Unbundled: European Collecting of Andean Mummies 1850-1930

Ordoñez Alvarez, M.P.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Framework

"Museums and libraries have become heterotopias in which time never stops building up and topping its own summit, whereas in the seventeenth century, even at the end of the century, museums and libraries were the expression of an individual choice. By contrast, the idea of accumulating everything, of establishing a sort of general archive, the will to enclose in one place all times, all epochs, all forms, all tastes, the idea of constituting a place of all times that is itself outside of time and inaccessible to its ravages, the project of organizing in this way a sort of perpetual and indefinite accumulation of time in an immobile place, this whole idea belongs to our modernity. The museum and the library are heterotopias that are proper to western culture of the nineteenth century".

Michel Foucault (1984), "*Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias*"; Architecture / Mouvement/ Continuité October, 1984; ("Des Espace Autres," March 1967 Translated from the French by Jay Miskowiec)

When Foucault referred to museums as heterotopias he was writing of the museum as an institution in the nineteenth century. This remarks however are as useful to understand museums of the nineteenth century as much as museums today, as has been argued by Van Broekhoven (2013). Heterotopias are spaces of contradiction, of otherness, while at the same time being familiar and ingrained in society. Counter-sites, spaces where other cultures can be found, simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted.

A museum is in essence such a place, where social and political discourses meet with real objects and offer the visitor glimpses of others: cultures, peoples, landscapes, while at the same time existing within contemporary realities, be them from the nineteenth or twentyfirst centuries. The idea of a museum, especially an ethnographic and archaeological museum, as an heteropia is crucial to this dissertation as it guides the possibility of collections being suspended in time, treasured and forgotten, contraposed and isolated in the same exhibit rooms. This idea will again be revisited on chapters 5 and 7 in relation to the separation of objects and the transmutation of mummies within storage rooms. It is also crucially relevant to the discussion of repatriation of collections in museums today, and the role of the modern ethnographic museum, as is argued in chapter 8.

Nevertheles, the main theoretical concerns that cross the research presented in this Ph.D. dissertation have to do with museums in the nineteenth-century. Spaces where the historical, archaeological, and ethical conundrums find an embodied meeting point: mummified human remains.[6]

On the following pages, the problematics described in the introduction are interrogated by combining a traditional historical and archaeological approach to human remains and their collecting. This allows an understanding not only of the narrative sur-

6 The ownership of bodies, their relations to the spaces they inhabit- and in which they transform- has been discussed by authors such as Puwar (2004) and Philips (2013). These discussions have also been undertaken by archaeologist, as is presented later in this chapter.

rounding the mummies after their excavation, but their lives as part of collected, stored and displayed human remains.

The theoretical discussions and premises that have guided this research are explained in this chapter through six subsections. The sections have been created in order to emphasize different points of inflection that rose while looking at the information available in both documental sources and the mummies researched. These sections also highlight the connections between historical processes, political narratives, archaeological practice, and ethical principles, in relation to museum collections in general, and human remains collections in particular – with Andean mummies as a specific type of human remains.

The first section is dedicated to defining terminology and concepts used throughout the research. It presents working definitions that clarify the subjects at hand, as well as short debates on the consolidation of the definitions chosen for this research. Seven key concepts are explored: nation, national museum, collection, identity, human remains, and mummy.

The second section focuses on exploring the practice of collecting as a way of translating knowledge. From the context where they were collected to the museum exhibit and storage room, the objects of any museum undergo several transformations of meaning. This subsection explores how those meanings are created, as a form of identity construction, in relation to their political dimension, and how they shape and create narratives from and about the collected objects.

The thirth section concentrates on the theme of collecting as a historical narrative. As a biased construct, it can offer important insight into the past, but nevertheless may hinder the transfer of information into the present. Following the information presented in the introduction, which briefly situated the collections explored and the historical context in which they were formed, this section contextualizes a broader description of the period between 1850 and 1930 and its relation to the development of archaeological collections and archaeological practices.

Finally, the fourth section focuses on the ethical discussions and considerations that have taken place regarding work with human remains, whether in archaeological practice, museum collections, or medical institutions. The importance of considering the contemporary ethical guidelines that encompass this research, while taking into account the historical processes that have led to those guidelines, is an essential part of this thesis. The discussion and data presented in the next chapters are situated within a particular set of parameters by presenting these theoretical considerations, The exploration of theoretical themes that have surrounded sensitive materials such as human remains in museum collections, both in the past and the present, allows the reader to consider the data presented as inhabiting both the historical and contemporary worlds.

2.1 Concept Definitions

The terminology used in this research, as in any other in social sciences, is not casual. It follows the need to present the data discussed within specific lines of argument, and as such should be explained to the reader in as much detail as necessary. The seven working concepts presented in the following section go from the more general to the particular, and aim to clarify their use throughout this dissertation.

The concepts chosen are crucial to understand this research as they frame the object of study of this thesis, both in terms of the museums chosen and the "objects" addressed. The nuanced description of the words used to describe the collections, the collectors, and the cultures involved in those transactions, becomes a necessary step in order to understand the authors position *vis-a-vis* their multiple meanings.

In the first place, it is necessary to address the concept of ***nation*** and the elements contained within it. The term has been heatedly debated in social sciences for as long as it has been used (Ernest, 1882). From Marx's discussions onwards, a nation has been considered in regard to its political presence, the institutions that comprise it, and in relation to a state, a land, and its subjects (Giddens, 1985). For the research presented here, the concept of nation has to do with three definitions: those of Weber, Giddens, and ultimately Smith (1999). Each defined a nation within similar boundaries, but considered, in turn, different spheres in which a nation is influenced and influences.

Max Weber sees the nation as a very subjective and ambiguous definition. Mostly, Weber presented the nation in its simplest terms as a system of administration and law that guides the state, and that has direct incidence and authority over the collective. The modern state is, in that sense, the means of rule over a territory. It is made up of a series of laws that mandate citizenship rights, and broad social and economic responsibilities. A state is the apparatus through which a government executes its power. It can be made up by several institutions, but its most important roles are to operate the bureaucratic system, levy taxes and operate a military and police force (Weber, 1994). This collective is made up of freely associated peoples, the members (usually by birth) that belong to the territory over which it exercises domination (Weber, 1994). Weber also mentions that within this nation there is a feeling of solidarity among its members formed through politics, culture, power, prestige, language, and race.

Sociologist Anthony Giddens proposes a very similar concept. He argues that a nation "only exists when a state has a unified administrative reach over the territory over which its sovereignty is claimed" (Giddens, 1985:119). What Giddens adds to the definition provided earlier is the idea that "the control over a territory with demarcated boundaries (borders), can only be ruled if being sanctioned by law and direct control of the means of internal and external violence"(Giddens, 1985:121).

For this research, both the ideas of Weber and Giddens regarding the nation are particularly important. The first delineates a relation between power, institutions and people, which can be ambiguous and change throughout time, while the second emphasizes the importance of a nation's borders, and the state mechanisms that control and maintain it. Both concepts suggest a sense of belonging to a defined, territorially linked group. This group cohesion, for Giddens, will also be aided by its contraposition to others outside the national borders.

A final definition included in this research's definition of the nation is the one proposed by Anthony D. Smith. In his work, Smith criticizes Giddens in particular for his "excessive emphasis on the role of political institutions, and is too dismissive of the legacies of pre-modern ethnic and cultural ties" (Smith, 1999:102). In that sense, this last definition includes a cultural-historical context in the consideration of the nation, and in particular in the connection of the people to the nation, "a sense of attachment to a country or state" (Smith, 1999:102).

