIAL

In December 1991, some months before Banyoles was due to be the venue for water sports at the 1992 summer Olympics, Alphonse Arcelin, a medical doctor practising in the town of Cambrils, began to protest about the degrading exhibition of 'El Negro' in the Darder Museum. Arcelin wrote to the national daily newspaper *El País*, demanding that the exhibit be removed before it caused offence to Olympic visitors and African athletes (see also Jaume *et al.* 1992):

It is incredible that at the end of the 20th century, someone still dares to show a stuffed human being in a show case, as if it were an exotic animal.

Spain is the only country in the world where this occurs. If the man is not moved, I'm willing to ask all black athletes not to participate in competitions in a place where such a racist statement is made even worse: it is a man stolen from his grave.

(cited in Robertson 1993: 2-3)

The townsfolk of Banyoles responded with outrage at the slight to their municipality: 'He is our African, and we are very fond of him' (Robertson 1993: 3). Both conservatives and socialists on Banyoles town council responded with a mixture of bewilderment and defiance. They voted to keep 'El Negro' on display in his glass box as before. According to Councillor Carles Abella, who was also the Darder Museum's curator: 'El Negro is our property. It's our business and nobody else's. The talk of racism is absurd. Anyway, human rights only apply to living people, not dead.' Abella was backed by the socialist mayor, Juan Solana (*The European* 5.3.1992).

Later, Abella justified the retention of the exhibit as an integral part of the thematic 'unity' of the museum:

The black man of the [Darder] museum forms part of the city's popular culture taught in school ... of course we don't consider it [racist] ... this is a museum that shows different races and cultures with adequate respect. It is a racial exhibit, ... racism or morbidity may be a personal attitude from visitors...

(*Lagos Daily Times* 11.3.1992)

The Nigerian ambassador in Madrid expressed his dismay that 'a stuffed human being can be exhibited in a museum at the end of the 20th century.' He added: 'I have already consulted with other African countries and we are making a protest at the highest levels of the Olympic Organising Committee in Barcelona and the Spanish Foreign Ministry' (Ramsay 1992a).

By March 1992, the matter was before the International Olympic Committee (IOC), where it was raised by the Senegalese vice-president of the IOC who argued that 'El Negro' was exhibited 'in such a way that it might cause offense'. An American member of the IOC was quoted as saying: 'It is unbelievable. I can't imagine that a country hosting the Olympic Games can be so inhumane and insensitive. It's time for Spain to join the modern world.' The International Olympic Committee reportedly 'ordered an urgent investigation after African diplomats in Madrid threatened to boycott the [Olympic] games unless the mummy is removed' (*The European* 5.3.1992: 1). It was around this time that 'El Negro' started to become known as 'Il Bosquimano', the Bushman. Abella believed that, according to skull shape, the man was a 'Bosquimano' from the Kalahari rather than a 'Negro'.⁶

Media interest ran high. European newspapers reported that 'El Negro' was a 'Kalahari bushman'. The London *Observer* (8.3.1992) published, under a photograph of the man in his glass box, a piece titled 'Dead African who haunts the Barcelona Olympics'. The newspaper also caused some confusion by stating, incorrectly, that the man had been dead for 104 years, i.e. since 1888.⁷ The headline in *The European*

(5.3.1992) 'Mummified bushman sparks Olympics storm', appeared under the front-page title banner of the newspaper, and reported that he had become 'Banyoles' most famous celebrity': 'Keep El Negro' T-Shirts are on sale in the town and the number of visitors to the museum has increased dramatically' – to 70,000 in 1992. Under the headline of 'Row over stuffed black man in Spanish museum' the Lagos *Daily Times* in Nigeria reported that 'he was chief of a Bechuana tribe in Bechuanaland, currently Botswana'.

In March 1992, the Botswana government, through its embassy in Brussels, began to prepare a statement for Gaborone to release during the week of Monday 9 March, on the return of the body to Botswana.⁸ Meanwhile, not only were T-shirts and balloons, with slogans like 'Banyoles loves you El Negro. Don't go!' on sale, but the citizens of Banyoles were treated with 'El Negro's' likeness in bite-sized Easter chocolates.

