



# Reparations for the genocide in Namibia?

Eleven Responses to Key Objections  
in the German Debate

ARGUMENTATION GUIDE

Völkermord  
verjährt  
nicht

No  
Amnesty  
on Genocide

Publication by the Alliance “No Amnesty on Genocide”  
[www.genocide-namibia.net](http://www.genocide-namibia.net)

Authors: Felix Henn, Julia Manek, Henning Melber,  
Laura Mahler, Reinhart Kößler, Tim Mulhanga, Anne Schroeter,  
Prince Kamaazengi Marenga

Publisher: Werkstatt Ökonomie e.V.,  
Landhausstraße 17, 69115 Heidelberg, Phone 06221-3618753  
Email: [info@woek.de](mailto:info@woek.de), [www.woek.de](http://www.woek.de)

Photos: Werkstatt Ökonomie / Simone Knapp  
Cover photo: Petra Rooi at the genocide commemoration  
at Shark Island in 2025.

Concept & Layout: Bettina Bank, Heidelberg

Gefördert durch:

**Brot** mit Mitteln des  
für die Welt Kirchlichen  
Entwicklungsdienstes

## Content

Reparations for the genocide in Namibia? .....	4
I. Fundamental questions.....	6
II. Legal responsibility .....	8
III. Political implementation and form of reparations .....	11
IV. Representation and participation in the negotiations on the Joint Declaration.....	14
V. Relativization and Distraction .....	19
Final remark.....	22

## Eleven Responses to Key Objections in the German Debate

The question of reparations for colonial injustice is gaining momentum internationally. At both the regional and global levels, there is increasing discussion about how historical and ongoing colonial crimes can be addressed appropriately under international law and politically. This includes the UN General Assembly resolution adopted on March 25, 2026, which designates the transatlantic slave trade as the gravest crime against humanity and emphasizes reparations as a concrete step toward addressing historical injustices.<sup>1</sup> Germany therefore has not only a historical but also a legal and political responsibility to address these demands.

This responsibility is particularly evident in dealing with the genocide committed by the German imperial “Schutztruppen” between 1904 and 1908 in the former colony of German South West Africa (now Namibia) against the Ovaherero and Nama as well as the Damara and San. Tens of thousands of people were systematically killed, driven into the desert, or interned in concentration camps. According to estimates, around 80 percent of the Ovaherero and 50 percent of the Nama died. They were victims of racist pseudo-

medical experiments, sexualized violence, or forced labor. The genocide was accompanied by massive expropriation of land and livestock and the destruction of economic, social, and cultural structures.

According to today’s understanding of international law, genocide and other serious human rights violations give rise to an obligation to provide reparations. The principle that actions contrary to international law are followed by an obligation to provide reparations is a recognized part of international law. The passage of time does not negate this responsibility, especially when the consequences of the crimes continue to have an impact to this day.<sup>2</sup>

This is precisely the case here. The groups affected by the genocide suffer from transgenerational trauma, structural marginalization, and economic disadvantage. This is directly related to the history of colonial violence. This is most evident in the land issue: today, 44% of Namibia’s land area and 70% of its farm land is owned by approximately 4,500 mostly white commercial farmers, who make up 0.3% of the population.<sup>3</sup> These land ownership patterns date back to the expropriation of the Ovaherero and Nama communities during German colonial rule.

---

1 UN-General Assembly (2026): Declaration of the Trafficking of Enslaved Africans and Racialized Chattel Enslavement of Africans as the Gravest Crime against Humanity (<https://docs.un.org/en/A/80/L.48>)

---

2 Human Rights Watch (2025): Q&A - Reparations for Historical and Ongoing Colonial Atrocities (<https://www.hrw.org/news/2025/09/04/qa-reparations-for-historical-and-ongoing-colonial-atrocities>)

3 Weizman (2024): Three Genocides (<https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v46/n08/eyal-weizman/diary>)

Against this backdrop, representatives of the affected communities have been demanding reparations from Germany for decades. They do not invoke moral generosity, but rather the principle of responsibility for injustices committed and their continuing effects.

Between 2015 and 2021, the German government negotiated bilaterally with the Namibian government on a so-called “Joint Declaration”. Key associations representing those affected, several UN special rapporteurs, and we as the alliance “No Amnesty on Genocide” criticized both the insufficient participation of the affected communities and the rejection of reparations. The German government repeatedly presented its approach as having no alternative.