Taking into account these three definitions, in all following pages, the use of the term nation includes the importance of the collective, the institutions, the power relations, the territorial borders, and lastly, the cultural-historical belonging to a nation. This last aspect of the nation is by far the most problematic, especially within culturally diverse countries, such as those of the Andean region. The official national discourse of the nineteenth century, by nature of the creation of the nation, excludes indigenous peoples. However it cannot delete their presence or hide the reciprocal actions between peoples. In that regard, the scope of this research includes the interactions between nations, those in the Andes and those Western Europe, between their peoples, and institutions, the most important of which are the national museums.

Following the discussion above, a ***national museum*** must be defined in terms of a nation first, and of its individual attributes second. To begin with, a national museum is, as its name indicates, maintained by a nation, by means of the state. This implies that a national museum is run, partially if not fully, through the allotment of state funds, and as such it is dependent on the correct functioning of the state, and to a lesser degree of the government.

Most of the time, national museums are situated in capital cities, while regional or local governments and foundations fund museums in the periphery. This is not always the case, as can be seen in this research. However, some of the characteristics that national museums share are collection size, its relative historical importance, and its contemporary value.

Not all national museums use the term in their name; some have undergone a reconceptualization of their roles in recent decades and have therefore chosen new names. Other museums use the term as a matter of branding and to belong to a group of nationally funded museums. Examples can be found in Austria in the recently reopened

Weltmuseum Wien, which used to be the National Museum of Ethnology, as well as in the Netherlands where the National Museum of Ethnology is now part of a larger group of three museums, and has been renamed the National Museum of World Cultures.

The concept of nation is also understood to mutate, transform in time. A nation can change its borders and in doing so change part of its history. Archaeological sites as well as cultural proveniences can move from one nation to the other, and in doing so transform the foundational mythos of the nation state. This mutability complicates what can happen to a collection, in terms of classification, or further when contested objects are reclaimed. A site of repatriation will many times have shifted in regards to what is noted as the original collection nation. This will be further explained in chapter 5.

This leads us to the complicated subject of ***collecting***. Many lines of thought in the humanities have looked at collecting from their own vein of study. Psychology, for example, looks at collecting as a manifestation of personal identity (Van der Grijp, 2006). Elsner and Cardinal, in their edited volume *Cultures of Collecting*, have summarized this manner of thought by stating that "As one becomes conscious of one's self, one becomes a conscious collector of identity, projecting one's being onto the objects one chooses to live with. Taste, the collector's taste, is a mirror of self" (Elsner & Cardinal, 1994:3).

The focus on the pathological aspects of collecting on which psychological studies have focused is not a concern for this research (S. Macdonald, 2006; Van der Grijp, 2006). This line of thought does make it apparent that there are important connections to be drawn between the individual impulse to collect and a series of underlying rules and conditions that stimulate collecting outside of the individual scope. Collecting is thus linked to the concept of taste through psychology.

Sociology has also looked at collecting from the perspective of taste. However, in this case, it is taken to be a conflictive notion. Immanuel Kant proposes in *Critique of Judgement*, that taste, is in essence, an antinomy, a judgment of power that is at the same time individual and social, private and public, subjective and objective (Kant in Gronow, 2002: 15). Following this line, sociologists have discussed that taste is indeed not exclusive to the cultural West, but to a society where power is measured not only by relationships but by a person's influence towards objects.[7] A pertinent example is posed by Trever and Pillsbury, who have argued that collecting, in the most overarching sense of the word, was already taking place in the Andes during the Inca Empire with the practice of textile preservation related to Inca mummies (Pillsbury & Trever, 2015: 240).

In that sense, both taste and collecting have been studied a social phenomena, whereby the emulation of the powerful, of what is considered "good taste", becomes standard (Gronow, 2002). Collecting thus becomes the practice of taste possessed, controlled, and showcased. Similarly, Pomian has defined a collection as a series of objects that have been withdrawn from economic circulation, temporarily or permanently, have been given

7 See Bourdieu's discussion on aesthetics for example (Bourdieu, 1990).

a special standing (protection), and are then exhibited (Pomian, 1987).

It is within this social understanding of collecting that both history and anthropology start looking at the assemblage of collections of ethnographic and archaeological materials. The ongoing exchange of such objects that begins during the sixteenth century and peaks during the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries becomes a frame from which to understand the movement of objects, meanings, and knowledge that characterizes the practice of collecting and the development of archaeology and anthropology as sciences, during particular moments in history.

Macdonald has argued that collecting can only be understood as the practice of creating a "collection," meaning the purposeful selecting and identification of objects to become part of a series of things that hold value together rather than individually (S. Macdonald, 2006:82). It is in this respect, that of creating series – and thereon classifications and typologies – that archaeology and anthropology are inextricably linked to the history of collecting. Riviale, for example, has argued that it is with the push to collect both natural and anthropological specimens that starts in the eighteenth century, and that is guided by an incipient classification of the universe according to natural kingdoms during the nineteenth century, that this relationship can be more clearly seen (Riviale in Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011:10). It is by this desire to collect that a globalizing classification of the world will be constituted. It is this classification, in turn, that would allow for the emergence of "science," and thereafter the system of knowledge production from which anthropology and archaeology today organize their studies (Riviale in Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011:225).

Going back to the issue of collections themselves, and following Appadurai and Clifford, anthropology has defined collections as sets of objects that have been taken out of their utilitarian context, and have been revalorized in relation to the other objects that are part of a whole. In that sense, the value of a collection is not measured by its individual parts but only when taken as a whole (Appadurai, 1994; Clifford, 1988). This value can be ascribed from a series of dimensions, for example, the completeness of a collection, its accessibility (private or public), its spatial distribution (in relation to where it is currently situated), the economic transactions that led to its formation, and its historic transcendence (what is collected according to a specific time) (Pomian, 2001).

It is through these dimensions that a collection is no longer a group of objects, but a connecting point to the invisible aspects of social, cultural and political interactions. Collecting is then the transformation of things into objects of signification, where the systems of circulation in which they move at one point or another in their histories become a reflection of a larger history.

The previous definition included the transformation of things into signification within the desire to collect. In practice, those significations are a reflection, on the public

and private spheres, of ***identity***. The term identity is used to refer to social categories[8] and to socially distinguishing features, and sometimes to both at the same time. Identity, in that regard, "refers to the ways in which individuals and collectivities are distinguished in their social relations with other individuals and collectivities" (Jenkins, 1996:4).

There are numerous definitions and studies surrounding the use of the term "identity" in anthropology. It is important to stress that nations, as much as cultures, more often than not, include a plethora of contradicting characteristics as part of the same collective, and hence cannot be essentialized, starting with critiques of essentialism, especially as linked with history and archaeology.[9] Indeed, when considering the processes of formation of nation-states in the Andes, essentialism cannot be applied, as the nation itself is ill suited for definition in those terms.

For the purpose of this research, identity is understood as the concept presented by Giddens: that of a symbolic construction of self, culturally dependent, and born from opposition (Giddens, 1991). It further delimited here by Touraine as a construction that differs when relating to personhood and to a collective (as an ideological construction) (Touraine, 1997). In that sense, the concept of identity is neither static nor singular; rather it may change through time and allow for plurality in self-determination.

