British Journal for Military History

Volume 9, Issue 3, November 2023

'Ashantee Loot is Unique': British Military Culture and the Taking of Objects in the Third Anglo-Asante War, 1873-1874

Patrick Watt

ISSN: 2057-0422

Date of Publication: 29 November 2023

Citation: Patrick Watt, "Ashantee Loot is Unique': British Military Culture and the Taking of Objects in the Third Anglo-Asante War, 1873-1874', *British Journal for Military History*, 9.3 (2023), pp. 21-40.

www.bjmh.org.uk

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

The BJMH is produced with the support of Goldsmiths UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

'Ashantee Loot is Unique': British Military Culture and the Taking of Objects in the Third Anglo-Asante War, 1873-1874

PATRICK WATT*
National Museums Scotland, UK
Email: patrick.watt@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT
There exists a popular perception that all objects collected as a result of British military action in imperial settings can be termed 'loot' or 'plunder'. This article argues otherwise and demonstrates that for British officers serving in the Third Anglo-Asante War (1873-1874) there existed a shared understanding of the legitimate and illegitimate ways objects could be acquired, with specific terms used to describe both practices. Furthermore, it highlights how objects acquired during the war were considered, displayed and interpreted in British institutions, centring the importance of setting in determining the object's significance and meaning to different groups of people.

On 10 March 1874 Lieutenant Henry Wood of the 10th (Prince of Wales Own) Royal Hussars attended an audience at Windsor Castle to present the official news of the British victory over the Kingdom of Asante in West Africa.[1] He brought with him gifts to the royal family from Sir Garnet Wolseley, the commander of the British expeditionary force. While the Prince of Wales was presented with an elaborate wooden stool finished with ornate silverwork which had been taken from the royal palace at Kumasi, Queen Victoria received the state umbrella of the King of Asante,

*Dr Patrick Watt is a research associate and former curator of modern history and military collections at National Museums Scotland.

DOI: 10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v9i3.1736

The quotation in the title is taken from Frederick Boyle, *Through Fanteeland to Coomassie, a diary of the Ashantee Expedition,* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1874), p. 376.

[1]In the 1870s the English spelling of this kingdom was commonly written as 'Ashantee' or 'Ashanti'. For the purpose of this paper, the modern spelling 'Asante' will be used; furthermore, the Asante capital will be spelled 'Kumasi' rather than the nineteenth-century anglicised spelling 'Coomassie', and the king of Asante will be referred to as 'Kofi Karikari' rather than the nineteenth-century phonetic spelling 'Coffee Calcallee'.

the *Asantehene* Kofi Karikari. The umbrella was around seven feet in diameter, made of sections of black and red velvet trimmed with gold, and had a number of charms attached, some of leather and cloth and another being a severed lion's paw. The umbrella was 'not for use, to keep off rain or sunshine…but it is an emblem of pomp and dignity, held over the king's head on all ceremonial occasions'.[2] The taking of this object and its presentation to the queen was an emphatic statement demonstrating that power and authority over the Asante people had been transferred from the *Asantehene* to the British monarch. Over the following weeks, as the members of the British expedition arrived home to a hero's welcome, they brought with them thousands of other Asante objects which currently reside in public and private collections across the country.

Objects acquired through the exertion of British military power abroad, particularly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, have been known by a variety of often indiscriminately applied terms.[3] Loot, plunder, prize, souvenirs, trophies, booty and spoil are all examples which have been used, sometimes interchangeably, despite there often being subtle – albeit ill-defined – differences in their meanings to contemporary military practitioners. Recently, scholars have started to unpick the cultures and conventions surrounding the taking of objects during military expeditions. Henrietta Lidchi and Stuart Allan demonstrated that in terms of collecting practices the British army should not been seen as a 'monolithic entity'; rather, it was an agglomeration of different regimental cultures and traditions, with formal and informal rules and customs, that shaped its soldiers' attitudes to the acquisition of objects.[4] These practices could change over time and location, could be sanctioned and unsanctioned, and were contingent on 'a degree of collective and individual agency among the officer class'.[5] Nicole Hartwell showed that during the Indian Uprising of 1857-58 there was a shared understanding within the British military establishment that trophies which were seen to symbolise victory could be distinguished from those objects taken during moments of unsanctioned looting.[6] Furthermore, Katrina Hill concluded that during the Second Opium War in China in 1860 objects were 'collected' in three distinct ways – the taking of trophies and prize on the battlefield, looting government and civilian targets, and purchasing goods from merchants, but acknowledges that the

[2]'Coffee Calcallee's Umbrella', *Illustrated London News*, 21 March 1874, p. 278.
[3]Edward Spiers, 'Spoils of War: Custom and Practice' in Henrietta Lidchi and Stuart Allan (eds), *Dividing the Spoils: Perspectives on Military Collections and the British Empire,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), p. 19.
[4]Henrietta Lidchi and Stuart Allan, 'Introduction', in Lidchi and Allan (eds), *Dividing the Spoils,* pp. 5-6.
[5]Lidchi and Allan, 'Introduction', p. 6.
[6]Nicole Hartwell, 'Framing Colonial War Loot: The 'captured' *spolia opima* of Kunwar Singh', *Journal of the History of Collections,* 34, 2 (July 2022), pp. 287-302.

'boundaries between modes of acquisition were not always clear'.[7] Indeed, in China, property which was deemed to be looted could be confiscated from individual soldiers by British senior officers so that it could then be sold back to the men at a prize auction, where individuals competed to buy objects with the accumulated proceeds proportionately divided among the officers and men. This process, whereby unsanctioned and disorganised 'plundering' by individuals was banned in favour of the formal acquisition of 'prize', was repeated in both the Maqdala Expedition of 1867 and the Third Anglo-Asante War of 1873-1874.[8]

Inasmuch as published academic research has refocussed attention on the nature of British military collecting across the empire, museum curators too have started to examine their collections to better understand both their own institution's historic engagement with colonialism and to inform how objects acquired during military expeditions should be appropriately interpreted.[9] A landmark exhibition held at the National War Museum of Scotland between November 2020 and January 2024 entitled 'Legacies of Empire' examined military collecting practices, studied the objects acquired, and ascertained how those objects came to be part of museum collections.[10] The exhibition presented the opinion that instead of considering all material obtained in imperial expeditions as simply being 'loot', each object should be considered in its own right to determine which could be classified as souvenirs, gifts, prize, trophies or plunder. It was a timely intervention as British museums face increased calls to decolonize their collections and repatriate objects to their place of origin.[11] Indeed, as

[7] Katie Hill, 'Collecting on Campaign: British Soldiers in China during the Opium Wars', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 25, 2 (2013), p. 228.