Against this background, this argumentation guide addresses key objections that are regularly raised in political statements, discussions with decision-makers, and media reports.<sup>4</sup> It analyzes them against the backdrop of historical facts, principles of international law, and political responsibility.

Reparations are more than financial compensation. They are a mechanism enshrined in international law for restoring justice and acknowledging responsibility. According to the United Nations Basic

Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation<sup>5</sup>, reparations comprise five levels: restitution (restoration of the original state, as far as possible); compensation (for material and immaterial damage); rehabilitation (medical, psychological, social, and legal support); satisfaction (including public acknowledgment of the injustice, apology, commemoration) and guarantees of non-repetition (structural changes to prevent future violence). The discussion of reparations is not backward-looking symbolic politics, but part of a present-day struggle for the rule of law, international credibility, and the demand that states take responsibility for historical injustices even today.

This paper is intended as a contribution to an informed and legally sound public debate.

*Alliance No Amnesty on Genocide / Bündnis Völkermord verjährt nicht (March 2026)*

<sup>4</sup> For clarity, the individual arguments are structured by topic and are not attributable to any specific person or institution. However, they are all part of the public debate.

<sup>5</sup> UN (2006). Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law: resolution / adopted by the General Assembly, New York. (<https://tinyurl.com/yc592pwn>)

## I. Fundamental questions

“We avoid the term reparations because it is a legal term and we want to avoid misunderstandings. We conducted the negotiations with Namibia for moral and political reasons. That is why we speak of healing wounds, which essentially means the same thing.”

Argument



### Our response:

- The deliberate avoidance of the term “reparations” is not a linguistic subtlety, but a political decision. It shifts the debate from a question of legal responsibility and obligation to a question of moral generosity on the part of the perpetrator.
- Reparations are based on a claim by the victims. Those who speak instead of “healing wounds” do not focus on the legitimate rights of the victims. The victims and their descendants remain in the position of objects receiving charity instead of becoming subjects with their own capacity to act.
- Responsibility thus becomes a voluntary gesture—and can therefore be limited, relativized, or revoked at any time. When reparations are based on goodwill, they are shaped by the perpetrators. The scope and nature of reparations then depend on Germany’s

goodwill and not on the actual efforts required to compensate or heal the victims and their descendants for the crimes and their consequences.

- In contrast, restorative justice is understood as a conscious act of reconciliation in perpetrator-victim relationships, based on responsibility for efforts to achieve sincere reparation.

**“Extensive development cooperation and development aid payments have already been made. That is a form of reparation.”**

*Argument*



### **Our response:**

- Development cooperation and reparations are fundamentally different. Development cooperation is a voluntary, intergovernmental instrument agreed upon by governments. Reparations, on the other hand, are based on a claim by those who have suffered specific harm. Those entitled to claim are the affected communities and their descendants.<sup>6</sup>
- Colonial-era power, property, and economic structures continue to have an impact today and shape global trade and financial relations. Development cooperation takes place within these

existing asymmetries. The German economy continues to benefit from colonial structures and perpetuates the power imbalances between the colonized and the colonizers to this day.<sup>7</sup> Development cooperation cannot therefore replace targeted reparations for a specific historical crime.

- Development cooperation often follows the political, economic, and strategic interests of the donor country. Reparations, on the other hand, are based on the damage caused and the responsibility for its ongoing consequences.

<sup>6</sup> European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights (2021): Das „Versöhnungsabkommen“ – Eine vertane Chance. (<https://tinyurl.com/3bx3utw7>)

<sup>7</sup> Tunn et al. (2025): Der deutsche Wettlauf um grünen Wasserstoff in Namibia. Koloniales Erbe neu betrachtet? (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2025.103293>)

## II. Legal responsibility

“Due to the concept of **intertemporality in international law**—according to which historical events must be judged according to the law applicable at the time—genocide cannot be legally recognized, as the definition of genocide did not yet exist at that time.”

Argument



### Our response:

- This is a complex legal issue that is the subject of intense and controversial debate among leading legal scholars, including in Germany and Namibia. Intertemporality is a controversial and contested concept and is far from clear-cut.<sup>8</sup> Focusing on European international law is only one possible perspective for legal analysis and perpetuates the colonial view of the Ovaherero and Nama and the crimes committed against them.
- The principle of intertemporality has two dimensions: First, a historical event must be viewed in the light of the law applicable

at the time. Second, legal assessment and interpretation evolve over time. Historical facts are also interpreted in the light of norms that have emerged later and human rights standards that have developed. This second dimension is ignored in the German government’s argumentation.

