

Chile, Archaeology and Indigenous Communities of



Patricia Ayala

Chilean Archaeological Society, Santiago, Chile

State of Knowledge and Current Debates

Introduction

After a long history of the denial and assimilation of indigenous peoples in Chile, the existence of ethnic groups in this country was recognized with the enactment of the Indigenous Law in 1993. Consequently, the Chilean State was assumed to be multicultural. This process was undoubtedly framed within a global context of the emergence of indigenous movements of the late twentieth century, in which indigenous leaders and intellectuals, as well as governmental and non-governmental institutions and organizations, and scholars from different disciplines were mobilized in Chile. This scenario implied a new ideological, legal, and institutional context in which the relations of the Chilean State with indigenous peoples changed, since the state moved from an assimilationist and integration policy to one of recognition and promotion of cultural differences. From a position of power different from that of previous years, Indigenous people emerged as agents of a multicultural patrimonialization, postulating a series of demands and leading struggles around the significance and power of their cultural rights

and the resources existing in their territories. In this scenario, Indigenous peoples claimed their rights over Indigenous cultural heritage and their right to participate in the bestowing of meaning, production, and control over this heritage, as agents interested in archaeological heritage and discourses of the past. In a north-south view of the native territories of the indigenous populations in Chile, the currently recognized ethnic groups are Aymara, Quechua, Atacameño, Kolla, Diaguita, Mapuche, Kawésqar, and Yagán, as well as the Rapa Nui that inhabit the Easter Island in Polynesia. Although a significant number continue to live on their original lands, there has historically been a significant migration to nearby cities and even to the capital of the country: Santiago. According to the 2002 census, 692,192 people declared themselves to be indigenous in Chile, corresponding to 4.58% of the total Chilean population.

This essay analyzes the connections between archaeologists and indigenous people in Chile, addressing the Aymara, Atacameño, Mapuche, and Rapa Nui cases in particular, since more information about their heritage claims is available. In order to contextualize the development of archaeology, I discuss relationships between the state and the indigenous peoples and the legislation related to cultural heritage, as well as the dominant theoretical paradigms in the archaeological field. It also reflects on the articulations of this discipline with colonialism, nationalism, and multiculturalism. We analyze the different approaches

from which indigenous peoples have been integrated into the archaeological field, concluding the existence of archaeologies committed to these societies. Finally, this essay addresses cases of reburial and repatriation in the multicultural era.

Colonialist and Nationalist Archaeology

In Chile, the first attempts to analyze the archaeological record occurred during the nineteenth century. Naturalists integrated ethnographic and archaeological studies in their research; they created a taxonomic system of nature ordering that was transferred and included the past and present of indigenous populations (Salazar et al. 2012). Although the contribution of the Chilean State was initially indirect, this changed in the late nineteenth century with the publication of José Toribio Medina's book: *The Aborigines of Chile* in 1882. This book analyzes the first settlements of the country and the Mapuche culture. To this growing interest and the state control of the indigenous past and the archaeological remains, the founding of the Museum of Ethnology and Anthropology in 1912 was added, as well as the law 651 enactment in 1925. Thanks to this law, the Council of National Monuments was created, the institution in charge of the national archaeological heritage up to the present.

From the beginning of the twentieth century, the Chilean State began to support and finance archaeological research in troubled territories. On the one hand, in the north of the country, there was a process of "Chileanization" after the War of the Pacific (1879–1884), a war with Peru and Bolivia, when Chile took control of the northern region of its present territory and embarked on the nationalization of Aymara and Atacameño populations. On the other hand, in the south, it continued with the "Pacificación de la Araucanía," a process through which the country continued taking over the Mapuche territory. From an assimilationist ideology, the indigenous populations were denied and considered in the process of disappearance or extinction. However, the nationalization project required a history that

covered the pre-Hispanic origins of the inhabitants of those territories. In this way, an important scientific activity was developed with the arrival of foreign teams such as the French Scientific Mission, which carried out archaeological and ethnographic research in the north. Besides, in 1911, the government hired German archaeologist and ethnologist Max Uhle, who carried archaeological investigations and historical reconstructions in this part of the country. Due to Uhle's ethnic and culturalist interpretations and his definition of the Atacameño for pre-Hispanic times, these indigenous populations were conceived of as territorialized and to remain in the past. This contributed to the construction of a culturally homogenous nation-state of white-European matrix. Later, Ricardo Latcham contributed to the chronological, spatial, and cultural ordering of the Chilean prehistory and the indigenous groups that inhabited the national territory, highlighting his contribution to the Mapuche archaeology (Salazar et al. 2012).