Linking the idea of identity with the terminology described earlier, Bloom has described national identity as the "condition in which a mass of people have made the same identification with national symbols – have internalized the symbols of the nation"(Bloom, 1993,52).

For the research presented in the following pages, the idea that the national museum functions as a platform for the expression and construction through opposition of identity is a central one. In that regard, individual identity is superseded by that of the collective, as represented by a nation, and is so showcased in a national museum. This is particularly relevant when discussing human remains, since they embody different identities: as human beings, as representatives of a social group, and as collected objects.

Another fundamental definition for this dissertation is that of ***human remains***. The working definition for human remains used in this thesis is at the same time very precise and very broad. For this research, the term includes the body of a deceased person, be it whole or in parts, regardless of its stage of decomposition. What the body encompasses includes bones, muscles, tendons, organs, teeth, nails, and hair. Any part of the body will be considered a human remain, even when it has been integrated into a different object (for example wigs, carpets, drinking bowls, shirts, drums, etc.).

In contemporary law, the rights that a person has over his or her dead body have been clearly defined as regards to tissue, blood, and organ donations, postmortem exam-

8 A social category is in itself defined by a series of rules, implicit or explicit, and a series of attributes, that the members of a group share, or to expected behaviors that characterize them (Tajfel, 1981).

9 In regards to essentialism it is worth mentioning Edward Said's critic to the field as necessarily colonial, or rather Eurocentric, overgeneralizing and reductionist.

inations, and the donation of bodies, in part or in whole, for scientific purposes. (For a nuanced discussion on this topic see Masters and Skene, 2002). The same considerations have been applied when discussing human remains in this dissertation, especially when referring to the ethical considerations regarding human remains in museum collections.

Building on the aforementioned definition, the main focus of this research has to do with a particular type of human remain, ***mummified human remains or mummies***. This research's working definition for "mummy" follows the definition made by Cockburn: "The term mummification will be used here to refer to all natural and artificial processes that bring about the preservation of the body or its parts"[10] (Cockburn et al. 1998,155). In that sense, not only full bodies but parts of a body that have been preserved are considered as mummified human remains.

Another important definition arises from the discussion regarding the determination of natural and artificial mummification. For the present study, we shall refer to Cockburn's distinction between artificial, intentional/natural and natural mummification, used to classify all human remains found in archaeological contexts (Cockburn et al. 1998).

The main variance between them is the intentional use of preservation techniques for the remains – be those applied balms, organ removal, drying of the remains, etc. – versus the effects of temperature and soil conditions on the preservation of remains. There is some debate in archaeology about whether the extended use of certain sites and burial types and the refinement of burial deposition for body conservation can be seen as examples of intentional use of natural mummification conditions. In the case of the Andes, there is only one example of reported artificial mummification, that of the Chinchorro mummies. The rest of the remains found have been classified as natural or intentional/natural depending on the region and the temporal depth of a burial tradition.

The remains' specific cultural contexts that form part of the different collections studied in this research will be described in following chapters. Given the wide variety of traditions present in the case studies, they are not considered when defining a body as a mummy.

The final term that needs to be explored before addressing the theoretical premises of this research is that of ***authenticity***. Its use implies originality and the idea that something has retained properties as close to their true form as possible. This narrow conception of what is authentic has been widely debated by archaeology and history, recognizing that an object may be authentic in a particular context and at a particular time without having been so in others. In that sense, the definition of authentic within archaeology is subject to an extensive and on-going discussion (Holtorf & Schadla-Hall, 1999; Jones, 2010; Smith, 2001).

10 It is important here to clarify that hair, teeth, nails and bones do not undergo a specific treatment for their preservation. In that regard, they cannot be considered mummies in their own right, but only in association with other parts of the body which have undergone an artificial process, or, in the case of wigs, have been specifically fashioned to be part of a mummy.

In this research, the working definition for "authentic" has been limited to the proximate claim to originality of the objects (Smith 2001,443). In other words, we use the term authenticity to reflect the implicit assumption that what we are seeing is a direct reflection of how it was found in its original context, without intentional modification of content and position, and more importantly, that the relation between two objects (in this case the human remains and their associated artifacts) has not been disrupted (Holtorf and Schadla-Hall 1999).

The seven concepts explored in the previous sections showcase some of the on-going discussion in sociology, anthropology and archaeology. They also highlight the importance of confining arguments within particular definitions, in order to provide clear statements. The following sections present discussions on broader considerations of the issues in this research, as mentioned in the introduction.

2.2 Collecting as a Historical Narrative

This research is limited by two critical political shifts, both with impacts on a global scale that dramatically changed the motives and ways of collecting between Europe and the Americas. The first, and perhaps most telling, is the independence and consolidation of nations. The second is the start of the Second World War during the mid-1930s that would culminate in the institutionalization of international cooperation through the creation of the United Nations and its subcommittees in 1945 (Carbonell, 2012; Crane, 1997).

The practice of collecting and its political dimension experienced little change until the late 1930s when the issues surrounding the Second World War had a significant impact on them (Crane, 1997). The gifts and exchanges between institutions, that had become more common at the beginning of the century ceased, and private collecting of archaeological objects by tourists and foreign collectors slowed almost to a halt. By the end of the war, both international relationships and the antiquities market had to rebalance and adjust. In addition, by the 1960s, most countries in the Andes had established legal precedents to prevent the exportation of their cultural heritage.[11] These national drives culminated in the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property on November 14th, 1970 (UNESCO, 1970).

Given that collecting is a political exercise at a national level, looking at the objects and communications exchanged between collectors becomes a great way to understand the political relationships between Europe and the new American nations, and em-

11 For example, in Peru regulations were formalized by the Decreto Supremo N° 89, enacted on April 2nd 1822, though not enforced regularly until 1911, with the Decreto Supremo N° 2612 ofAugust 19. In Colombia the earliest law is the Ley 103 of 1931, related to the site of San Agustín and reinforced nationally by 1936. In Chile the first drafted law is that of 1925, the "Ley sobre Monumentos Nacionales," which would be reformulated in 1970 as Ley 17.288.

phasizes the role of gift-giving of cultural objects in cementing such relationships.[12]

The aspects of nostalgia, imagination, and amusement that story-telling encompasses must also be considered when looking at collecting as a creation of narratives, (Elsner & Cardinal, 1994; Geurds & Broekhoven, 2013; Hallam & Street, 2013). A clear example of this exercise is presented by Cummins. In his work he considers the practice of collecting pre-Columbian objects during the colonial occupation in Peru as a way to retain historical memory and reinforce cultural heritage (Cummins, 1998). Similarly, Julien (1999) and Sullivan (2007) have attempted to understand European collecting of Peruvian art and archaeological objects (Julien, 1999; Stanfield-Mazzi, 2009; Sullivan, 2007).

Within that understanding, the collections of Andean human mummies in Western Europe, especially by those countries that had a pivotal role in the conquest and colonization of the Americas, garner great importance in grasping these political relations. The way in which these highly sensitive collections were formed, their transition – their re-contextualization – from when they were collected to the role they now play in the museums where they are stored and exhibited, has helped shape the representation of what is known as "the Andes" where they are exhibited. In other words, they allow an understanding of the narrative about the Andes that has been told by the collecting of its mummies.