- In certain cases, German courts recognize exceptions to the application of the first principle, in particular to avoid the application of certain laws from the Nazi era or the German Democratic Republic (GDR), even though these were technically legal at the time.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Goldmann (2020): „Ich bin Ihr Freund und Kapitän“. Die deutsch-namibische Entschädigungsfrage im Spiegel intertemporaler und interkultureller Völkerrechtskonzepte (<https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3672406>)

Theurer (2023): Litigating Reparations. Will Namibia Be Setting Standards? (<https://voelkerrechtsblog.org/litigating-reparations/>)

<sup>9</sup> Hackmack / ECCHR (2023): Das Irreparable reparieren? Der Umgang mit den langfristigen Folgen des deutschen Kolonialismus in Deutschland und Namibia (<https://tinyurl.com/4c3ya3yc>)

April 12, 2025: Gathering in !Nami#Nus (Lüderitz) for the commemorative march. Nama people from all over the country have come together for this important day.



In doing so, they applied Radbruch's formula, according to which a law must give way to justice if it legitimizes intolerable injustice. And now the question arises: Isn't this colonial genocide precisely one of these intolerable injustices?

- Other genocides, such as the Holocaust or the Armenian genocide, were also committed before the adoption of the UN Genocide Convention, which was adopted in 1948 and entered into force in 1951. Nevertheless, they are rightly recognized as genocides without reservation. The UN Genocide Convention obliges UN member states to name and denounce acts of genocide as genocide, even if they were committed before the convention

came into force.<sup>10</sup> If intertemporality were interpreted as the German government argues in the case of the genocide in Namibia in 1904-1908, the Holocaust and other forms of mass extermination with the intention of destruction would also only be classified as genocide "from today's perspective." This position would be historically, politically, and morally unacceptable.

<sup>10</sup> Schiffbauer (2018): "The Duty to Prevent Genocide under International Law: Naming and Shaming as a Preventive Measure." In: Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal (12/3): P. 83-94. (<https://doi.org/10.5038/1911-9933.12.3.1569>)

**“The concept of reparations in international law arises from the violation of an international obligation—and that did not exist at the time the injustice was committed. The concept of reparations is therefore not applicable in the context of Germany’s colonial past.”**

*Argument*



### **Our response:**

- This argument is based on a selective interpretation of the principle of intertemporality.
- Standards for the protection of civilians already existed at the end of the 19th century, for example in the Hague Convention of 1899. According to this, mass murders of civilians in the context of war were already illegal. However, it only applied to wars between “civilized peoples” and ignored colonial violence against indigenous peoples. Indigenous communities were subject to racist colonial laws and power relations and did not count within the scope of protection of “civilized peoples.” This hierarchy was no coincidence, but rather an expression of colonial power relations. The German reference to the “law applicable at the time” means that the murder of the Ovaherero and Nama continues to be understood as the extermination of “uncivilized savages” and is

considered legitimate. What is particularly contradictory here is that German colonial rule based its legitimacy on treaties with the Ovaherero and Nama, thereby recognizing them as legal actors, but at the same time denied them the protection of fundamental legal norms. This argument perpetuates the racist discrimination of the colonial era.

- A credible reappraisal must reflect this structural asymmetry rather than adopting it. It must recognize that the law in force at the time was embedded in colonial and racist power structures and was an expression of them, and that today’s standards of international law arose precisely in response to such historical crimes.

### III. Political implementation and form of reparations

**“The payment of reparations is no longer possible, as there are no survivors from that period still alive.”**

*Argument*



#### **Our response:**

- The genocide has had an impact across generations. The policy of extermination destroyed not only lives, but also social structures, land ownership, economic foundations, and cultural knowledge. These losses and traumas continue to shape the realities of life for the descendants of survivors to this day—materially, socially, politically, and psychologically.<sup>11</sup>
- Reparations do not require the existence of living witnesses, but rather the continuation of the damage. If the consequences of a crime continue structurally, the responsibility also continues.
- Restorative justice is directed at the community of descendants. The claim continues to exist as long as the historical dispossessions, marginalizations, and structural inequalities continue to have an effect.
- A sincere and credible apology is not limited to words. The perpetrators must show “sincere and credible remorse” that can be accepted by the victims as a meaningful apology. Reparations are an essential part of this credible apology, as they express an admission of guilt and offer material compensation.