[8]Spiers, 'Spoils of War', p. 25. A recent paper has refocussed attention on the inclusion of members of staff from the British Museum on the Maqdala Expedition, see: Lucia Patrizio Gunning and Debbie Challis, 'Planned Plunder: the British Museum and the 1868 Maqdala Expedition', *Historical Journal* (2023), online, https://www-cambridge-org.ezproxy.is.ed.ac.uk/core/journals/historical-journal/article/planned-plunder-the-british-museum-and-the-1868-maqdala-expedition/3109780C72D6A3E24D6B5A5387B6087C. Accessed 25 January 2023.

[9]National Museums Scotland has recently completed a research project entitled 'Baggage and Belonging: Military Collections and the British Empire' and are currently examining their collections acquired in Ethiopia. The National Army Museum has begun a project examining their collections with a connection to India.

[10]Patrick Watt, 'Exhibition Review: Legacies of Empire', *Journal of the Society of Army Historical Research,* 99, 4 (Winter, 2021), pp. 442-446.

[11]The issue is wide ranging, however for Asante objects see: Gertrude A. M. Eyifa-Dzidzienyo and Samuel N. Nkumbaan, 'Looted and Illegally Acquired African Objects in European Museums: Issues of Restitution and Repatriation in Ghana', *Contemporary Journal of African Studies,* 7, 2 (2020), pp. 84-96; Anon, 'V&A Asante Loans: A Prelude

Lidchi asserted, colonial collecting is perceived in the popular imagination as being solely comprised of 'illicit acts of appropriation' by 'imperious governments…vengeful armies…and greedy soldiers'.[12] 'Legacies of Empire' concluded by advocating for further analysis of objects collected during Britain's military expeditions; this article is a response to that call. Here, evidence from personal accounts and material culture is used to present a case study of collecting practices during the Third Anglo-Asante War of 1873-1874. In doing so, it follows the themes of 'Legacies of Empire': the first section focuses on the different ways that objects were acquired by both military men and the civilians attached to the expedition, and the second section studies the objects' afterlives, examining what happened once they passed into British hands and institutions.

Collecting On Campaign: Taking Objects from Asante

The West African Asante Empire was founded around a centre of power at Kumasi in 1695 by Akan-speaking peoples who were pushed together by a period of war and disruption on the Gold Coast in the preceding fifteen years.[13] Over the following two centuries the Asante empire grew in military and economic power, subsuming nearby kingdoms and trading with local, regional and European powers to become 'a highly advanced state', by the mid-eighteenth century.[14] Underpinning their status was access to gold. The Asante used slave labour to work gold mines and by the 1750s controlled virtually all the production of gold in the region.[15] While much of this gold was held as capital in the form of dust and nuggets, some was worked into elaborate pieces of art, many of which made up the Asante state regalia. As Ryan Patterson noted, the Asante Empire was, in the nineteenth century, 'economically successful, administratively centralised, militarily powerful and geographically vast, encompassing much of modern-day Ghana, Togo, Benin and Ivory Coast'.[16]

---

to Full Restitution?', Returning Heritage, online, 24 September 2022, https://www.returningheritage.com/v-a-asante-loans-a-prelude-to-full-restitution. Accessed 30 December 2022. Furthermore, the place of origin of objects can also be problematic to ascertain; as empires, like that of the Asante, broke down and new states were created in their place, competing claims have sometimes arisen.

[12]Henrietta Lidchi, 'Afterword: Material Reckonings with Military Histories', in Lidchi and Allan (eds), *Dividing the Spoils,* p. 273.

[13]Toby Green, *A Fistful of Shells: West Africa from the Rise of the Slave Trade to the Age of Revolution,* (London: Penguin, 2019), p. 297.

[14]Jarvis L. Hargrove, *The Political Economy of the Interior Gold Coast: the Asante and the Era of Legitimate Trading, 1807-1875,* (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2015), p. 47.

[15]Green, *A Fistful of Shells*, p. 300.

[16]Ryan Patterson, 'The Third Anglo-Asante War, 1873-1874', in S. M. Miller, *Queen Victoria's Wars: British Military Campaigns, 1857-1902,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), p. 106.

The British Empire established trading posts on the coastal region to the south of Asante in 1672, although British authority did not extend far beyond the walls of their forts into the African interior.[17] By the 1860s, many of the small kingdoms situated between the coast and the Pra River in the north, and the Tano and Volta rivers on the west and east, respectively, were under informal British protection, albeit there were frequent misunderstandings over what that meant in practice.[18] Furthermore, the Dutch also maintained forts along the same coast and the spheres of influence were ambiguous and ill-defined. Formal relations with the Asante were established in 1817 and they were, for the most part, cordial, notwithstanding periods of violence between 1823-1831, the First Anglo-Asante War, and 1863-1864, the Second Anglo-Asante War. The Dutch fort at Elmina on the Gold Coast had always paid a tribute to the Asante Empire but when this fort passed to British control in 1867 payment stopped. Worried that the British would unite coastal states against them, the Asante invaded the protectorate in 1872, and in doing so created the context for the British invasion the following year.

The course of the war has been well described elsewhere, so only a brief overview will be given here.[19] In 1873, the British government ordered that an expedition to Asante be mounted under the command of Sir Garnet Wolseley. A combined British and African force first raided along the coast burning towns deemed hostile before the Asante responded by attacking a British outpost at Abrakampa. While some British officers were despatched to lead African troops in decoy invasions, the main force led by Wolseley crossed the Pra River and marched on the capital Kumasi. Preparation had been thorough; the Royal Engineers had advanced ahead of the main force and had created a series of camps and a network of communications. Transport was provided by thousands of Fante auxiliaries who carried supplies up and down the lines of communication. Progress was swift; on 30 January 1874 British forces reached Amoafo where the Asante had prepared their main line of defence. The following day saw battle and an overwhelming British victory as the infantry, led by the 42nd (Royal Highland) Regiment of Foot, charged following a brief artillery barrage. The disparity in firepower meant that while the British forces lost only four men killed, the Asante

