On Latin American Archaeology: Colonial legacy and current disciplinary trends in Peruvian and Argentinan national archaeologies

Semak Fiedler, Karla

On Latin American Archaeology: Colonial Legacy and Current Disciplinary Trends in Peruvian and Argentinian National Archaeologies

Karla Semak Fiedler

On Latin American Archaeology: Colonial Legacy and Current Disciplinary Trends in Peruvian and Argentinian National Archaeologies

Karla Semak Fiedler

Graduation Project Applied Archaeology (1084VTMAY)

Dr. A. Geurds

Leiden University, Faculty of Archaeology

The Hague, 23/06/2022, final version

Table of contents

1. Introduction

"South America is a huge subcontinent that encompasses a wide variety of physical landscapes and environments. It includes different peoples, languages, and cultures, even if outside observers tend to look at it as a single entity."

(P. P. A. Funari et al., 2009, p. 399)

Gustavo Politis (2003, p. 115) comments on the term "Latin America" as a common designation for a large region encompassing several countries whose traditions, language, and colonial background share common traits. Archaeology in Latin America evolved from the search for the exotic, and according to Politis and Perez Gollan (2004, p. 363) "explaining difference and appropriating the past and the material culture of the dominated "other". This legacy still clouds a portion of the theory and practice of archaeology, both local and from overseas." In the United States, archaeologists have begun a more intensive collaboration with Native Americans—the idea is to bring together Indigenous and scientific values, perspectives, and practices on equal terms in order to understand the material past in a new way. This "post-colonial project" ought to understand the social context of archaeological practices, with an emphasis on how archaeology navigates the historical legacy of colonialism and how it functions within it (Colwell, 2018, p. 151). According to Funari (2001, p. 239) archaeology and historical narratives are deeply connected within sociopolitical realities. With that in mind, the thesis ties into this discussion from the perspective of Latin America, the trends in archaeology and its relationship with foreign researchers, as well as the local people. It is an attempt to contribute to the growing body of works studying sociopolitical conditions of Peru and Argentina, and their effect on theoretical trends in archaeology (Alberti & Politis, 2005; Diaz-Andreu, 2018; Gómez Romero, 2005; Oyuela-Caycedo, 1994; Politis, 2003, 2005; Politis & Curtoni, 2011; Politis & Perez Gollan, 2004; Tantaleán, 2013, 2014b), as well as to explore the meaning of the term *Latin American archaeology* in the context of both the term *Latin America* in general (Castillo & Mignolo, 2007; Espinosa, 1918; Gobat, 2013; Phelan, 2018), and of Peruvian and Argentinian national archaeologies.

The research is founded in the question how archaeology in Latin America might be defined—if at all possible keeping in mind Funari's and Politis' remarks stated at the beginning of the paper, and questioning whether it is feasible to group archaeological traditions of such a vast, geographically and culturally diverse area. An understanding of "Latin American archaeology"

as a single entity could be interpreted as lingering Eurocentrism and colonialist legacy still hovering above the "other" (in this case Peruvian and Argentinian researchers whose scientific efforts are not as valued as those of their European and North American colleagues). The subject is relevant to the discussion of the decolonization of archaeology through the engagement in the development of national archaeologies in terms of the various theoretical discourses influencing them, as well as the wider historical and sociocultural contexts of the countries they were developing in. Furthermore, it is relevant in understanding the ongoing discourse of public archaeology and the discipline's relationship with regions outside of Latin America. The historical background that spans the majority of the paper could in simple terms be explained as integral in understanding the discipline as it is today, and perhaps shape what it could be in the future through "the development of reflexive attitudes regarding the connotations and uses of archaeology, together with a delegitimization of hegemonic discourses of the past" (Politis & Perez Gollan, 2004, p. 363).

Due to the scope of the paper and the pandemic limiting travel opportunities, the paper was focuses on studying Peru and Argentina primarily through literature. The choice of these two countries in particular is founded in the notion that countries with rich archaeological heritage that draw many local and foreign researchers would have more resources available in English and Spanish, and the chance that these resources can be found online could be higher. Furthermore, it would yield greater result than researching more geographically distant countries because the exchange of ideas would be considerably more pronounced.

The aim of the paper is to deconstruct the term *Latin American archaeology* within the context of Peru and Argentina in terms of the imperialist roots of their national archaeologies, as well as its relationship to the present through the exploration of the system in which archaeology operates, its institutions and educational programs, legislative frameworks, and relationship with the public.

With this in mind, the following research questions are formulated: what the meaning of the term *Latin American archaeology* is in terms of Peruvian and Argentinian national archaeologies; what the impact of post-colonialism on current theoretical trends in these countries is; and how exactly do the theoretical and methodological frameworks of these two countries differ.

The following chapter outlines the methodological and theoretical foundation of the paper, and introduces the various theories that influenced or were present in the development of Peruvian and Argentinian national archaeologies. The historical background of the topic begins by defining *Latin America* as a concept and exploring its roots in Chapter 3. This is then followed by zooming in from the general area of Latin America into the target countries of research—Peru and Argentina. Starting with Peru, early archaeological efforts and the development of archaeology as a science are explored within the context of the socioeconomic and political development of the countries themselves, thus exploring the relationship between archaeology and conquest, politics, economy, nationalism and nation- building. The pattern is then repeated for Argentina, following its development from the Colonial period to the end of the twentieth century. The topic then continues into the twenty first century in chapter 4 when the focus shifts to the presentation of national theoretical frameworks through its "infrastructure" and institutions (museums, universities, educational and public outreach programs, legislation) inspired by Novaković's (2011, p. 349) chapter on the archaeologies of South-eastern Europe. Once the complex theoretical and historical context have been detangled, a number of case studies in chapter 5 can then be analyzed for insight into the methods and practical application of theory in investigations carried out by both local and foreign researchers. Information from chapters 3,4, and 5 can then be put into perspective, reviewed and discussed in chapter 6 in an attempt to answer the research questions and come to a conclusion in chapter 7.

2. Methodological and theoretical background

Archaeology, the peculiar and heavily interdisciplinary science has a myriad of theoretical approaches to choose from. The paper draws some influence from processual archaeology and cross-cultural studies in that it attempts to compare two national archaeologies within the "category" of *Latin American archaeology*. The approach to cultural comparison is largely influenced by Trigger's chapter *Cross-Cultural Comparison and Archaeological Theory* (2004) which explores the processual and post-processual approach to the topic, and pushes the argument that cultures ought to be understood on their own terms, and that they cannot legitimately be compared to one another in terms of generalizations that explain cross cultural *regularities*. Comparison could however, be used to document cross-cultural *diversity*—an approach characteristic to post-processual archaeology (Trigger, 2004, pp. 47–48). Post-processual thought is then further pursued in a critical reflection of professional practice and its political implications, as well as the acknowledgement that the past can be seen in more than one way (Politis & Perez Gollan, 2004, p. 364).

As theory heavily influences archaeological interpretation and practice, a brief introduction is given into the characteristics of the different theoretical discourses that could be found throughout the history of Peruvian and Argentinian national archaeologies, with an emphasis on the twentieth century that saw the rise and entanglement of various theories and disciplines. The content of the chapter is structured into subchapters describing each theoretical trend in chronological order from oldest to most recent with an emphasis on their characteristics and influence in Latin America/Peru and Argentina. It should be noted that the theoretical landscape of the countries is more complex than this simple overview, and that the "theoretical-methodological frameworks" are a number of diverse currents "competing for leadership" (Ramundo, 2012c, p. 538).

2.1. Social Archaeology

The concept of "social archaeology" can be traced back to the late 1930s with V. Gordon Childe's and Grahame Clark's initiative to contemplate the social relations and organization of people related to discovered artifacts (Patterson, 2004, p. 66). Social archaeology as a "trend", however, grew during the 1970s and early 1980s (Oyuela-Caycedo et al., 1997, p. 365; Patterson, 2004, p. 67). Although it is an often discussed approach (Dillehay, 2008; Jamieson, 2005; Meskell & Preucel, 2004; Patterson, 1994, 2004; Vargas Arenas & Sanoja, 2005; Vargas,

2007), it had relevant appeal in only four Latin American countries, with Peru and Venezuela as its pioneers (Oyuela-Caycedo et al., 1997, p. 365).

The term generally denotes the acknowledgement of the relationship between how society and history are theorized about, and what is written about particular societies—including our own—known from the archaeological record, as well as historical and ethnographic data (Patterson, 2004, p. 66).

"Latin American Social Archaeology School" under Bate, Choi, Lumbreras, Sanoja, Tabio, and Vargas (Browman, 1995, p. 17) was formed at the "Aboriginal Formations in America" symposium at the International Congress of Americanists in Lima in 1970 (Patterson, 1994, p. 533). The movement started as explicitly Marxist oriented, focusing on periodizing the historical development of ancient societies in the Americas through Marxist analytical categories and procedures concerning precapitalist societies in the Americas (Patterson, 1994, p. 533), but it eventually cooled down and created a platform that allowed the separation from U.S. influences and the creation of several national schools of Latin American archaeology (Browman, 1995, p. 17). The development of Latin American social archaeology is seen by some as a uniquely Latin American development, but Lanata and Borrero (2005, p. 75) see it as an application of Childe's ideas, or at least as a variety of Marxist-oriented research specifically focused on South America that emerged as a reaction to the empirical approach of North American archaeologists.

Latin American social archaeology was different than its predecessors in: (1) the rejection of past perspectives in favor of Marxist dialectical materialism i.e. social collectives are seen as the products of complex interactions between parts that have until now been studies in isolation and used as puzzle pieces in the reconstruction of the whole picture; (2) the discipline no longer being a set of techniques used in studying artifacts or an interpretive practice but as a "social science or "historical social science" with the goal of reconstructing historical societies from the ancient past to the present; (3) the use of analytical categories (some of which Marxist) in the examination of history such as "socioeconomic formation", "mode of production", culture, and everyday life; (4) the continuous inspection and refinement of the analytical framework that contributes to the study of the social dynamics between archaeology and "official" history and problems of their uneven development, the repatriation of Indian remains, and other issues; (5) the dissolution of barriers within archaeological discourse that allows for the establishment and propagation of meaningful dialogue with individuals outside the discipline (Oyuela-

Caycedo et al., 1997, p. 365; Patterson, 1994, pp. 533–535). Marxist and liberal-positivist theories were rarely discussed in anglophone countries during the 1950s and 1960s due to fear of political persecution, but in countries such as Mexico and Peru—where various social theories and their political implications were analyzed—these theories took on a more "varied and theoretically textured" discussion (Patterson, 2004, p. 67).

The change in thinking was discernible in dialectical materialism, where social totalities were seen as the products of complex interactions between parts and other totalities that were previously examined in isolation and used as puzzle pieces to reconstruct the greater picture (Patterson, 1994, p. 533). Both Marxists and symbolic anthropologists share an interest in discursive and practical consciousness with the former tending to stress the practical as the place to start in generating understanding, and the latter emphasizing the need to conceive the world symbolically before acting upon it practically (Gosden, 2004, p. 165). In terms of the Andean region, the majority of historical archaeologists are not actively involved in the debate surrounding social archaeology and politics. Many of these researchers could be classified as cultural historians or 'nationalist' archaeologists seeking to commemorate the colonial past through its monuments (Jamieson, 2005, p. 354). Social archaeology was also not particularly interested in indigenous communities, but in maintaining a firm anti-capitalist stance (Díaz-Andreu, 2013, p. 228).

2.2. Culture-historical archaeology

The hallmark of 20th and 21st century *Latin American archaeology*, is the culture history paradigm—originating in Europe and wildly popular in North America during the first half of the twentieth century (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 45). Along with Marxist archaeology, it was one of the almost exclusive approaches until the arrival of processualism in the 1960s (Politis, 2003, p. 116; Webster, 2008, p. 11). In spite of Peru's and Argentina's colonial foundations of archaeology, heavily influenced by foreign researchers, they utilized those various influences to create an original methods and conceptual frameworks (Politis, 2003, p. 116).

The cultural history paradigm originated in Europe, and was widespread in Germany (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 45) – one of the most influential centres for the development of Peruvian archaeology. Conclusions in culture-historic archaeology is based on material evidence of past activities, as well a written accounts and documents, photographs, paintings, and oral tradition (Landa, 2016, p. 96). In the United States, the paradigm took on the name of "historical particularism" – with diffusion being the causal mechanism of social change (Tantaleán,

2014b, p. 45). This American version of cultural history is sometimes also referred to as "the American school", and it was particularly prevalent in Peru (Silva S., 2013, p. 214). This paradigm is based on Boas' (Gosden, 2004, p. 163) inductive, normative approach to cultures that came to be as a reaction to generalisations of linear evolutionism—remains are to be collected first, models and relations can then be developed after the remains have been subjected to their respective analyses (Silva S., 2013, p. 214). Boas propagated the culture-historical approach as a reaction against the earlier paradigm of evolutionary anthropology practiced by the Bureau of American Ethnology. On the other hand, Lévi-Strauss proposed the idea that cultures have their own sets of logic and in some ways are sufficient unto themselves. (Gosden, 2004, p. 163). Webster (2008, p. 11) notes that cultural historical archaeology was not recognized as such by its practitioners—it was largely the critics who defined its principles in retrospect. At the time, "Culture history" was understood as the eighteenth and nineteenth century concept from German ethnology as the product of research—a culture history (ger. *Kulturgeschichte*).

Culture history is considered by many to be the dominant paradigm from the beginning of the twentieth century until the arrival of the "New Archaeology" or processualism in the 1960s (Webster, 2008, p. 11). Although of widespread influence, it is not always accepted as an archaeological tradition; its methods touch upon both those of history and archaeology (Landa, 2016, p. 97), and it is often equated to research histories or biographies of key figures, and the work of culture historians. Because of its "dubious nature", its has been referred to as a period or stage in archaeological evolution, a movement, an approach (Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 498) , a perspective, an interpretative trend, and an "intellectual adaptation to specific socio-political circumstances" (Webster, 2008, p. 11). The debate whether the culture-historical approach is part of history or archaeology would delay its development, resulting in three modes of research (Landa, 2016, p. 97): (1) historical archaeology as part of history where archaeology fills the gaps in documentary sources—an increase in information available from written sources means a decrease in need for archaeological input, and the assumption is that writing supports archaeological evidence instead of vice versa. In this context historical archaeology is but an auxiliary science; (2) historical archaeology as part of archaeology (or anthropology in the U.S.) which corresponds to "the American school" of historical archaeology mentioned above. It was heavily influenced by positivism through researchers such as Binford who sought to unravel universal laws and generate explicatory models through which to study sociocultural systems and processes. They saw history as particularistic and

subjectivistic, thus ascribing historical documents with less value than archaeological material; (3) historical archaeology as a standalone field of research with its own characteristics. The premise is that historical archaeology shares paradigms, theories, methodologies and models with various other scientific disciplines (such as anthropology, sociology, geography, biology, and economy) without it becoming their subordinate. In simple terms, Landa (2016, p. 96) describes it as a specialisation studying the "recent" past, and in terms of Latin America—the period from the European arrival to the continent.

The researchers from the Austrian-German school opposed the evolutionist frames and emphasized a historical approach that led them to put forward the "theory of cultural cycles"—the main mechanisms used to explain change in societies were cultural exchange and human migration. The German influenced culture-history in Argentina was carried by archaeologists such as Menghin, Bórmida, and Lafón, focusing on prehistory and hunter-gatherer archaeology of the Pampa and Patagonia. The Anglo-Saxon culture-history approach was different in that it focused on the definitions of phases and traditions to organize the cultural change and stability, focusing on the regional changes and taking into account local innovations, although its main agent of change was still diffusion. Anglo-Saxon culture-history was established by Serrano, but it was the work of A. R. Gonzalez that popularized it. Gonzalez attended Columbia University where he would have interacted with Boas's students Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict and it played an important role in the development of hunter-gatherer archaeology in Peru and Argentina (Politis & Curtoni, 2011, pp. 498–500).

2.3. New Archaeology

The rise of cross-cultural studies in 1950s and 1960s sociocultural anthropology resulted in the development of processual or "New Archaeology". Processual archaeology heavily drew inspiration from neopositivist philosophy, with a focus on neo-evolutionary theories and middle-range generalizations (Martinón-Torres & Killick, 2015, p. 2; Trigger, 2004, p. 45). It employed ethno-archaeological data in determining cultural regularities (or lack thereof) among equally developed societies (Trigger, 2004, p. 45). This interest in regularities stems from nineteenth century evolutionism under the assumption that humans naturally tend to behave in the same manner, meaning that knowledge, and thus various social systems, generally develop along similar lines—with environmental and racial factors causing differences to emerge (Trigger, 2004, pp. 43–44).

It can be said that processual archaeology enjoys a palette of ecological explanations with various combinations of practical reason and culture (Trigger, 2004, p. 46).

Processualism reached Argentina in the 1970s, delaying the development of historical archaeology in the region due to its strong antihistorical component (Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 136). This component resulted in the perception of historical research as particularist and related only to certain historical events—the sole concern of history as a discipline (Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 136). Processual archaeology may have been the driving factor that fundamentally changed the way archaeology in Argentina was practiced in the second half of the twentieth century (Fondebrider & Scheinsohn, 2015, p. 376). Although this point of view is not unchallenged, it draws on the fact that archaeologists at University of Buenos Aires who resisted the military dictatorship between 1976 and 1983 drew on New Archaeology. Fondebrider and Scheinsohn (2015, p. 376) then propose that it was the introduction of processualism that enabled the shift of focus from prehistory and the remote past to the present day, and the foundation of the EAAF[1] and forensic archaeology in Argentina.

2.4. Post-processual archaeology

Post-processual archaeology first appeared in Britain in the 1980s, with Ian Hodder, Michael Shanks, and Christopher Tiley as its most prominent advocates (Martinón-Torres & Killick, 2015, p. 5). Trigger (2004, p. 46) calls it a "mixture of trends derived from the new cultural anthropology, French Marxist anthropology, structuralism, post-structuralism, critical theory, Heiddegarian existentialism, and various liberation movements". As was mentioned in chapter 2, processualists seek to explain cross-cultural *regularities*, post-processualists focus on documenting cross-cultural *diversity* (Trigger, 2004, p. 47). While postprocessualism finds itself in the center of much archaeological work carried out in Europe and the United States, it is still at an early stage in Latin America and is thus not as far-reaching (Politis & Perez Gollan, 2004, p. 362). The emergence of post-processual views in reaction to positivist processual trends brought about the issue of considering multiple versions of the past. Indigenous people and representatives of other interest groups began to take part in projects related to culture resource management, interpretation, and in the production of archaeological knowledge. Consequently, the issue of ownership of cultural resources, especially related to human remains and land rights, was included into archaeological agendas (Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 497).

[1] *Equipo Argentino de Antropología Forense* (Argentine Forensic Anthropology Team).

Funari (1997, p. 197) recounts an earlier publication by T. Patterson that distinguishes three post-processual archaeologies: (1) a strand which claims Collingwood as ancestor and which cites Barthes, Bourdieu, Geertz, Giddens, and Ricoeur; (2) a current emerging from Marx and Foucault; and (3) a line concerned with communication and ideology and deriving its inspiration from Althusser, Habermas, Leone, and Wylie. Others, such as Härke would oppose the Anglo-American theoretical archaeology to the German tradition, which puts a heavy emphasis on the exhaustive and learned study of detail. It should, however, be noted that Argentine scholars are used to stressing the study of both detail and theory, quoting the various authors mentioned above and accounting for this diversity of outlooks Funari, 1997, p. 197).

Latin American social archaeology still persists to this day, but in a form somewhat different than in the time of Marxist social archaeology. It has become enmeshed with postprocessualism and started towards creating a politically engaged scientific community. This turned archaeology toward a critical understanding of the past (P. P. A. Funari, 2001, p. 241) that recognizes the “other” within indigenous communities (Endere et al., 2022, p. 101). Lane (2012, p. 222) however, states that social archaeology in Latin America has been almost extinguished, with some Peruvians waiting for a revival and the consolidation of this trend.

3. Historical background

Perhaps the simplest way to begin exploring Peru and Argentina in the context of "Latin American archaeology" and its colonialist roots is to begin exactly there—the roots. Before delving into what makes the archaeologies of these two countries different, it is perhaps logical to take a look at "the category" and the colonial background that brings them together. The individual histories of both the countries and their archaeologies can then be explored to potentially reveal the "deeper" layers of their foundations—after all, one cannot understand post-colonialism without the colonialism, and the archaeology without the system it exists in.

3.1. Behind the term "Latin American archaeology"

"Latin America" as a region is difficult to define—the most rudimentary definition is that of countries where Spanish or Portuguese are the dominant language (this excludes Haiti, the French Caribbean, the Anglophone Caribbean, English speaking Belize and Guayana, and the Dutch-speaking Suriname, Aruba, and the Netherland Antilles). Others definitions include countries where any Romance language is predominant, countries formed under Iberian (Spanish and Portuguese) colonialism, or all the countries of the Western Hemisphere south of the United States (Bodenheimer, 2019). Although at first glance not tied to the topic *per se*, if we are to understand where Peru and Argentina stand in terms of *Latin American archaeology*, especially in terms of colonialism and post-colonialism, then it is important to understand the colonial roots of *Latin America* itself.