In the case of Easter Island, which was annexed to Chilean territory in 1888, the earliest archaeological expedition in the twentieth century was carried out by English archaeologist Katherine Routledge (1914–1915). However, according to Vilches (2015) unlike other cases where the political manipulation of knowledge had a sound state control, archaeology on this island was an opportunity for the Chilean nation to take advantage without state planning. Most of the archaeological restoration projects have been at least co-financed with foreign funds, and Chile had the vision to support an activity that did not mean large investments. For other researchers, the early development of archaeology in Easter Island made it possible to know a past almost forgotten by the Rapa Nui population, which was considered to be in a process of cultural disintegration and depopulation since the sixteenth century, increasing from the eighteenth century with the island's discovery by the Western world (Cristino 2011).

From the perspective of the anthropology and archaeology of these times, indigenous populations were considered as objects of study, reminiscent of a past that it was important to know before it disappeared. Although the interests of the

scholars of those times were eminently scientific, their interpretations were incorporated into political agendas and justified the national policy of denial, integration, and assimilation of indigenous peoples. In the north of the country, Gundermann and González (2009) argue that the anthropological balance of the situation of the Northern natives indicated their complete integration, in the case of the *Changos*, or the presence of few survivors who were in a clear process of assimilation, in case of the Aymaras and Atacameños. Furthermore, Seelenfreud (2008) states that in the Easter Island case the ethnological works focused on the study of the megalithic constructions from a rescue point of view, considering the Indigenous subjects as living vestiges of a glorious and mysterious past, a society on the verge of disappearing or extinguishing, without giving much relevance to the social and political contexts in which the Rapa Nui people were inserted or of the westernization processes they were undergoing.

Archaeology at that time was characterized by a markedly asymmetrical power relationship between archaeologist and Indigenous populations, who from a position of structural subordination fulfilled a role of workers and/or “informants.” The archaeologists were connected with state and/or private interests and were foreigners or professionals from Santiago City associated with the ruling class. In these circumstances, Chilean archaeology reproduced a colonial rationality, which not only pressurized and territorialized native societies but attempted to impose a Western knowledge and value to history, the past, and archaeological remains. Reproducing what has happened in other contexts worldwide, some of the archaeological practices that continued the logic of colonialism in Chile are the denial of the other as subject, the exile of Indigenous people to a remote past, and the rupture of their historical continuity: the digging, study, and exhibition of Indigenous ancestors and collecting, musealization, monumentality, and patrimonialization of the Indigenous past. Through its interpretations and legitimation of the state ownership of archaeological heritage, nationalist archaeology contributed to the construction of an imagined national community. In

this case, directly or indirectly, archaeological knowledge and practice were used to shape the Chilean national identity and validate its power and authority in the definition and control of the past and Indigenous heritage. Archaeology contributed to the myth of origin of the Chilean nation-state, naturalizing and legitimizing its presence in indigenous ancestral territories, while the latter were assimilated or integrated into a monocultural society.