[17]W. D. McIntyre, 'British Policy in West Africa: the Ashanti Expedition of 1873-4', *Historical Journal,* 5, 1 (1962), p. 20.
[18]McIntyre, 'British Policy in West Africa', pp. 20-21.
[19]See, for example, Henry Brackenbury, *The Ashantee War, A Narrative: Prepared from the Official Documents by Permission of Major-General Sir Garnet Wolseley,* (London: Blackwoods, 1874); Edward M. Spiers, *The Victorian Soldier in Africa,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 20-34; Patterson, 'Third Anglo-Asante War', pp. 106-25.

suffered between 800 and 1600 dead.[20] Four days later, after capturing a succession of villages including Ordasu and Bekwa, British troops entered and occupied Kumasi. Aware of their imminent arrival, the *Asantehene* and his royal household left the city. British forces spent two days in Kumasi before Wolseley gave orders for his men to withdraw and march back to the coast, burning the city as they left. On 13 February, Wolseley signed a peace treaty with the Asante who agreed to renounce their right of tribute from the protectorate states, withdraw their forces, and allow free trade between the coastal kingdoms and Asante.[21]

The taking of objects during military expeditions appealed to soldiers of all ranks and backgrounds and was motivated by competing and conflicting factors including opportunism, natural curiosity, a desire for a physical memento to remember a difficult situation or exotic location, personal desire for financial gain, and orders to gain reparations from a defeated enemy.[22] Analysis of written sources and museum collections reveals that there were six main ways that members of the British expedition to Asante obtained objects: confiscating materiel from the enemy; collecting souvenirs; gathering prize to be sold at auction; plundering; being presented with an indemnity; and receiving gifts from allies.

Edward Spiers asserted that 'the right of a soldier to retain anything seized at the point of the bayonet' was an established custom in the British army.[23] In practical terms, the soldiers' first experience of taking objects in Asante was the stockpiling of weapons and materiel to deny their use to the enemy. After the capture of the village of Borborassi, Colonel John MacLeod of the Highlanders, noted that fifty-three muskets and twelve kegs of gunpowder had been taken from the village and were destroyed by the Naval Brigade attached to the expedition.[24] A similar scene occurred when troops of the 2nd West India Regiment and locally-recruited Fante soldiers attacked an Asante camp near Iscabio.[25] The process of destroying key war materiel to prevent it from assisting the enemy was an accepted convention rooted in military logic.[26] In the context of the Asante campaign, it proved to be a sensible course of action as once British forces moved from a village it invariably fell to the Asante once more, who

[20]Patterson, 'Third Anglo-Asante War', p. 121.
[21]Patterson, 'Third Anglo-Asante War', p. 123.
[22]Spiers, 'Spoils of War', p. 34.
[23]Spiers, 'Spoils of War', p. 20.
[24]Colonel John MacLeod to Major-General Sir Garnet Wolseley, 30 January 1874, in Henry M. Stanley, *Coomassie: The Story of the Campaign in Africa, 1873-4,* (London: Sampson Low, 1896), p. 152.
[25]Brackenbury, *The Ashanti War*, i, p. 239.
[26]It has been shown that this also occurred in the Indian Uprising in 1857-58. See Hartwell, 'Framing Colonial War Loot', p. 295.

then used it as a base to mount attacks on the British rear-guard. Furthermore, this was an accepted practice according to the contemporary rules of war and lacks the controversy of other means of taking objects.

In the moments after a battle, some soldiers acquired what could be considered to be 'campaign souvenirs' from the villages they had captured. After the Highlanders had spent seven hours in close-quarter combat in the jungle around Amoafo, they were relieved of duty and allowed to 'go and hunt' for souvenirs in the village.[27] Here, Lieutenant Mackay Scobie took a wooden chair, Private Fullarton Boyd took a small wooden stool, and an unknown soldier of the regiment took a wooden drum.[28] The presence of two wooden stools and two wooden chairs in the Royal Green Jackets Museum suggests that the 2nd Rifle Brigade also took objects around this time after their duty was done. Furthermore, Lieutenant Deane of the Naval Brigade took a brass lamp after the action at Adobiassi, and Captain Alfred Rait of the Royal Artillery took a state umbrella and a wooden chair which he believed to be 'the King of Becqua's throne'.[29] These objects were easy to find. Captain Henry Brackenbury, Wolseley's military secretary, noted that after the action at Amoafo: 'The ground was covered with traces of [the Asante soldiers'] flight. Umbrellas and war-chairs of their chiefs, drums, muskets, killed and wounded covered the whole way'.[30] A similar scene was found after the capture of the village of Bekwa where British soldiers found themselves 'trampling over the relics of property which the fugitives had abandoned'.[31] There may have been a practical purpose in soldiers taking some objects. When Major Duncan Macpherson of the Highlanders was wounded in the leg and neck at Amoafo he was laid to rest on 'a bedstead removed from a chief's house'.[32] Over the course of the action, other wounded officers joined Macpherson, including Lieutenant George Cumberland of the same regiment. The journalist Frederick Boyle of the *Daily Telegraph* observed that Cumberland, 'too hard hit for much conversation', sat on 'a notable chair, all carved wood and brazen knobs'.[33] Indeed, Cumberland may have

[27]William Winwood Reade, *The Story of the Ashantee Campaign,* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1874), p. 314.

[28]The stool acquired by Boyd is currently held by Glasgow Museums with the reference number 1886.1 and the drum is in the collection of National Museums Scotland with the reference number M.1930.903. The chair taken by Scobie remained in family hands until it was destroyed by woodworm (letter from Ronald Scobie to the author, 1 November 2021).

[29]Boyle, *Through Fanteeland to Coomassie*, p. 322 & p. 355.

[30]Brackenbury, *The Ashanti War*, ii, p. 215.

[31]Henry M. Stanley, *Coomassie and Magdala: The Story of Two Campaigns in Africa,* (London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co., 1874), p. 211.

[32]Boyle, *Through Fanteeland to Coomassie*, p. 335.

[33]Boyle, *Through Fanteeland to Coomassie*, p. 335.

given this chair to Macpherson at a later point, as Macpherson's brother donated a 'chair taken at Amoaful (sic), and brought home by Duncan Macpherson' to the Naval and Military Exhibition held at the Royal Scottish Academy in Edinburgh in 1889.[34] The taking of objects viewed as souvenirs was, then, permitted by the army hierarchy, widespread after different actions and undertaken by men of different units, suggesting that it was a broadly accepted practice and part of a wider shared understanding of British military culture during the campaign.