As previously mentioned, the particular time frame outlined for this research marks the beginning of a transformative political, economic and social period in the Andes: that of independence from the Spanish Crown and the difficult quest to form the present nation-states (Cañizares-Esguerra, 2001; Earle, 2007). It also marks a period of profound evolution of institution of museums, both in Europe and in the Americas. The practice of collecting finds itself in center stage for national identity building, and in entering that stage both objects and collectors initiate a narrative that transcends to modern times (Anishanslin, 2013, 2013; Gänger, 2014b; Kohl et al., 2014; S. J. Macdonald, 2012; Mahoney, 2012; Pearce, 1994).

It has been widely regarded that the Industrial Revolution sparked what would become an era of collecting of mass-produced objects at a popular level, while at the same time encouraging elitist collecting of art and antiquities, and the acceleration of museum formation. Van del Grijp notes that in this period three general tendencies can be noted: the "democratization" of private collections that included archives, exotic plants and animals, antiquities, art and ethnographical objects; the institutionalization of this process through museums, universities, public libraries, botanical gardens and even zoological gardens; and finally the continuous mutual encouragement between the private and public collectors that led to competition and tensions in the formation of these collections (Van der Grijp, 2006).

12 This is especially true for mummies at the beginning of the twentieth century, as will be seen in chapter 3 in detail.

The narratives put forward by what was collected and exhibited by the national museums – of natural history, archaeology and anthropology— in England, Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Denmark, Austria, Switzerland and Sweden, become especially relevant. They allow a differentiation between the narrative used within a public institution with a history that begins before the nineteenth century, and that continues to be maintained and supported at the state level, from those narratives that can be told in more secluded settings, such as private collections, smaller institutions like as University museums, heritage centers, or even municipal and regional museums. The museum, in that sense, also holds political responsibilities. According to Tony Bennet, a modern museum demands there "should be parity of representation for all groups and cultures within the collecting, exhibition and conservation activities of museums, and the demand that the members of all social groups should have equal practical as well theoretical rights of access to museums" (Bennett, 2013:9)[13].

Precisely, one of the main differences between these types of institutions, and therefore the collections housed within them, is the permanent character of the public collection. Private collections can be dismembered, sold and dispersed according to personal histories – death and economic misfortunes for example – while national institutions are built to transcend the individual lives of their founders (Van der Grijp, 2006). As is clearly put by Van der Grijpt: "The nation-state makes itself both subject and object of this new cult [of collections as knowledge] by founding, maintaining and extending museums, and by representing in them its own history, both national and colonial, as well as its own culture, the natural history, the activities of the different professional groups within the frontiers, the big men produced by the nation, and its major products" (Van der Grijp, 2006).

For the purpose of this research, it is relevant to understand not only the history of scientific knowledge production that led to the formation of the mentioned collections but also to look at the political, economic, and social circumstances that strengthen that history, and the discussions regarding concepts and terminology that have shaped the understanding of said history by social scientists.

Over the last thirty years, many paradigms of knowledge production have changed. The introduction of concepts such as modern and postmodern, postcolonial and de-colonized, globalization and hybridization, to name a few, have shifted interpretations of the world which had, in many ways, remained unchanged since the nineteenth century

13 This is not always the case. Especially for the last point, in regards to the theoretical rights of access to museums, Bourdieu has argued, particularly in regards to art museums, that "is the accumulated effect of exposures and experiences in upbringing and schooling that generates adult cultural dispositions. Rather than originating in 'virtues inherent to the person,' these form within the fields of 'unequal education' and socialization though which individual trajectories pass" (Bourdieu, Darbel, & Schnapper, 1991: 111-112). In other words, if life experiences have not taken a person to a museum frequently, they are less likely to go to a museum.

(Coronil, 2004; Dube, 1999; Escobar, 2004; Loomba, 2015; Quijano, 2000).

The creation of narratives about the Andes from the collections of pre-Columbian and colonial antiquities is a relevant window into these issues, as mentioned earlier. Besides looking at the narrated histories of collections in terms of identity and representation, it is important to look at them simultaneously in terms of their political weight. This, following Appadurai's view of commodities, which ascribes the notion that all collections are commodities, and as such, inherently political (Appadurai, 1994) [1986]: 57). Collections are born and imagined through trade and through value systems that change and shift with the cultural body in which they are embedded (S. Macdonald, 2006; Pearce, 1994).

In those terms then, it is of vital importance to understand the political process in which these collections were circulating during the time period studied by this thesis. The best approach to understanding these issues requires that Andean collections be viewed through the traditional power relations that were involved in their formation, and the possibilities for resistance to those relations as highlighted by Stanfield-Mazzi, 2009). Methodologies and strategies born in Europe and transformed within Latin America provide the most appropriate theoretical framework to address these issues, such as postcolonialism and more precisely the idea of "Coloniality."

As a starting point, it is useful to contemplate the theoretical and methodological shift in the thinking of the social sciences from colonialism to postcolonialism. The first is a product of institutionalized repression, which systematically suppresses specific ideologies, knowledge and associated symbols that were not part of the European global mind-frame; while at the same time appropriating (expropriating) from the colonized the knowledge that helped to reinforce the colonial enterprise (Quijano, 2007).

Colonialism cannot be understood separately from modernity. At the same time that Europe was expanding its control over the Americas; within its borders the idea of a rule of rationality, of the modern, was being consolidated. As Quijano puts it, "Such confluence between coloniality and the elaboration of rationality/modernity was not in any way accidental, as is shown by the very manner in which the European paradigm of rational knowledge was elaborated" (Quijano, 2007).

Taking into account the importance of national identity building during the period of 1810-1850, the founding of cultural institutions like national museums became necessary. In these institutions, what is stored, collected, and exchanged becomes part of the political identity of the new nation and consolidated by the end of the period. This founding presence of the national museum makes it a key piece to understanding the development of collecting relationships between Europe and the Americas.

After the political and organizational changes that started in the nineteenth century with the independence of colonized lands, the idea of a world that was now "postcolonial" took root. Simply put, postcolonialism is a current of thought that tries to look

at knowledge production through its political production, both in terms of what was produced from and by the people that live in countries that are no longer colonized, and how the previously existing power relation created the subjugation of knowledge that was not created in Europe (Escobar, 2004; Quijano, 2000).

Nevertheless, adhering to the later conceptualization of postcolonialism that emerged in the 1970s through critical studies of the effects of colonialism on knowledge production (especially literature), by making use of postmodern perspectives, the picture becomes more nuanced. In fact, both the postmodern and poststructuralist premises became pivotal to understanding postcolonialism (Coronil, 2004). In that sense, the biggest contribution of postcolonial studies is to see colonialism as an inextricable constituent part of the world we now live in, while at the same time contesting modernity and the presupposition that knowledge is exclusively western (Coronil, 2004; Quijano, 2000).

Though the initial conceptualization of the West, as argued by Said, is in large part reductionist (Said, 1979; Said, 1985), now it is used to refer to that technological, political and economic influence that radiates not from one but multiple centers, including Europe, the United States, Japan, Australia, the Soviet Union and China, in what Duvignaud has termed a variety of "macro sociological" contexts (Duvignaud, 1973).

Postcolonialism is therefore not a corpus of intellectual production aimed at understanding the world after colonization, but rather a critique of modernity and the colonial construction of knowledge. It has been argued that this critique can be made visible by postmodernism, post-occidentalism and postcolonialism, according to the areas of the world where it is produced, be it Europe, Asia, Africa or Latin America (Mignolo, 1993). In that sense, postcolonialism seems hard to define, too broad-reaching. It can be argued that the use of the literal meaning of postcolonialism, as a large umbrella to encompass any study conducted in the "Third World," has contributed to its criticism, and therefore relevance, in social sciences.