Archaeology as a discipline began its institutionalization in the 1940s and 1950s, mostly through studies carried out by the Natural History Museum, La Serena Archaeological Museum, and San Pedro de Atacama Archaeological Museum, whose investigators had different trajectories influenced by empiricism and cultural history. In 1959, the Regional Museum was inaugurated in the city of Arica, highlighting the work of foreign archaeologists based in the country such as Percy Dauelsberg, Oscar Espouey, and Guillermo Focacci, pioneers in the development of Arica’s archaeology. According to Romero (2003), the growing emphasis on the study of archaeological burial sites, in particular the Chinchorro mummies, generated wide expectations among the general public, in addition to promoting an external view of archaeology as a study of remote societies that have little or nothing in common with the present indigenous peoples. At the same time, the Museum of Arica worked with a group of Indigenous people of Aymara origin who helped as labor force during the excavations and in the conservation of materials and especially in passing of vernacular knowledge (Espinosa et al. 1998; Romero 2003). During the same period, Belgian priest Gustavo Le Paige developed his investigations in San Pedro de Atacama (Ayala 2008). The relevance of his work lies in the fact that he managed to establish, early and permanently, the scientific power represented by the museum he founded in the main Atacameño settlement. Even though Le Paige defended the idea of Atacameño cultural continuity, he conceived the idea of a population in the process of vanishing and reproduced colonial relations of denial by not considering the Atacameño beliefs in the “grandfathers or gentiles” and their

opposition to excavating archaeological burial sites and displaying human remains in the museum. From the Atacameño perspective, the “grandfathers or gentiles” are entities from long bygone time, from a pre-Christian time, and the interruption of their rest and negligence in the performance of ritual offerings impels them to provoke diseases in the living; this is why they are respected and feared. In spite of this, the archaeological work of Le Paige was supported by some members of the local community, whose expertise in archaeology and museology has been recognized at local and national spheres.

In Southern Chile, many of the sites studied in Mapuche territory were cemeteries excavated by foreign archaeologists, including those worked by Schneider in the Bío-Bío region (Paredes 2015). Although in the 1950s Menghin established a more detailed pre-Hispanic chronology and smaller-scale excavations, it was Gordon who worked with burial sites in a more systematic way since the late 1960s and early 1970s. In addition, like Le Paige, self-taught archaeologist Maya Calvo de Guzman lived in her study field and developed funerary archaeology. According to Adán et al. (2001), this researcher established a relationship with Mapuche communities that was far from being horizontal, because it was mediated by her position in local power relations as she was the owner of an important property in Calafquén.

As in the north and south of the country, in Easter Island, archaeological remains were used as exchange assets in national and international standards. As a result of the great scientific expedition (1934–1935) led by the French archaeologist Alfred Métraux, together with the Belgian archaeologist Henri Lavachery, two “moai” (large stone statue) were removed from the country. One “moai” was sent to the Royal Museum of Art and History in Brussels and another to the Louvre in Paris, in addition to many smaller artifacts (Seelenfreud 2008; Vilches 2015). Prior to this, this colonialist practice was reproduced by Routledge (1915) by taking a “moai” to the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford. The departure of these objects provoked an immediate reaction on the part of the Chilean State, which sought to exercise sovereignty over the island by early appointing

Easter Island as a National Monument in 1935. Although archaeologists had so far assumed that the Rapa Nui people did not have any relationship to archaeological sites, Norwegian Thor Heyerdahl’s stay (1955–1956) marked a major turning point in the relationship between researchers and Indigenous people, who were involved in the research process for the first time (Seelenfreud 2008).

During the 1960s and 1970s, the teaching of archaeology was institutionalized in several state universities, and its scientific authority was reaffirmed, shortly before the National Congresses of Chilean Archaeology began and the Chilean Society of Archaeology (1963) was formed. Since then, archaeology in Chile has been characterized by research teams mainly directed and integrated by national archaeologists and a limited presence of foreign professionals, except for Easter Island. At the same time, the New National Monuments Law was enacted (1970), and with this the state began to intervene directly in the control of archaeological heritage, declaring all sites National Monuments, not only imposing state ownership over them but also nationalizing them. That same year, the socialist government of Salvador Allende (1970–1973) took on political power. During his government the first Indigenous Law (17,729) of the country was passed, recognizing the existence of culturally differentiated communities, admitting a historical debt, and acknowledging their political participation (Bolados 2010).