If the taking of souvenirs by individual soldiers was deemed to be a legitimate, if disorganised, practice, then the organised taking of property by the British state was also viewed by soldiers as legitimate practice at the end of the conflict. Indeed, as Edward Spiers noted, while all objects taken in war technically belonged to the Crown, the army had express permission to regulate their sale and apportion the profits once specific items had been set aside for the royal family.[35] In January 1874, prior to beginning his march from the coast into Asante, Wolseley gave orders that the taking of 'plunder' was expressly forbidden with regimental officers responsible for keeping their men together in occupied villages or camps to prevent them dispersing to seek plunder or destroying property.[36] Transgressors would be severely punished; indeed, a Fante soldier was hanged at Kumasi when being found in possession of what was deemed to be stolen property.[37] Captain Henry Brackenbury found that during the brief occupation of Kumasi 'the troops refrained, with the most admirable self-control, from spoliation or plunder'.[38] Another staff officer, Lieutenant Frederick Maurice, noted that if the 'spirit of plunder' was allowed to break loose perfectly behaved soldiers would quickly lose their discipline'.[39] In both Brackenbury's and Maurice's accounts, 'plunder' is a word not only consistently used with negative connotations, but is loaded with racial undertones. In the Third Anglo-Asante War, plundering was something done only by black African troops. Interestingly, while both authors make reference to the Asante soldiers plundering during their advance to the coast in 1872, Brackenbury also referred to the actions of Britain's African allies in those terms. Thus, at Anasmadie, Hausa troops advanced too far as 'the temptation to plunder

[34]Anon., *Catalogue of the Naval and Military Exhibition, historical, technical and artistic, held in the Royal Scottish Academy Galleries, Edinburgh,* (Edinburgh: Frank Murray, 1889), p. 245.
[35]Spiers, 'Spoils of War', pp. 19-20.
[36]Brackenbury, *The Ashanti War,* i, p. 366.
[37]The most severe punishment appears to have been reserved for Britain's African allies; the author has seen no evidence to suggest that British soldiers received any form of corporal or capital punishment for plundering during the campaign.
[38]Brackenbury, *The Ashanti War,* ii, p. 247.
[39]John Frederick Maurice, *The Ashanti War: A Popular Narrative* (London: Henry King, 1874), p. 374.

overcame them'; soldiers from Accra were found 'loitering…where they intended to come up to share plunder'; and men from Ahwounah had gone on the offensive with the desire to 'destroy and plunder the entire place'.[40] For British staff officers involved in this campaign, plundering was an undesirable and unsanctioned act which resulted from a lack of discipline and, in the words of Henry Brackenbury, '[did] not appeal to the instincts of a true soldier'.[41]

This is not to suggest that British soldiers left Kumasi empty handed. As King Kofi Karikari refused to deal with the British, Wolseley ordered that prize agents be elected to examine the property found in the royal palace with a view to securing the most valuable items which would later be sold at auction and the proceeds distributed amongst the expeditionary force. This was an accepted practice among British army officers and had taken place since at least the late eighteenth century but was only formally enshrined in military doctrine by Wolseley himself in 1886.[42] Among the prize agents were Captain Redvers Buller, the intelligence officer on the staff, Captain Henry Dugdale of the Rifle Brigade and Lieutenant Maclean of the Naval Brigade, who were assisted by Andooa, the leader of the Elmina people, and Marie-Joseph Bonnat, a French trader who had been captured by the Asante in 1869.[43] The prize agents worked within some well-defined parameters: they were only given permission to remove as much material as could be carried by thirty Fante labourers and they had only one night to sift through the material in the palace.[44] This resulted in many things being destroyed when the palace was demolished. The British were, however, not the only people to take objects from Kumasi; the war correspondent Henry Stanley lamented that the lack of guards placed at the palace on the night of 4-5 February allowed the Asante to return and take 'the most valuable plunder' including the *Asantehene's* golden stool, and the *aya kese* basin, the most prized possession of the Asante people.[45] Furthermore, despite Wolseley's ban on plunder, objects worth over £3000 were confiscated from Fante soldiers as they tried to return south of the Pra River, much more than the £2000 raised from the sale of the objects taken from Kumasi by the prize agents.[46]

---

[40]Maurice, *Ashanti War*, p. 108; Brackenbury, *The Ashanti War,* i, p. 271, pp.385-386 & p. 400.

[41]Brackenbury, *The Ashanti War,* ii, p. 238.

[42]Spiers, 'Spoils of War', p. 20.

[43]Unfortunately, Buller's war journal makes no reference to his work on the prize committee. See Devon Archives and Local Studies Service, 2065M-2/SS5.

[44]Brackenbury, *The Ashanti War*, ii, p. 240.

[45]Stanley, *Coomassie and Magdala*, p. 230. The *aya kese* is now in the collections of the National Army Museum (hereinafter NAM) in London, being taken during a subsequent British expedition to Asante.

[46]Maurice, *The Ashanti War*, p. 375.

The souvenirs taken after the actions at Amoafo, Adobiassi and Bekwa and the prize taken at Kumasi were considered by the British military establishment to have been acquired legitimately. For them, the soldiers had risked their lives and deserved a reward. However, the civilians who accompanied the expedition also acquired objects, although the terminology they used to describe them differed from that used by the soldiers. After stopping for lunch following the action at Amoafo, William Winwood Reade sent his assistant Edward Lake 'to "loot" for curiosities' and at the same time Frederick Boyle of the *Daily Telegraph* noted that 'our servants looted and brought us their plunder'.[47] Analysis of their accounts of the campaign shows that the war correspondents viewed the taking of objects as a desirable and normal occurrence. Once at Kumasi, some of the correspondents took the opportunity to visit the palace where they found 'valuable, curious and worthless things heaped together in every room'.[48] Melton Prior's account deserves particular attention. He entered the king's bedroom first, even before the prize agents:

> By the side of [the Queen's] bed were a pair of slippers with beautiful gold buckles. I could not resist examining them; then an idea came into my head that one would make a handsome brooch for my wife in England, so it did not take me long to remove it from the slipper. Then I thought, if I take only one it will be missed, so I had better take the other, and nobody will know there were any at all.[49]

As he wandered around the other rooms of the palace, Prior removed other objects which were small enough to be concealed in his pockets. Later that day Wolseley gathered the war correspondents together and placed them on their honour that they would not remove anything from the palace and Prior 'very reluctantly gave the necessary assurances' but did not admit that he had already taken objects and made no attempt to return them.[50] He was, then, acutely aware that he was committing theft and acting contrary to the commanding officer's orders. However, in their own opinion, the war correspondents viewed the taking of objects as 'a harmless recreation, which it is mere pedantry to forbid'.[51]

---

[47]Reade, *The Story of the Ashantee Campaign*, p. 313; Boyle, *Through Fanteeland to Coomassie*, p. 323.
[48]Stanley, *Coomassie to Magdala*, p. 234.
[49]Melton Prior, *Campaigns of a War Correspondent,* (London: Edward Arnold, 1912), p. 25.
[50]Prior, *Campaigns*, p. 25.
[51]Reade, *Ashantee Campaign*, p. 313.