Looking into the origins of the term, it is often tied to French imperialism and its occupation of Mexico (1862–1867), with the idea of a "Latin race" indeed coming from France and émigrés from Latin America that helped spread the term (Gobat, 2013, pp. 1345–1346).
Phelan (2018, pp. 279–280) states that the term was invented during the 1860s under the "Pan-Latin program" by Michel Chevalier[2]—a celebrated political economist. At the time, France was a bustling financial and industrial power, second only to England. This allowed for Napoleon III's regime to shift their focus overseas to Suez, Mexico, and Indo-China. Chevalier's geo-ideological program split Europe into three "racial blocks": the Germanic or Anglo-Saxon North Europe, the Latin nations of South Europe, and the Slavic nations of Eastern Europe— led by England, France and Russia (Phelan, 2018, p., 280- 281). This

[2] Phelan (2018, pp. 295–296) comments that although Chevalier was the one to promote the idea of Latin America, but he was not the one to coin the term—it first appeared in 1861, the same year that the Mexican expedition began, in a column on recent events in the Latin world, "Situation de la latinité" by L. M. Tissenrand.

division was important in the expansion of commerce and competing economic power across the world where Slavs and Anglo-Saxons threatened (according to Chevalier) to push out the French in both America and the Orient — the Americas are thus divided into the Anglo-Saxon North and Latin (French dominated) South. The "idea" of "Latin America" and the "Americas" in general cannot be separated from Europe and the US, as they are products of early European commercial expansion (Castillo & Mignolo, 2007, p. xiii)—Pan-Latinist propaganda quickly spread through Mexico during Napoleon III's Mexican expedition (1861-1867) which aimed to establish a barrier on the Rio Grande to deter the spread of Anglo-Saxons (the United States) further South (Phelan, 2018, pp. 281–282) and prevent them from taking control over the Gulf of Mexico, the Antilles and then spread their influence into South America which would allow for the creation of a monopoly on products coming from the New World (Phelan, 2018, p., 284).

The French provenience of the term or it's existence was not always widely accepted. An early account from 1918 states that the term is relatively new, and that any writer of importance would instead have used the term *Spanish America* (Espinosa, 1918, p. 135). Espinosa (1918, p., 135) then goes on to say that the term is vague, meaningless, unjust, and unscientific—the correct term is *Spanish America* because Spain was the one to discover, colonize, and civilize South America. The remainder of the paper comments on his contemporaries' opinions and discussions on the importance of Spain in the development of South America—it mentions the minor contribution of Portugal in Brazil, and the fact that if the term were to be valid it would have to encompass French and Italian territories (which, according to the author, had not produced any nations), as well as Romania and Sardinia—today's *Latin America* is thus Spanish (and somewhat) Portuguese territory *ergo* it is *Hispanic* and not *Latin* (Espinosa, 1918, p., 139)To further cement his argument, Espinosa (1918, p. 140) remarks that the term is obsolete in terms of linguistics, as the romance languages derived from Latium, and can be called *Latin*, whereas the language of the newly created South American countries inherited Spanish[3] legacy and cannot be called *Latin*. Émile Ollivier, leader of the French liberal opposition, critiqued Chevalier's Pan-Latinism as being nebulous, stating that a Latin empire

[3] In this context Espinosa (1918, p. 140) places Portuguese under Spanish quoting Menéndez Pidal: "If then for natives and foreigners the name *Spain* represents, in its broad sense, this ancient quadripartite unity (Galician, Portuguese, Catalonian, Castilian), which errors in thinking and policy have not succeeded in maintaining in its due cohesion, I see no obstacle to comprehending under the name of *Spanish America*, by the side of the eighteen republics born in the territories colonized by Castile, the republic that sprang up in the land of Portuguese colonization."

is impossible without Latins, as Mexico's people is predominantly Indian and Mestizo. This would in term mean that Saxon and Latin races make sense in terms of the Catholic and Protestant religions, but that would then mean that France is not protecting Mexico, but Catholicism (Phelan, 2018, p. 293).

Regardless of Espinosa's and his contemporaries' opinions on the validity of the term, it can be concluded that its "mainstream"[4] popularity began to increase somewhere around the beginning of the 20th century. Castillo & Mignolo (2007, p. xiii) argue that the concept of the "Americas" and modernity are intertwined, as Columbus' "discovery" and the genocide of Indians and African slaves that followed in the next centuries are the very foundations of the modern world. The term then has a variety of different meanings—Latin in terms of French imperialism opposing US expansionism; Latin as Spanish meaning neither Europe or the US; Latin as obstacle to industrialization or democracy; Latin as Catholic (Phelan, 2018, p. 293; Tenorio-Trillo, 2017, p. 2). To disentangle the term and attempt to (dis)prove its validity or existence would mean to delve into all the events and intellectual trends in Europe that then spilled into the Americas (Tenorio-Trillo, 2017, p. 2). To explore this topic would mean to exceed the scope of this paper so with that in mind the term will be used in the context of its simplest definition as "generally understood to consist of the entire continent of South America in addition to Mexico, Central America, and the islands of the Caribbean whose inhabitants speak a Romance language" (Lockhart et al., 2021).

In terms of a *Latin American archaeology*, Politis (2003, p. 115) comments that such a concept does not exist. The fundamental premise of this paper is outlined in the rest of Politis' paper, explaining that the continent is teeming with distinct national and regional traditions. The factors that bind these countries are their socioeconomic situations and neocolonial status which in term influence the development of theoretical trends within archaeology. The relationship between politics and archaeological practice dates back to the emergence and development of the discipline in the nineteenth century. The association between an ethnic group and its material culture has been used to legitimize national history, codify national

[4] The "mainstream" was written in brackets because as was seen, the term did not originate then and was certainly not obscure—it was mostly used in France by French and South American thinkers (Tenorio-Trillo, 2017, p. 5), and was spreading throughout Mexico as part of Napoleon III's Pan-Latinism propaganda (Phelan, 2018, p. 281). Espinosa's (1918) account postdates the creation of the term by more than half a century, but is portrayed as a rather recent phenomenon—this is supported by arguments of Espinosa's contemporaries whose opinions are also recorded in the paper.

traditions, and assert the supremacy of one group over another. Any attempt to study relationships between archaeology and politics and between archaeology and the public cannot avoid considering this, as well as related issues, such as the idea of the "other", politics of culture, modelling of the country by the ruling classes, and the position of the country in the world context (Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 496-497).

3.2. History of Peruvian archaeology

The roots of Peruvian archaeology can be traced back to antiquarian ventures into the Andes in the 19th century (Stanfield-Mazzi, 2018, p. 428). At the time, most of the world was either directly colonized, or under imperial influence, and Peru is no exception (Diaz-Andreu, 2018, p. 6). After the execution of Atahualpa and the collapse of the Inca empire in 1533, political control of Peru fell into the hands of Francisco Pizzaro and King Charles V of Spain as the viceroyalty of Peru, until the end of the war of independence in 1825 (Hunefeldt, 2004, pp. 37–45, 105). It should be pointed out that interest in the past was likely to have existed in pre-contact Peru, as the importance of special sites and places, known as *huacas*, have been revered in Tiwanaku and Inca societies as means of creating historical narratives, however, as there are no written records before 1532 in the area, it is difficult to infer the intentions of individuals and institutions involved (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 20). Since the roots of archaeology begin in the nineteenth century, it would be logical to begin there. However, in the context of also exploring colonialism, it would perhaps be better to go back in time just a bit further and explore the earliest "attempts of archaeology". The development of archaeology in Peru is then studied in the context of the Colonial period, the "nation-building" period that brought a number of changes to the state and early archaeology, and the twentieth century as a separate period when archaeology went through another period of intensive development.

3.2.1. Spanish expeditions and the Colonial period

The first historical documents that could be interpreted as early archaeological documents are those of chroniclers from the 16th century. Miguel de Estete's description of Pachacamac, an important Pre-Inca and Inca site, from 1533 notes the antiquity of the village through its abandoned buildings (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 20). Two decades later, chronicler Perdro Cieza de León studied the difference between Pre-Inca and Inca buildings and settlements, and the first ethnographic records of Andean societies, albeit written as part of an attempt to erase indigenous beliefs and practices, was an anonymous text attributed to Francisco de Ávila known as the "Huarochirí Manuscript" which contains information about archaeological sites

and objects (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 21). The looting of sites begins in this period, bureaucratic and tax documents show that many archaeological sites were looted, grants of mining concessions were given for the excavation of *huacas*[5] and the looting of precious metals and stones, golden vessels, and other material associated with elite burials (Contreras, 2010, pp. 545–546; Delibes Mateos, 2021; Lasaponara & Masini, 2017, p. 715; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 21, 2014a, p. 32). The crown's sympathy towards the looting of sites in Peru was in part motivated by economic gain, but symbolism and ideology also found themselves intertwined in this practice through an attempt to eradicate indigenous cults and religious practices in favor of Catholicism (Delibes Mateos, 2021). The spread of European traditions of archaeological representations can be seen in the Bishop of Trujillo, Baltasar Jaime Martínez Compañón's, work *Trujillo del Perú* (ca. 1781- 1789) with watercolor depictions of archaeological objects from the north coast of Peru. (Jamieson, 2005, p. 355; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 21). Jamieson (2005, p. 355) credits Compañón as the first to conduct historical archaeology in the region, sending many objects recovered from the ruins of Chan Chan to Spain. The paintings in *Trujillo del Perú* are noted to be exceptionally detailed, and Compañón's inference of social status of the deceased based on funerary treatment and associated goods (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 570) can be described as being rather progressive for its time. He was also the first to encounter, albeit unbeknownst to him at the time, the continuity of burial practices on pre-Hispanic sacred sites into the early colonial period (Jamieson, 2005, p. 355). In spite of these early archaeological ventures, it was only after the appearance of the Republic in 1821 that systematic efforts to "create a deeper historical sense in the Peruvian nation" were being carried out (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 21).

3.2.2. Creating national identity

As Spanish influence in South America began to crumble, new countries emerged from revolutions that spread to Latin America triggered by Napoleonic Wars that then resulted in the re-establishment of absolutist Bourbon monarchy in the Iberian Peninsula in 1812, and the Spanish Liberal revolution in 1820 (Díaz-Andreu García, 2007b, p. 87). These newly formed republics had to establish national and territorial boundaries, as well as their national identities, which resulted in a number of wars and military campaigns against their neighbors (Hunefeldt, 2004, p. 119). This tumultuous period saw the rise of nationalism across the Western world,

[5] *Labor de huacas* was a trade treated similarly as mining, with wages that were subject to the *quinto real* that had to be paid once the treasure was discovered (Delibes Mateos, 2021).

and Latin America was no exception – the importance of national history began to increase, and while most countries focused on history starting from the European conquest, Peru as the seat of the Inca empire, with Lima as an intellectual center, began to focus on its pre-Columbian history. Leaders of the past such as Manco Capac, the founder of the Inca Empire, the Quechua language, and monumental structures became important links between modern Peruvians and their past (Diaz-Andreu, 2018, p. 88–89).

The climate in Peruvian politics after the war of independence had not stabilized as Simón Bolívar expected, but gained new layers of complexity and uncertainty after his attempts to introduce liberal- minded reforms, that aimed to eliminate colonial institutions and the exploitation of indigenous populations, had not taken root and were often ignored (Hunefeldt, 2004, p. 105). Political programs proposed by the various political parties envisioned a better future, but lacked solutions how to implement them, resulting in the failure to establish a clear political structure and republican democracy (Hunefeldt, 2004, p. 105; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 22) Indigenous communities had significantly benefited from Independence, as they remained in farmer communities, paying tribute, and providing unpaid services to individuals and public institutions (Hunefeldt, 2004, p. 105). Furthermore, the idealization of the Inca Empire did not necessarily mean the improvement in treatment of indigenous populations or their beliefs. The pre-Columbian past was appropriated through a rhetoric of creolization – as the majority of the populace was of mixed descent – Incas and other non-civilized indigenous populations were set apart and excluded from the national history (Diaz-Andreu, 2018, p. 89).

Because of the importance of Inca monuments in the narrative of a national identity, it was important to protect them, and efforts were made to regulate archaeological activities, albeit at times lacking effective measures to enforce laws and regulations; the excavation of *huacas* was forbidden by Supreme Decree in 1822 – assigning the state as the protector of archaeological and cultural heritage (Diaz-Andreu, 2018, p. 90; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 24). The National Museum of Peru[6] was founded in the same year in an attempt to consolidate the foundations of the republic and promote General Don José de San Martín's, its founder's, political agenda (*Historia | Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Antropología e Historia Del Perú*, n.d.). The museum permitted the establishment of a society tasked with the supervision of activities related to the discovery and excavation of archaeological remains, and members of the elite

[6] Known today as the National Museum of Archaeology, Anthropology and History of Peru (*Historia | Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Antropología e Historia Del Perú*, n.d.)

from cities such as Lima, Trujillo, Arequipa and Cusco were collecting objects and creating collections of antiquities, but at the time these activities could still be described as antiquarianism and not archaeology as it is today (Diaz-Andreu, 2018, p. 90; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 24). The first attempt at creating a "national archaeology" was carried out by Mariano Eduardo de Riviero y Ustariz with the foundation of the first Natural History Museum in 1836 that exhibited a collection of "indigenous antiquities" (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 24). Together with Johann Jakob von Tschudi[7], he published the first book on Peruvian antiquities and Inca history—*Antigüedades Peruanas*— in 1851. The book focused mainly on the Inca, but societies predating them were included as well. Descriptions of major sites such as Chan Chan, Pachacamac, Huanco Pampa, and Tiwanaku were often accompanied by drawings, and the work also encompassed objects originating in Colombia and Bolivia (Diaz-Andreu, 2018, pp. 90–91; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 24) — marking an "increase in the degree of sophistication that the pre-contact past acquired in the national imagination" (Diaz-Andreu, 2018, p. 90), as well as being the first instance where a local scientist assumed one of the leading roles in a project (López-Hurtado, 2014, p. 212). Nation-building through nationalist ideas was not without its problems. As the racial factor became more important, creole elites began to downplay the importance of their Indian ancestry and focus began to shift to the early modern period as the beginning of the Peruvian nation with the colonial period perceived as its civilized past (Diaz-Andreu, 2018, p. 91). Bernardo de Monteagudo, Minister of War and Navy of the newly independent country, had already expressed his concern over the future of democracy in such a socially and racially divided country in his *Memorias sobre los principios politicos que seguí en la administración del Perú* in 1823 (Galindo, 1999, p. 2).

Early archaeological efforts in Peru were carried out under the influence of foreign investigators, or within largely European models, which were directly imposed in Peru (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 21). Ideas from these models came to be during the Enlightenment and were used to impose cultural imperialism over the Peruvian "other", asserting Western dominance and perpetuating the idea of the noble savage, creating different visions of "lo Andino"[8] (Raina, 2007; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 28). Archaeological fieldwork and empirical

[7] Von Tschudi spent four years in Peru collecting antiquities for the Museum in Neuchâtel, Switzerland

[8] From the Andes, an Andean. Jamieson (2005, p. 353) describes it as a "catchphrase for things culturally Andean". Beaule (Beaule, 2016, p. 602)remarks "*Lo andino* as a modern concept presents a picture of highland Andean peasants as unsullied bearers of cultural practices continued from pre-Hispanic times. Its features can serve as

observation began in the mid-nineteenth century with notable early archaeologists such as the American commissioner to Peru Ephraim G. Squier, and German geologists Wilhelm Reiss and Alphons Stübel (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 570) who published the first scientific excavation report in Peru – *Das Todtenfeld von Ancon* or *the Burial Grounds of Ancon*—in 1887 (Díaz-Andreu García, 2007a, p. 176; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 32). The importance of foreign influence in Peruvian archaeology should also be noted in the work of Thomas J. Hutchinson who promoted the stratigraphic principle then used at Heinrich Schliemann's excavation of the City of Ilium (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 570). Antonio Raimondi should be mentioned as an important individual in the early exploration of the Andes. Although not an archaeologist *per se*, but a geographer who embarked on a series of expeditions from 1851 during which he would produce extensive records of Peru's geography, geology, botany, zoology, ethnography and archaeology that would later inspire Squier, Stübel and Raimondi, and provide the base for the development of scientific archaeology in South America (López-Hurtado, 2014, pp. 212–215).

3.2.3. Max Uhle and first Peruvian archaeologists

The archaeology of the second half of the nineteenth century would be marked by the application of various scientific concepts and methods that will become the nucleus of Peruvian archaeological practice (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 570).

It was only at the end of the century and the beginning of the next that archaeology found its way into Peruvian academia with Max Uhle and Julio C. Tello. Uhle, a German scholar often known as the "father of Peruvian Archaeology" (Matos Mendieta, 1994, p. 105; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 29) established the first archaeological chronology of the Andes (Politis & Perez Gollan, 2004, p. 356) a quadripartite pan-Peruvian stylistic chronology based on a combination of the previous works of Reiss and Stübel at Ancón on the south shore of Lake Titicaca, results of stratigraphic excavations at Pachacamac. Daggett (2013, p. 31) places these excavations from 1896 as the "official" beginning of archaeological practice in Peru), similarity seriation, the integrative concept of horizons, and ethnohistoric insights. His chronology, made of two major horizon styles (Tiwanaku and Inca) and two intermediate (early and late) regional styles, established the chronological framework necessary for the development of systematic archaeological research in the region, and remains relevant (albeit refined) today (López-

rallying points for indigenous peoples seeking to preserve their cultural heritage in the face of intense pressures to abandon them".

Hurtado, 2014, p. 216; Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, pp. 570–571; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 30). He was also one of the "neutral" archaeologists who had access to the "captive provinces" of Arica, Tarapacá and Tacna after Chile annexed Bolivian and Peruvian territories in the War of the Pacific (1979 – 1883) (Gänger, 2009, p. 700). His work was heavily influenced by positivist tradition, as was often the case in the late nineteenth century. Positivism, along with Darwinism, were the primary frameworks of scientific inquiry and the interpretation of reality (Politis & Perez Gollan, 2004, p. 355). At the time, Social Darwinism was a popular explanation for the backwardness of some countries and the "disappearance" of primitive peoples in the face of progress—this focused on the supposed "racial" problems of these "inferior" societies that could not keep up in the survival of the fittest (Politis & Perez Gollan, 2004, p. 356; Tantaleán, 2014, p. 30). In the context of Peru, this was aimed at indigenous populations hampering progress (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 30). Uhle's initial research was backed by the University of California, Berkeley, and were later continued by Alfred L. Kroeber, Willian D. Strong, and then John H. Rowe (López-Hurtado, 2014, p. 216; Matos Mendieta, 1994, p. 106; Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 573).

Cosmopolitan Peruvianist archaeology's longest tradition is in German antiquarianism and archaeology—making it one of the most influential traditions with its enduring efforts to establish comprehensive collections of images and artifacts (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 572). In the period between 1870 and 1930, German archaeologists and anthropologists intensely studied, categorized and defined the region and its inhabitants, making Berlin the nineteenth century center of Peruvianist study (Raina, 2007, p. 2). The Andes and its diverse population, paired with Peru's archaeological, ethnographic, and linguistic wealth, were the object of fascination for many German intellectuals in such a degree that many of them, including Johann Jakob van Tschudi and Ernst W. Middendorf, would spend their entire lives studying them (Raina, 2007, pp. 23–24). Many of their works were published in journals such as such as the annual *Beiträge zur Allgemeinen und Vergleichenden Archäeologie* of the Commission for General and Comparative Archaeology, and the *Baessler-Archiv* by the Baessler Institute of the Ethnological Museum in Berlin (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 572), and the Ethnographic museum in Berlin housed approximately 73,000 ancient Peruvian objects (Raina, 2007, p. 23).

German intellectuals were, of course, not the only travelers interested in Peru. Many notable scholars from the United States, England and France such as George E. Squier, traveled around South America in the nineteenth century. All of them contributed to the development of what

would become Peruvian archaeology, but they ultimately brought the colonialist worldview with them (Matos Mendieta, 1994, p. 105; Raina, 2007, p. 24; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 28).

The gathering of knowledge by these intellectuals was generally imperialist in nature, but a notable exception to this was the work of the first director of the National Museum in Lima, Mariano Eduardo de Rivero, who wrote an archaeological synthesis of Peru in 1841, and went on to expand it with Johann von Tschudi into a two-volume publication, which albeit criticized for its superficiality and limited first-hand knowledge encompassing only the Incas, let the Peruvian public peek into Peruvian preshistory (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 573).