<sup>11</sup> Danieli (1998): International Handbook of Multigenerational Legacies of Trauma (<https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-1-4757-5567-1>)

**“A state like Germany cannot pay reparations to individuals or a specific community such as the Ovaherero or Nama.”**

*Argument*



#### **Our response:**

- This claim is refuted by Germany's own practice. Germany has repeatedly made payments to individuals (e.g., victims of medical experiments) and victims' associations (e.g., Jewish Claims Conference, Reparations Disposition Fund) and continues to do so. These include, among other things, the return of property, pensions, or support for living expenses. Some of the victims were allowed to submit individual applications for this purpose.<sup>12</sup>
- The Ovaherero and Nama (including the late Ovaherero Paramount Chief Riruako) have made it clear that reparations should not be individualized, but should be directed at the entire community as such. The genocide destroyed not only individual lives, but also the economic and social existence of entire communities: land, livestock, knowledge, property, and self-determination were systematically destroyed. All of this destroyed the communities' long-term ability to develop independently and self-determinedly.
- Compensatory measures that improve the situation of the Ovaherero and Nama can also have positive effects on other groups. The decisive factor is the earmarking of funds: reparations must be recognizably responsive to specific historical damages. For example, if educational or health facilities are built in the communal Ovaherero area, they are also open to members of other

<sup>12</sup> German Ministry of Finance (2023): Wiedergutmachung. Regelungen zur Entschädigung von NS-Unrecht. (<https://tinyurl.com/smuv3pnc>)

### III. Political implementation and form of reparations

The march commemorates the Hornkranz massacre of 1893, in which German soldiers wiped out the entire village of Nama chief Hendrik Witbooi.

ethnic groups. It is crucial that the measures aim to improve institutional structures and living conditions (such as health, education, and other services) for the Ovaherero and Nama without excluding other potential beneficiaries.

- Even the Scientific Service of the German Bundestag concludes in a report that voluntary compensation payments to the Ovaherero and Nama would in principle be permissible under German law. The question is therefore not one of legal impossibility, but of political will.<sup>13</sup>



<sup>13</sup> Wissenschaftlicher Dienst des Bundestages (2021): Zur völkerrechtlichen Zulässigkeit von freiwilligen Entschädigungszahlungen an Herero und Nama in Namibia. Sachstand WD 2 - 3000 - 067/21. (<https://tinyurl.com/3csacsek>)

## IV. Representation and participation in the negotiations on the Joint Declaration

“The Namibian government is the democratically elected representative of all Namibians and is **solely** responsible for involving the affected communities. It is the **only** legitimate contact for the German federal government.”

Argument



### Our response:

- Namibian sovereignty is an achievement of the liberation struggle that is not questioned by the descendants of the victims of genocide, who are demanding direct participation in the negotiations. However, the crucial question is not who represents Namibia under international law, but whether a bilateral government agreement can replace the specific rights of the communities of victims who are directly affected.
- The negotiations do not concern a general national interest, but rather the reappraisal of a specific colonial genocide against identifiable communities – the Ovaherero and Nama as well as the Damara and San – each with their own legitimate representative bodies. This gives rise to the demand for a triologue involving at least representatives of the descendants, government

representatives from Namibia and Germany. This is the only way to ensure that the survivor community is given appropriate consideration. This was also in line with the agreement between the German government, the State of Israel, and the Jewish Claims Conference.

- Historical precedents also show that victim representatives can be involved alongside states. The involvement of more than twenty Jewish civil society organizations in the German-Jewish negotiations in Wassenaar in 1953 is an example of a multi-party negotiation format. Many Ovaherero and Nama representatives often refer to this and ask (rightly so): Why not for us?

#### IV. Representation and participation in the negotiations on the Joint Declaration

Arrival on Shark Island, the site of a former concentration camp and thus one of the most important memorial sites for the Nama and OvaHerero peoples.



- The descendants of these communities had already begun talks with the German government about their reparation claims before Namibia's independence, putting the genocide on the political agenda long before the bilateral government negotiations between Namibia and Germany.
- In 2006, the Namibian National Assembly mandated the government to convene a consultation conference.<sup>14</sup> However, the Namibian government is now monopolizing the negotiations, favoring the interests of the government at the expense of the indigenous communities of the descendants.
- While the Namibian government has formal democratic authority, structural weaknesses, limited inclusivity, and ethnic imbalances challenge the notion that it alone represents all Namibians. A more nuanced approach would consider the inclusion of other actors (civil society groups, regional representatives, or minority communities of the Nama and OvaHerero) who also embody legitimate democratic voices.<sup>15</sup>
- During colonial rule, Germany concluded so-called "protection treaties" (Schutzverträge) and mining agreements with OvaHerero and Nama communities. This recognized them as legitimate political representatives and bodies.