The Botswana media were divided in their views on the possible return of the Banyoles body. In his *Midweek Sun* (Gaborone) column (3.4.1992), Sandy Grant was forthright about the irrelevance of a Kalahari Bushman who had died so long ago in the face of a recent report to the Botswana Christian Council on the current human rights status of Basarwa ('Bushmen' or Khoisan) in Botswana. The report carried allegations of police and game guard brutality and torture towards people who tried to stay on their ancestral land in a proclaimed game reserve and to hunt there for their subsistence.

Jeff Ramsay, the *Mmegi/The Reporter* columnist, remonstrated with Grant (8.5.1992). The 'mummified Mosarwa', he said, might have caused 'greater concern in Lagos and London than in Lehututu (his possible hometown)', but 'both controversies are about the same issue: the continued marginalization of this region's Khoisan-speaking communities'.

The first academic discussions of the case were published in 1992–3 (Jaume *et al.* 1992; Robertson 1993), but despite this, and all the media attention at this time, the issue appears to have been more or less forgotten for the next five years. Certainly, there were no moves to repatriate the body during this time. However, in 1997, the matter was brought to the attention of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU). The representatives of the Republic of Botswana were urged to receive and lay the body of 'El Negro' to rest. In the *Botswana Gazette* (Gaborone) of 9 July 1997, the Permanent Secretary in the Department of Foreign Affairs, Ernest Mpofo, was quoted as saying, 'whether we like it or not, people are saying that the remains are that of a Motswana. We have no choice.'

Mpofo used the term 'Motswana', which had been adopted since independence in 1966 to cover any citizen of Botswana regardless of original ethnicity. The Botswana government, Mpofo said, was willing to accept the body from the Spanish government, and would then bury it. The *Gazette* then suggested to Mpofo that the body was only being accepted 'because of the pressure put on the government by some West African countries'. Mpofo denied this but added that Africans wanted the body repatriated from Spain, and the Botswana government was doing 'what we can do as Africans'.

Two and a half years later, in January 2000, the issue of repatriating 'El Negro' resurfaced in Banyoles. By this time, the socialists were now in opposition to a newly

elected conservative municipal government. Jaume Camprodon, Bishop of Girona, the capital of Catalonia, argued for the repatriation of the body on the grounds that all degrading human exhibits in museums should be removed from display, and that there was a need for cultural sensitivity in the new pluralism of his diocese, which included new mosques and other non-Catholic places of worship.

Opposing the repatriation, Joan Domenech, the Provincial Minister for Cultural Affairs in Girona, argued that, 'politicians would better concern themselves with live black people than dead'. He reserved particular ire for Haitian-born Arcelin, the originator of the controversy, as having given 'the impression of a grievance about having been born black' and being 'incapable of understanding the rationale behind the Darder Museum [representing] another way of thinking, pertaining to another time'. As for 'the bushman warrior', he would be no better off if repatriated and 'will not [then] revive either' (*La Vanguardia* 25.1.2000, 3.2.2000, 4.2.2000).

The majority view in the Banyoles town council, however, was in favour of repatriation. The deputy mayor, Jordi Omedes, insisted that 'the return of the soldier to his country of origin is the most satisfactory solution', and the position on the municipal governing party on 'the repatriation of the body of il bosquimano' would 'not change' – whatever the opposition parties did.

The matter was then taken up by the Spanish national government which welcomed the decision of the Banyoles Council after such extended debate. The responsibility for the actual repatriation was then handed over to the Spanish ministry of foreign affairs (*La Vanguardia* 25.1.2000, 3.2.2000, 4.2.2000).