Uhle's work would continue into the early twentieth century, which was marked by formalization of archaeological research and systematic fieldwork overseen and authorized by the government – this is still done today under the authorization by the Ministry of culture. The approach to archaeology would shift from natural history to ethnology and history, and archaeologists would focus on defining temporal-spatial frameworks and "newly discovered" cultures and the reconstruction of regional cultural history. Peruvian archaeology would consolidate its basic concepts, approaches and priorities that will characterize it in the twentieth and twenty first centuries (López-Hurtado, 2014, p. 215; Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 573).

The first decades of the twentieth century are sometimes referred to as the "Aristocratic Republic" when Peru was governed by the Partido Civil—a party that was first closely related to the aristocracy, but began to include members of the middle class, as well as intellectuals and professionals most often from the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos. These intellectuals would form the *"generación del novecientos"*[9] (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 44). The development of the national economy known as the "*Reconstrucción Nacional",* begun by Andrés Avelino Cáceres in the 1880s, resulted in population growth that mostly affected coastal cities. The rise in population in areas such as the northern haciendas, in combination with the growing number of workers in the cities would give way to fertile ground for the development of social movements during Leguía's[10] government (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 44). Liberalism and modernization were in full swing in the first two decades of the 20th century.

[9] "Twentieth-century generation" (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 44), also sometimes referred to as "generation of the eighties" (Politis, 2005, p. 195)

[10] President from the Partido Civil (also known as the *civilistas)* between the death of president Candamo in 1908 and the first workers' strike in Lima in 1912 (Hunefeldt, 2004, p. 159)

The governments at this time sought ways to implement measures and turn Peru into a prosperous, better-educated and better-organized nation—a more "European" nation (Hunefeldt, 2004, p. 159–160). Several government institutions and banks were founded, tax on goods such as tobacco, opium, matches and salt was raised—enabling the reduction of taxes on exports, and thus increasing them. Because of this economic progress, the state was no longer dependent on private enterprise, and this enterprise had diversified from guano export to investment into sugar, cotton, wool and silver. This gave the state a certain amount of independence in decision-making and allowed for further sponsoring of economic development (Hunefeldt, 2004, p., 156-157)—this included the financing of institutions such as museums which found themselves on the government agenda (Daggett, 2013, p. 31). As the first National Museum was looted and destroyed in 1881 during the War of the Pacific (Daggett, 2013, p. 31; Gänger, 2009, p. 695), a new one—*El Museo Nacional de Historia*—was founded in 1906, and the departments of archaeology and anthropology fell to none other than Uhle himself. *El Instituto Nacional de Historia*[11], the institution overseeing the museum, was founded in 1905 (Gänger, 2009, p. 31). The social movements of the time were represented by parties such as APRA (Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana) and the Socialist Party which would later become the Communist party, with Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre and José Carlos Mariátegui as leading intellectuals (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 45).

Although the century was a time of great developments in archaeology, its first years were still somewhat humble—Institutions were not yet adequately organized, research was still mostly carried out by foreigners working for foreign institutions, and the looting of archaeological sites was still widespread (Astuhuamán Gonzáles, 2013, p. 492) (a problem that still persists today) (Contreras, 2010; Lasaponara & Masini, 2017; Proulx, 2013; Smith, 2005). This is the time when another prominent individual in Peruvian archaeology, Julio C. Tello, began his investigations. Born in Huarochirí in 1880 (Lothrop, 1948, p. 50), he was the first archaeologist of Peruvian descent (Matos Mendieta, 1994, p. 105), and is regarded by some as the true father of Peruvian national archaeology (Astuhuamán Gonzáles, 2013, p. 483; Kaulicke, 2006, p. 12). He is most notable for his discovery of the Chavín and Recuay cultures, and the necropolis of Paracas, as well as his hypothesis placing the roots of the Andean civilization with that of Chavín and into the highlands of the mountains from which it would have spread to the coast (Lothrop, 1948, p. 51; Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 575). He greatly prided himself in

[11]Can be found as *Instituto Histórico del Perú,* today known as *La Academia Nacional de la Historia del Perú* (*Historia | Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Antropología e Historia Del Perú*, n.d.)

his “almost pure” indigenous descent, and is thus exalted among the Peruvian people as somewhat of a national hero. His accomplishments were celebrated by the inhabitants of Huarochirí with a three-day festival upon his arrival with Dr. Aleš Hrdlička in 1913 (Lothrop, 1948, p. 51). Kaulicke (2006, p. 12) reports on a comment from Tello’s obituary from 1948 where he is described as not a humanist, but a man who’s work cannot be compared to anything since the time of the builders of Tiwanaku, Chavín and Machu Picchu—he is a pure indigenous scientist, conducting research in the way of the Incas. His involvement in the *indigenismo*[12] movement was fuelled by desire to undo the marginalization of the indigenous population in a Creole republic legitimized by a colonial past and resting upon a glorified indigenous past (Kaulicke, 2006, p. 13).

Matos Mendieta (1994) presents Uhle and Tello as two opposite, but nonetheless important, figures competing with each other. While Uhle is the “father of Peruvian archaeology”, Tello is the first “Peruvian” archaeologist. He then draws a parallel between them as belonging “to two different schools, to two nationalities, to two cultures and possibly to two ways of thinking oriented in their separate ways by their respective knowledge and their personal sentiments” (Matos Mendieta, 1994, p. 105–106). The author emphasizes their origin as the leading factor in the difference between their perspectives, as one is a stranger interested in Andean history, and the other a native driven by nostalgia and love for his indigenous past—which he pushed through his involvement in the aforementioned indigenous movement and an attempt to understand the history of his people through an indigenous point of view (Matos Mendieta, 1994, p. 106). Apart from their personal feelings toward the research subject, the difference in background affected the way the research was carried out—while both strived to understand “the Andean culture”, Uhle was influenced by methods of European scholars such as Flinders Petrie and Johann J. Winckelmann and his focus was on the understanding of sequences of prehispanic history that led him to conclude that Andean culture originated in Mesoamerica (Matos Mendieta, 1994, p. 106) Tello on the other hand, was first trained in medicine, graduating on the topic of the history of syphilis in Peru and subsequently studying

[12] A political movement protesting the exploitation and injustice suffered by indigenous peoples. It appeared in the 1920s, and flourished in the 1930s mainly in Mexico and Peru, but it later spread throughout the South America and into Argentina (Curtoni & Politis, 2006, p. 104). The aim of the movement was to integrate indigenous people into national society with regard to their particular values and customs, and while it was useful in terms of introducing the Indian issue into the national agenda, some criticize it as being paternalizing and assimilationist, as well as a means of advancing political political careers (Becker, 2011; Curtoni & Politis, 2006, p. 104).

anthropology at Harvard university (Arroyo Aguilar, 2014, p. 123; Lothrop, 1948, p. 51), having been greatly influenced by the work of Franz Boas (Astuhuamán Gonzáles, 2013, p. 488). The legacy of Uhle's work was published in its entirety and continued at the University of California, Berkeley, with great vigor well into the present day, while Tello was pushed aside at the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos. Although Tello was not popular among the graduates at his university, he became a mystical entity in the defense of "the archaeological patrimony of Peru" led by non-academic enthusiasts and amateurs (Matos Mendieta, 1994, pp. 106–107). Their paths did, however, cross when Uhle assisted Tello during his first public conference in 1906, and they were due to cooperate on an excavation of the Choquequirao ruins that never came to pass (Daggett, 2013, p. 32).

A notable self-taught, but nevertheless important, individual was Rafael Larco Hoyle (Matos Mendieta, 1994, p. 107). He was an affluent *hacienda* owner in the Chicama Valley on the north coast with great interest in archaeology—he excavated the lands within his *hacienda* and purchased artifacts to amass a collection of predominantly Moche origin that would become the foundation of the private Rafale Larco Herrera Museum in Lima[13] (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 575). Greatly influenced by Uhle, his work was pioneered the archaeology of the north coast of Peru—his five-phase seriation of Moche ceramics, and his identifications of Cupisnique and Salinar cultures are just some of his contributions to expanding Uhle's basic chronology (Matos Mendieta, 1994, p. 107; Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, pp. 575–576).

The work of American explorer and historian Hiram Bingham brought Peru to the world stage once again with his study of Inca sites in 1909, and his "discovery"[14] of Machu Picchu in 1911 (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 574). Bingham set out on a journey to find Vitcos, the White Palace of Manco Inca, and Vilcabamba (also known as Espiritu Pampa). He gathered oral testimonies in the region, used names from maps and Spanish chronicles, and maps of Curtis Farabee who told him that there are lost cities above the Urubamba. He stumbled upon Machu Picchu thinking it was Vitcos, but he later twisted the evidence to show that Machu Picchu was the legendary city of Vilcabamba (which he did find, but was not impressed). It was made popular thanks to the National Geographic Society who backed Binhgam's

[13] Larco's father was also an avid artifact collector—his collection is today located in the Museum of the Americas in Madrid (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 575)

[14] Peruvian farmers in the region had visited the ruins long before Bingham's arrival, but he was the first one to photograph it and bring it to a larger audience (Strochlic, 2017).

expeditions in 1912 and 1915, and devoted its entire April 1913 issue to Machu Picchu (Potts, 2010).

The development of technology and aerial photography found their way into Peru rather fast. Geologist Robert Shippee and U.S. Navy pilot George R Johnson conducted the Aerial Photography Expedition in 1931(Denevan, 1993, p. 238; Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 577). Funded by the American Geographical Society, it was 'the first systematic attempt to use aerial photography to discover, locate, and describe prehistoric ruins and agricultural features in South America" (Denevan, 1993, pp. 238–239). They produced high resolution vertical, oblique, and ground photographs of which are most impressive photographs of the Colca Valley in southern Peru (Denevan, 1993, p. 239; Leisz, 2013, p. 12). The photographs were later used by historian Paul Kosok in his investigation of pre-hispanic irrigation systems (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 577) and they remain frequently used by geographers, archaeologists, and other researchers today (Denevan, 1993, p. 239). The Kosok-Schaedel collaboration produced a volume of great value for research and was crucial in establishing the importance of macroregional surveys in the research of irrigational systems and the centralization of political power. Kosok was not the first to observe the existence of the Nasca geoglyphs, but he was responsible for initiating their systematic study nevertheless. This work was carried out by his German colleague, Maria Reiche, until her death in 1998 (Shimada & Vega-Centeno, 2011, p. 577). Nineteenth century positivism and Darwinism evolved and spread from science to politics— the consolidation of a Peruvian nation and its identity moved from eugenics to the education of indigenous people and the rise of nationalism in the southern highlands (Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 45). While positivism was replaced with culture history, social Darwinism continued until the 1960s when processualism established itself as the predominant approach (Webster, 2008, p. 11) Patterson (1994, p. 531) suggests Marxist theory arrived in Peru before the Russian Revolution even started with Luis Valcárcel's B.A. theses inspired by Engels, Comte, Durkheim, Spencer, Darwin and Lamarck.

Peru went through a political, cultural, and economic crisis in the 1980s and 1990s, which negatively impacted archaeological discourse at state funded universities with the army occupying universities and foreign-led and financed excavations being shut down (Lane, 2012, p. 222). Nevertheless, one of the most important projects of early historical archaeology in Peru was the Moquegua Valley Project between 1985 and 1990. It turned out to be the start of several prominent US archaeologists' careers, including Greg Smith, Susan DeFrance, and Mary Van Buren (Jamieson, 2005, p. 355).

3.3. History of Argentinian Archaeology

As was the case of Peru, Argentina too was under the rule of the Spanish Empire, however, its demography greatly differs from other Latin American countries—most of its population is of European descent (Curtoni & Politis, 2006, p. 96), and it is the country with one of the smallest indigenous populations in Latin America. A distinctive archaeological tradition evolved in an extreme political climate that dominated over much of the twentieth century (Politis, 2005, p. 194).

The beginnings of what will become Argentinian archaeology can be traced through the 16th to the 19th century—from the arrival of Juan Díaz de Solis to the Río de la Plata in 1516 until the foundation of the *Sociedad Cientifica Argentina* in 1872. Ramundo (2012a, pp. 501–502) the further subdivides this period into; (1) The Conquest of America during which Europeans started collecting information on local populations and started asking questions about their origins. The empirical evidence of this time is represented in the Chronicles of the Indies and the Chronicles of the Río de la Plata, as well as documents on the service of the conquistadors; (2) the Colonial period during which English, French, and Dutch maritime expansion resulted in sporadic and fragmentary observations of life in the Americas. Priests' and missionaries' stories[15] were an important source of information, and D. Filiberto de Mena was the first to document archaeological sites/ruins; (3) The period of scientific voyages from 1806 including those of Charles Darwin (Hasbrouck, 1935, p. 196), as well as George Claraz's 1865 and 1866 voyages to the province of Chubut. Texts written by these explorers became important sources of ethnographic and historical information for the forerunners of archaeology and subsequently, historical archaeologists into the twentieth century.

3.3.1. Conquest of the South Cone

Unlike Peru, the area that would become Argentina was neither particularly attractive or easily conquerable—the area of the Southern Cone was inhabited by a number of ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse groups, none of which were consolidated into polities such as the Inca Empire in Peru, resulting in high political decentralization (Brown, 2010, p. 3). The area, that spans almost half of South America, south from the Tropic of Capricorn, was at the

[15] The earliest authentic account from "the desert" was published by Thomas Falkner, a Jesuit missionary in 1774. Falkner based his work on forty years of working among the Indians (Hasbrouck, 1935, p. 196).

time populated largely by nomadic and hunter-gatherer societies estimated to have numbered between 700 000 to 1 000 000 inhabitants at the time of Columbus' arrival to the Caribbean (Brown, 2010, pp. 1–3; Hedges, 2011, p. 1; Larson, 2020, p. 4). As the Spanish came in search of wealth and labor, the "underdeveloped" and poor societies that did not practice metallurgy were of little interest to them. In spite of its name, the Río de la Plata or "River of Silver" did not yield riches found in the silver mines of Potosí in Alto Perú (today's Bolivia) (Hedges, 2011, p. 1). A lack of resources and political decentralization slowed Spanish advancement, where each decentralized group had to be defeated in order to be subjugated, and the defeat of a group would generally not result in the submission of their neighbors—the people recognized only their local leaders and competed with other groups for territory and resources (Brown, 2010, p. 4). Upon arrival, the Spanish created a "frontier" separating them from the barbaric and savage Indigenous "Other"—this incomprehensible "Other" was emphasized through the inability of Spanish chroniclers and later Argentine writers to distinguish between the various southern Indigenous groups, often disagreeing with one another whether these groups even existed and what to call them (Larson, 2020, p. 4). Due to the independent spirit of the indigenous peoples and their lower numbers, the spread of Christianity was slower and the Church's influence was never as influential as it was in the rest of South America (Hedges, 2011, p. 1). Pre-Columbian traditions, religious beliefs, ethnic diversity and gender relationships survived the arrival of the Spanish. In combination with a long history of rivalry and competition that resulted in "accumulated experience in the arts of resistance and independence" (Brown, 2010, p. 19), the foundations were laid for a restless nation, different from its neighbors in many ways. The Jujuy and Salta regions in the northwest were home to agriculturalist societies that were in contact with the Incas of Peru. The dominant society of the area were the Diaguita, whose main tool for agriculture was the digging stick with which they could cultivate corn, beans, and peppers. Their settlements were not as large as those of other pre-Columbian societies in the Andes, but they were similar in terms of family-sized stone masonry dwellings along streams and pathways, as well as in the exploitation of domesticated llamas and alpacas, and the production of pottery shaped in geometric designs similar to those of Bolivia and Peru. They lived in relative harmony, enforced by the Inca empire, with people from the Atacameño, Huamahuaca, Chicha, and Lule cultures (Brown, 2010, pp. 5–6).

Early attempts to explore and establish a permanent settlement in the area that is now Buenos Aires encountered many difficulties—the first expedition of the coast carried out in 1516 by Juan de Solís failed amid Indian attacks. Pedro de Mendoza attempted to found a settlement at

the mouth of the estuary in 1536, but he too was driven out by disease and Indian attacks leaving behind only cattle and horses (Hedges, 2011, p. 2). The horses were later domesticated by the Indigenous nomadic groups that started hunting the roaming cattle (Lewis, 2002, p. 3).

The Guaraní, one of the agricultural societies of the north, saw potential in helping the Spanish as their allies against neighboring groups. They assisted the group from the Mendoza expedition in the founding of Asunción, the first permanent Spanish settlement in the Río de la Plata, in 1337. The settlers of Buenos Aires then abandoned the city and moved to Asuncíon. As there were only four women with them, they took Guaraní women in exchange for military support, and as no gold was found, the Spaniards adopted the native custom. The children of these women grew up speaking Guaraní rather than Spanish, but nonetheless saw themselves as European—these first- and second-generation mestizos would become the gentry of Paraguay, and the leaders of numerous military expeditions acquiring wealth and status in the form of slaves captured in battle during thedecades after the abandonment of Buenos Aires (Brown, 2010, p. 23).

Among the first cities to be settled in present day Argentina were Santiago del estero (1554), Tucumán (1565) and Córdoba (1573). The first governorships was established in Tucumán (also the seat of the first diocese from 1570) and Paraguay-Río de la Plata in 1563. Santa María del Buen Ayre, or Buenos Aires, was successfully founded in 1580 as a city in the Charcas region of the viceroyalty of Peru (Lewis, 2002, p. 6). As it was settled later, Tucumán which encompassed Córdoba, Santiago del Estero, Jujuy, Salta, La Rioja and Catamarca was the more influential than Buenos Aires (Hedges, 2011, p. 2) until 1776 and the creation of the viceroyalty[16] of Río de la Plata which encompassed the territories of present-day Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay, some parts of Chile and Argentina with Buenos Aires as its seat (Lewis, 2002, pp. 7–8). As the Río de la Plata was under the authority of Lima, the Andean region was the center of power at the time, and the north-west and Cuzo provided pasture for animals to be fattened before they arrive from the coast into Potosí in the Andes, and provided a range of artisan products such as woolen ponchos, wine, spirits, and pottery (Lewis, 2002, p. 6). Contraband was an important source of income in the first decades of Buenos Aires' existence as it only served as a port for the shipment of silver to Spain and import of Spanish goods for

[16] The viceroyalty of Peru was split into the viceroyalties of Peru, New Granada, and Río de la Plata during the Bourbon Reforms—a series of measures aimed at strengthening Spanish authority in the Americas through administrative reorganisation, the introduction of *comercio libre* ('imperial free trade'), and the easing of some race-based social restrictions where *repúblicas de indias* (Community indians) were in theory protected by the Crown (Lewis, 2002, p. 8)

more important settlements in Alto Perú. The *porteño*[17] custom of evading the law and using loopholes may have originated in trading wild cattle hides for contraband goods. (Hedges, 2011, p. 3).

3.3.2. Nineteenth Century

Argentina came onto the world stage during the nineteenth century, when political independence movements sought to put an end to European rule and create new national identities. Some of these identities, including Argentina, were created "on-the-spot" resulting in the creation of regional identities—the territory that would become Argentina was split from the viceroyalty of Peru as an extension of Buenos Aires (Brown, 2010, p. 64; P. P. A. Funari et al., 2009, p. 399).

The ideal of "progress and civilization", as opposed to "barbarism", had not avoided Argentina either—The society of the second half of the nineteenth century saw civilization as centered around a handful of towns, with the rural countryside deemed as an environment lacking in ideas, community spirit, and thus progress (Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 138). Social Darwinist ideas were used to support the political agendas of the nation state, resulting in the exclusion of the Indigenous peoples in favor of European immigrants (Endere, 2005, p. 155).

While the nation-state was established after the European model, the history of the indigenous peoples would provide the nation with an ancient past to base its tradition on. In this regard, the focus of archaeology was split between the northwestern provinces where agriculturalist settlements and Inka influences were present, and the prehistory where natural history dominated as 'antiquities' were equated with fossils as items from the distant past (Fondebrider & Scheinsohn, 2015, p. 371). Museums as institutions were another integral part of creating national identity, whose importance Fondebrider and Scheinsohn (2015, p. 371) infer from the fact that the first museum in what was then called the *Provincias Unidas del Río de la Plata* (United Provinces of the Río de la Plata), the *Museo del País*[18] (Museum of the Country), was founded in 1812 during the war of independence. These museums were modelled after those in Europe and America. Academic institutions and museums claimed intellectual ownership of

[17] Residents of Buenos Aires (Hedges, 2011, p. 3)

[18] Known today as the Bernardino Rivadavia Argentinean Natural Sciences Museum (*Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales [MACN] 'Bernardino Rivadavia')* (Fondebrider & Scheinsohn, 2015, p. 371). The museum was split in 1947 when the archaeology, ethnography, and anthropology departments were transferred to the Juan B. Ambrosetti Museum of Ethnography (Museo Etnográfico Juan B. Ambrosetti) (MuseoARGcn, n.d.)

archaeological sites and collections, in the process dispossessing indigenous people of their past (Endere, 2005, p. 155). Archaeology was first practiced by naturalists collecting objects from animals and fossils to 'antiquities'. This was also the case with Peru, where these activities turned out to be crucial in the establishment of a national identity after the proclamation of independence (Fondebrider & Scheinsohn, 2015, p. 371). Following the pattern of its neighbors, archaeology as a science appeared in Argentina in the time of the "*generación del novecientos"* when sensibilities toward indigenous and creole populations were not yet developed, and European cultural values were "all the rage" (Politis, 2005, p. 195).