<sup>14</sup> Namibian Parliament (2006): Motion on the OvaHerero Genocide. (<https://tinyurl.com/4w2za7nt>)

<sup>15</sup> Anaya (2013): Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples: The situation of indigenous peoples in Namibia. (<https://tinyurl.com/ycyzktnm>)

#### IV. Representation and participation in the negotiations on the Joint Declaration

The memorial stone on Shark Island was erected in 2023. At that time, it was still an official campground. This is despite its history as a concentration camp where countless Nama and OvaHerero were killed and their skulls had to be packed by their relatives for transport to Germany.

- The ILO and UN conventions on the rights of indigenous peoples confirm that all matters affecting them must involve their directly appointed legitimate representatives. All agreements must be based on the free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) of the indigenous communities.<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, the communities have the right not to give this consent. The German and Namibian governments voted in favor of this normative framework as a UN resolution and should therefore adhere to it. By signing and ratifying ILO Convention 169, Germany also bears responsibility for ensuring an inclusive process.

<sup>16</sup> UN (2007): United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 61/295 (<https://tinyurl.com/ykj66ens>)



**“The participation of the affected communities in the negotiations on the Joint Declaration was and is sufficient.”**

*Argument*



**Our response:**

- Purely bilateral negotiations between Germany and Namibia are insufficient for the simple reason that descendants in the diaspora (e.g., Botswana, Canada, etc.) cannot be represented by the Namibian government. The existence of these diaspora communities is a direct consequence of the genocide.
- The involvement of those affected via a so-called “Technical Committee” of the Namibian government did not constitute equal co-negotiation on an equal footing, but merely consultative participation without decision-making authority. Several UN Special Rapporteurs have pointed out that the requirements of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN-DRIP) have not been met. This requires the substantial

involvement of self-determined representatives (!) of indigenous communities in matters that affect them and emphasizes the principle of free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC).<sup>17</sup>

- In its response to this criticism, the federal government stated that there is no right to participation in a specific form and no right of veto for individual representatives.<sup>18</sup> However, this formal argument falls short. The question is not whether there is a right of veto, but whether the chosen procedure was suitable for ensuring legitimate participation. Participation means more

17 Letter from various UN Special Rapporteurs to the German government (2023) (<https://tinyurl.com/9ck8ejw6>)

18 Response from the Federal Government to the letter from the UN Special Rapporteurs (2023) (<https://tinyurl.com/5n6fve57>)

#### IV. Representation and participation in the negotiations on the Joint Declaration

Since 2020, a small memorial stone in Swakopmund has served as a reminder of the many people who starved to death or were killed in the concentration camps and buried in this cemetery. The vast graveyard is left completely exposed to the elements.

than offering one (!) specific form of participation. If key representatives of the affected communities reject the negotiation structure as inadequate, it cannot simply be concluded that the offer of participation has been fulfilled. Germany also bears joint responsibility for designing an inclusive and legitimate process.

- When key representatives of the Ovaherero and Nama communities reject the Joint Declaration and criticize that they were not included in the actual negotiations, this is a clear indication of a lack of legitimacy.<sup>19</sup> A process aimed at apology and reconciliation cannot be successful if those to whom the apology is addressed do not perceive it as just.



<sup>19</sup> Ovaherero Traditional Authority & Nama Traditional Leaders Association (2021): Joint Press Release (<https://genocide-namibia.net/2021/05/16-5-2021-joint-press-statement-by-the-ovaherero-traditional-authorities-ota-and-nama-traditional-leaders-association-ntla/#page-content>)

## V. Relativization and Distraction

“Why should we still pay today? Will all the other former colonies come to us too? Today’s generations in Germany are not responsible for the crimes of the colonial era.”