Postcolonialism has been accused of not recognizing the persistence of power structures that remain very unbalanced, made more visible by the concepts of imperialism and neo-colonialism, that maintain relations of dependency (Coronil, 2004). Though this thesis is in agreement with this critique, it is also in agreement with Escobar when he argues that a way to get past these issues is, rather, epistemological: questioning the idea of modernity as an "intra-European phenomenon" (Escobar, 2004). This reconceptualization of modernity allows us to appreciate those practices and knowledge that had been made subaltern to modernity, and made invisible, but which are still present. It is this way of looking at the postcolonial world that has been grouped as "coloniality," and its manifestations of knowledge, power and being that imperialism/neo-colonialism tries to contain (Escobar, 2004).

Furthermore, coloniality is an important part of modernity; it is linked with the idea of oppositions between the First and Third Worlds, for example. As Escobar explains, "The conceptualization of modernity/coloniality is grounded in a series of operations that

distinguish it from established theories" (Escobar, 2004). These concepts include locating modernity as a consequence of the European discovery of America and the subsequent colonies that started in 1492, and not as a phenomenon born at the end of the eighteenth century with the Enlightenment. As such, it is constituted by colonialism, postcolonialism and imperialism, since it cannot be understood as anything but a series of constructs designed to exercise dominion over non-European, and hence "a conception of Eurocentrism as the knowledge form of modernity/coloniality—a hegemonic representation and mode of knowing that claims universality for itself, derived from Europe's position as center" (Escobar, 2004). In this regard, the production of Indigenous Methodologies, methodologies that include indigenous thought, worldviews, and approaches to practices, is fundamental[14].

In that sense coloniality has been understood, especially by Latin American authors, as a complex or multi-faceted concept. It includes the recognition of a global power model tightly linked to capitalism: coloniality of power, as explained by Quijano (Quijano, 2000); an understanding of the cultural dimensions, cultural differences of the "subalternisation processes effected by the coloniality of power" seen as global coloniality by Mignolo (Mignolo, 1993); and the idea of a coloniality of being, as the "ontological dimension of coloniality" as explained by Nelson Maldonado-Torres (Maldonado-Torres, 2004).

These concepts and their discussion are particularly relevant in the case of Latin America, and especially in understanding the history of knowledge production regarding the Andes. As Cañizares-Esguerra so lucidly argues: "The struggle of Latin American intellectuals to correct what they considered to be stereotypes about Latin America circulating among the North Atlantic public survived through the nineteenth century. In fact it still continues" (Cañizares-Esguerra, 2001).

It is important here to mention that internal colonialism, the dominion of one culture over other within the same nation, is still a prevalent situation in Andean nations. The voices of indigenous peoples, hindered by lack of representation on political spheres, continue to be silenced by others.

Today's museum collections still reflect nineteenth-century notions, be they of classification, exhibition and research, but those notions are not necessarily at odds with the ones presented and continuously used in Latin America and particularly in the mummies' source countries.

2.3 Materiality Translated

What is collected, and from whom, has changed repeatedly since the fifteenth century, but the principle of collecting archaeological and ethnographical objects remains constant: the desire to understand the "other" (be it people, a moment in time, a tradition,

14 Further reading on the topic include Linda Tuhiwai's "Decolonizing Methodologies", and Larry Zimmerman's "Liberating Archaeologies: Liberation Archaeologies and WAC."

etc.) (Anishanslin, 2013; Pearce, 1994). Collections are classified, organized and arranged for public or private viewing, and in doing so display not only history but reproduce an understanding of it (Anishanslin, 2013; Bernstein, 1989; Pearce, 1994). These "others" are then not only understood by the collector, but represented to an intended audience in an effort to communicate —and allow them to share– this understanding (Pearce, 1994). It is through the dialogue between what is collected and what is exhibited that objects, in turn, become the representation of the "other."

This research is based on the understanding that museums, as the physical repositories of collections, become collectors themselves. As in private collections where objects are selected, organized and exhibited according to the collector's scale of value, in a museum objects too are classified according to an invisible set of values. According to Macdonald, a museum is "*an institution of recognition and identity par excellence"* (S. Macdonald, 2006:4). The collections exhibited and stored in a museum obey a selection of specific cultural products that are linked to the official discourse; identities are either omitted or affirmed. These are the narratives transmitted both through spatial and language cues to the public visiting the museum's rooms.

Many authors have explored the link between language and power (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991; Fairclough, 2001), language as a reflection of personal identity (Edwards, 2009), and social identity (Heller, 2003). For this research, the most interesting part of language is its malleability, a property most visible through the practice of translation, by which meanings can be created or adjusted in order to communicate across cultures. Language has been recognized as not only a social construct, but also as being framed in temporal and geographically specific manners. The words used and read are chosen from those discourses available at a specific point in time (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008:349).

Once objects are integrated into a museum, they are cataloged and renamed according to specific classifications. The language used to describe them becomes part of their identity. Susan Bassnet has argued that translational studies are a useful tool to understand the nuances of power relationships. By understanding the words and synonyms used and the way meanings have been adapted, we can start to see intentionality in what words communicate. Translation, she says, is "never innocent" (Bassnett, 2013).

Accession books, museum inventories, object labels and descriptions are interspersed with such translations, as are many other documents written about museum collections and the practice of collecting. For example, in the nineteenth century, travelers, missionaries and ethnographers all adopted linguistic styles that would distinguish their writings from one another (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008:353). Museums have adapted their language –and therefore the tools they use to communicate a certain narrative– through two key terms: poetics and politics (Karp, 2012; Lidchi 1997 in Mason in Macdonald, 2006:20). The first term is the meaning conveyed through the ordering and unification of the elements in an exhibit –to create authenticity, for example– while the second is the intention-

ality or role of the exhibit on a social scale. An entrance into this discursive world has been found by examining the words used to describe the collections examined in this research,.

Traditional historiography has provided most of the literature on the history of museum and collection formation by approaching the subject through a timeline of collection making, their impact on the state-making process (Mahoney, 2012), and between whom and when these exchanges took place (Olmi, Impey, & Macgregor, 1985). More recent work by way of micro-histories and connected histories has offered a different perspective on the connections and interactions that impact this collection-making process (Anishanslin, 2013; Françozo & Strecker, 2017). This information is clearly valuable. It shows trajectories and voices intentions by giving names and places to the people who collected the objects we now see displayed. The aforementioned literature has, for example, been of great importance to identify two big moments of museum creation in the time frame on which this thesis focuses, between 1849 and 1884 and later from 1890 to 1931 (before and during the colonization of Africa by European nations) (Shelton in Macdonald, 2006, 65). However, for the most part, history has seen collecting as a process, and therefore the objects that make up part of that process are largely ignored, considered only as examples of traceable trajectories, or iconic[15] collecting strategies.

With a few exceptions where researchers have tried to link objects directly to the history of collection making (Gänger, 2014b; Kohl et al., 2014), objects have been largely up-staged by their collectors. It is only recently that authors like Ganger have taken a similar stance to those of Bruno Latour and Johanness Fabian to argue that the collecting of antiquities should be seen not just as an objects, but as a category. Therefore, it is only through looking at the objects agency within categories that we can understand their circulation and relationship with nation-making and knowledge production processes (Gänger, 2014: 6).