The first archaeological papers were published when interest in natural history was the dominant drive behind research—Liberani and Hernández published the first 'catalogue' of "Indian antiquities in 1877, and Florentino Ameghino proposed in his 1880 paper that first humans arrived in the Argentine pampas during the Tertiary period (Politis, 2005, p. 195). Ameghino's early work focused on identifying ancient stone tools and placing them withing an evolutionary framework. Following his work, research became influenced by the nationalism that accompanied the consolidation of the national state of the Argentinian Republic. In archaeology, an interest in the origins and evolution of humanity was replaced by the search for indigenous national traditions (Oliva, 1994, p. 110). Artifact looting by private collectors who then resold them to European museums was becoming a problem and the first heritage legislation was passed in XX. The legislative framework for heritage protection gives legal and exclusive ownership of pre-Hispanic sites to the state, making it responsible for the protection of all archaeological heritage (Endere, 2005, p. 156).

The year 1872 is an important marker in the development of Argentinian archeology. The archaeology of this time was "antiquarian in its methods, cumulative in its purposes, pioneer in its development, romantic in its spirit and in its actions"[19] (Ramundo, 2012a, p. 504). Archaeology in Argentina was in no way lacking behind its neighbor Peru, as it too began to professionalize in this period while capital-dependent development was at its peak, backed by the expansion of territory through the so called *Conquista del Desierto* or "Conquest of the Desert"[20] (1878-1885) (Delrio et al., 2010, p. 139; Politis, 2005, p. 196; Ramundo, 2012a, p.

[19] Translation by author

[20] "The Desert" encompasses one of the currently richest pastoral and agricultural areas of the La pampa, Neuquén, and Río Negro territories. Before the introduction of irrigation, it was an arid region with little rainfall (Hasbrouck, 1935, p. 196). It is not the landscape itself that makes it a desert, but the notion that it was an uninhabited place

504). The dominant theoretical discourses was once again evolutionism coming from Europe enmeshed in positivistic thought (Ramundo, 2012a, p. 504).

3.3.2.1. Conquest of the Desert

In the periodization of the extinction of Indigenous peoples in Argentina vaguely begins with the Spanish conquest in the mid-sixteenth century to the Conquest of the Desert. As it was generally accepted that civilizations progress from barbaric societies to civilization, it was thus natural that the Indigenous societies either disappear or become part of the "civilized world (Delrio et al., 2010, p. 139; Politis, 2005, p. 196; Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 498). The Conquest of the Desert took thousands of lives, and enslaved the rest—often described as genocide (Delrio et al., 2010; Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 498), it was linked to the constitution and organization of the Argentinean national state and to its expansion of land jurisdiction over Indigenous territory by the late nineteenth century. The military campaigns of occupation on the southern frontier (Pampa and Patagonia, 1878-1885) and the northern one (Chaco, 1884-1917) were executed with a continuity of criteria, agencies, and actors. In addition, the realization of these campaigns boosted the political careers of persons and groups and eventually shaped the state's organization. In this way, later Argentineans inherited a state and a society built upon an elimination objective that was aimed, in particular, against the cultural "other," and as a result the survivors of this genocidal project could be incorporated as a labor force (Delrio et al., 2010, p. 139).

Some of the expeditions into "the desert" were accompanied by scientists studying the landscape, its flora and fauna, as well as to collect the heads of the dead Mapuche and Tehuelche people for bio-anthropological purposes (Politis, 2005, p. 196). Although the national heroes of the War of Independence at the beginning of the nineteenth century considered Indigenous peoples as "brothers" or "fellow citizens", these feelings of unity waned, and by the late nineteenth century turned into expressions of condemnation for their genealogical imperfection and effective policies of land expropriation. Some of the most prominent theorists of the republic expressed their desire to eliminate the Native population (Delrio et al., 2010, p. 140).

Narratives of the "grandparents' times" talk about material and non-material losses, as well as about displacements toward specific places is present across many Pampean and Patagonian

(disregarding the existence of its "uncivilized" inhabitants) that ought to be occupied by European settlers (Curtoni & Politis, 2006, p. 102; Politis, 2005, p. 196).

communities. Other sources, such as the memoirs of Salesian priests, personal diaries of the people, and military reports . There were also according to Father Milanesio, more than 20,000 Indians concentrated near the Andes, in the current province of Neuquen (Delrio et al., 2010, p. 141).Great scandal erupted concerning the treatment of the prisoners. The National Congress had to react in 1884, denouncing the acts of campaigns. In terms of archaeology, records from the Martín García Island concentration camp where Indigenous people were incarcerated for racial reasons. The people who arrived to the island were catalogued according to their sex, age, working capacity, and military competence (Delrio et al., 2010, p. 142).

3.3.3. Twentieth century

The first law regulating Argentine archaeological heritage was introduced in 1913 (Endere, 2014, p. 320; Ramundo, 2012b, p. 90). This law was created as a response to the interest generated by Ameghino's theory in the Nation State, as well as the alarming rate at which artifacts were being clandestinely excavated and taken out of the country. The Bernardino Rivadavia Museum of Natural Science, the La Plata Museum, and the Juan B. Ambrosetti Museum of Ethnography were tasked with the supervision and execution of this law. This law had a number of problems such as the centralization of power in Buenos Aires, resulting in an uneven balance of relations, and a much lesser participation of the provinces in which most heritage is located. As it was difficult to enforce a centralized power over such a vast country, the law was never effectively enforced, but the state nevertheless attempted to continue fighting illicit excavations through the sponsorship of excavations and archaeological studies (Ramundo, 2012b, p. 90) Some of the most important occurred in 1946 when the Partido Justicialista or Peronista—after its president Juan Peron—came to power, bringing with it a number of changes that greatly affected archaeologists and other scientists. The Peronistas were in strong support of the working class and trade unions, carrying out a process of social inclusion of the working class into national life through authoritarian populism. The authoritarian government violated the opposition's political rights and strictly controlled the universities—this resulted in the expulsion of a number of professors whose agendas were not in line with that of the government. Some of the best known archaeologists affected by this were Marquez Miranda, De Aparicio, and Palavecino. Remaining university staff had to show loyalty and obey the government (Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 499). In spite of hardships faced by universities and the Argentinean Society of Anthropology who fell out of favor, the government did promote the revitalization of indigenous traditions resulting in the establishment of many local museums (Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 499).

Bonnin (2008) posits that at least three theoretical directions were present in Argentinian archaeology at the beginning of the twentieth century: evolutionism introduced by Florentino Ameghino in 1885, culturalism entwined with diffusionism and the use of ethnohistorical data characteristic of Antonio Serrano's work from 1941, and the north American variant of culturalism with refined methodology as practiced by Alberto Rex Gonzáles after his return from the United States in 1948. Theoretical developments in Argentina were heavily influenced by Oswald Menghin's and Marcelo Bórmida's immigration to Argentina after the end of WWII (Oliva, 1994, p. 110; Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 499). Menghin was a distinguished Austrian prehistorian with links to the Nazi regime in Austria. Their work opened a new field of investigations on sites related to prehistoric hunter-gatherers in Pampa and Patagonia aimed at identifying the temporal length of human presence there, furthermore he revised the collections in Buenos Aires Province and initiated stratigraphic excavations at various sites (Oliva, 1994, p. 110) The new development in archaeological research ended with the methodological phase of historical exegesis marked, by the work of A. Salas on *Antigal de la Ciénaga Grande* in 1945. An important milestone for contemporary Argentinean archaeology was achieved in 1951 with A. R. González's excavation of the Intihasi cave. His resources were limited with little support from the government, but the excavation yielded the first stratigraphic sequence for hunter-gatherers in Argentina, with the first radiocarbon dates (Politis & Curtoni, 2011, pp. 499-500).

Politis & Curtoni (2011, p. 500) suggest that there were three fundamental theoretical approaches in Argentean archaeology of the mid-1950s: (1) the Austrian-German culture-history paradigm influencing hunter-gatherer archaeology in La Pampa and Patagonia; (2) a historicist approach in the archaeology of the Argentinean Northwest; (3) Anglo-Saxon culture-history established by Serrano and popularized by A. R. Gonzalez. The "Revolución Libertadora" or Liberating Revolution brought an end to Peron's government. Its aftermath resulted in the persecution of counter-revolutionary individuals, and even the execution of some.

The year 1958 was significant in more than one way. The first important development were the establishment of graduate-level anthropology courses at the University of Buenos Aires (UBA) and the La Plata University (UNLP), as well as the creation of the National Council of Scientific and Technical Investigations (CONICET) which was, and still is, responsible for the majority of archaeological research in the country (Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 495,450; Ramundo, 2012b, p. 90). Archaeology started to transform into an academic discipline, and

was gaining recognition as a scientific practice much akin to the natural sciences (Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 495). Arturo Frondizi's democratic government was established in the same year, forming and alliance with the Peronist party. In this time, modernizing elites flooded the Argentinean cultural horizon, and some liberal-oriented scholars, such as Márquez Miranda, returned to universities and museums after years of exile. In spite of the militarism, developments in the fields of humanities and social sciences were made, and several university courses opened resulting in the emergence of sociology, education, psychology, and anthropology majors. The year 1958 was also significant for the National University of La Plata and University of Buenos Aires who introduced the first anthropology courses in Argentina, with the former placing it within the Faculty of Natural Sciences and introducing a number of biology and geology courses in the curricula with professors such as F. Márquez Miranda, O. Menghin, and E. Cigliano developing their theoretical views .The latter hosted students of history majors the first year, with professors who generally supported the culture-history school of thought, such as M. Bórmida, O. Menghin, and C. Lafón (Politis & Curtoni, 2011, pp. 500–501).

The Civil Code was reformed in 1968, establishing archaeological and paleontological sites and ruins as assets under public domain, belonging to either the Nation or the provinces. This resulted in the decentralization of power concerning the protection of cultural heritage, and stimulated many provinces to pass their own laws concerning the registration, cataloguing and protection of heritage. This change brought a number of problems such as strong localism that in some cases resulted in the obstruction of fieldwork and the apprehension of archaeologists (Ramundo, 2012b, p. 91). Apart from legislative changes and "hiccups" in their enforcement, archaeological research had greatly improved in the region, with a number of systematic studies of Pampean archaeology appearing in the 1970s and more localized studies in the province of Buenos Aires in the 1980s, calling into question the existing chronologies and the archaeologists have proposed new patterns of cultural development (Oliva, 1994, p. 110). It was evident that new regulations were necessary in order to better streamline the archaeological process, but their formation, as well as the progress archaeology was making, were pushed into the background when Frondizi's government was overthrown by the military that ruled from 1976 until 1983 (Fondebrider & Scheinsohn, 2015, p. 369; Politis & Curtoni, 2011, p. 500; Ramundo, 2012b, p. 91, 2012a, p. 472). Academics, especially archaeologists, once again found themselves persecuted (Funari, 1997, p. 194). The military regime was a particularly cruel period when between 10,000 and 30,000 people were abducted, and many of them

executed (Fondebrider & Scheinsohn, 2015, p. 369). The kidnappings and executions of people during the military regime resulted in the foundation of the EAAF[21] in 1984, marking the start of forensic archaeology in Argentina (Fondebrider & Scheinsohn, 2015, p. 369). Although a very important institution, it is a non-governmental and non-profit organization, formed by students and fresh graduates without any official involvement of the universities—this situation is more akin to a rule than an exception with most academic disciplines in Argentina where considerable contributions to science were made outside of official institutions (Fondebrider & Scheinsohn, 2015, p. 371; Ramundo, 2012a, p. 475). The first exhumation using archaeological techniques was carried out on an individual grave at the Boulogne cemetery, province of Buenos Aires in June 1984, led by Hernán Vidal (Fondebrider & Scheinsohn, 2015, p. 371)

The status of indigenous people and their involvement in archaeology and heritage had also changed in the 1980s. Endere (2005, p. 156) reports that until then people's concern regarding the ownership and display of archaeological heritage was considered a product of ignorance and a potential threat to science. Between the 1930s and the 1980s Argentina's pre-Hispanic past was becoming less important in the construction of the 'national history' centered on the Spanish Catholic Tradition and its national heroes. This agenda resulted in the absence or misrepresentation of indigenous peoples (and religious or racial minorities), whose status eventually changed from 'exponents of an inferior race' to 'lower class members' and not a relevant audience for heritage places (Endere 2005, p. 156)

Historical archaeology in Argentina began to professionalize after the end of military rule in 1984, when archaeologists were once again allowed the freedom to work on historic objects (Funari, 1997, p. 194; Jamieson, 2005, p. 355). With professionalization, interest in the subject went through a "boom" considering the fact that post-1492 sites were not often the focus of research throughout much of the 20th century (Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 135) as in its beginnings, archaeology concerned itself with the study of prehistory and historical material culture was generally studied by non-archaeological disciplines such as architecture and art history (Funari, 1997, p. 193). Agustin Zapata Gollán was one of the predecessors of Argentinian historical archaeologists with his research at *Cayastá*, the ancient capital of the Santa Fe province—founded at the end of the sixteenth century by Spanish conquistador Garay. Intertwined with the culture-history approach, the use of archaeological units derived from the

[21] Equipo Argentino de Antropología Forense (Argentine Forensic Anthropology Team). In spite of its humble beginnings, today it includes archaeologists, social anthropologists, as well as law and IT specialists, growing its influence beyond Argentinean borders, carrying out investigations in other Latin American countries (including Peru) and in more than thirty other countries across the world (Ramundo, 2012a, p. 475).

American culture-history was recorded in investigations from 1973 by Nuñez Reguiero and Nuñez Reguiero De Lorenzi at post-Hispanic Indian settlements in the northwestern province of Corrientes (Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 135). The work is significant, not only because of the application of the culture-historical approach, but also because the continuity of Indian traditions and the definition of a sequence of post-Hispanic phases and subphases were established through the quantitative seriation method applied to changes in pottery (Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 135). Historical archaeology is closely tied to Urban archaeology, which also underwent a period of growth. A part of the success of Urban archaeology in Argentina can be tied to its accessibility and lower cost as it generally does not require long transfers of personnel and equipment, and its results can be quickly disseminated by the press that also has no need to travel long distances—thus making scientific research more visible to both the public and research centres providing funding (Ramundo, 2012a, p. 477). Some of the most influential research in early Argentinean archaeology was that of two forts excavated in 1983 by Lagiglia and Ceres Freyre with the former excavating at San Rafael del Diamante fort in Mendoza, and the Latter at the San Blas del Pantano fort. The results of these excavations were published in the volume *Presencia Hispánica en la Arqueología Argentina* (Gómez Romero, 2005, pp. 135–136).

Daniel Schálvezon, architect by trade, began to conduct fieldwork and study colonial buildings in Buenos Aires after 1984 (Funari, 1997, p. 194) until 1989 when he began excavation in Mendoza City (Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 136). From here he would go on to study Córdoba, Palermo, and other cities, producing monographs on pottery and other artifacts. He can also be credited to the majority of publications featured in the "Urban Archaeology Program Publications" between 1987 and 1989 (Funari, 1997, p 194), and the series "Historical Archaeology at Buenos Aires" encompassing eighteenth and nineteenth century material culture, as well as underground buildings, and the excavations at Imprenta Coni and San Telmo (P. P. A. Funari, 1997, p. 194).

The economic growth and stability of the 1990s resulted in the proliferation of archaeological specializations, more research subsidies became available, resulting in a larger number of publications and their presentation at national and international congresses (Ramundo, 2012a, p. 474). Many of the aforementioned collections were used as references for the first archaeology graduates working on historical archaeology projects at the beginning of the 1990. Some of the more prominent work from this period includes the Quilmes Archaeological Project under Zulinda Quatrín, the Tandilia Lithic Structures Project under Mariano Ramos,

and the Fortlet Miñana Historical Archaeologica Project carried out by Facundo Gómez Romero and Mariano Ramos, and several Jesuit *reducciones* in Misiones Province were excavated by Ruth Poujade The number of projects multiplied in the following years, with growing interest in the studies of military settlements along the "Indian frontier", urban archaeology, rural archaeology, and Indian settlements (Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 136) Foreign interest in Argentina can be seen in the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology of the University of South Carolina's publication of a periodical series titled *Historical Archaeology in Latin America* (published from 1994 to 1996) —in which 11 of the 16 volumes were related to, and five dedicated to research conducted in Argentina (P. P. A. Funari, 1997, p. 196; Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 137). Papers in these volumes were published in English, Spanish, and Portuguese, and they were distributed to the main research institutions in the Americas (P. P. A. Funari, 1997, p. 196).

Although historical archaeology was becoming widespread in Argentina, its first explicit theoretical perspectives and guidelines, with a focus on the role of written documents during investigation, were defined only at the end of the 1990s. Two different viewpoints formed concerning the matter of documentation—that of Rafael Goñi, Patricia Madrid, and Andrés Zarankin who saw documents as being secondary and the archaeological record as "the ultimate judge". On the other hand, Facundo Gómez Romero and Victoria Pedrotta stressed that it is "more fruitful to manage alternatively the two types of data in the instances both of formulating hypotheses and of testing them" (Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 137). The relationship between history and archaeology in Argentina has had a long-standing and traditional problem with a lack of communication, in large part due to the fact that archaeologists in Argentina usually deal (or have dealt) with prehistory, while art historians, architects, and antiquarians dealt with historic sites and artifacts (P. P. A. Funari, 1997, p. 196). Argentinian archaeology has close ties to that of the Andes, as they stretch through 10 of its provinces from the southern Tierra del Fuego to Jujuy in the north (Iñigo, n.d.). The oldest finds from the Andes date back to the first half of the twentieth century, but it wasn't until the 1990s that research in this area gained both national and international prominence Juan Schobinger carried out a number of surveys across the mountains, and Constanza Ceruti's systematic regional surveys, theoretically and methodologically driven by cognitive archaeology, sparked new interest in research of the Andes. Working with both national and international teams, some of the best preserved mummies in the world were recovered. Her repertoire also includes some of the most complete sets of ceremonial objects discovered on top of the Llullaillaco Volcano in Salta, at an altitude

of 6,700 meters—greatly contributing to the study of human sacrifice and sacrificial offerings among the Incas (Ramundo, 2012a, p. 476). The recovery of the mummies has however, been disputed by the *Kolla* community as a violation of the community's rights for a number of reasons, but their claim was rejected at first, resulting in the organization of a 'round table' at the University of Salta discussing the implication of this type of work. Several recommendations concerning its legal and administrative framework were made, including the adoption of ethical standards for site and collection management and conservation. Although the recommendations did little to change the government's attitude, it was the first time a group of specialists recognized the need to guarantee the participation of local and indigenous communities in managing archaeological sites (Endere, 2005, p. 159).

The last century was wrapped up with the publication of Schálvezon's *The Historical Arcaheology of Buenos Aires: A City at the End of the world* in 1999. It contained 15 years of archaeological excavation in Buenos Aires, covering a wide range of sites—from slave dwellings to bourgeois family homes and old political centres such as *Caserón de Rosas* (Governor Rosa's villa) (Gómez Romero, 2005, p. 138).

3.4. Summary

It can be concluded that "Latin America" has little to do with the cultures or the people inhabiting it. Although it would make sense that the term was coined by the Spanish that occupied most of the continent, it was actually a French invention used in propaganda and the rivalry between "us" Latins and "them" Anglo-Saxons that came to mean a variety of different things over time, and is still a category with many potential definitions. The position of Peru and Argentina is then better placed when looking at their histories—markedly different cultures were brought together under the same flag, with Peru taking a central, and Argentina a peripheral position because of the economic potential (and in the end archaeological potential) of the territories. Already different, they began to move away from each other when the time came to break off from the Spanish empire and consolidate into independent nations. Archaeology started developing in both countries under heavy European influence and Darwinist ideas of progress until the twentieth century when new technologies appeared, and a new influx of ideas came from overseas but the different socioeconomic situations and the profile of people coming to the countries pushed each country in its own direction.

4. Current Situation

We concluded the last chapter with the final years of the twentieth century, after which we explore how Peruvian and Argentinean archaeologies function in the present day. The topics of this chapter move away from the individual accomplishments of archaeologists and the shifting sociopolitical conditions and theoretical trends into the various elements of the system archaeology exists in—the chapter presents an overview of Peruvian and Argentinean university majors, the laws that regulate the profession, institutions tied to it, and its involvement with the public. Each of these topics is complex in its own right, and the scope of this work cannot give them justice, hence why they are structured to reflect their most important elements. The original intention to include a separate subchapter on institutions and congresses was scrapped because many of the institutions have been founded before the twenty first century, they are mentioned in various chapters across the text, perhaps making a separate chapter with a long list of institutions and their founding dates somewhat redundant and unnecessary.