IDENTITY IN DOUBT

In 2000, the combined efforts of investigative journalists and academics in Barcelona and Gaborone brought to light information that had been available in 1992 but had been, it seems, largely ignored. The information showed not only that the body had been stolen in about 1830, some 58 years earlier than had previously been widely believed, but confirmed that it belonged to a 'Bechuana' and had probably been taken from a place near the Orange and Vaal rivers, on the border of the Kalahari desert, in what was now South Africa. The intervention at this late date of information that showed 'El Negro' was not, in fact, from Botswana threatened to muddy the 'clear waters' of repatriation for the politicians and bureaucrats. The ministries of foreign affairs in Madrid and Gaborone sounded less than pleased. The Spanish Secretary for Foreign affairs, Julio Nunez, responded somewhat testily when confronted by *La Vanguardia*:

The government's hope is that the bushman's body may go to Botswana. If they don't want it back there – something which is difficult to [arrange] – we will look for another place where they have ethnic groups similar to the body which was exhibited in Banyoles. Besides I talked last week with the Botswanan secretary of foreign affairs, Mr Ernest Mpofo, who said that his government will prepare for 'El Negro' the ceremony that it deserves when

there is an agreement with the Spanish government for its return. He seemed willing to accept the return of the body. More than this, he said it will be something symbolic for the whole [of] Africa.

(reported in *Mmegi* 3.3.2000)

However, although the location of the most likely group of 'Bechuana' and their descendants could be identified in South Africa, no initiative was forthcoming from the South African side to claim the body of 'El Negro'.

Mpofu reiterated (*Mmegi* 3.3.2000) that as far as the Botswana government was concerned, 'El Negro' was, as mandated by a resolution of the Organisation of African Unity, 'a bushman from Botswana'. With a Spanish general election imminent, the authorities of Banyoles and Girona delayed their final decision on 'El Negro' until after April 2000. Over the next five months there were other procedural delays on the Spanish side, but the National Museum in Madrid took possession of the body from the Darder Museum in Banyoles around August 2000. A last ditch attempt by the Darder Museum to stop the repatriation argued that since 'El Negro' was really a Kalahari 'Bushman', the Botswana government should be punished for the maltreatment of people in the Kalahari today by withholding the body from repatriation. The museum's attempt failed, and arrangements were made to transport 'El Negro' to Botswana.

ARRIVAL IN GABORONE, OCTOBER 2000

The eight years of campaigning for the return of 'El Negro', and the controversy that surrounded it, ensured that the eventual arrival of 'El Negro' in Botswana would attract great public and media attention. Crowds of people converged on the Sir Seretse Khama airport, to greet the arrival of 'El Negro'. However, it became clear as soon as the remains were taken from the airplane that the controversy would continue. The first startling revelation was that the remains were contained in a plain wooden packing case measuring approximately 1.5 × 1.5 m. Immediately, members of the public present at the airport began asking why 'El Negro' was not in a coffin. The box was received by a small guard of the Botswana Defence Force who draped a flag in national colours over the box and carried it to a hearse for immediate transport to the Gaborone City Hall. Here the remains were to lie overnight for public viewing.

The doors to the city hall opened shortly after four in the afternoon for the public to view the body. Hundreds of people had come to witness this event. To their horror, instead of the expected body of 'El Negro', a bare skull was all that was displayed in the glass window of a square box, the dimensions of which suggested that it did not contain the complete stuffed body of 'El Negro' as had been displayed standing up in the Darder Museum. Over the next few days, the intense public dismay and perception that Botswana had been 'hoodwinked' was conveyed in the media and via talk shows, phone-in radio programmes and other public forums. Of overriding

concern was the question of what had happened to the rest of the body, and its corollary, how could anyone be sure that the skull was really that of 'El Negro'? There were no immediate answers to these questions. What would emerge later in a statement from the Spanish museum professionals who had been responsible for preparing the body for transportation was that during this process they had taken the liberty of scraping the skin from the bones and removing all other accessories and material culture which had been displayed with 'El Negro' for more than a hundred years. The statement suggested that this had been done because of the Botswana request for 'remains' (*masalela*), which had been interpreted to exclude any material culture, which, they argued, was Spanish property. While 'accounting' for the lack of artefacts, this statement clearly did not explain why the body had been reduced to a skull and a few bones.