More recently, the notion of collecting as not only classification –lived and experienced– but as a narrative has become prevalent. In that sense, collecting becomes an expression of the desire of humankind to tell stories, where objects take the place of words (Elsner & Cardinal, 1994:103). For Elsner and Cardinal, this narrative creates a history of collecting that recounts the way in which human beings "have striven to accommodate, to appropriate and to extend the taxonomies and systems of knowledge they have inherited" (Elsner & Cardinal, 1994: 2). If one is to consider that collecting is a narrative of what surrounds us, then the notion of collecting as a reflection of the collector's identity, projected into the objects he collects, mirroring tastes and experiences, must also be contemplated, as has been argued by Elsner & Cardinal, (1994).

15 In the sense of collecting icons as well as strategies for collecting that would become iconic of the period, such as those implemented by scientific missions in the late nineteenth century by intellectual societies and institutions in France and Germany.

Collected objects are separated from their original contexts and become re-contextualized by placing them within new narratives. The collection in itself, as a group of associated objects, stops being textual narrative and is turned into material reality "in which the objects attain the function of memory trace" (Van der Grijp, 2006). At the same time that collection occurs, new identities are created; firstly, that of the individual as a collector, and later by reflecting the narratives of the world on the objects collected.

The term ***narratives*** is used throughout this research as interchangeable with that of ***accounts***, ***descriptions*** or perhaps more accurately ***histories***. Several narratives can be read from any particular object, with an emphasis on those that address identity.

In those terms, collecting antiquities is a form of identity construction. Since the focus of this research is the collecting practices of national institutions, it follows that it concentrates on the role of antiquities collecting in the formation of the identity of a nation. Museums are considered a platform on which two narratives meet regarding the same object, that of the national trajectory and the relation of that trajectory to the others (Carbonell, 2012:75). Both narratives are influenced by the representation of the other in a specific way, understanding that precisely that portrayal embodies relations of power, authority and meaning, be they of complicity or resistance, and shapes the perception of self (Carbonell, 2012: 75). The task of identifying these narratives involves understanding the abstraction of identity into objects, which in turn become actors in a play, "staged to be read as if they were the relics or effect of that abstract identity" (Preziozi in Carbonell, 2012: 88). In that sense, the museum also becomes a location where knowledge is translated from object to meaning, but especially from foreign meaning to local understanding. Indeed, in considering collecting and exhibiting as synonymous to translations, it follows that most museum exhibitions in Europe where this research has been conducted exist to make knowledge from other cultures translatable to "western" understanding. In this case in particular, that western understanding is itself embedded in a particular historical context, and therefore, a particular historical narrative.

On those terms, and having explored the way materials are translated into different meanings according to the dominating zeitgeist of where they are held, it is useful to consider the practice of archaeology, in particular its relation to human remains.

There are close to 300 years of professional archaeological and anthropological practice that have dealt with the description and classification of human remains. Human remains have been seen as both object and people, and as such, their handling in museum collections has been complicated. The variables taken into account have changed in order to accommodate the transformations of scientific and non-scientific knowledge. The way researchers have used them and the way they have been presented or hidden from the public has also undergone drastic transformations, directly linked to what is perceived as ethical and suitable for a targeted audience.

Within the humanities, Igor Kopytoff has advanced this stance significantly by arguing that it is the biography of things that leads us to meanings. According to Kopytoff, things and people can be equally questioned, in terms of their status, life journey, and how its/their identity has changed through time according to their roles or usefulness during each of those stages, all of which are culturally defined (Kopytoff, 1986: 66–68). Things move from one stage of circulation to another through their lives, objects in collections, for example, are now outside of the commodities circulation system, but they can go back into it if they are sold, exchanged or deaccessioned.[16] The control of access to or restriction of those means of exchange, for any commodity, but especially for antiquities, is politically managed, and by observing the point at which things enter or leave the systems of exchange, pieces of that political interaction can become visible.

In that sense, political interactions are crucial because politics are power relations, perceived by the rules of social control they entail. The practical manifestations of politics can be seen in ascribing value to things (production cost versus market price), and the tensions this produces. For Appadurai and many others, these politics take many forms, including those of display, authenticity and demand, and they affect the circuits within which the objects move (Appadurai, 1994:90).

A main difference between Kopytoff and Appadurai's discourses is that they state there is a clear difference in the way objects and people are considered. For both, things are commodities, while people are individuals. The former are meant to be owned, while the latter are not subject to ownership or possession. Though slavery is seen as the exception to the rule, as an "intellectual and moral problem in the West" (Kopytoff, 1986:84), here it is argued that human bodies have been and are still being commodified through collecting.

Human remains in museum collections are a complicated issue precisely because of their apparent dichotomy as commodities and people. Theoretical approaches of material culture studies in archaeology from the last 30 years have tried to discuss this issue from the perspective of embodiment. The philosophical discussions that led to the creation of the term embodiment are particularly enlightening for this research.

A direct line can be drawn between the sociological practice theories of Bourdieu and Giddens and the way archaeology has looked at the impact of material structures in the

16 Deaccessioning is the process followed by a museum to dispose permanently of an object or series of objects from their collections, as well as to document the reasons why those elements are no longer stored in the museum collections. Deaccessioning takes place, for example, when objects are no longer supporting the museum's mission statement, when they can no longer be stored, preserved and used, or when their authenticity or physical integrity is in doubt. In that sense, it is argued that the sale, trade, or indefinite loan for research activities of museum collections can only take place if the overall result is the advancement of a museum's mission statement. Associations such as ICOM have created codes of ethics in relation to the practice, where the main ethical considerations are the prohibition of selling objects to museum members and stakeholders, or the transfer of those objects to the same groups and their relatives; and the need control and regulate the use of the proceeds from sales or actions of the items (Lewis, 2003).

world and in people, or in other terms embodied practice (Ahmed, 2000; Crossland, 2012). The body becomes the conduit for the reproduction and integration of social and material structures, for Bordieu through the habitus (Bourdieu, 1990), while for Giddens it is through specific structures (Giddens, 1991). The impact of Foucault's perspectives on the lived body has likewise impacted archaeological perceptions of human remains (Hicks & Beaudry, 2010).

Crossland very clearly summarized the impact of these theoretical approaches on how the human body is thought of in archaeology (Crossland, 2012). She argues that in archaeological practice there are two currents that look at bodies in very different ways. In the first, bodies are social constructs and therefore past bodies become artifacts that need be understood only in conjunction with the social practices in which they are embedded and as reflection of identity –meaning as part of the understanding of mortuary treatments, in relation to grave goods, etc. The second perspective, the bio-archaeological approach, places the human body as a source of data in itself about the living – diet, living conditions, demographics, etc. This division stems from the birth of archaeology and anthropology as products of enlightened thought, again going back to the division of the world in a dichotomy between nature and culture, the physical and the subjective (Thomas 2004 in Crossland 2012).

Archaeological theory first started to concern itself with the body in relation to sex and gender, and from there, with the importance of considering the body as constructed through life experiences, as established in the previous paragraph. A very good example of archaeological thinking of bodies through their materiality can be found in the works of Joanna Sofaer. Gender and age can be used as a platform to discuss how these two seemingly opposed perspectives of the human skeleton can, in reality, find a common ground through methodology (Sofaer, 2006). Crossland and Sofaer both recognize that this division, at times highly problematic, begins with the separation of body and mind that can be traced to the consideration of the dead as no longer socially active, and therefore assumed to be no longer capable of agency. It is important to understand, however, that while it is precisely considering dead bodies as such that allows for archaeology to excavate burial contexts and conduct bio-archaeological analysis, it simultaneously conflicts with the interpretations that archaeology is exploring while researching those same contexts.