Archaeology in Peru has in the recent years mostly been concerned with the Incas, the Moche are becoming more prevalent in research, and to a lesser extend Chavín, Nascha, Wari, Ichma, and Chimu along, or near, the coast (Lane, 2012, p. 223). Archaeology in Latin America generally depends on the state for its funding (Politis & Perez Gollan, 2004, p. 363), Peru however, has very limited funding coming from the state. Most of its projects are funded by overseas organizations such as field schools and foundations (Wenner-Gren Foundation, Ford Foundation, National Geographic Conservation Trust), but every project requires a Peruvian co-director approved by the Ministry of Culture[22] (Lane, 2012, p. 223). Cultural resource management (CRM) constitutes an important part of archaeological investigation in Peru. The number of qualified archaeologists working in CRM has been increasing over the years, so much that the resource-lacking Ministry of Culture has been unable to properly oversee it. This resulted in unchecked competition for the lowest bidder, inexperienced archaeologists leading

[22] *Ministerio de Cultura*, also known in literature as the INC or Institute of National Culture (Endere, 2014, p. 320; Lane, 2012, p. 223). Founded in 1971 during Juan Velasco Alvarado's military government as the INC, its purpose was to defend archaeological heritage, but since 2010 and its transformation into the Ministry of Culture it has been concerned with research and management of archaeological sites and collections (Endere, 2014, p. 320; Tantaleán, 2014a, p. 33) Archaeology is included within the Directorate General of Heritage that oversees the implementation of legislative policies (Tantaleán, 2014a, pp. 35–36).

projects under pressure to work faster and remove archaeological remains by building and mining companies. The price of CRM work has risen recently, but this in turn created the problem of archaeologists being unwilling to work in remote areas without adequate compensation. This can be interpreted as good, because it pushes for better work conditions, but it has an adverse effect on university research with limited funding. Furthermore, corruption has been developing in the form of signature selling to foreign projects that want minimal intrusion from the absent Peruvian co-director (Lane, 2012., p.224).

The apparent economic stability and proliferation of archaeological research in Argentina since the 1990s came to a halt with the 1998 economic crisis that hampered the further development of archaeology for some time. The scarcity of funding and resources at times resulted in the inability to carry out research—fieldwork far from research centers was especially affected. This in term at times resulted in the push for laboratory work, which again, could not be properly conducted without the budget for costly analyses, pushing researchers to work with what they can—e.g. macroscopic analyses (Ramundo, 2012a, p. 474). This situation may have been the reason why Urban archaeology remained one of the more prominent directions due its affordability and visibility in the public eye, and its importance can be attested through its presence in various symposiums and the National Congress for Historical Archaeology (Ramundo 2012a, p. 477; 2012c, p. 539). The current theoretical landscape of Argentina is a mixture of "old" and "new" traditions from the European version of culture-history to moderate processualism, and Marxist, neo-Marxist, and other post-processualist schools (Ramundo, 2012c, p. 539).

Andean historical archaeology is proliferating with a number of theoretical approaches emerging in the late nineties and early two thousands, with many of them being present in the Southern Cone. Argentinian, Brazilian, and Uruguayan researchers organize a number of national and regional conferences in Argentina (Santa Fe, 1995; Mendoza, 2000; Tierra del Fuego, 2003), Chile (Santiago 2001; Americanists' Conference Santiago, 2003) and Panama (2001), bringing together historical archaeologists from various regions of South America. These events provide opportunity to exchange ideas and form new foci in historical archaeology, "creating international interchange on the many issues that historical archaeologists working in the Andean nations hold in common" (Jamieson, 2005, p. 354). The theoretical and methodological development of the discipline have become important topics of discussion, as evidenced by a number of publications cited in this paper. Examples of this trend can be witnessed in panels such as those on the *Theoretical and Methodological Advances in*

Argentinean Archaeology and *History of Argentinean Archaeology*, the gathering of the *1st Meeting on archaeological practice and communities in Norhtwest Argentina* in 2009 that was attended by both archaeologists and members of different indigenous communities (Ramundo, 2012a, p. 482). Although research capabilities of the Argentina significantly diminished during the economic crisis in the 1990s, funding has recently become more abundant through grants awarded by the universities, CONICET, and the National Agency of Scientific and Technological Promotion (ANCyT) (Ramundo, 2012c, p. 539).

4.1. Education and training programmes

In Peru education on matters of archaeological heritage are being introduced to students at a young age, sensitizing them toward issues in heritage protection (Tantaleán, 2014a, p. 38).

Archaeologists in Peru and Argentina are trained at university level that somewhat differs from its counterparts in Europe. The education is divided into undergraduate and postgraduate study, starting with the *Licenciado*, corresponding to a Bachelor's degree, followed either by a Master's Degree or a Doctorate. Not all universities offering undergraduate archaeology and anthropology programmes have postgraduate studies, and some offer Doctorates but not Master's degrees.

In Peru, archaeology can be studied at ten universities—La Universidad Nacional de San Antonio Abad del Cusco (UNSAAC) (UNSAAC, 2019), Universidad Nacional Pedro Ruiz Gallo (UNPRG) (UNPRG, n.d.), Universidad Nacional Federio Villarreal (UNFV) (UNFV, 2018), Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP) (PUCP, n.d.-c), Universidad Mayor de San Marcos (UNMSM) (UNMSM, 2018), Universidad Nacional de Trujillo (UNT) (*UNT | Universidad Nacional de Trujillo*, n.d.), Universidad Nacional Toribio Rodríguez de Mendoza de Amazonas (UNTRM) (UNTRM, 2016), Universidad Nacional Santiago Antúnez de Mayolo (UNASAM) (UNASAM, n.d.), Universidad Nacional San Luis Gonzaga (UNICA) (UNICA, 2021), and Universidad de San Cristóbal de Huamango (UNSCH) (UNSCH, 2018), all of which offer licenciaturas in archaeology, with the PUCP, UNMSM, UNT, and UNSCH (*Maestría En Ciencias Sociales Con Mención En Arqueología Andina*, n.d.; PUCP, n.d.-b; UNMSM, n.d.; UNSCH, n.d.) offering *maestrias* in archaeology with many Andean elements, and three universities offering a doctorate in Humanities (UNFV) (UNFV, 2019), Social Sciences (UNMSM) (UNMSM, n.d.) or Andean Anthropology, Archaeology, History and Linguistics (PUCP) (PUCP, n.d.-a). The curricula of these programs are relatively aligned—

with a focus on Peruvian and Andean archaeology, through zooarchaeology, public archaeology, ethnography, material culture, and elements of ethics, heritage, museology, and physical anthropology. Anthropology studies are separate from archaeology, and generally contain a introductory archaeology courses—this could perhaps reflect European, especially German, influences and culture-historical traditions that form the foundations of the Peruvian archaeological "system". In terms of employment after graduation, the situation is not the most fortunate. Due to a lack of funding opportunities, students may conduct mostly non-intrusive surveys, usually for their graduation thesis. Afterwards, the majority of graduates works as freelance archaeologists—often in foreign-led projects—while others find employment in rescue archaeology or CRM (Lane, 2012, pp. 223–224).

The educational landscape of Argentina is somewhat more complex. Archaeology is studied through Anthropology programmes which offer varying degrees of archaeological content, blurring the line between the two disciplines. There seem to be two orientations in the archaeology/anthropology studies—anthropology and natural history. Seven universities with anthropology in the humanities and social sciences faculties, and two at natural history faculties. There has been an increase in interest in archaeological studies, but this creates the problem of a lack of future academic and career prospects, with the added difficulty of scheduling participation in research with the academic responsibilities of students (Ramundo, 2012c, p. 542). Historically, universities began leading their own research programs in the 1960s, with the most research having been conducted in Buenos Aires, La Plata, and Córdoba (Podgorny et al., 2005, p. 60). Because of the less clear line between archaeology and anthropology, as well as its mixing in natural sciences, identifying "archaeology" programmes might be a more challenging task; in some cases rather arbitrarily posing the question how many archaeology courses in an anthropology curriculum are needed produce a qualified archaeologist? The *Universidad Nacional de Catamarca* (UNCa) and (*Licenciatura En Arqueologia | Escuela de Arqueología - UNCa*, n.d.) *Universidad Nacional de Tucumán* (UNT) (*ARQUEOLOGO*, n.d.) offer bachelor programmes in archaeology, while *Universidad Buenos Aires* (UBA) (Facultad de Filosofia y Letras - UBA, n.d.) and *Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires* (UNICEN) offer archaeological orientations within anthropology (*Licenciatura En Antropología*, n.d.-a). The other institutions offer archaeological courses within anthropology itself, with courses such as prehistory, Quaternary geology, and Argentinean archaeology at the *Universidad Nacional de Córdoba* (UCO), and *Universidad Nacional de Jujuy* (UNJu) ('Departamento de Antropología', n.d.; *Licenciatura*

En Antropología, n.d.-b). The *Universidad Nacional de La Plata* (UNLP) anthropology programme has more courses geared toward archaeology and natural sciences than cultural and social anthropology through introductions to zoology, botany, and geology, as well as prehistory, multiple levels of American archaeology, and the option to study methods of archaeological investigation in the fourth year (*Licenciatura En Antropología*, n.d.-c). Postgraduate education in archaeology is available at UBA with a master in historico-archaeological studies, and a doctorate in archaeology. UNICEN and UCO offer doctorates in archaeology and anthropological science respectively. The role of forensic archaeology in Argentina was discussed in chapter 3.3.3., but Fondebrider and Scheinsohn (2015, p. 376) report that there are no courses or majors offering training in forensic archaeology or anthropology in Argentina, except one at the UBA School of Medicine taught by the EAAF— The situation is somewhat different now, with a forensic anthropology course available at the UCO. Although forensic archaeology is an important part of archaeology in Argentina, the universities are more interested in geoarchaeology, bioarchaeology, ethnicity, and cultural heritage.

4.2. Legislative frameworks

In Peru, the destruction and looting of sites and *huacas* has been a problem since the arrival of the Spaniards (Contreras, 2010, pp. 545–546; Delibes Mateos, 2021; Lasaponara & Masini, 2017, p. 715; Tantaleán, 2014b, p. 21, 2014a, p. 32), and is a problem that persists until today (P. P. A. Funari, 2001, p. 240). In order to combat this, a number of laws have been established both on national and international levels, aimed at the protection of cultural heritage and regulation of archaeological activities. Tantaleán (2014a) provides an overview of the legal situation and problems regarding cultural heritage and the Peruvian people in the first decade of the twentieth century. Although many laws exist that are meant to protect cultural heritage (Talancha Crespo, 2012), they often have nothing to do with the needs or social realities of many groups in the different areas of Peru (Tantaleán, 2014a, p. 33).

There are a number of national, regional, and international regulations that affect Peruvian and Argentinean archaeology that can be categorized into; (1) universal laws of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) with conventions and protocols concerning the protection of cultural heritage in case of armed conflict, protection of immaterial heritage, underwater heritage, and the illicit trade of artifacts among others; (2)

regional laws promoting the cooperation among Latin American countries and the suppression of illegal import and export of looted objects. The *Comunidad Andina (CAN)* or Andean Community which seeks to improve the standard of living of its member states through economic and social cooperation (Peru is member state, while Argentina is an associate member) (*Comunidad Andina (CAN) | Cancillería*, n.d.) signed Decision 588 in 2004 concerning the Protection and Repatriation of Cultural Heritage Goods of the Andean Community Member States with the intent to promote policies, mechanisms and legal resources for the identification, registration, surveillance, and repatriation of cultural heritage assets of member counties, as well as to implement joint actions in the prevention of extraction, international transit, or illicit transfer of heritage assets between the members and third countries (Talancha Crespo, 2012). (3) And finally, bilateral agreements signed because of the very high number of looted archaeological assets. Peru has signed 25 agreements in the period between 1975 and 2010 with countries such as the United States, Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Colombia, and Guatemala, but also with overseas countries such as Turkey and Montenegro (Talancha Crespo, 2012).

The situation is no less complicated on the national level—there is legislation tied to archaeological heritage that regulates the identification, registration, inventory, and protection as some of its more important activities regulation of archaeological heritage with regard to its social and economic impact such as laws N°24513, N°2492, and N°24650, and a number of laws protecting archaeological heritage that belong to other legislative systems like laws N°27444 and N°27616. Laws concerning cultural heritage itself were formed in the Political Constitution of 1993 in article 21 (Talancha Crespo, 2012; Tantaleán, 2014a, p. 35), with the law N° 28296 being one of the most important laws defining what is considered cultural heritage, stating that undiscovered cultural assets belong to the State, deeming non authorized excavation and distribution of artefacts illegal, obliging owners of heritage assets (including the Church) responsible for their registration, protection, and preservation. The law determines the relationship between state and private owners of collections, the conditions for the retrieval of archaeological objects, imposes constraints on the modification of objects, calls for international cooperation in preventing illicit trafficking of objects, as well as their repatriation, and asserts the responsibility of the State in protecting Cultural Heritage in case of armed conflict (Ministerio de Cultura, 2015).

In terms of legislation, Endere (2014, p. 324) places Peru and Argentina into the group of Latin American countries that have been declared as multiethnic and multicultural nations that

explicitly recognize the preexistence of indigenous peoples, giving them a new set of rights. This leads to the topic of the repatriation of human remains. Rocabado (p. 192) reports that indigenous communities in Peru did not contest archaeological activities. The situation in Argentina is the opposite—several ethnic groups protested archaeological intervention in sacred sites (Endere et al., 2022), sought the repatriation, and reburial of archeological remains (Endere, 2005), and attempted to recover control over their natural resources (Endere, 2007). The first laws tackling this issue in Argentina were passed in 1991 with the new amendments to the National Constitution. Claims for the return of human remains held in museums, thus having the status of national heritage, were the first issue regarding indigenous heritage. The first law ordered the return of the remains of the Teheulche chief Inkayal to his homeland in Tecka, Chubut province (Law 23.940). The remains of the Ranquel chief Panquitruz Güor were returned to the Ranquel Community in La Pampa province from the La Plata Museum with the law passed in July 2000, and a general law concerning repatriation was finally passed in 2001 (Endere, 2005, p. 157, 2014, p. 324). The law states that human remains kept in museums must be delivered to the indigenous peoples or communities that have claimed them (Law 25.617/01,art. 1). It also declares that those human remains that have not been claimed may continue to be held under the custody of the museums and institutions that have kept them, but they are to be treated with respect (art. 2). It finally states that any scientific activity that involves indigenous communities should be agreed upon and supervised by those communities. This law substantially changed heritage legislation in that archaeological heritage had previously been under the exclusive ownership of the State, but it did not state how the communities should claim the remains, what the criteria for the assessment of these remains are, nor in which cases researchers ought to request permission from the communities to carry out their research (Endere, 2005, p. 157).

A new law, law 25.743, concerning archaeological and paleontological cultural heritage was passed in 2003 (Endere, 2005, p. 157), and it seems that this is the law still in use today, along with provincial laws 2038 and 3104 (*AAPRA – asociación de arqueólogos profesionales de la república argentina*, n.d.) . A brief outline with the most important points from the law is given on the government website (*Patrimonio cultural, arqueológico y paleontológico*, 2019) including the definition of cultural heritage as "the set of material and non-material goods selected by a society in a certain historical time to express the creativity of that human group and reinforce its sense of identity and belonging"[23], from pictures, music, and books to

[23] Translation by author

architectural monuments, archaeological sites, and archaeological remains. The law then defines the protection of cultural heritage as based on the fight against illicit artifact trade, the awareness and dissemination of the meaning and importance of cultural heritage, and keeping inventory of movable and immovable property forming the cultural, archaeological, and paleontological heritage of each province through the formation of a National Registry of Archaeological Deposits, Collections and Objects *(Registro Nacional de Yacimientos, Colecciones y Objectos Arqueológicos)*. The ownership of private collections is also outlawed, as archaeological artifacts are owned by the provinces they originate from, and the only legal public collections are those that were formed before passing the law in 2003 and are declared and registered with the province the collection is situated in. Archeological material can temporarily be taken out of the country for scientific and educational purposes, but it cannot permanently be removed from the country. There are two exceptions to this rule—the first when material is repatriated to their countries of origin, and when small fragments and elements are being taken for analysis and will be destroyed in the process.

Indigenous people from Argentina are some of the most active in claiming the restitution of human remains, and the country has seen an increase in successful cases with some remains having been voluntarily returned to national museums or indigenous communities of other countries. An example are the Maori tattooed heads returned to the Te Papa Museum in 2004 from the Ethnographic Museum of the University of Buenos Aires (Endere, 2014, p. 325). The case of the Llullaillaco volcano mummies has been resolved in 2004, when several indigenous leaders campaigned against the exhibition of the mummies in a new museum in the city of Salta—the case was presented and approved at the Plenary Session of the XV National Congress of Argentine Archaeology (Endere, 2005, p. 159).

4.3. Archaeology and the public

Public archaeology has been gaining in importance in recent years, especially concerning the role of community participation and our obligation as archaeologists to involve a wider audience in archaeological research (Kellet, 2006, p. 8), and think about the role of archaeologists in the preservation of cultural heritage and its ties to indigenous communities (Conforti et al., 2013; Endere, 2005, 2007).

Although a country of rich archaeological heritage, there is no legal obligation of foreign archaeologists to make the public aware of their research with the investigators, project

funding, and the support of local communities determining the level of public engagement meaning that local communities might not even be informed of research happening in their vicinity if it is deemed unnecessary or disadvantageous. Archaeology might be so poorly understood in some areas that the people are completely oblivious as to who archaeologists are and what they do, and in extreme cases resulting in hostilities when archaeologists are mistaken for *huqueros* (Kellet, 2006, p. 8-9). Some years alter (Saucedo Segami, 2010, p. 251) reports that public archaeology is not yet an established field of study, with archaeological knowledge being generally disemminated through textbooks, newspapers, and exhibitions in public museums, but that archaeologists themselves are rarely directly engaged with the public. Publications on the topic of public archaeology (not including archaeological tourism) tied to the developments in the twenty first century appear to be somewhat scarce, or at least access to them is limited.

The start of public archaeology in Argentina can be traced back to 1983 and the change to a democratic government that attempted to acknowledge the pluralistic nature of the Argentine nation, and include this idea in areas from political speeches to educational curricula (Endere, 2005, p. 156). Archaeology faces diverse challenges connected with the social valuation of archaeologists' professional activity and the objects of their study. Among these is the inclusion of contemporary archaeological interests and the valuation, conservation, and protection of the tangible and intangible archaeological heritage (Conforti et al., 2013, p. 28). Since the establishment of the democratic government in 1983, the presence of archaeology and issues of cultural heritage in the press has risen. The majority of press coverage concerns either urban and historical archaeology, Andean archaeology, or underwater archaeology most often in Northwest Argentina, the Pampas, and Patagonia. Newspapers have also begun to increasingly highlight the institutional affiliation of archaeologists, most often CONICET, UBA or UNLP possibly to increase the credibility of the news, but in turn pushed away many archaeologists who did not want to get involved in the media in fear of losing credibility or who do not feel qualified to write for the general public CONICET has however, attempted to motivate researchers to disseminate their research in the public through a system of giving scores to those who do engage with the public (Ramundo, 2012a, p. 483)..Salerno (2009, p. 50) reports that the importance of archaeological topics in newspaper articles has increased in the early years of this century, with a focus on topics such as hominization, forensic anthropology, underwater archaeology, and the peopling of the Americas. Strong public in archaeological matters is beneficial in archaeology can develop on funding acquired through its visibility to

the general public and financial bodies Examples of this are the developments in Andean and underwater archaeology (Ramundo, 2012c, p. 540). Engagement with the public, however, does not seem to be a particularly popular activity—Endere (2005, p. 158) reports that although some archaeologists have recognized indigenous peoples' concern and invited them to participate in projects such as the Proyecto Arqueológico Quilmes in 1999, archaeologists are often unprepared to engage in discussions with non-professional groups and do not consider the socio-cultural contexts of their work. A notable example of the Añelo museum and the Ñorquinco community's sacred site in Lanín Park.

Archaeologists in Argentina have begun to interact with primary school children in 1990 through the organization of anthropological and archaeological field trips, training archaeologists how to interact with the public, holding conferences and courses for teachers, and holding presentations in classrooms (Oliva, 1994, p. 109) The Buenos Aires Province was first province to take action in improving cultural education through topics such as cultural ethnocentrism, the peopling of the Americas and the region, the local indigenous people, and the archaeological record (Oliva, 1994, p. 109). The La Plata Museum carried out an university outreach project called 'Archaeology, Education, and Museums. Encounters between Researchers and Local Communities', funded by the La Plata National University, that involved the participation of regional museums and a stable group of volunteers who studied the use of archaeology workshops for children and adolescents (Conforti et al., 2013, p. 28). The results of the study showed that such activities improved understanding of archaeology as a discipline, and the importance of preserving archaeological heritage. Despite its positive impacts, the study also reinforced the notion that the Argentinean public knows little about both archaeology and the pre-hispanic past (Conforti et al., 2013, p. 42).