Public dismay in Botswana was fuelled by the disappointment expressed by Arcelin who had spent over eight years fighting a lone battle in Spain to see the body returned to Africa. Having travelled all the way from Spain, he was shocked to see the skull and indicated that there was no way of now telling whether or not it belonged to 'El Negro'. The public was outraged at the extreme insensitivity of the Spanish officials who had, as they claimed, reduced 'El Negro's' body to a skull. Callers to Radio Botswana's RB 2 station pointed to the double standards involved, by questioning whether Spanish people treated their dead with similar disrespect.

Burial

The burial ceremony, held on the morning of 5 October, was a sombre affair attended by large crowds. As they would for a normal funeral, women wore scarves on their heads and shoulders and men wore jackets. Clergymen performed Christian burial rites and the minister of external affairs presided over the ceremony as declared uncle and chief mourner. This was in accordance with the custom of funerals in Botswana where an uncle of the bereaved family speaks on their behalf. 'El Negro', of course, had no known family to speak for him.

The insensitivity of Spanish officials continued at the funeral. During his address, the Spanish ambassador announced that his government could not be held responsible for the tragedy surrounding 'El Negro's' departure from Africa since the people who took him were not Spanish. Instead, he suggested that by bringing the body back, his country had done more than enough. These words provoked the reaction of the Senegalese diplomat who represented the OAU, who had also travelled to attend the reburial. He noted that it was not the action of the Spanish *per se* that was being atoned for by the ceremony, but the collective wrong of any nation which had indulged in the inhuman act of trading in human beings whether alive or dead. As such it was wrong for Spain to argue its innocence by claiming it had merely displayed the body and not stolen it from Africa in the first place. He noted that Botswana's offer to rebury 'El Negro' was an equal act of collective goodwill because of the continuing uncertainty of 'El Negro's' origins.

Government involvement

A joint committee comprising the Ministry of External Affairs (which was coordinating the event), the Ministry of Home Affairs (represented by the Department of Culture and the Botswana National Museum), the Office of the President and the Ministry of Finance made the decision to bury 'El Negro' in Tsholofelo Park. This in itself raised public outcry, as concerns were raised that by choosing the park, Botswana was simply continuing the public display of 'El Negro'.

Tsholofelo Park was chosen as a symbolic burial ground because of its central location in Gaborone, but many people felt that the body should have been buried in a proper burial ground. People also thought that given the 170 years of waiting for a proper reburial, it would have been best to wait a bit longer and trace his kin so that he could be buried properly amongst his people. The park was also chosen from a diplomatic point of view as a neutral place where people other than Batswana could easily visit the burial place, as 'El Negro' had become a Pan-African citizen. 'El Negro's' burial place has thus become a national monument and, as such, falls under the jurisdiction of the Botswana National Museum.⁹

The inclusion of Christian rites at the burial ceremony was also questioned by people who felt that they detracted from the occasion of the return of a true son of Africa. Traditional doctors (*dingaka*) were not invited to officiate at the ceremony, and many people felt that failing to carry out the appropriate funeral rites would cause calamities, such as poor rainfall. They argued that while Botswana's decision to accept the body for reburial might be honourable, the government had not fulfilled its responsibilities to 'El Negro'. Traditional ceremonies, such as cleansing ceremonies conducted for soldiers who had died in war, or hunters who perished in the bush, would have been more appropriate for someone such as 'El Negro', whose actual identity was unknown. The reburial of the remains returned by Spain highlighted many issues hitherto not debated in the public domain in Botswana.

The decision to treat the repatriation of El Negro as a 'foreign affairs matter' meant that the whole exercise was not handled with the sensitivity it deserved. The exclusion of the Department of Culture and the Botswana National Museum in the preparations for repatriation, and the treatment of the body as a diplomatic exchange process, resulted in failure to take into account fundamentally important cultural issues. Spanish indifference may be explained by the negative attitude of relevant museum officials. In Botswana, the intense diplomatic sensitivity of the matter meant that the government wanted to get the whole thing finished and done with as quickly as possible, instead of taking time to pay attention to the cultural issues involved.