Argument



### Our response:

- The Federal Constitutional Court has consistently held that the “German Reich” as a subject of international law has not ceased to exist, and that the Federal Republic of Germany is not its legal successor but is identical to it as a subject of international law.<sup>20</sup> The German state must therefore be held accountable for the crimes of the German Reich. This includes the genocidal wars in the German colony of South West Africa and the claims of the Ovaherero and Nama.
- Germans living today bear no personal guilt, but as German citizens they have a social responsibility to confront Germany’s colonial legacy, including genocide. This argument is widely accepted in relation to the Holocaust and should therefore also apply to colonial oppression and mass extermination.
- As long as Germany continues to reap economic, social, and geopolitical benefits from structures created during the colonial era, it remains obligated to critically examine and compensate for them.

<sup>20</sup> Response by the Federal Government to a parliamentary question from The Left Party (2015): Drucksache 18/5178 (<https://tinyurl.com/4467srbh>)

“Germany’s role in global colonialism was rather minor.”

Argument



**Our response:**

- Germany became a colonial power relatively late, in 1884. Nevertheless, between 1899 and 1914, the German colonial empire was the fourth largest in the world in terms of area.<sup>21</sup>
- For colonized peoples, it is not decisive whether an empire was “bigger” or “smaller,” or by whom they were colonized and how long this lasted. Genocide or the destruction of infrastructure do not lose their devastating impact when compared to the crimes of other nations.

- German imperialist ideology (Weltpolitik) strongly influenced world politics in the late 19th and early 20th centuries through the Berlin Conference (1884–85) and aggressive geopolitical ambitions.<sup>22</sup>

21 Ziemann (2016): Deutschland in der Welt. (<https://tinyurl.com/bdemm93n>)

22 Melber (2024): The Long Shadow of German Colonialism: Amnesia, Denialism and Revisionism. (<https://africanarguments.org/2024/07/the-long-shadow-of-german-colonialism/>)

**“Lothar von Trotha acted without the support of the ruling political elite in Germany and must be held individually responsible for his actions.”**



**Our response:**

- Von Trotha did not act as an individual, but had been granted extensive powers by the emperor (Kaiser). He acted under conditions of unequal/superior colonial relations created by the German state and from which the German state profited. His military actions took place within a colonial system that was politically legitimized, financed, and structurally secured.
- Even though large sections of the labor movement, the SPD, and individual politicians from the Center Party did not support the genocide and opposed the colonial war, the colonial project as a whole remained state-sponsored. The genocide was embedded in a system of land expropriation, forced labor, and racist rule that served German settler colonization. This enabled Germany to expand its colonial control and improve its position as a world power.
- Economic expansion and racist ideologies created conditions in which the violent expulsion and extermination of the indigenous population was seen as a means of securing colonial control.
- Settler colonization carries with it a tendency toward genocide. The German state, which created these colonial conditions, is fully responsible for the genocide and cannot shift the blame to von Trotha as an individual.

A look at previous reparations processes in the Federal Republic of Germany shows that these were also politically contested, limited, and shaped by external and internal political conditions.<sup>23</sup> Numerous victim groups were initially excluded or only considered after many years of political debate. The term “reparations” was deliberately avoided in negotiations with Israel and the Jewish Claims Conference, as it was feared that this would trigger further demands from other groups.<sup>24</sup>

At the same time, a combination of international pressure and moral and political responsibility led the Federal Republic to conclude a series of payment agreements – but always emphasizing that this was done on a voluntary basis and not because of any obligation under international law.<sup>25</sup>

These historical experiences show that reparations were not a straightforward, conflict-free process in other contexts either, but always the result of political negotiation. That is precisely why lessons should be learned from these experiences. An inclusive, transparent, and victim-centered process strengthens the legitimacy of the state’s assumption of responsibility and creates the necessary basis for serious attempts at restorative justice.



In October 2016, the first major congress on the genocide in Namibia took place in Berlin. A broad coalition of civil society organizations had issued the invitation. A delegation of official Nama and OvaHerero representatives participated.

23 Wissenschaftlicher Dienst des Bundestages (2025): Reparationen und Wiedergutmachung. Übersicht der geleisteten Zahlungen Deutschlands im Zusammenhang mit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. (<https://tinyurl.com/yck2h5u6>)

24 De Vita / Goschler (2025): Wassenaar, 1952: Redefining Reparations. In: Redefining Reparations Wassenaar 1952 and the Global Politics of Repair. Routledge. (<https://tinyurl.com/4k8ndnhz>)

25 Wissenschaftlicher Dienst des Bundestages (2022): Reparationen und Wiedergutmachung. Übersicht der geleisteten Zahlungen Deutschlands im Zusammenhang mit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg (<https://tinyurl.com/yck2h5u6>)