Archaeological tourism and its ethical concerns has become an important topic in Latin America. Díaz-Andreu (2013, p. 226) defines it as the practice of visiting archaeological sites in order to experience them and learn about the people who inhabited them, consuming archaeology as a leisure activity. This results in the commodification of material remains and issues of ownership and economic exploitation of these remains, with archaeologists playing an important role in the process. Although indigenous communities were not particularly interesting, even to social archaeologists, this trend has slowly begun to change in the 1990s—

an ethical code in Argentina was published in 2010 by the AAPRA[24] which states that archaeologists should promote a positive interaction with local communities directly linked to the research area regardless of ethnicity, occupation, values or beliefs (art. 15). It also states that the results of archaeological research should be available to the public in a reasonable amount of time in as many areas as possible (art. 16) (Asociación de Arqueólogos Profesionales de la República Argentina (AAPRA), 2010, p. 2). The ethical code of the Professional Body of Archaeologists in Peru[25] does not mention indigenous communities (Colegio Profesional de Arqueólogos del Perú, 2010; Díaz-Andreu, 2013, p. 228). Although not part of its ethical codes, archaeological tourism in Peru is important because of its many ruins that attract numerous tourists, but there is a continuous struggle between governmental agencies trying to protect archaeological ruins and tourists that want to visit the sites, and locals who might profit from it (Hoffman et al., 2002, p. 31).

4.4. Conclusion

The archaeologies of twenty first century Peru and Argentina are quite different—with Peru "lagging" behind Argentina in terms of legislation concerning Indigenous communities but being much more straightforward in terms of educating archaeologists—with Peru having a number of explicitly archaeological university majors and Argentina putting it under the umbrella of anthropology, but with a stronger emphasis on the natural sciences in some cases. In terms of research output, Argentina has strong institutions such as CONICET providing grants for various projects, with urban and prehistoric archaeologies as the most prominent ones, but also experiencing the development of bioarcheaology, forensic archaeology, and public archaeology. Something that is not as visible in Peru because most projects are being

[24] *Asociación de Arqueólogos Profesionales de la República Argentina* (Association of Professional Archaeologists of the Argentine Republic). It was founded after the XII National Congress of Archaeology in Cordoba held in 1999, it was formally constituted in 2000, and received its legal status in 2001 as the representative body of professional archaeologists in Argentina. It regulates the ethics of archaeological practice, and defends its members if they find themselves in conflict, or at risk of being unable to execute their responsibilities (*AAPRA – asociación de arqueólogos profesionales de la república argentina*, n.d., p. 4)

[25] *Colegio Profesional de Arqueólogos del Peru* (COARPE), a representational organisation founded in 1986 by law N° 24575. It advocates for mutual respect, both institutional and personal, between its members, the development of solidarity principles, honest work within the discipline, transparency in archaeology and cultural heritage, and the development of a democratic, inclusive institution for all of its members (*(2) Colegio Profesional de Arqueólogos Del Perú: About | LinkedIn*, n.d.).

carried out by foreign institutions, due to a lack of state funding, and with local archaeologists generally working as either freelancers or CRM archaeologists—and thus not generating much "authentic Peruvian" research. Argentinean indigenous communities are very active, pushing legislation and ethical issues, while even literature for Peruvian public archaeology is scarce and general knowledge on archaeology is almost non-existent in some parts of the country, many sites are in danger because of urban and industrial development, and others are seen as a source of income to be exploited.

5. Case studies

Four case studies are presented in the following chapter, two from Peru and two from Argentina. When looking for viable case studies, it was difficult to determine exactly which ones would be best representations of archaeological practice in each country, as there are a number of different possible research areas and research questions. Texts in Spanish were avoided as to reduce the likelihood of terminological misunderstanding, and the topics were chosen randomly out of a pool of reports that included methodological explanation and topics that can be useful for further analysis of the current situation in both countries.

Jequetepeque-Zaña Project and the Tembladera Sites, Peru

Situated on the Peruvian North Coast, the Tembladera sites were part of the Jequetepeque-Zaña Project which began in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The project was undertaken because the Jequetepeque Valley suffered from water flow unreliability, causing periodic droughts—the aim was to improve water control and irrigation of the largest agriculturally productive region through the construction of a dam across the Jequetepeque River.the expansion of existing irrigation networks and the construction of the Tlambo-Zaña Canal. The initial feasibility studies in the area completely neglected the impact of the development project on archaeological resources (Keatinge, 1980, pp. 468–469). The Museo Nacional de Antropología y Arqueología in Lima and the Centro de Investigación y Restauración de Bienes Monumentales (part of the Ministry of Culture, then INC) commissioned an intensive archaeological survey of the area in 1977. This study can be taken as an example of rescue archaeology—based on the engineering company's maps and aerial photographs, it was determined that the most affected area will be north of the river where the survey was concentrated. The survey located 21 site in the area, 17 of which would be damaged. The sites were identified as belonging to various periods of Peruvian pre-Contact history— 11 sites were dated to the late Initial (1800-900 B.C.) to Early Horizon (900-200 B.C.), two to the Early Intermediate period (200 B.C- 600 A.D.), four to the late Intermediate Period (1000-1467 A.D.), and four dating from the Early to the Late Intermediate Period. The majority of the sites were surveyed by means of random sampling and transects (Keatinge, 1980, p. 468). Many of the sites had been looted after a severe drought in 1967-68 forced the local population to loot the sites, making the finds rather well known in the region by the time the survey took place. In spite of the attested archaeological sites, it was seldom visited by archaeologists and no intensive excavation had taken place in the area. The case study was important not because of

the methodology of its investigation—apart from surface survey and transects, the only other analyses that were done was the description of identified structures and looted areas, and cross-referencing of similar Initial Period to Early Horizon Chavín finds from other areas of the north coast. The conclusion of the analysis was not definitive, with the author suggesting that Tembladera ceramics are closer to those of La Copa than Chavín de Huantar, but that more research was necessary in order to determine the definite temporal affiliation of the sites. The real significance of the case study was in the attempt to draw attention to issues of CRM and rescue archaeology that were severely underfunded and overlooked by the foreign countries carrying out development projects in Peru, calling for a reorientation of both foreign and national archaeologists because numerous cultural heritage sites will be lost by the time the majority of Third World countries are capable of funding adequate CRM projects (Keatinge, 1980, p. 469-475). The paper was written in 1980, indicating that archaeologists were already aware of problems that still persist today. The area is still under development with the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation Development as the responsible institution. The project is going forward with the Special Hydroenergetic Project and the improvement of drainage infrastructure, river basin management, and infrastructural upgrades with active participation from both public and private sectors (*Proyecto Especial Jequetepeque Zaña*, n.d.).

Prehispanic Highland Textile Technologies at Hualcayán, Ancash, Peru

Andean ornate textiles and tapestries are well known around the world, especially due to their almost pristine condition in spite of their age. The exact origins of many of these tapestries is unknown because many of them were purchased from their original owners or were "collected" from tombs and then transported to overseas museums under the misconception that they were archaeologically excavated (Stanfield-Mazzi, 2018, pp. 427–428). The remarkable preservation of the textiles can be attributed to the arid conditions of the coastal desert, whereas preservation of textiles in the Andean highlands is more difficult due to moisture, but camelid fibers are still often present in excavated sites (Grávalos & Bria, 2021, p. 781; Murra, 1962, p. 710; Stanfield-Mazzi, 2018, p. 428). The state of preservation of the prehispanic tapestries allows for the study of technological practice over the centuries, attributes of the textiles in terms of social identities, economic and cultural exchange, power relations, camelid domestication, and in the end imperialism expressed through the "collecting" and their representation in foreign institutions (Grávalos & Bria, 2021; Moore, 2016; Murra, 1962; Stanfield-Mazzi, 2018; Yacobaccio, 2004).

The aim of the investigation by researchers from University of Illinois at Chicago and University of Texas-San Antonio was to study the construction techniques of the textile assemblage at Hyalcayán to identify communities of craft producers (Grávalos & Bria, 2021, p. 785). Hualcayán is a notable complex . The complex has four primary sectors, A to D—the assemblage in question was recovered in Sector C, the primary mortuary zone with over a hundred *machays*[26] whose architectural style and associated artifacts mostly date to the period between the Early Intermediate period and the Middle Horizon (1-1000 A.D.) with evidence of reuse in the Late Intermediate Period (Grávalos & Bria, 2021, p. 784). The researchers documented the range of perishable artifact construction types, inspected their technical attributes, and measured yarn and textile standardization. 1,445 perishable fiber artifacts were found in four *machays* during various excavation operations from 2011 to 2012. 20% (n=292) of the perishable artifacts were subject to a technical attribute analysis of a combined and random sample. The materials were then classified as either single-element constructions (looped fabrics), constructions with one set of elements (baskets and braided cordage), or constructions with two sets of elemens (woven textiles). The general categories of the raw fiber type were examined under a digital microscope with a magnification of 220x to distinguish between cotton and camelid fibers, after which individual yarn features were examined. The technological traits of the artifacts were then measured and their uniformity correlated—each tomb was evaluated for the possibility of different weaver communities—and the results of the analysis were then quantified and compared to fabrics from other Andean regions (Grávalos & Bria, 2021, p, 785-786). It was determined that the single-element fabrics such as mesh nets and bags might be evidence of shared practices, but that there was considerable variability in woven fabrics, and a noticeable difference between cotton and camelid textiles (Grávalos & Bria, 2021, p. 794). In other words, Hualcayán traded with different coastal communities to obtain pre-spun cotton yarns, explaining their heterogeneity. Furthermore, cotton textiles akin to Chan Chan textiles from the Moche Valley were identified, suggesting either an exchange of whole cotton fabrics or an exchange of ideas and influences between the coast and the highlands. The results of the camelid textiles indicate uniformity likely resulting from local textile production of imported highland fibers (Grávalos & Bria, 2021, p. 796). The results of the analysis were affected by looting, which made the reconstruction of their original deposition impossible especially in the case of Wari tapestries that may have indicated intra-

[26] Single and multi-chamber burial structures located underneath natural boulders, mostly along cliffsides (Grávalos & Bria, 2021, p. 784).

highland interactions, but too few were still available for a viable analysis (Grávalos & Bria, 2021, pp.795- 796).

Fortín Otamendi site in the context of spatial analysis and GIS of the Argentinean frontier

Maximiano and colleagues (2018, p. 681) conducted an investigation of the *Fortín Otamendi* site in Buenos Aires province as part of Conflict archaeology studies regarding the dynamics and conflict of the border spaces during the *Conquest of the Desert.* The study, conducted by researchers affiliated with universities in Spain, UBA, UNICEN, and CONICET aimed to determine the spatial arrangement of material associated with specific practices linked to the advance of the frontier and the dynamics of military fort abandonment. Information gathered was used in an attempt to adjust and improve fieldwork methodology, characterize the spatial distribution of remains, and predict building locations based on the dig area and features of the spatial distributions. Spatial variance in excavated sites was quantified and defined based on topographical characterization of the site after Total Station survey and the production of a DEM used in analysis of micro-topographical disturbances and slope analysis. A GIS platform was then used for further analysis and visualization of the results, followed by statistical analyses (Ripley's K-function, autocorrelation, and semivariance). Alternative excavation methods were being tested, with the best option being a change in data collection methodology from coordinate data to spatial frequencies. After testing, it was concluded that efficiency of excavations tasks was lower in sectors 1 and 3 (excavated with coordinate data) in comparison with sector 2 (spatial frequency data). It was also observed that other statistical methods such as Moran's Correlogram to be a better option for frequency spatial data. It was also concluded that although the results of the analysis yielded a hypothetical statistical relationship between empty spaces and places with determinate functions (i.e. buildings, interiors, transit areas), site taphonomy and the condition of soft-building practices hamper the recognition of existing buildings without the use of more criteria (such as GPR and EM) (Maximiano et al., 2018, p. 687).

Parasite remains in historical contexts of nineteenth century city of Córdoba

The last case study concerns a paleopathological analysis of coprolites and sediments from two trash pits and a cesspool from the area of the nineteenth century city of Córdoba (Ramirez et al., 2022, p. 397). Carried out by researchers affiliated with CONICET, the UNC and

IDACOR[27] (Ramirez et al., 2022, p. 395) at a site spanning 1,200m^2 from which 875 m^2 were excavated. Various structures were identified during excavation, their contemporaneity and age were determined based on material and construction techniques, as well as the contents of the trash pits (mostly secondary domestic trash). The sediment samples were collected either from the profile or the walls of each individual context after the first film of sediment was removed, with control samples taken outside of each context (Ramirez et al., 2022, p. 398-399). Paleoparasitological examination was carried out with two methods—the first included the rehydration of samples, followed by a spontaneous sedimentation technique. The samples were then prepared and observed with an optical microscope with 100x magnification, parasite remains were photographed with 400x magnification, software was used to measure the eggs in a semiquantitative approach. The parasites were identified based on their morphological and morphometric characteristic, after which the genus of the tapeworm eggs was determined through paleogenetic analysis. The two different methods of examination yielded different results, highlighting the usefulness of using multiple analytical methods (Ramirez et al., 2022, p. 399-400). Although a complete zooarchaeological analysis of the animal remains had not been carried out yet, the researchers identified remains of whipworm, possible roundworm, and tapeworm as a result of poor hygiene practices and poor food preparation in growing urban areas (Ramirez et al., 2022,p., 499).

Paleopathological analysis is very rarely done in the Americas, mostly being restricted to the United States (Ramirez et al., 2022, p. 396). Although uncommon in South America, it has been done in mostly precontact sites—meaning that there is lots of potential in urban-historical contexts (Ramirez et al., 2022, p. 404)

Conclusion

The intention was to present very recent work because each paper includes recommendations or comments on what sort of research is lacking the field, however, the first case study is dated to 1980 because the project it was involved with is still active, and the author points out issues of underdeveloped CRM and the threat of improperly supervised development projects, that are still relevant today. The second case study, related to Peruvian textiles, was chosen because multiple other publications (Moore, 2016; Murra, 1962; Stanfield-Mazzi, 2018; Yacobaccio,

[27] Instituto de Antropología de Córdoba (Córdoba Anthropology Institute), founded in 2011 by CONICET and the Anthropology Museum (part of UCO). It specializes in biological and social anthropology, as well as archaeology and museology. It also houses an ethnobiology laboratory. Its work is related to social issues such as identity restitution, the dynamics and processes of indigenous community visibility, heritage preservation, social inequality, as well as scientific input on environmental care (*Historia*, n.d.).

2004) expressing the importance of the textiles in various contexts were found, ranging from imperialism and site looting, to camelid domestication and prehispanic exchange networks. The third and fourth case studies were chosen because they introduce new or uncommon methods in both Argentinean and South American archaeology in general, carried out by local archaeologists affiliated with the leading scientific institutions of the country, while the Peruvian case studies were carried out by foreign researchers. Only four case studies are, of course, not enough for a full comparison between the countries, but they do provide some insight into the situation. The inclusion of more case studies was contemplated, but it was determined that two more studies would likely not contribute significantly, while a large amount would exceed the scope of the work.

6. Discussion

"It would be unjust to consider Latin American archaeology as a passive reflection of foreign, essentially North American, influences"

(Politis, 2003, p. 116).

Vargas Arenas and Sanoja (2005, pp. 57–58) present a somewhat apocalyptic portrayal of the situation in Latin America with the death of theories, threatening the survival of our societies, and archaeology as a testing ground for foreign theories—where even the Latin American social archaeology is not engaged in discovering anything new, but only redefining existing historical categories (Vargas Areans & Sanoja. 2005, p. 61). The general state of mind is that Latin American archaeologists produce information, and on some occasions, more elaborate patterns or conceptual tools. This is consistent with Latin America being a producer of raw materials and cheap labor for less complex industrial manufacture (Politis & Perez Gollan, 2004, p. 363). The reality is that the socio-historical background of the countries that underwent political struggle through much of the twentieth century, determined the development of a range of specialist disciplines such as forensic archaeology or urban archaeology in Argentina (Ramundo, 2012c, p. 539) and CRM (Lane, 2012) or Andean archaeology in Peru (Jamieson, 2005). As archaeology is largely dependent on the state for its funding, it is then subordinated to its political power. With a history of violent and unstable political regimes, archaeology in Peru and Argentina would have been hampered in the development its own tradition which requires autonomy and innovative thinking, both of which are suppressed by authoritarian regimes (Politis & Perez Gollan, 2004, p. 363). Ramundo (2012c, p. 538) argues that the current theoretical landscape is more tolerant than it used to due to be, potentially due to the period of silence and theoretical dormancy imposed by the military government, and because access to foreign schools of thought is now more readily available.

It was already established that archaeology played an important role in forming new nations' identities in South America after their emancipation from Spain. Although the roots of both Peruvian and Argentinean archaeology can be found in antiquarianism and European expeditions into the New World (López-Hurtado, 2014, p. 210), both countries were under Spanish rule for three centuries (some parts of Argentina less) and their cultural development was heavily influenced by it, one cannot forget that they had thousands of years of history prior to the arrival of Europeans. From the Incas to the hunter-gatherers and nomads of the Pampas and Patagonia, the legacy of those people survived Spanish colonialism in one way or another.

The countries started diverging rather quickly after their independence, and so did archaeology, especially after the establishment of first university courses that allowed for the training of local archaeologists. European and North American influences were always present, either brought from overseas (especially by Germans whose presence was strong in nineteenth century Peru, and then again in Argentina after World War II) or by local scholars (such as Tello) who spent at least a part of their education or professional career abroad—the difference being that foreigners studied the "other" and usually took artifacts back to their home countries, while the locals studied their own past. The problem is that the expansion of European colonialism throughout the world promoted the construction of a Eurocentric perspective on knowledge, which still permeates social science—especially archaeology (Curtoni & Politis, 2006, p. 96).

In spite of its colonial roots, foreign influences, and unstable socioeconomic situations, South and Central America developed some of the most dynamic and globally committed historical archaeology of the 21st century, creating a "local scene" the likes of which exist in both America and Europe. The "scene" is however somewhat regionally exclusive in terms of linguistic barriers and a natural tendency of many researchers to focus on their home regions, focusing on the results of regional topics an methodologies in a common language—Spanish—which might be one of the factors contributing to the fact that the archaeology of this area is underappreciated in the English-Speaking world (Brook & Torres de Souza, 2020, p. 758; Evans & Meggers, 1973, p. 257). Jamieson (2005, pp. 352–353) states that there is as of yet no uniquely Andean brand of historical archaeology in spite of the enormous amounts of interest generated by the geographically limited research zone around the Inca empire. Researchers that have been interested in this area from the beginning of archaeological and anthropological inquiry formed a rather strongly interactive group of "Andeanists" across the globe. He then goes to explain how in Peru, the problem Andeanists face in the attempt to create a unique Andean archaeology is a lack of unity between the theoretical approaches present there—some of the proposed reasons are heavy investment in idealizing the pre-Columbian past as a model for national identity, the minimization of the impact of Spanish colonialism on Andean cultural practices by scholars tracing the Andean cultural continuity, and by those celebrating nationalism in the Andes. Furthermore, historical archaeology in the Andes faces a lack of unity in its theoretical approaches. Peru and Venezuela are unique in their tradition of social archaeology and Marxist social thought, the spread of which can be attributed to socialist and communist movements interlaced with indigenous identities, and

political and racial debate resulting in ongoing confrontations, but as was mentioned before, social archaeology is diminishing in spite of its transformation with post-processualism (Lane, 2012). Perhaps this could be tied to the fact that (at least in Peru) the overwhelming majority of research is being carried out by foreign archaeologists who have already moved on from social archaeology into other waters. Peruvian archaeology is currently riddled with problems ranging from *huaquros* looting sites, the underfunded, centralized Ministry of Culture, complicated legislation that overlooks indigenous communities, nepotism, fraud, and conflict between various industries such as mining, tourism, and local agencies among other things (Lane, 2012, p. 225). At first glance it appears as if there are plenty publications dealing with archaeological topics in Peru, but underneath the surface there appears to be a lack of local Peruvian research output that addresses issues such as a lack of adequate public archaeology—this trend was observed in the last three years' publications from the journal *Latin American Antiquity* where projects were mostly led by North American scholars (Beresford-Jones et al., 2021; Conlee, 2021; Grávalos & Bria, 2021; Hernández Garavito, 2021; Jennings et al., 2021; Langlie, 2020; Quilter, 2020), sometimes in collaboration with Peruvian researchers (Socha et al., 2021; Valdez et al., 2020), followed by sporadic European researchers (Cagnato et al., 2021; Szykulski & Wanot, 2021). The only leading authors of Peruvian institutions were Uceda et al. (2021) from the UNT, leading the Huacas de Moche Archaeological Project, and Tantaleán (2022) from the UNMSM. The upper hand of Argentinean archaeologists in this context can be attested by various publications, most of which can be associated with CONICET and the UNLP (Alunni et al., 2020; del Papa, 2020; Flensborg et al., 2020; Neme et al., 2020; Prieto-Olavarría et al., 2020; Ratto et al., 2022; Rughini et al., 2020; Scheifler, 2020; Suby, 2020; Pedrotta & Bagaloni, 2021; Villar & Hocsman, 2021; Nielsen et al., 2022), UBA (Killian Galván et al., 2021; Miyano, 2021), CONICET and UNICEN (Endere et al., 2022), CONICET and UNC (Ramirez et al., 2022), and CONICET reserchers collaborating with US and Chilean researchers (Echenique et al., 2021). More research would likely be necessary to confirm this, but it is possible that the situation in Peru is not obvious at first glance because foreigners might not be as interested in local problems, but another (perhaps not mutually exclusive) possibility might be that the bad state of archaeology is a reflection of the even worse economy that does not have the "luxury" of tackling archaeological problems when it has more pressing matters at hand.