On the return march from Kumasi an order was issued that 'private spoils' acquired during the campaign were to be produced before the prize agents.[52] Those present were given the possibility of buying back their souvenirs at a fixed price or handing them over to the prize agents to be sold at auction. This practice had been witnessed by Wolseley in China in 1860, when British officers were ordered to hand in objects they had taken from the Yuanmingyuan Palace so they could be sold and the proceeds divided proportionately among the whole force, as the non-commissioned officers and men had not had an opportunity to obtain objects themselves.[53] However, as he knew, this practice relied on officers' honesty in voluntarily giving up objects; indeed, in China, Wolseley himself failed to comply with orders to turn in an object he had acquired, keeping a valuable miniature painting he had been given by a French officer who had looted it from the palace. While most soldiers and journalists in Asante did hand in the objects they had collected, at least one war correspondent refused. Melton Prior thought it was 'rather hard lines' that he was to be deprived of his newly-acquired property so placed everything in a hammock, covered it and lay on it feigning illness to avoid the searches being carried out; as he later recalled, 'many others had to give up a lot of valuable and very interesting curios'.[54] For the most part, it seems that the British were eager to confiscate items made from gold which would fetch the greatest price either through private sale or at auction, going as far as bringing a gold assayer from Elmina to set prices for the objects. This focus on confiscating gold may explain why so many wooden objects – drums, chairs and stools, especially – are found in military museum collections today. And as the examples of both China and Asante show, the purpose of taking of a prize was not only to secure trophies from a defeated enemy, but to ensure that the money subsequently raised from their sale was evenly distributed to the lower ranks who had fewer opportunities to obtain objects on expeditions.

A further group of objects was obtained by British soldiers at Fomena on 13 February. As part of the peace settlement the British demanded the payment of an indemnity of 50,000 ounces of gold from Kofi Karikari as recompense for 'the expenses he has occasioned to Her Majesty by the late war'.[55] The settlement required the Asante to present 1000 ounces of gold immediately, with other instalments to be delivered as

[52]Maurice, *The Ashanti War*, p. 375.
[53]Garnet J. Wolseley, *The Story of a Soldier's Life,* (London: Constable, 1903), ii, p. 78.
[54]Prior, *Campaigns*, p. 29.
[55]'Treaty of Peace between Wolseley and Saibee Enquie, acting on behalf of King Kofi Kakari', in Ian F. W. Beckett (ed.), *Wolseley and Ashanti: The Asante War Journal and Correspondence of Major General Sir Garnet Wolseley, 1873-1874,* (Stroud: History Press for the Army Records Society, 2009), p. 399.

and when the British government demanded.[56] In the shade of a mess hut at Fomena, a delegation of seven Asante officials laid out the gold on a white sheet; it consisted of 'gold plates and figures, nuggets, bracelets, knobs, masks, bells, jaw-bones, and fragments of skulls, plaques [and] bosses'.[57] While Wolseley thought the government should 'throw the amount into the prize fund', the indemnity was treated differently to the prize, and, rather than being sold at auction at the Cape Coast, the golden objects presented at Fomena were sent back to Britain.[58] Incidentally, the 1000 ounces of gold presented at Fomena was the only instalment the Asante ever gave to the British.

The final way British soldiers obtained objects was through the receipt of gifts. There is only material evidence of one such cultural exchange. In the collections of the National Army Museum in London are two objects which were supposedly presented to Colonel Evelyn Wood by an African leader, Prince Charles Bonny, whose kingdom was located in what is now Nigeria. The first object is a pill box and the second is an ammunition belt known as an *ntoa* made of animal hide containing space for eight cartridges, gunpowder and several small knives.[59] Throughout the war the Bonny people were allied to the British and supplied 160 men for the expedition against the Asante, serving in a battalion commanded by Evelyn Wood.[60] Wood was not overly impressed with the behaviour of the troops from Bonny, later recalling that they 'had no special aptitude for war' and lamenting that he had to spend four hours in front of Ordasu entreating them to advance.[61] However, it seems that Prince Charles sought to solidify his alliance with the British by presenting gifts to his commanding officer, a process which was repeated in social interactions across the British empire in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

This section has shown the different processes whereby military and civilian members of the British expedition to Asante in 1873-1874 obtained objects. While many individual soldiers sought to acquire a 'campaign souvenir' to mark their time fighting

[56]Wolseley's original request was for 5000 ounces as the initial payment but the Asante claimed they could not raise that amount in a short time, and the treaty was amended to 1000 ounces.
[57]Maurice, *Ashanti War*, p. 374.
[58]Beckett, *Wolseley and Ashanti*, p. 395, Wolseley's Journal entry, 13 February 1874.
[59]National Army Museum, NAM.1965-07-31-1; NAM.1965-10-151. For a brief discussion of the *ntoa* see Alastair Massie, 'Community Consultation and the shaping of the National Army Museum's Insight Gallery', in Lidchi and Allan (eds), *Dividing the Spoils,* pp. 237-40.
[60]Patterson, 'Third Anglo-Asante War, 1873-74', p. 113.
[61]Evelyn Wood, *From Midshipman to Field Marshal,* (London: Methuen, 1906), 2 vols, i, p. 279.

in Africa, the British army as an institution resorted to the more formal means of taking 'prize' and collecting an 'indemnity'. Other objects were received as gifts. For the staff officers attached to this expedition these terms had clear meanings: souvenirs were viewed favourably as 'little innocent articles costing a few pence or a few shillings' which reminded soldiers of their experiences; prize and indemnity were viewed as a means of providing a fair financial share to men without the means to obtain their own 'spoils'; and 'plunder' referred to stolen property taken during clear lapses of military discipline and deemed unworthy of British troops.[62] These same linguistic parameters were not shared by the civilians who accompanied the expedition. For the British journalists in Asante, looting and plundering was viewed in the same terms as the taking of souvenirs and was spoken of as a thoroughly normalised, if not expected practice.