There are several examples in which the dead are seen to have agency (Hertz 1960 in Crossland, 2012), but perhaps the most relevant for this thesis is the example of the Inca royal mummies, in which a dead body is considered to both have a stake among the living and to be a conduit with the world of the death (Salomon, 1995; Sillar, 1996). Tim Ingold explains this cases by saying:

Although the materiality of the corpse is situated within a discursive field that brings it into being as a corpse and as an object that can be excavated and dissected, at the same time el-

ements of the corpse's materiality escape and disrupt this field, contributing to the perception of the corpse as active and 'enminded' (Ingold 2000a: 170 in Hicks & Beaudry, 2010).
It has been argued that the more a body resembles the living after death, the harder it is for it to be considered an object, in the medical and the anthropological fields alike (Garret, J. Harris, 1988; Walker, 2000). There is a pronounced gap between the practice of archaeology and the discourse built around human remains, but it is precisely through the consideration of their agency in relation to the living, past and present, that perhaps some of these gaps may be narrowed. The relationship of the living with the dead is a subjective one, led by emotional responses in regard to death, and in that sense, no observation of human remains is completely devoid of feeling. Bio-archaeologists say the dead speak through their bones, for example, and hence they still have a role in contemporary society.

2.4 The Role of Ethics in Regard to Human Remains Collections

Much has been written regarding the ethical considerations of human remains in museum collections; an ongoing debate on the use and display of these remains in the context of a museum has existed since 1990. Three main issues that have been included in this debate and will be the center of our discussion are: 1) the exhibiting of human remains in museum contexts; 2) the conservation and protection of human remains in museum contexts; and 3) the claims for repatriation and reburial of human remains that are part of museum collections.

During this research the aim is to emphasize that to talk about ethics is also to talk about cultural perceptions and about views that can be colored by historical processes such as colonialism, national conflict and times of war. In fact, discussions regarding what is ethical or not are very often enveloped within highly political national discussions regarding identity and heritage, and can, therefore, be hard to discuss in a "one-size-fits-all" fashion. Nevertheless, for the particular case of human remains, at least one consideration is clear and can be universally recognized: when we discuss human remains, we are actively engaging with our thoughts about the dead and death in the present (Macdonald, 1998).

The push given by strong social movements who openly addressed the need for ethical standards to be written down and put into practice would ultimately lead to the creation of the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in the 1990s. Vast literature can be found on the motivations, struggles, and acknowledgment of NAGPRA at a national and international level Rose (1996), Clark (1996), Nash and Colwell-Chanthaphonh (2010). Undoubtedly, the impact of this legislation has dramatically changed the relation between archaeologists and other social scientists with human remains.

This social interest provided the momentum for international organizations such as the International Council on Museums (ICOM), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the World Archaeology Congress (WAC) to establish standards and recommendations for subscribing nations to deal with the safekeeping and protection of heritage that includes human remains. Similarly, professional associations such as the Society for American Archaeologists (SAA) have developed ethics and practice codes that are in line with this movement.

Since then, national and international agreements have been reached, taking into account the views of a variety of stakeholders. Given this situation, we are left to wonder why are there still so many challenges when dealing with the use of human remains in professional practice? One reason may be the broadness of the agreements. Because of the nature of the institutions that are behind them, these agreements serve as general guidelines of professional conduct, more so than directives for practice, and therefore there is flexibility in their enforcement. While there is awareness that respect and honorable treatment should be given to the remains, that their wishes should be honored as well as those of their descendants, and though the involvement of formerly-ignored stakeholders is embraced, there are still considerations and actions to be taken regarding human remains collections on a case by case basis (Larsen and Walker, 2005; Walker, 2000).

There are three pieces of legislation or treaties drafted by world organizations regarding to human remains research, conservation, and preservation. Of these, the proceedings of the World Archaeology Congress (WAC) meeting in 1989 in South Dakota, US, named The Vermillion Accord on Human Remains, was the first (The Vermillion Accord on Human Remains, 1989). This accord covers in six points the ideals represented by WAC regarding the importance of human remains, highlighting the importance of dialog with native communities and the consideration of the research value of contested human remains. A year later at WAC's meeting held at Barquisimeto, Venezuela, the issue of human remains and archaeological practice was addressed again, this time as part of the Code of Ethics of WAC.

UNESCO has included funerary remains to the list of protected cultural property in all its declarations concerning the protection of material culture since 1964, having a special consideration in 1978 "Recommendation on the Protection of Moveable Cultural Property," and more recently in 2001 an entire subchapter of Rule 5 of the "Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage" (Carducci, 2002; Dromgoole, 2003).

On a national scope, the consideration of the ethical and procedural issues of working with human remains has been varied. For the most part, it has been addressed through the creation of institutional codes of ethics, by the regulations of national museum associations, and by professional associations. Particular emphasis has been given to the topic of repatriation of contested human remains (Márquez-Grant, Litherland, & Roberts, 2012).

There are plenty of laws that regulate excavation and research on human remains in countries that have dealt or are dealing with armed conflict and civil war in Latin America. Such is the case of Guatemala, El Salvador, Colombia, Peru, Chile, Uruguay and Argentina (Marquez- Grant & Fibiger, 2011). However, those provisions deal exclusively with forensic contexts where the current political implications of the remains make them subject to a variety of different legislations.

If social scientists are considering anonymity as a tool to protect victims and informants and to try and keep patent the political layer of research in the present, it is necessary to consider how the former codes of ethics and practice for dealing with human remains need to change to ensure the same respect. There are very important differences between the conceptions of ownership of human remains among the existing legislation. The definition of consent as seen by NAGPRA and the Human Tissue Act, (regulations regarding the property of living and dead human tissue as ruled by the UK in 2004) is a clear example of this contradiction. While remains older than 100 years and procured before the enactment of the regulations can be stored and kept by an institution, for recently discovered remains, there is no time frame that can supersede the needed consent from the descendants.

Considering the usefulness of medical research collections all over the world, and the use they have had for the creation of forensic anthropology standards for calculation of age, ancestry, sex and stature of individuals, then the holding of vast quantities of human remains should be an uncontested necessity. However, given the advancement of medical imaging techniques that make some of the measuring and identification of traits more precise, as well as allowing for the data to be stored permanently in a variety of digital forms, we need to question if there is still a real need to keep physical specimens in collections and, even more so, if there is a reason to enlarge those existing collections. Are endless rows of boxes with human remains neatly stored in human remains repositories really needed? (Albertti & Hallam, 2013; Balistreri, 2014) If so, are these remains being treated with respect and dignity or are there additional measures that should be taken to assure this happens. If the conclusion is reached that there is no need to have human remains repositories in institutions, then the question becomes, as has been pointed out by (Aranda, García, Díaz & Díaz, 2014), what should happen to them?.

Most of the remains in holding cannot be identified, they belong either to unclaimed or unidentified victims of crime, as well as to ethnographical collections that have no recorded provenance and therefore cannot be repatriated to a specific group of descendants. What is the best practice in those cases? Consider for example the numbers of people that donate their remains to science, including forensic research facilities such as body farms all over the world (Bass, Bass, & Jefferson, 2004; Mertens & Garrett, 2003). Can we argue the same ethical principles for the holding and storing of those remains as we do for the unidentified? It may be safest here to once again advocate for a case-by-case approach.