With this in mind, the question of post-coloniality becomes somewhat more complicated. Gosden (2012, p. 245) defines post-colonial archaeology as a political archaeology that

positions itself contrary to archaeology as science in terms of using archaeological material not just to construct narratives and create knowledge, but to create awareness of colonial history in both its economic and material impacts on the world and to drive collaboration of Native peoples with non-Native archaeologists. Shifting global perspectives have begun to deconstruct colonialist ideas in the second half of the twentieth century, developing postcolonial theory that calls for the recognition of differences and nuances in power relations that arise from the agency of local people resisting colonialism (Gosden, 2004, pp. 165–166). The impact of colonialism on the development of nations with the notion that indigenous people are savages that ought to be either exterminated or assimilated into European culture had a much greater impact on Argentina than it did on Peru. For example, most Argentinian people today see the Conquest of the Desert as a heroic campaign to bring civilization to the barbaric landscape with Roca as a national hero—the problem with this view is that it neglects the fates of the Indigenous people. Roca's statute in Bariloche, province of Río Negro, formerly the territory of the Mapuche, is often covered in slogans such as "Roca = genocide" and "The Mapuche People Live", splashed in red paint, and is a rallying point for Mapuche activists who see the statue as offensive as Roca murdered their ancestors (Larson, 2020, pp. 1–2). Argentineans are very active in terms of restitution of remains, and their protection in the future (Endere, 2005, 2007, 2014), while indigenous communities were marginalized by the Peruvian government and excluded from the 'national culture' (Tantaleán, 2014a, p. 41)—they are neither present in the legislation nor ethical code of the COARPE (Colegio Profesional de Arqueólogos del Perú, 2010; Díaz-Andreu, 2013, p. 228).

Perhaps when taking into account the situation of archaeology in Peru, Vargas Areans and Sanoja's (2005, p. 57) bleak outlook might sound reasonable, however it should be noted that the status in the other South American countries is very likely to be different than in Peru, unless Argentina happens to be an anomaly. Without generalizing on subjects that were not part of this research (countries other than Argentina and Peru), one is likely to agree with Funari's observarion (2009, p. 399) from the beginning of the paper, because if these two neighboring countries developed in such different directions, countries across the continent with different environmental, historical, and sociopolitical contexts would also develop differently.

7. Conclusion

Surely, archaeology in Peru and Argentina are heavily influenced by overseas theoretical trends. The current situation is a product of the environment in which theory was practiced and developed. The colonial roots of archaeology in these countries were different, the territories were treated differently with one as the center of the colonial world, and the other a periphery of unconquerable wilderness. Archaeology too was developing differently—both started with ethnographers, geologists, and explorers, but the central area gained more international attention, possessed more resources, and could support an academic infrastructure. The frontier on the other hand, was focused on conflict, industry, and evading the law. Archaeology in these countries came to be at a time when the nations were searching for their identity, with the discipline developing under foreign influences still asserting their domination with theories akin to Social Darwinism. Differences between these countries lay in the demographic difference of these countries—Peru is mostly inhabited by *mestizos*, with lines between Europeans and Indigenous people blurring, whereas Argentina had more European settlers, with Indigenous communities living in provincial pockets—these different settings attracted different academic profiles and theoretical trends. The twentieth century was a time of both theoretical bloom and political oppression. Both countries experienced dictatorship and military rule stifling academic voices, halting the development or influx of new theoretical directions. At this time the "power balance"[28] between Peru and Argentina begin to shift with Peru lagging behind, getting entangled in illicit artifact trade, lack of resources for scientific research, fraud and lack of opportunities amplified by a difficult economic situation. Not to say there are no positive developments, CRM is developing and growing at a faster rate, more research is being conducted by foreign institutions, and globalization and connection to neighboring countries boost the development of a wider area. Argentina on the other hand, is growing a scientific community, with stronger institutions and funding schemes, different areas of interest than that in Peru (Argentina being more focused on prehistoric, urban, and forensic archaeology, as well as matters of cultural heritage and Indigenous involvement), and different influences brought by European immigrants in the twentieth century. The twenty first century is a time begun by economic crises, but with a strong foundation for what is to come. While archaeologists operating in Peru are identifying and working toward solving its problems, Argentina is developing its own methods and developing a relationship with a wider audience.

[28] The perceived importance and socioeconomic wealth of the countries

The difference between Peru and Argentina can also be felt in the impact (or perhaps lack of it) of post-colonial archaeology on the theoretical trends in the country. The practices, legislation, ethic codes, and public engagement are geared toward creating awareness of colonial history and improving collaboration with Native peoples. The situation in Peru is somewhat more complicated because of the lack of local research efforts, making the impact of theoretical trends brought to it by the many international archaeologists less clear because it poses the question is there no impact or is the current local system unable to properly process it?

The context of Peru and Argentina within *Latin American archaeology* itself would appear to be a product of pure colonialism, because of the history of the term *Latin America* itself that was used to divide spheres of political interest (Anglo-Saxon and Latin blocks), but that would not mean much in the context of current archaeology because Peruvian and Argentinean archaeologies are too different to be grouped in the same category if the common denominators (Spanish language, geographical position, and history of Spanish colonialism) were to be ignored. The history of the two countries (or at least their territories) is millennia older than Spanish colonialism and there is plenty of potential for archaeological research not directly tied to it, but it does not mean that common themes do not exist—such as historic archaeology and Andean archaeology.

The scarcity of literature on the roots of antiquarianism and archaeology in Argentina during the colonial period could be attributed to the fact that Argentina was the frontier of the Spanish world, with the majority of its archaeological history being that of the twentieth century, and Peru having a long archaeological tradition, but perhaps being recently somewhat less represented in literature, or being perceived as more problematic. The topic has potential for more in-depth exploration, with many niches that need more detailed elaboration to present the whole picture. Better analysis of some areas would be beneficial—for example, while Argentinean law regarding archaeology is rather straightforward with an official website explaining in short, Peruvian legislature is more complex and harder to navigate. Information on professional training that forms the backbone of the discipline is somewhat less represented in literature, and mostly focusing on the most prominent institutions. The scope of the topic is perhaps better suited for a more detailed and more sizeable volume that would ideally include more countries of the continent.

Abstract

The term “Latin America” is used as the common that encompasses a large region with several countries whose traditions, language, and colonial background share a set of common characteristics. By keeping in mind the current post-colonial trends in the world, such as the intensification of collaboration between Native Americans and archaeologists in the United States, the question is how archaeology in Latin America can be defined and whether the term is still feasible in an attempt to understand how archaeology navigates the historical legacy of colonialism. The paper explores the meaning of *Latin American archaeology* through the examples of Peruvian and Argentinean national archaeologies. The problem is approached through a study of the historical development of both the countries and their respective archaeologies from the Colonial period to the present. After a short introduction on the major theoretical trends present during the twentieth century, Peru and Argentina are first presented separately—with a focus on the socioeconomic status of the state combined with the influx of foreign theoretical trends and their impact on the development of archaeology within the context of colonialism and post-colonialism. Because of the scope of the paper, only some of the most important contributions of various scholars and their projects are discussed. The tone of the research changes from the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty first century when focus shifts onto the “functioning” of archaeology through its legislative frameworks, university education programmes, and public archaeology. These elements are used to compare the archaeologies of Peru and Argentina in order to reveal their characteristics, and potentially the ways in which colonialism and subsequent historical events pushed the development of archaeology, and how it is manifested today. Four case studies are then presented with the intention of providing insight into how the theory works in practice. It was revealed that the pre-colonial history of the countries and their subsequent treatment significantly impacted the development of two markedly different national archaeologies, who might appear to be quite similar in the themes they research (such as Andean archaeology and historical archaeology) and in the theoretical trends they share (for example the culture-historical approach) but are quite different in practice (differences in treatment of Indigenous communities, structure of educational programmes, opportunities to conduct research or interest in engaging with the public). When the current situation of archaeological practice is put into perspective and the most rudimentary elements keeping “Latin America” together (language, geography, colonial past), it appears as if the archaeologies of the two countries have less in common than thought at first. If the research were to be expanded to include a

more detailed analysis of all of its elements, and if it were to be expanded onto a wider geographical area, would *Latin American archaeology* still be a legitimate term or would "smaller" categories such as Andean archaeology be more feasible?

Bibliography

(2) Colegio Profesional de Arqueólogos del Perú: About | LinkedIn. (n.d.). Retrieved 20 June 2022, from https://www.linkedin.com/company/coarpe/about/

AAPRA – asociación de arqueólogos profesionales de la república argentina. (n.d.). Retrieved 20 June 2022, from https://aapra.org.ar/

Alberti, B., & Politis, G. G. (2005). *Archaeology in Latin America*. Routledge. http://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=241760

Alunni, D. V., Tivoli, A. M., & Zangrando, A. F. (2020). Movilidad y explotación de recursos terrestres por cazadores-recolectores costeros de Bahía Moat, costa sureste de Tierra del Fuego, Argentina. *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(3), 576–594. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.27

ARQUEOLOGO. (n.d.). Facultad de Ciencias Naturales e Instituto Miguel Lillo | Universidad Nacional de Tucuman. Retrieved 18 June 2022, from http://www.expovirtual.unt.edu.ar/fac/naturales/arqueologo.html

Arroyo Aguilar, S. (2014). Julio C. Tello y la antropología. *Investigaciones Sociales*, *7*(11), 123–144. https://doi.org/10.15381/is.v7i11.8108

Asociación de Arqueólogos Profesionales de la República Argentina (AAPRA). (2010). *Código de Ética Profesional*. http://www.aapra.org.ar/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/AAPRA-C%C3%B3digo-de-%C3%89tica-Profesional.pdf

Astuhuamán Gonzáles, C. W. (2013). Tras los pasos perdidos de Julio C. Tello 1909-1919. In H. Tantaleán (Ed.), *Historia de la arqueología en el Perú del siglo XX* (Primera edición, pp. 483–507). IFEA Institut Français d' Études Andines : IAR Institute of Andean Research.

Beaule, C. D. (2016). Lo andino, duality, and indigenous identities in Prehispanic highland Bolivia. *Social Identities*, *22*(6), 602–618. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2016.1161504

Becker, M. (2011). *Indigenismo*. Indigenismo. https://www.yachana.org/research/indigenismo.html

Beresford-Jones, D. G., Pomeroy, E., Alday, C., Benfer, R., Quilter, J., O'Connell, T. C., & Lightfoot, E. (2021). Diet and Lifestyle in the First Villages of the Middle Preceramic: Insights from Stable Isotope and Osteological Analyses of Human Remains from Paloma, Chilca I, La Yerba III, and Morro I. *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(4), 741–759. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.24

Bodenheimer, R. (2019). *What Is Latin America? Definition and List of Countries*. ThoughtCo. https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-latin-america-4691831

Bonnin, M. (2008). Arqueólogos y aficionados en la Universidad Nacional de Córdoba (Argentina): Décadas de 1940 y 1950. *Arqueoweb: Revista Sobre Arqueología En Internet*, *10*(1). https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=2753221

Brook, A., & Torres de Souza, M. A. (2020). Historical archaeology in South and Central America. In C. E. Orser & A. Zarankin (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of global historical archaeology* (pp. 758–779). Routledge.

Browman, D. L. (1995). History of Latin American Archaeology. *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology*, *5*(2), 16–17. https://doi.org/10.5334/bha.05203

Brown, J. C. (2010). *A brief history of Argentina* (2nd ed). Facts On File.

Castillo, S., & Mignolo, W. (2007). The Idea of Latin America. *The Modern Language Review*, *102*(4), 1125. https://doi.org/10.2307/20467557

Colegio Profesional de Arqueólogos del Perú. (2010). *Reglamento del Código de Ética Profesional*. http://coarpe.org.pe/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/REGLAMENTO-C.E..pdf

Colwell, C. (2018). The Entanglement of Native Americans and Colonialist Archaeology in the Southwestern US. In B. Effros & G. Lai (Eds.), *Unmasking ideology in imperial and colonial archaeology: Vocabulary, symbols, and legacy* (pp. 151–172). Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press, University of California, Los Angeles.

Comunidad Andina (CAN) | Cancillería. (n.d.). Retrieved 16 June 2022, from https://www.cancilleria.gov.co/international/regional/can

Conforti, M. E., Madrid, P., Bonomo, M., & Prates, L. (2013). The Public Communication of Science and Non-Formal Education Within the Framework of Public Argentine Archaeology: The Case of Archaeology Workshops. *Public Archaeology*, *12*(1), 27–47. https://doi.org/10.1179/1465518713Z.00000000026

Conlee, C. A. (2021). The Impact of Coastal–Highland Interactions and Population Movements on the Development and Collapse of Complex Societies in Nasca, Peru (AD 500–1450). *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(2), 405–421. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.12

Contreras, D. A. (2010). *Huaqueros* and remote sensing imagery: Assessing looting damage in the Virú Valley, Peru. *Antiquity*, *84*(324), 544–555. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X0006676X

Curtoni, R. P., & Politis, G. G. (2006). Race and racism in South American archaeology. *World Archaeology*, *38*(1), 93–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/00438240500510080

Daggett, R. E. (2013). Un panorama de la arquelogía peruana: 1896-1930. In H. Tantaleán (Ed.), *Historia de la arqueología en el Perú del siglo XX* (Primera edición, pp. 31–42). IFEA Institut Français d' Études Andines : IAR Institute of Andean Research.

del Papa, L. M. (2020). Diferenciación de camélidos en la región Chaco-Santiagueña (Argentina) para el período Agroalfarero (350-1550 dC). *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(2), 375–391. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2019.104

Delibes Mateos, R. (2021). Entre tumbas y tesoros: Una perspectiva histórica del expolio en el temprano Perú colonial (s. xvi). *Mélanges de La Casa de Velázquez*, *51–2*, 319–324. https://doi.org/10.4000/mcv.15551

Delrio, W., Lenton, D., Musante, M., Nagy, M., Papazian, A., & Pérez, P. (2010). Discussing Indigenous Genocide in Argentina: Past, Present, and Consequences of Argentinean State

Policies toward Native Peoples. *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, *5*(2), 138–159. https://doi.org/10.3138/gsp.5.2.138

Denevan, W. M. (1993). The 1931 Shippee-Johnson Aerial Photography Expedition to Peru. *Geographical Review*, *83*(3), 238–251. https://doi.org/10.2307/215727

Departamento de Antropología. (n.d.). *Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades | Universidad Nacional de Córdoba*. Retrieved 13 June 2022, from https://ffyh.unc.edu.ar/grado/departamento-de-antropologia/

Díaz-Andreu García, M. (2007a). *A world history of nineteenth-century archaeology: Nationalism, colonialism, and the past*. Oxford University Press.

Díaz-Andreu García, M. (2007b). Archaeology and the 1820 Liberal Revolution: The Past in the Independence of Greece and Latin American Nations. In *A world history of nineteenth-century archaeology: Nationalism, colonialism, and the past* (pp. 79–98). Oxford University Press.

Díaz-Andreu, M. (2013). Ethics and Archaeological Tourism in Latin America. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, *17*(2), 225–244. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10761-013-0218-1

Diaz-Andreu, M. (2018). *Archaeology and Imperialism: From Nineteenth-Century New Imperialism to Twentieth-Century Decolonization* (B. Effros & G. Lai, Eds.). Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press, University of California, Los Angeles.

Dillehay, T. D. (2008). Latin American Archaeology in History and Practice. In R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner, & C. Chippindale (Eds.), *Handbook of archaeological theories* (pp. 165–185). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Endere, M. L. (2005). Talking about others: Archaeologists, indigenous peoples and heritage in Argentina. *Public Archaeology*, *4*(2–3), 155–162. https://doi.org/10.1179/pua.2005.4.2-3.155

Endere, M. L. (2007). *Management of Archaeological Sites and the Public in Argentina*. University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.30861/9781407301525

Endere, M. L. (2014). Archaeological Heritage Legislation and Indigenous Rights in Latin America: Trends and Challenges. *International Journal of Cultural Property*, *21*(3), 319–330. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0940739114000174

Endere, M. L., Heider, G., Chaparro, M. G., & Giacomasso, M. V. (2022). La Gruta de Intihuasi como sitio patrimonial: Devenir histórico y lineamientos para un plan de gestión integral. *Latin American Antiquity*, *33*(1), 97–114. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.84

Espinosa, A. M. (1918). The Term Latin America. *Hispania*, *1*(3), 135–143.

Evans, C., & Meggers, B. J. (1973). United States “Imperialism” and Latin American Archaeology. *American Antiquity*, *38*(3), 257–258. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0002731600089514

Facultad de Filosofia y Letras - UBA. (n.d.). *Plan de Estudios*. Ciencias Antropológicas. Retrieved 18 June 2022, from http://antropologia.filo.uba.ar/plan-de-estudios

Flensborg, G., Martínez, G., & Tessone, A. (2020). Paleodieta en grupos cazadores-recolectores de la transición pampeano-patagónica oriental (Argentina) durante los últimos 6.000 años. *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2019.72

Fondebrider, L., & Scheinsohn, V. (2015). Forensic archaeology: The Argentinian way. In W. J. M. Groen, N. Márquez-Grant, & R. C. Janaway (Eds.), *Forensic Archaeology: A Global Perspective* (p. 618). Wiley-Blackwell.

Funari, P. P. A. (1997). Archaeology, History, and Historical Archaeology in South America. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, *1*(3), 189–206.

Funari, P. P. A. (2001). Public archaeology from a Latin American perspective. *Public Archaeology*, *1*(4), 239–243. https://doi.org/10.1179/pua.2001.1.4.239

Funari, P. P. A., Zarankin, A., & Salerno, M. A. (2009). Historical Archaeology in South America. In D. Gaimster & T. Majewski (Eds.), *International Handbook of Historical Archaeology* (pp. 399–408). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-72071-5

Galindo, A. F. (1999). La tradición autoritaria: Violencia y democracia en el Perú. *APRODEH*, 1–34.

Gänger, S. (2009). Conquering the Past: Post-War Archaeology and Nationalism in the Borderlands of Chile and Peru, c. 1880–1920. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *51*(4), 691–714. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417509990107

Gobat, M. (2013). The Invention of Latin America: A Transnational History of Anti-Imperialism, Democracy, and Race. *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, 31.

Gómez Romero, F. (2005). A Brief Overview of the Evolution of Historical Archaeology in Argentina. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, *9*(3), 135–141. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10761-005-8275-8

Gosden, C. (2004). The Past and Foreign Countries: Colonial and Post-Colonial Archaeology and Anthropology. In L. Meskell & R. W. Preucel (Eds.), *A companion to social archaeology* (pp. 161–178). Blackwell Pub.

Gosden, C. (2012). Post-colonial Archaeology. In I. Hodder (Ed.), *Archaeological theory today* (2. ed, pp. 251–266). Polity.

Grávalos, M. E., & Bria, R. E. (2021). Prehispanic Highland Textile Technologies: A View from the First Millennium AD at Hualcayán, Ancash, Peru. *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(4), 781–799. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.30

Hasbrouck, A. (1935). The Conquest of the Desert. *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, *15*(2), 195–228.

Hedges, J. (2011). *Argentina: A modern history*. I.B. Tauris.

Hernández Garavito, C. (2021). Experiencing Community: Continuity and Transformation of Residential Life under the Inka Empire in Huarochirí (Lima, Peru). *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(2), 255–273. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.91

Historia. (n.d.). Retrieved 22 June 2022, from https://idacor.conicet.gov.ar/?post_type=page&p=1557

Historia | Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Antropología e Historia del Perú. (n.d.). Retrieved 22 February 2022, from https://mnaahp.cultura.pe/elmuseo/historia

Hoffman, T. L., Kwas, M. L., & Silverman, H. (2002). Heritage Tourism and Public Archaeology. *The SAA Archaeological Record*, *2*(2), 30–32.

Hunefeldt, C. (2004). *A brief history of Peru*. Facts on File.