Afterlives: Asante Objects in British Collections

At 10.30am on Monday, 23 February 1874, the prize objects taken from the palace at Kumasi, those given up by members of the expedition at Wolseley's request, and the items confiscated from Fante carriers were offered to the highest bidder in the palaver-hall of the Cape Castle. Frederick Boyle of the *Daily Telegraph* described the scene in the following terms:

> …the long centre table was covered as thickly as it could bear with jewellery and gold. On a side table stood the king's plate. Against a broad screen hung swords and cartouche belts of leopard skin, and canes of huge silver heads, and calabashes bound in gold and silver, and embossed brass pans. Beneath lay the stools so placed that their fine silver bosses and adornments could be seen in one glittering display. Under the tables a miscellany of odds and ends were piled. At the other end of the room cloths and silks were disposed, neatly wrapped and labelled, one on another, hundreds of them…it is easy to make a fine display of things tastefully coloured. And gold is always pretty.[63]

By the time the auction began, the three British infantry battalions which had accompanied the expedition – the 23rd (Royal Welch Fusiliers) and the 42nd (The Royal Highland) Regiments of Foot, and the 2nd Regiment The Rifle Brigade – had embarked onto transport ships for the journey back to Britain. This meant that the majority of the British regimental personnel had departed prior to the prize auction with those Europeans present at the sale being largely limited to staff officers, members of the Royal Navy, journalists and colonial officials. However, the largest group of visitors to the prize sale were men and women from Fante and the Gold Coast who bid primarily

[62]Maurice, *Ashanti War*, p. 375.
[63]Boyle, *Through Fanteeland to Coomassie*, pp. 377-79.

on textiles and Aggrey beads.[64] This ensured that many objects taken from Kumasi remained in West Africa. The agency of local populations is often overlooked in examining collecting practices associated to British military action, however, that Fante soldiers carried away more objects of monetary value from Kumasi than Europeans, coupled with the prominence of African bidders at the prize auction, adds a further dimension to the processes through which objects were dispersed following their acquisition.

Sir Garnet Wolseley bought a number of objects at the prize sale after being given a private tour on the evening of 22 February where he was able to 'examine the loot'.[65] After finding a number of interesting items, he despatched one of his staff officers to bid on his behalf but the officer soon found himself priced out. Wolseley had set his heart on a bronze group of fifty figures depicting the *Asantehene* being carried in state but his bid of £16 was far exceeded by the winning bid of £100.[66] Instead, he settled for a battered old English coffee pot which belonged to Kofi Karikari, a golden rattle from the palace nursery, wooden stools to give as presents, a hat supposedly worn by the *Asantehene* at Ordasu, and some other gifts for his wife, including Aggrey beads.[67] Furthermore, Wolseley's staff officers bought Kofi Karikari's sword and presented it to him as a gift. These objects joined others that he acquired on different colonial expeditions including a sketchbook of pen, ink and watercolour drawings by the artist Dong Guo which Wolseley 'found' in the Yuanmingyuan Palace in Beijing in 1860; a kulah khud helmet 'taken' from Sudan in 1885; and a knife made of bone, red leather, white snakeskin, and silver which he 'brought back' from the Nile Expedition in 1884.[68] Wolseley viewed these objects as legitimately acquired, harmless souvenirs of a life's soldiering; the exception being the miniature painting he had refused to give up in China in 1860, which he described as 'the only bit of loot I possess'.[69]

The prize auction realised a sum of around £3000. The inflated prices ensured that few officers came away with more than a handful of objects. One who did was Prince Leonid Vyazemsky, who had attached himself to Wolseley's headquarters on 16 February with letters of introduction from the Duke of Cambridge. It was Vyazemsky

[64]Boyle, *Through Fanteeland to Coomassie*, p. 377.
[65]Beckett, *Wolseley and Ashanti*, p. 403, Wolseley's Journal, 22 February 1874.
[66]Beckett, *Wolseley and Ashanti*, p. 406, Wolseley to Louisa Wolseley, 25-26 February 1874.
[67]Beckett, *Wolseley and Ashanti*, p. 406-7, Wolseley to Louisa Wolseley, 25-26 February 1874.
[68]Wolseley's collection is held by the National Army Museum (NAM). The terms of acquisition are those used on the NAM's website www.nam.ac.uk. Accessed 31 January 2023.
[69]Wolseley, *Story of a Soldier's Life*, ii, p. 78.

who outbid Wolseley for the group of fifty golden Asante figures and he supplemented this by purchasing a golden-handled sword, among other items. Some officers chose to speculate, buying objects at prices above their value in the hope that they would realise more on their return to Britain. This may have been what prompted Dr James Clutterbuck, the surgeon-major of the Highlanders, to pay £114 for a bracelet comprised of golden ornaments and Aggrey beads.[70] Other officers sought out gifts. Wolseley spent £20 on a silver goblet which he presented to Commodore Sir William Hewett, the naval commander in West Africa, 'as a remembrance of our march to Coomassie'.[71] Furthermore, he gifted the *Asantehene's* hat to his friend Alexander Holmes. Gifting of objects bought at the prize auction continued back in England; Captain John Hawley Glover, who had raised a force of Hausa soldiers for the war, visited a merchant named Charles Leigh Clare in Manchester soon after his arrival from West Africa and brought with him a wooden chair as a gift for Clare's wife, Elizabeth.[72]

By the end of March 1874, the majority of soldiers and civilians had returned to Britain; with them came chests of unsold prize, gold indemnity, gifts from allies, plunder and campaign souvenirs. While many objects were retained by individuals, the remainder of the prize and indemnity was bought by the jeweller Garrard & Co. for the sum of £11,000 in early April. Later that month, they were placed on public display in London's Haymarket ahead of their sale at auction. Here, they were exhibited not as trophies of a victorious campaign but as commodities to be bought. Contemporary newspaper reports opined that some of the objects were unsuitable for private collections and would be 'more fitly suited to a museum or public institution'.[73] Several museums sent representatives to view and buy objects which reside today in Britain's public collections as tangible examples of Britain's former imperial power.