Context

At the time of 'El Negro's' repatriation, there were two major issues in the news. They provide a context for the public response to the reburial. Both are sensitive issues which highlight perceptions of identity and status in Botswana society.

Mistreatment of 'Bushmen'

The first was the case of a stay of execution, and a retrial, granted to two Basarwa ('Bushman') men who had been sentenced to death for murder. The retrial was ordered after much publicized lobbying by the Botswana centre for human rights, Ditshwanelo, which had argued that the accused had been poorly represented because of their identity as Basarwa. Ditshwanelo also alleged that the men had been tortured, and had been the victims of human rights abuses carried out on Basarwa generally by the police, prisons officials and other officials of the Botswana government. With this case in mind, concerns were raised that the return of 'El Negro' might distract Botswana from considering 'more immediate horrors'. It was questioned whether Africa as a continent could validly maintain its high moral position over the 'El Negro' issue given its own history of human rights abuses.

Ritual murders

The second focus in 2000 was on ritual murders. Historically, the ritual murder of (mostly pre-pubescent) youths was carried out by traditional doctors at times of adversity to invoke the gods to overcome calamities such as severe drought. In more recent times, ritual murder has been increasingly associated with commercialized 'traditional' medicine to advance the fortunes of powerful or would-be powerful individuals. In the last few years there have been a number of well-publicized cases of young people disappearing and their mutilated bodies recovered with organs missing. The choice of organs such as genitals, heart, tongue and brain is thought to link these murders to rituals associated with achieving or restoring potency. At the same time as 'El Negro' was buried in the Tsholofelo Park, the mutilated body of a young man, who had disappeared a decade before, was found a few kilometres away in a shallow grave. Similar cases occurred in Mochudi.¹⁰ Most of the people who have died have been from poor families. The return of 'El Negro' to Botswana brought these issues to the fore. The history of 'El Negro' demonstrated the mistreatment of 'Bushman' people and highlighted the continuing human rights issues in Botswana. The return of only the partial remains of 'El Negro' highlighted the continuing practice of ritual murders in Botswana and common jealousy of the newly rich and powerful. It has made Botswana aware of the need to question more critically incidences of disappearances of people, and the common lack of follow up by law enforcement agencies.

CONCLUSION

The case of 'El Negro' stands as an example of a lingering belief that bodies of 'the Other', in this case an African, can still be treated as objects that can be justifiably displayed in a museum collection. While the existence of 'races' as biological entities has been refuted for decades, the popular perception of humankind in both Europe and Africa is often framed in racial classifications largely abandoned by the scientific community. This popular view was supported by the exhibition of 'El Negro' in the

Darder Museum which served also to promulgate the view that a display of this kind was morally acceptable.

The history of the treatment of 'El Negro's' body has raised questions that have come to be asked by ordinary Batswana about the differential treatment accorded to the living people of different identities, 'races' and social classes. In particular, the arrival of bones, and not a body, from Spain and the controversy that ensued, showed that while Spanish authorities had agreed to return the remains of 'El Negro', their fundamental attitude towards him had not changed. 'El Negro' continued to be perceived as a museum object, to the extent that, as a final act of abuse, his skin, nails, hair and penis were removed. It is still impossible to confirm whether the bones buried in the Tsholofelo Park are actually those of 'El Negro'. The insult to Botswana caused deep resentment and supported a perception that Spain's lack of sensitivity towards 'El Negro' pointed towards a similar attitude towards Africans in general.

The *New York Times* described the feelings of a nurse who had waited for hours to see the remains of 'El Negro' as they lay in state in Gaborone City Hall:

She struggled to recognize the lines of his cheekbones and the breadth of his brow. 'he has got a small forehead like me' [she said], her voice breaking. 'This part of southern Africa where they say he is from, I have kin there, and when I saw him, I saw a person. Not a skull – a human being. I felt like crying because of the belief that he might be related to me. And it makes you wonder, how many people have been stolen like this?