Furthermore, assessing these various claims for repatriation is a complex matter involving permutations of three variables: the age of the skeletal material, the time at which the material was unearthed (ranging from the present to, most commonly, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries), and the manner of death (at its extremes either natural death or murder). These three variables can be thought of as three independently operating sliding scales (Page 2011; Jenkins, 2012).

To further complicate the matter, there is fierce opposition to the idea of repatriation from some scientific lines. The significance of archaeological and anthropological remains outside and beyond of the groups to which they belong to has been quoted as a reason to "question the wisdom of handing back remains to indigenous groups" (Quigley, 2001). This is further reinforced by opinions such as the one by Jane Buikstra, a preeminent forensic anthropologist, who argues that "in addition to piecing together the past, collections of human remains are necessary to train forensic anthropologists to carry out identification procedures" (Buikstra, 1981).

The history of collections of human remains, particularly in Europe and the US, has to do with the housing of specimens for medical examination and anthropological studies (Quigley, 2001). The fact that these collections are still in use for ends other than archaeology complicates the applicability of the law and expands the debate of repatriation to a case-by-case basis, taking into account not only the legality of the claims but the value ascribed to remains by the scientific community. It is in those specific cases where the Vermillion Accord and subsequent agreements are particularly relevant. However, the fact remains that "In some European museums, the skeletal collections are not at risk of being lost, but in danger of not being fully utilized" (Quigley, 2001:124).

The debate around the exhibition of human remains revolves around two arguments: education and entertainment. While most museums will emphasize the educational value of the display of human remains like Egyptian mummies and Bog mummies, there is an increasing trend of showcasing the human remains for entertainment value. That is the case for example of exhibits like "Mummies of the World" or "Body Worlds" (Page, 2011).

The popularization of forensic anthropology by TV series like Bones and C.S.I. has also had an impact on public opinion regarding human remains and their value. Several surveys conducted in museums show that over 60% of the visitors in archaeological museums expect to see human remains (Kilmister 2003;57, Brown, 2011). However, in the same studies, it was shown that: "Of the 80% of respondents who were comfortable viewing ancient remains, over half (54.7%) of these would be sensitive to viewing modern remains" (Kilmister 2003: 61).

Arguments in favor of displaying human remains have to do with the increasing audience interest in topics such as archaeology, history, and science. This has been shown from visitor studies conducted during exhibits such as that of Lindow Man at the Manches-

ter Museum (Brown, 2011), the surveys conducted by Kilmister at the British Museum, Manchester Museum and Petrie Museum (Kilmister, 2003); and the analysis of visitors to the Body World Exhibit of 2007 in London (Albertti et al., 2009).

The main argument against the display of human remains in museums is that, through exhibition, we transform bodies into things and people into objects (Brooks and Rumsey 2006:138 in Cassman et al. 2006). Furthermore, the contexts in which we display them have been manufactured and can only serve the purpose that the curator has decided for them (Albertti et al. 2009:137). Another relevant argument has to do with Article 2 of the Vermillion accord. The displaying of the dead is most of the times a direct disregard to the wishes of the deceased themselves, though admittedly for some archaeological traditions it could be harder to establish. As articulated by Brooks and Rumsay: "Bodies in museums are 'recontextualized human remains' – they have been removed from their place of burial into what is seen as 'another sacred context where they are preserved for a different function" (Brooks and Rumsey 2006: 261 in Cassman et al. 2006).

There are many instances in modern history where human remains have been used in exhibits even against the explicit desires of the individual to which they belonged. For example, the case of Charles Byrne, whose "giant" remains have been exhibited at the Hunterian Museum and have formed part of the collection since the eighteenth century despite his specific instructions to be buried at sea. The ultimate fate of his remains continues to be a topic of discussion in British medical and museum journals (Doyal, Muinzer,et. al., 2011; McAlister, 1974). In a similar fashion, the cases of Sara Baartman and Julia Pastrana, whose bodies were on display while living in a series of freak show-like events and after death continued to be exhibited until their repatriation and reburial decades later.

It is of interest to note that, in these cases, emphasis was made on collecting as much information as possible regarding the body by means of destructive and non-destructive analysis before reburial. As has been noted before, digital images and biological information gathered from individuals by anthropological means can be viewed as valid replacements for their physical counterpart. The question to be asked then is what are the limits and regulations to which those images and samples should be subjected?

Radiological instrument advancement has afforded higher resolution images. Access to equipment by an increasing number of anthropologists has allowed for a close relationship between anthropologists and archaeologists with radiologists, diagnosticians, pathologists and radiographers. In turn, these relationships have led to multiple interdisciplinary research projects and a series of important publications on the use of medical digital imaging for anthropology and archaeology (see for example Beckett 2014; Beckett and Conlogue 2009; Previgliano et al. 2003).

The issue is far from resolved, but the advancement of technology, and more importantly of museum collaboration with source countries and native groups, is opening new discussions and allowing for a transformation of human remains exhibitions. Indeed,

the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) has gone a long way in bringing the viewpoint of these groups into consideration. Further, Article 12 of said declaration establishes that "States shall seek to enable the access and/or repatriation of ceremonial objects and human remains in their possession through fair, transparent and effective mechanisms developed in conjunction with the indigenous peoples concerned" (UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2007).

2.5 Chapter Conclusions

This chapter has explained the main concepts and theoretical premises that guide this research. As stated in the first few lines, its primary aim has been to emphasize different points of inflection that arose while looking at the information available in both documentary sources and the mummies researched. A few key points should be highlighted in those discussions.

The first has to do with the idea of collecting as the transformation of things into objects of signification, where the systems of circulation within which they move at one point or another of their histories becomes a reflection of History. In that sense, the research that is presented in the following pages is both archaeological and historical; it is the archaeology of a series of museum collections.

Furthermore, questioning national museum collections as platforms for the expression, and construction through opposition, of identity is particularly relevant, especially when discussing human remains, since they embody different identities: as human beings, as representatives of a social group and as collected objects.

It is also relevant to underline the importance of looking at these collections in light of nineteenth-century contexts, as well as compared to one another. All the collections researched show commonalities born out of a global change the perception of culture. Therefore, it is by first looking at what the "objects" in and of themselves are saying that we can more accurately reconstruct the narratives that they come to represent once in their current holdings.

Centering on collected objects as the starting points of this research highlights the relevance of the objects exchanged as witnesses of the links that exist between objects' value and paths and politics. It is of vital importance to understand the political process in which these collections are circulating. The best approach to understand these issues requires that Andean collections be viewed through the traditional power relations that formed them, and the possibilities for resistance to those relations.

The way these objects, or in Appadurai's terms, commodities, move and are transacted is embedded with the meaning given to them by the agents/actors who moved them. This is vital in understanding archaeological materials, in particular when looking at museums as collectors, translators, and communicators of object's meanings. Finally, it is also vital to take into account that the particular subset of objects looked at, mummified

human remains, have been seen as both object and people, and as such, their handling in museum collections has been complicated.

The issues pertaining to collecting, exhibiting and storing human remains are far from resolved. This thesis points at the history of their collecting at a national level as means to re-contextualize them in museum collections, as a starting point to embark on further discussion in terms of their roles and permanence in those collections.

From this point onwards, appears a description of the data collected, as well as discussions on how this information, both documentary and archaeological, can be seen.