Henrietta Lidchi noted that popular perceptions of material acquired in non-European settings and housed in British museums tend to reduce all objects to the status of illegally appropriated 'loot', or as John Mack termed them, 'abducted objects'.[74] However, the setting in which the objects are displayed and the type of institution that exhibits them changes how they can be seen. The Royal Regiment of Artillery has in their collection a golden mask in the shape of a ram's head which was taken as prize

[70]Boyle, *Through Fanteeland to Coomassie*, pp. 379-85.
[71]Beckett, *Wolseley and Ashanti*, p. 407, Wolseley to Louisa Wolseley, 25-26 February 1874.
[72]'The Return of Captain Glover', *The Standard*, 6 April 1874, p. 3.
[73]'Trophies from Ashantee', *Evening Standard & Echo*, 20 April 1874, p. 4.
[74]Lidchi, 'Material Reckonings', p. 273; John Mack, 'The Agency of Objects: A Contrasting Choreography of Flags, Military Booty and Skulls from late nineteenth-century Africa', in Lidchi and Allan (eds), *Dividing the Spoils*, pp. 39-59.

from Kumasi and sold at the auction. That object forms part of the officers' mess, an exclusive space where regimental culture is propagated and the officers bond over a shared history.[75] Soon after it entered the mess, the officers of the Royal Artillery commissioned an elaborate tripod stand depicting African figures, transforming the ram's head into a regimental possession which simultaneously marked their involvement in the war and performed a ceremonial role within the mess. Indeed, for the Royal Regiment of Artillery, this is not an object to be displayed in a public institution; rather it is 'private property' which has become part of the fabric of the regiment.[76]

The addition of the tripod attributes trophy status to the object, intending to permanently alter its materiality and transform it into a symbol of victory.[77] Another way this was undertaken was through the use of inscriptions. On 14 May 1874, Brigadier Sir Archibald Alison, who had commanded the British infantry in the war, presented a carved wooden stool to the City Industrial Museum in Glasgow. The stool – now held by Glasgow Museums – had been the possession of Afua Kobi, the *Asantehemaa*, or queen mother. Prior to its donation, it had been modified with the addition of the words 'Taken from Royal Palace (Coomassie) Feb. 4th 1874', written in red paint along the base, presumably at Alison's request.[78] As Nicole Hartwell has shown, the practice of inscribing objects is 'embedded in British military tradition', however the inscriptions themselves 'have the power to be misleading'.[79] This may well be the case with this stool. The inscription conjures the image of Alison searching the Kumasi palace for a souvenir and personally 'taking' the stool, however contemporary sources reveal that immediately prior to entering Kumasi, Alison, who had lost an arm fifteen years earlier in India, had stumbled and fallen underneath his mule into a swamp filled with human remains, from which he was only saved from drowning by his staff.[80] It is difficult to imagine this man then proceeding immediately

[75]Nicole Hartwell and Charles Kirke, 'The Officers' Mess: An Anthropology and History of the Military Interior', in Lidchi and Allan (eds), *Dividing the Spoils*, pp. 106-27.
[76]Martin Bailey, 'The V&A likely to return looted Asante gold treasures to Ghana', *The Art Newspaper* online, 12 September 2022, https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2022/09/12/va-raises-real-prospect-of-return-of-asante-treasures-to-ghana. Accessed 13 February 2023.
[77]Lidchi and Allan, 'Introduction', p. 5.
[78]Glasgow Museums, 1874.22, http://collections.glasgowmuseums.com/mwebcgi/mweb?request=record;id=128873;type=101. Accessed 2 February 2023. The author thanks Patricia Allan of Glasgow Museums for allowing access to the object file for this stool.
[79]Hartwell, 'Framing Colonial War Loot', p. 292.
[80]Stanley, *Coomassie and Magdala*, pp. 222-223.

to search for a souvenir. Rather, it is more likely that this high-status stool, probably found in the royal apartments, was taken from Kumasi as part of the prize and bought by Alison at the auction at Cape Coast. Other objects were similarly modified; an *ntumpane* drum donated to the Scottish National Naval and Military Museum in 1930 has a carved inscription that informs us that it was 'taken by the 42nd Highlanders' and the box containing a knife presented by Lieutenant William Knox to Prince Alfred has an inscribed silver plaque declaring that it was 'taken from King Kofi Karikari, King of Ashanti, at the capture of Kumasi'.[81] The inscriptions overwrite their earlier histories, define them solely as military objects and materially tie them to the overwhelming defeat of the Asante. However, they must be treated with caution. Inscriptions like those mentioned here indicate that the objects were obtained though one of the myriad processes soldiers could acquire things on campaign, rather than an admission of illegal appropriation.

Military museums perform a different function to the officers' mess and they acquire and display their objects in different ways. In the first place, regimental museums can be seen as an integral part of the regiment itself, linking current soldiers with those who went before them, promoting a shared identity and fostering *esprit de corps*.[82] The Royal Green Jackets (Rifles) Museum in Winchester holds twelve objects which they describe as being 'taken' from Asante; all of which were donated in the last twenty years. These objects appear to be a mixture of soldiers' souvenirs – objects with a low monetary value including two wooden chairs and two stools – and others possibly purchased at the prize auction, including a brass plate, silver dagger and necklace decorated with green glass. Alternatively, they may have been plundered by individual soldiers when the 2 Rifle Brigade were ordered to guard Kumasi palace. In the setting of a regimental museum, these objects are viewed solely through an imperial lens. Here, they are symbols of victory, of the exertion of British military power, and of the regiment's prowess in battle.

National military museums also display and interpret objects acquired in Asante. The National War Museum of Scotland, part of National Museums Scotland (NMS), have in their collection a carved, silver-mounted gourd obtained by Lieutenant Andrew Wauchope of the Highlanders, which was donated by his family in 1931.[83] Wauchope was seconded to Russell's Regiment of Hausa, Mumford and Sierra Leonean soldiers, and he was severely wounded at Amoafo. The gourd was mounted in silver and engraved with the words 'Coomassie 1874' on one side and 'A.G.W. 1893' on the other, modifications which mark it as a trophy object, although not in a triumphant

[81]National Museums Scotland, M.1930.903; Royal Collection Trust, RCIN 70496.
[82]Louise Tythacott, 'Trophies of War: Representing "Summer Palace" Loot in Military Museums in the UK', *Museum & Society* 13.4 (2015), p. 470.
[83]National Museums Scotland, M.1931.730.

sense. It is on display in the museum's 'Highland Soldier' gallery alongside others which examine the experiences of renowned Highland regiments in the nineteenth century, a time when Highland soldiers were considered as the military spearhead of empire. Like those in regimental museums, it is only considered as a military object, its earlier history, cultural significance and original meaning unaddressed, its importance to the museum deriving solely from its acquisition by a Highland soldier.