Iñigo, A. (n.d.). *Argentinian Territories: The Trail of the Andes*. Google Arts & Culture. Retrieved 18 April 2022, from https://artsandculture.google.com/story/argentinian-territories-the-trail-of-the-andes-gustar/4QWxZla0_pe0Pg?hl=en

Jamieson, R. W. (2005). Colonialism, social archaeology and *lo Andino*: Historical archaeology in the Andes. *World Archaeology*, *37*(3), 352–372. https://doi.org/10.1080/00438240500168384

Jennings, J., Yépez Álvarez, W., Bautista, S. L., Scaffidi, B. K., Tung, T. A., Alaica, A. K., Berquist, S., González La Rosa, L. M., & Rizzuto, B. (2021). Late Intermediate Period Funerary Traditions, Population Aggregation, and the Ayllu in the Sihuas Valley, Peru. *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(3), 517–535. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.15

Kaulicke, P. (2006). Política, práctica y teoría en la Arqueología del Perú. *Arqueología y Sociedad*, *17*, 11–18. https://doi.org/10.15381/arqueolsoc.2006n17.e13132

Keatinge, R. W. (1980). Archaeology and Development: The Tembladera Sites of the Peruvian North Coast. *Journal of Field Archaeology*, *7*(4), 467–477. https://doi.org/10.1179/009346980791505284

Kellet, L. C. (2006). Public archaeology in an Andean community. *The SAA Archaeological Record*, *6*(2), 8–11.

Killian Galván, V. A., Cortés, L. I., & Rabuffetti, N. (2021). Composition of Prehispanic Diets from Stable Isotope Analysis in Human Remains of the Southern Calchaquíes Valleys, Northwest Argentina (3600–1300 BP). *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(2), 350–367. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.101

Lanata, J. L., & Borrero, L. A. (2005). The archaeology of hunter-gatherers in South America: Recent history and new directions. In B. Alberti & G. G. Politis (Eds.), *Archaeology in Latin America* (pp. 74–88). Routledge. http://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=241760

Landa, C. G. (2016). Arqueología histórica: Especificidades del campo y problemáticas de estudio en Argentina. *QueHaceres*, *3*, 96–120.

Lane, K. (2012). Prospects: Archaeological research and practice in Peru. *Antiquity*, *86*(331), 221–227. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00062578

Langlie, B. S. (2020). Late Intermediate Period Plant Use at a Colla Hillfort, Puno, Peru (AD 1300–1450). *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(4), 702–719. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.28

Larson, C. R. (2020). Tracing the Battle for History. In C. R. Larson (Ed.), *The Conquest of the desert: Argentina's indigenous peoples and the battle for history* (First edition, pp. 1–16). University of New Mexico Press.

Lasaponara, R., & Masini, N. (2017). Space Based Monitoring of Archaeological Looting: An Overview in Peruvian Archaeological Areas. In O. Gervasi, B. Murgante, S. Misra, G. Borruso, C. M. Torre, A. M. A. C. Rocha, D. Taniar, B. O. Apduhan, E. Stankova, & A. Cuzzocrea (Eds.), *Computational Science and Its Applications – ICCSA 2017* (Vol. 10408, pp. 713–727). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62404-4_52

Leisz, S. J. (2013). An Overview of the Application of Remote Sensing to Archaeology During the Twentieth Century. In D. C. Comer & M. J. Harrower, *Mapping Archaeological Landscapes from Space* (Vol. 5, pp. 11–19). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-6074-9_2

Lewis, C. M. (2002). *Argentina: A short history*. Oneworld.

Licenciatura en Antropología. (n.d.-a). UNICEN - Universidad Nacional Del Centro de La Provincia de Buenos Aires. Retrieved 18 June 2022, from https://www.unicen.edu.ar/content/licenciatura-en-antropolog%C3%AD

Licenciatura en Antropología. (n.d.-b). Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales | Universidad Nacional de Jujuy. Retrieved 19 June 2022, from http://www.fhycs.unju.edu.ar/oferta/licenciatura_%20antropologia.html

Licenciatura en Antropología. (n.d.-c). Universidad Nacional de La Plata. Retrieved 19 June 2022, from https://unlp.edu.ar//carreras_de_grado/licenciatura-en-antropologia-8109

Licenciatura en Arqueología. (n.d.). Escuela de Arqueología | Universidad Nacional de Catamarca. Retrieved 18 June 2022, from https://arqueologia.unca.edu.ar/?p=contenidos&id=12&t=Licenciatura+en+Arqueolog%25C3%25ADa

Lockhart, J., Bushnell, D., & Kittleson, R. A. (2021). *History of Latin America*. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/place/Latin-America

López-Hurtado, E. (2014). South America. In P. G. Bahn (Ed.), *The history of archaeology: An introduction* (pp. 210–227). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Lothrop, S. K. (1948). Julio C. Tello, 1880–1947. *American Antiquity*, *14*(1), 50–56. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0002731600009926

Maestría en Ciencias Sociales con Mención en Arqueología Andina. (n.d.). Universidades de Perú. Retrieved 23 June 2022, from http://carrerasuniversitarias.pe/

Martinón-Torres, M., & Killick, D. (2015). Archaeological Theories and Archaeological Sciences. In A. Gardner, M. Lake, & U. Sommer (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Theory*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199567942.013.004

Matos Mendieta, R. (1994). Peru: Some Comments. In A. Oyuela-Caycedo (Ed.), *History of Latin American archaeology* (pp. 104–123). Avebury.

Maximiano Castillejo, A., Gómez Romero, F., Landa, C., & Barcia García, C. (2018). Archaeological spatial analysis and GIS in a small fortification: Ephemeral occupations along the border during the 'Conquest of Desert' process in Argentinean Pampas (19th Century). *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports*, *18*, 679–688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2017.09.010

Meskell, L., & Preucel, R. W. (Eds.). (2004). *A companion to social archaeology*. Blackwell Pub.

Ministerio de Cultura. (2015). *Marco legal de protección del patrimonio cultural*. https://www.cultura.gob.pe/sites/default/files/archivosadjuntos/2016/08/marcolegalokversion digital.pdf

Miyano, J. P. (2021). Aprovechamiento de animales en la puna transicional de Chaschuil (Catamarca, Argentina): Análisis zooarqueológico de dos ocupaciones del sitio San Francisco Inca (ca. siglos diez a quince dC). *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(1), 19–38. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.63

Moore, K. M. (2016). Domesticated Camelids in the Andes. In J. M. Capriles & N. Tripcevich (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Andean Pastoralism* (pp. 17–38). University of New Mexico Press.

Murra, J. V. (1962). Cloth and Its Functions in the Inca State. *American Anthropologist*, *64*(4), 710–728. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1962.64.4.02a00020

MuseoARGcn. (n.d.). Historia del macn. *Museo Ciencias Naturales*. Retrieved 1 June 2022, from http://www.macnconicet.gob.ar/historia-del-macn/

Neme, G. A., Otaola, C., Giardina, M. A., Gil, A. F., & Franchetti, F. R. (2020). Consumo de fauna y funcionalidad de sitios: Testeando hipótesis en los Andes meridionales. *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(1), 163–179. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2019.100

Nielsen, A. E., Vázquez, M. M., & Avalos, J. C. (2022). La Quebrada de Humahuaca (Jujuy, Argentina) y sus relaciones sur andinas en tiempos del "fenómeno Isla": Arqueología de Muyuna. *Latin American Antiquity*, *33*(1), 115–134. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.44

Novaković, P. (2011). Archaeology in the New Countries of Southeastern Europe: A Historical Perspective. In L. R. Lozny (Ed.), *Comparative Archaeologies*. Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8225-4

Oliva, F. (1994). Education as a means of protection of the archaeological heritage in the districts of Buenos Aires Province, Argentina. In B. L. Molyneaux & P. G. Stone (Eds.), *The Presented Past: Heritage, Museums and Education.* Routledge. http://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=179424

Oyuela-Caycedo, A. (Ed.). (1994). *History of Latin American archaeology*. Avebury.

Oyuela-Caycedo, A., Anaya, A., Elera, C. G., & Valdez, L. M. (1997). Social Archaeology in Latin America?: Comments to T. C. Patterson. *American Antiquity*, *62*(2), 365–374. https://doi.org/10.2307/282518

Patrimonio cultural, arqueológico y paleontológico. (2019, July 12). Argentina.gob.ar. https://www.argentina.gob.ar/justicia/derechofacil/leysimple/patrimonio-cultural-arqueologico-y-paleontologico

Patterson, T. C. (1994). Social Archaeology in Latin America: An Appreciation. *American Antiquity*, *59*(03), 531–537. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0002731600065471

Patterson, T. C. (2004). Social Archaeology and Marxist Social Thought. In L. Meskell & R. W. Preucel (Eds.), *A companion to social archaeology* (pp. 66–80). Blackwell Pub.

Pedrotta, V., & Bagaloni, V. N. (2021). Un cuarto de siglo de arqueología histórica en las fronteras y espacios rurales de Argentina. *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(2), 368–384. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.5

Phelan, J. L. (2018). Pan-latinism, french intervention in México (1861-1867) and the genesis of the idea of Latin America. In J. A. Ortega y Medina (Ed.), *Conciencia y autenticidad históricas: Escritos en homenaje a Edmundo O'Gorman* (pp. 279–298). Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras.

Podgorny, I., Tobías, M. D., & Farro, M. (2005). The Reception of New Archaeology in Argentina: A Preliminary Survey. In P. P. Funari, A. Zarankin, & E. Stovel (Eds.), *Global Archaeological Theory: Contextual Voices and Contemporary Thoughts* (pp. 59–76). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/b110039

Politis, G. G. (2003). The Theoretical Landscape and the Methodological Development of Archaeology in Latin America. *Latin American Antiquity*, *14*(2), 115. https://doi.org/10.2307/3557590

Politis, G. G. (2005). The Socio-Politics of the Development of Archaeology in Hispanic South America. In P. J. Ucko, *Theory in Archaeology: A World Perspective.* http://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=242215

Politis, G. G., & Curtoni, R. P. (2011). Archaeology and Politics in Argentina During the Last 50 Years. In L. R. Lozny (Ed.), *Comparative Archaeologies* (pp. 495–526). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8225-4

Politis, G. G., & Perez Gollan, J. A. (2004). Latin American Archaeology: From Colonialism to Globalization. In L. Meskell & R. W. Preucel (Eds.), *A companion to social archaeology* (pp. 353–373). Blackwell Pub.

Potts, M. A. (2010, May 26). *Finding Machu Picchu: A Look at Explorer Hiram Bingham, A Real-Life Indiana Jones*. Adventure. https://www.nationalgeographic.com/adventure/article/machu-picchu-hiram-bingham

Prieto-Olavarría, C., Chiavazza, H., & Castro de Machuca, B. (2020). Cerámica híbrida, huarpes y etnogénesis en una ciudad colonial meridional (Mendoza, Argentina). *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(3), 458–476. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.17

Proulx, B. B. (2013). Archaeological Site Looting in 'Glocal' Perspective: Nature, Scope, and Frequency. *American Journal of Archaeology*, *117*(1), 111–125. https://doi.org/10.3764/aja.117.1.0111

Proyecto Especial Jequetepeque Zaña. (n.d.). Retrieved 21 June 2022, from https://www.gob.pe/institucion/pejeza/institucional

PUCP. (n.d.-a). *Doctorado en Antropología, Arqueología, Historia o Lingüística con mención en Estudios Andinos*. Escuela de Posgrado - PUCP. Retrieved 23 June 2022, from https://posgrado.pucp.edu.pe/doctorados/antropologia-arqueologia-historia-y-linguistica-andinas/

PUCP. (n.d.-b). *Maestría en Arqueología con mención en Estudios Andinos*. Escuela de Posgrado - PUCP. Retrieved 23 June 2022, from https://posgrado.pucp.edu.pe/maestria/arqueologia-con-mencion-en-estudios-andinos/

PUCP. (n.d.-c). *Plan de Estudios de la Especialidad de Arqueología*. Retrieved 14 June 2022, from https://www.pucp.edu.pe/carrera/arqueologia/

Quilter, J. (2020). Moche Mortuary Pottery and Culture Change. *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(3), 538–557. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.44

Raina, U. (2007). *Intellectual Imperialism in the Andes: German Anthropologists and Archaeologists in Peru, 1870-1930*. Temple University.

Ramirez, D. A., Lindskoug, H. B., & Nores, R. (2022). Presence of Parasite Remains in Historical Contexts in the City of Córdoba, Argentina, in the Nineteenth Century. *Latin American Antiquity*, *33*(2), 395–407. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.68

Ramundo, P. S. (2012a). Arqueología argentina: Una lectura arqueológica de su devenir histórico. *Arqueología argentina: una lectura arqueológica de su devenir histórico*, *59*, 469–510.

Ramundo, P. S. (2012b). Legislación del patrimonio arqueológico argentino: La compleja articulación entre teoría y práctica. *Cuadernos electrónicos de derechos humanos y democracia*, *8*, 89–96.

Ramundo, P. S. (2012c). Argentinian archaeology: Status and prospects. *Antiquity*, *86*(332), 538–545. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00062931

Ratto, N., Basile, M., Aranda, C., Luna, L., & Andreoni, D. (2022). Articulando imágenes, salud y alimentos: Entierros de infantes en urna siglos doce a quince, Fiambalá, Catamarca, Argentina. *Latin American Antiquity*, *33*(2), 242–261. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.46

Rughini, A. A., Romero Villanueva, G., Lucero, G., Cardillo, M., Borrazzo, K., Fernández, M. V., Brera, A., Frigolé, C., Castillo, A., Vitores, M., Llano, C., Garvey, R., & Barberena, R. (2020). Arqueología distribucional y biogeografía humana en un paisaje andino-patagónico. *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(3), 595–614. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.22

Salerno, V. M. (2009). "Popularization" of archaeology in the Argentinian newspapers: Social representation and education. *Archéologie et Médias Quelles Représentations, Quels Enjeux?*, 61–71.

Saucedo Segami, D. (2010). Arqueología y Difusión en la Internet: La experiencia de Arkeos, Revista Electrónica de Arqueología PUCP. *Virtual Archaeology Review*, *1*(2), 167. https://doi.org/10.4995/var.2010.4723

Scheifler, N. A. (2020). Fogones, combustible óseo y procesamiento faunístico en el sitio de Huencú Nazar (Sistema Lagunar Hinojo-Las Tunas, región pampeana, Argentina): Implicancias para el uso del espacio por cazadores-recolectores. *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(3), 517–537. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.12

Shimada, I., & Vega-Centeno, R. (2011). Peruvian Archaeology: Its Growth, Characteristics, Practice and Challenge. In L. R. Lozny (Ed.), *Comparative Archaeologies* (pp. 569–612). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8225-4

Silva S., J. E. (2013). Teoría y método en la arqueología del Perú: Primera mitad del siglo XX. In H. Tantaleán (Ed.), *Historia de la arqueología en el Perú del siglo XX* (Primera edición, pp. 209–236). IFEA Institut Français d' Études Andines : IAR Institute of Andean Research.

Smith, K. L. (2005). Looting and the politics of archaeological knowledge in Northern Peru. *Ethnos*, *70*(2), 149–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/00141840500141139

Socha, D. M., Reinhard, J., & Chávez Perea, R. (2021). Inca Human Sacrifices on Misti Volcano (Peru). *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(1), 138–153. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.78

Stanfield-Mazzi, M. (2018). The Cloth of Colonization: Peruvian Tapestries in the Andes and in Foreign Museums. In B. Effros & G. Lai (Eds.), *Unmasking ideology in imperial and colonial archaeology: Vocabulary, symbols, and legacy* (pp. 427–452). Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press, University of California, Los Angeles.

Strochlic, N. (2017, July 24). *These Stunning Pictures Revealed Machu Picchu to the World*. Photography. https://www.nationalgeographic.com/photography/article/machu-picchu-panoramas-henry-bingham-discovery

Suby, J. A. (2020). Paleopathological Research in Southern Patagonia: An Approach to Understanding Stress and Disease in Hunter-Gatherer Populations. *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(2), 392–408. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2020.5

Talancha Crespo, E. (2012, June 13). Legislación del Patrimonio Arqueológico Peruano. *Eliseo Talancha Crespo*. https://eliseotalanchacrespo.wordpress.com/articulos-de-interes-2/

Tantaleán, H. (Ed.). (2013). *Historia de la arqueología en el Perú del siglo XX* (Primera edición). IFEA Institut Français d' Études Andines : IAR Institute of Andean Research.

Tantaleán, H. (2014a). Archaeological Heritage in Peru: Definitions, Perceptions and Imperceptions. In L. Grove & S. Thomas (Eds.), *Heritage Crime* (pp. 32–51). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137357519_3

Tantaleán, H. (2014b). *Peruvian archaeology: A critical history*. Left Coast Press.

Tantaleán, H. (2022). Un encargo muy especial: George Dorsey, las necrópolis de Ancón y la Exposición Universal de Chicago de 1893. *Latin American Antiquity*, *33*(1), 41–59. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.45

Tenorio-Trillo, M. (2017). *Latin America: The allure and power of an idea*. The University of Chicago Press.

Trigger, B. G. (2004). Cross-Cultural Comparison and Archaeological Theory. In L. Meskell & R. W. Preucel (Eds.), *A companion to social archaeology* (pp. 43–65). Blackwell Pub.

Uceda, S., Gayoso, H., Castillo, F., & Rengifo, C. (2021). Climate and Social Changes: Reviewing the Equation with Data from the Huacas de Moche Archaeological Complex, Peru. *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(4), 705–722. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.35

UNASAM. (n.d.). *Portal del Programa de Estudios Arqueología*. Retrieved 23 June 2022, from https://www.unasam.edu.pe/programadeestudio/y0zJyMzKTy1OLk3NSdQ1NAUA

UNFV. (2018). *Malla Curricular*. Facultad de Humanidades. http://www.unfv.edu.pe/facultades/fh/escuelas/escuela-profesional-de-antropologia-y-arqueologia/itemlist/category/128-malla-curricular

UNFV. (2019). *Humanidades*. EUPG | Escuela Universidaria de Posgrado. http://www.unfv.edu.pe/eupg/index.php/doctorados/humanidades-y-ciencias-sociales/humanidades

UNICA. (2021). *Plan de Estudios del Programa Académico de Arqueología*. https://www.unica.edu.pe/cctya/info/estudios/2021/P10%20-%20Plan%202021.pdf

UNMSM. (n.d.). *Maestría en Arqueología Andina*. Posgrado de Ciencias Sociales. Retrieved 23 June 2022, from http://upgsociales.unmsm.edu.pe/maestrias/arqueologia-andina/

UNMSM. (2018). *Plan de Estudios*. https://csociales.unmsm.edu.pe/images/Reporte_Planes_EP_Arqueologia_Plan_Estudios_2018.pdf

UNPRG. (n.d.). *Plan de Estudios Arqueología*. Retrieved 23 June 2022, from http://www.unprg.edu.pe/univ/portal/documentos_s/planes/P28.%20ARQUEOLOG%C3%8DA.pdf

UNSAAC. (2019). *Plan de Estudios*. http://aq.unsaac.edu.pe/home/documento.php?uid=7897b2462bd611e9b067005056930008&filename=Plan+de+estudios+de+Arqueolog%C3%ADa

UNSCH. (n.d.). *Unidad de Posgrado*. Facultad de Ciencias Sociales | UNSCH. Retrieved 23 June 2022, from https://www.unsch.edu.pe/facultades/sociales/index.php/unidad-de-posgrado/

UNSCH. (2018). *Carrera Profesional de Arqueología*. https://www.unsch.edu.pe/facultades/sociales/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/PLAN-DE-ESTUDIOS-ARQUEOLOG%C3%8DA-E-HISTORIA_ARQUEOLOG%C3%8DA.pdf

UNT | Universidad Nacional de Trujillo. (n.d.). Retrieved 23 June 2022, from https://www.unitru.edu.pe/

UNTRM. (2016). *Plan de Estudios*. UNTRM. https://www.untrm.edu.pe/en/facultades/ciencias-sociales-y-humanidades/68-pregrado/arqueologia/864-plan-de-estudios.html

Valdez, L. M., Huamaní, M. N., Bettcher, K. J., Liza, M. A., Aylas, K., & Alarcón, W. (2020). Recent Archaeological Research at Tambo Viejo, Acari Valley, Peru. *Latin American Antiquity*, *31*(1), 202–208. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2019.95

Vargas Arenas, I., & Sanoja, M. (2005). Archaeology as a Social Science: Its expression in Latin America. In B. Alberti & G. G. Politis, *Archaeology in Latin America.* (pp. 57–73). Routledge. http://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=241760

Vargas, I. (2007). La Arqueología Social: Un paradigma alternativo al angloamericano. *Revista de História da Arte e da Cultura*, *8*, 73–78.

Villar, F. A., & Hocsman, S. (2021). Viviendas, espacios y relaciones sociales en un contexto fabril: El caso del Ingenio Lastenia (Tucumán, Argentina) durante el último cuarto del siglo diecinueve. *Latin American Antiquity*, *32*(3), 627–646. https://doi.org/10.1017/laq.2021.27

Webster, G. S. (2008). Culture History: A Culture-Historical Approach. In R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner, & C. Chippindale (Eds.), *Handbook of archaeological theories* (pp. 11–28). AltaMira Press.

Yacobaccio, H. D. (2004). *Social dimensions of camelid domestication in the southern Andes*. 237–247.