(*New York Times* 6.10.2000)

NOTES

- 1 This chapter was originally presented as two papers at the University of Botswana Workshop on the Repatriation of 'El Negro' on 24 May 2001, held at the Department of History (which includes an Archaeology and the Museum Studies Unit), University of Botswana.
- 2 Post-mortem report summarized for participants at a meeting in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs conference room, 26 Sept. 2000; personal communication to author from Miquel Molina, n.d. See <http://ubh.tripod.com/afhist/elnegro/eln-pm.htm> for this summary.
- 3 *Le Constitutionnel, Journal du Commerce, Politique et Littéraire* (Paris), Nov. 1831 (copy courtesy of Jacinto Anton).
- 4 Australian National Botanic Garden web-site on Verreaux, J.P. citing A. E. Orchard (n.d.) *A History of Systematic Botany in Australia*, 1.
- 5 Catalogue in Spanish for Darder exhibit at Barcelona Universal Exposition, 1888 (partial copy courtesy of Miquel Molina).
- 6 When the CAT scan was conducted on the body in 1993, the lawyer-anthropologist among the gathered scientists pronounced that the man was a Bushman.
- 7 This information led to initial speculation that the body might have been stolen by a notorious grave-robber called 'Scotty Smith', who was active between Kimberley and the Molopo River. See Frederick Charles Metrowich (1962/1970), *Scotty Smith, South Africa's Robin Hood*, Cape Town: Books of Africa, 1st and revised editions.
- 8 At that time information in Botswana was limited to what had been in the *European* and the *Observer*. The former said that 'El Negro' is said to have been taken from a grave in

Bechuanaland (now Botswana) and brought to Banyoles in 1916', while the latter told us that 'El Negro has been dead since 1888'.

- 9 Until 'El Negro's' remains were buried, they fell within the jurisdiction of the National Monuments and Relics Act because of their age. It is doubtful whether they remain under this jurisdiction now that they are buried.
- 10 Six years previously, also in Mochudi, a young school girl had also been found murdered, and the case remains unresolved. Rumours spread like wildfire about who the murderer or murderers might be. Violent riots by students and the unemployed erupted in Mochudi and Gaborone after her death, and the government invited Scotland Yard to assist with the case. (Unfortunately the findings of Scotland Yard remain confidential.)

REFERENCES

- Grant, S. (1992) 'Et cetera, et cetera'. *Midweek Sun*, 3 April.
- Jaume, D., Pons, G., Palmer, M., McMin, M., Alcover, J.A. and Politis, G., (1992) 'Racism, Archaeology, and Museums: the strange case of the stuffed African male in the Darder Museum, Banyoles (Catalonia), Spain'. *World Archaeological Bulletin* 6: 113-18.
- Kenosi, L. (2000) 'Our collective wrong'. *Botswana Guardian*, 3 October.
- Mearns, B. and Mearns, R. (1998) *Biographies of those Commemorated in Western Palearctic Bird Names*. London: Academic Press.
- Morris, A.G. (1987) 'The Reflections of a Collector: San and Khoi skeletons in museum collections'. *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 42, 12-22.
- Parsons, N. (1983) *A New History of Southern Africa*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Education.
- (2000) El Negro of Banyoles: Bushman from Bechuanaland, or Bechuana from Bushmanland? Unpublished paper delivered at University of Botswana History and Archaeology Research Seminar, Gaborone, 30 March 2000. Currently available on the Internet at the UB History web-site <http://ubh.tripod.com>.
- Ramsay, J. (1992a) 'Lost in time'. *Mmegi/The Reporter* (Gaborone), 3 April ('Back to the Future' column no. 67).
- (1992b), 'Why El Negro matters'. *Mmegi/The Reporter*, 8 May ('Back to the Future' column no. 71).
- Robertson, A.F. (1993) 'The Desiccated African in Banyoles'. *Anthropology Today* 9, 1, 2-3.
- Tutwane, L. (2000) 'El Negro - where did you come from?' *Mmegi/The Reporter*, 3 March.
- Willcox, A.R. (1986) *The Great River: The Story of the Orange River*. Winterton, Natal: Drakensberg Publications.