Garnet Wolseley's collection of objects was donated to the Royal United Services Institution Museum after his death and were incorporated into the National Army Museum's (NAM) collection in the 1960s. As 'the flagship museum of the British Army', NAM is 'dedicated to preserving the Army's history and communicating its role in society, past and present, to the general public'.[84] Between 2017 and 2022 Asante objects were displayed to the public in the 'West Africa' case of the 'Insight' gallery, where objects that relate to Britain's colonial past were presented with interpretations that link them to the current British army's operations overseas, in this case interventions and peacekeeping in Sierra Leone.[85] There, the *ntoa* belt given by Prince Charles Bonny to Redvers Buller sat alongside objects obtained on other expeditions to Asante, including a war horn taken in 1824 and the *aya kese* bowl taken from the royal mausoleum at Bantama in 1896. In this gallery, African voices were included; a preparatory workshop invited members of the Ghanaian community to examine and interpret the objects themselves, and their perceptions were included in the gallery. In the setting of a military museum, this was a unique interpretation, albeit one which was not without its critics; the historian Andrew Roberts commented in 2017 that the NAM is now 'obsessed with making us feel post-colonial guilt' when it should be concentrating on displaying the uniforms, medals and memorabilia of the heroic British army.[86] And it seems that a return to this more traditional approach is in the offing, with Roberts writing in 2022 that the museum's new management would return to the principles of the original charter from 1960, including the opening of the new 'Global Role' gallery 'which tells the Army's worldwide story from an evidence-based, objective perspective' rather than what he termed the 'political correctness' and 'wokery' of the past five years.[87] It is clear that arguments over the supposedly 'correct' way to exhibit and interpret these objects show no signs of abating.

[84]Massie, 'Community Consultation', p. 229.
[85]Massie, 'Community Consultation', p. 232. The 'Insight' Gallery at NAM no longer exists, having been replaced in 2022 by the 'Formation' Gallery.
[86]Andrew Roberts, 'The newly refurbished National Army Museum is full of inaccuracies and post-colonial guilt', *The Spectator*, online, 2 June 2017 www.spectator.co.uk/article/national-army-museum. Accessed 14 February 2023.
[87]Andrew Roberts, 'The Triumph of the National Army Museum', *The Spectator*, online, https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/the-triumph-of-the-national-army-museum/. Accessed 14 February 2023.

Asante objects are also displayed in non-military museums. The British Museum, the Pitt-Rivers Museum, the Wallace Collection, the Victoria & Albert Museum and others have among their collections objects which were acquired in 1873-1874. Instead of being the wooden objects of cultural significance commonly found in military museums, these national institutions' collections are largely comprised of golden objects taken by the prize committee or presented as part of the indemnity. The Wallace Collection in London holds eighteen objects bought from Garrard & Co. in 1874 by their founder, Sir Richard Wallace. Curators have worked hard to research the objects' original uses and significance and they communicate their findings in a number of engaging ways, including in a freely downloadable information pack aimed at secondary school educators teaching the history of Africa and the British Empire.[88] The Department of World Cultures at National Museums Scotland holds a number of Asante objects bought from Garrard & Co. by its forerunner the Royal Scottish Museum, including an embossed sheet of gold formerly used as an amulet case. These objects, a part of the Asante indemnity, are displayed alongside others from Asia and the Americas in the 'Inspired by Nature' gallery, which seeks to examine 'the way humanity has engaged, emotionally, spiritually, religiously and culturally with nature through art'.[89] In this context, they are presented as examples of elaborate African gold working rather than as military objects. However, several objects from the World Cultures galleries were included in the 'Legacies of Empire' exhibition at the National War Museum of Scotland where they were displayed alongside others taken as 'loot and prize' from military campaigns in India and Africa. These objects exhibit what Henrietta Lidchi termed 'transcultural roles, identities and histories', with particular aspects of their past emphasised depending on setting and interpretation.[90]

Conclusion

This article set out to examine British collecting practices during the Third Anglo-Asante War and to explore how objects taken from Asante have been treated once they passed into British hands. Its findings show that there were a number of ways soldiers and civilians could acquire objects, ranging from those deemed to be legitimate in the eyes of the British forces such as collecting prize or indemnity, or those that were explicitly banned such as plundering. The collecting of campaign souvenirs was encouraged, as long as the objects the soldiers took were of low monetary value. The primary rationale behind this was not to deprive the Asante of objects of cultural

[88]Anon, 'Asante Gold and the Wallace Collection', The Wallace Collection online, https://www.wallacecollection.org/documents/552/Asante_Gold_TN__latest_1.pdf. Accessed 14 February 2023.

[89] NMS online, https://www.nms.ac.uk/national-museum-of-scotland/things-to-see-and-do/explore-the-galleries/world-cultures/. Accessed 6 February 2023.

[90]Lidchi, 'Material Reckonings', p. 274.

significance but was motivated by a desire for all soldiers to receive a fair share of the victory through the sale of high-status objects at the prize auction. Tangentially, it has highlighted the agency of African communities in acquiring objects themselves from their defeated enemies, both through 'plunder' and from the prize auction. Most crucially, it has highlighted that in this campaign there existed a shared understanding among British officers of what could be taken and in what context, an understanding that was not shared by civilian members of the expedition. This is not to suggest that the soldiers' attitudes extended beyond the specific circumstances found in Asante in 1874, however, it opens up future avenues for research into the British army's culture of taking objects on military expeditions.

The way these objects were treated by the British after they were taken differed. Some objects were raised to trophy status through their modification or inscription, others were not. Some were immediately donated or acquired by museums, others remained in private hands for generations. Most importantly, the setting in which the objects are currently situated profoundly alters their meaning. In regimental museums and messes objects taken in Asante became part of the fabric of the regiment, an indelible link between generations of soldiers, emphasising their prowess in battle and materially reflecting their part in victory. For other museums, the meanings change. As we have seen, Asante souvenirs, prize, gifts and indemnity have been used to tell the story of the Highland soldier in the British empire, to link nineteenth century expeditions with the current operations of the British army, and to highlight the prowess of West African goldsmiths. And yet, for many descendants of the Asante, these 'abducted objects' can still accurately be described as 'loot' or 'plunder' whose loss is still keenly felt. These objects mean different things to different people in different contexts and, as 'Legacies of Empire' has shown, it is the responsibility of curators, academics and members of indigenous communities to come together to better understand the processes involved in the taking of objects such as these and their subsequent display in British institutions.