During this government, the Latin American Social Archaeology emerged arguing that archaeologists as social agents should not only reflect on society but may even prompt social change (Salazar et al. 2012). The main centers of development for this form of archaeology were located at the south and the north of the country, following conferences given by Peruvian archaeologist Luis Guillermo Lumbreras in Concepción in 1974. From this perspective, the prevailing cultural historical approach was criticized, and new ways of practicing the discipline were explored beyond the diagnosis of cultural phenomenon. In the north, some archaeologists developed research projects in which they dialogued and collaborated

with indigenous communities, while others focused on the continuity of the Andean culture and its role in the transition to socialism. An example of this was the ethnoarchaeological investigations led by the “Grupo Toconce” in the north of Atacameño territory (Aldunate and Castro 1981). This research team led by Victoria Castro, Carlos Aldunate, and José Berenguer influenced later generations of archaeologists who created different lines of collaborative work with indigenous people (Adán et al. 2001; Carrasco et al. 2003; Jofré 2003; Ayala et al. 2003; Ayala 2008, 2014). The research of this group was pioneering in the development of ethnoarchaeology in Chile, although its links with the trajectory of this subdiscipline in the Latin American context (Politis 2015) remain to be studied. In this case, the local perceptions of archaeological practice were considered when choosing the topics and study methodologies, since along the investigation process apprehensions of some inhabitants of Toconce were identified on the archaeological excavations. For Ayala (2008) these politically committed academic agendas can be framed in a nationalist archaeology that contributed in the construction and imagination of a national community in transit to socialism. However, it was also practiced in a cultural historical archaeology that did not consider the indigenous populations as valid interlocutors and with rights to have an opinion on the archaeological heritage. This is the case of San Pedro de Atacama where Le Paige continued excavating burial sites and spreading the “Atacameño Culture.”

The socialist government was interrupted by the military regime in 1973, and Augusto Pinochet governed the country until the beginning of 1990. During these years, the “war” had a central role in shaping national identity, and military heroes became important symbols of the nation. The Chilean nationality was imagined as a homogeneous entity composed of a mixture of the best European values and the most heroic Mapuche warriors, who were valued for their arts for war and not for their cultural particularities. The authoritarian government was not interested in the figure of the Indian, except to denying

it. Ethnicity was banished to the past, to folklore, and to museums; it was specified as a cultural heritage that should be represented and documented in writing but which had no present or future meaning. During this period, the previous advances made by the socialist government regarding the state’s relations with the indigenous populations were disarticulated. According to Bolados (2010), during the dictatorship two decrees accelerated the process of division and liquidation of the communities from legal standards in 1979, since any state or private organism was allowed to tax the lands as they were not recognized as indigenous and their owners were not considered indigenous either.

The Pinochet dictatorship abruptly disrupted Marxist thought, interrupted the development of social archaeology, and closed archaeology majors in different universities. It also cancelled national congresses and controlled the theoretical reflection in the discipline. Despite the persistence of the historical cultural approach in different sectors of the country, New Archaeology gradually became the dominant paradigm. From this perspective research focused on problems related to the natural sciences, archaeological discourse was depoliticized, and new lines of study were opened. In part, this was the result of the concentration of political relations between Chile and the United States and the implementation of neoliberalism, which will keep Chilean archaeology away from the Latin American and, to some extent, European theoretical discussion (Salazar et al. 2012). It was during the dictatorship that archaeology was legitimated as a science, not only due to the influence of New Archaeology but also to the standards imposed to get research grants from the National Fund for Scientific and Technological Development, which followed the guidelines of north American capitalism.

In the north of the country, particularly in San Pedro de Atacama, archaeologists dissociated themselves from the social contexts in which they developed their research, assuming the neutrality of scientific discourse and ignoring the social and political impact of the discipline (Ayala 2008, 2014). As part of the disarticulations produced by the military coup, several

professionals of archaeology from the university in Antofagasta were sent to the Museum in San Pedro de Atacama, which in 1984 was transformed into the Archaeological Research Institute and Museum Gustavo Le Paige. From a depoliticized approach to archaeology, the exhibition of this institution was renewed without breaking the preterizing device of exhibiting human bodies, and excavating archaeological burial sites continued. The relations between archaeologists and Atacameño people continued reproducing colonial logics of denial, although some activities of diffusion and collaboration were conducted by archaeologists of the Institute.

In the south, from a perspective that combined archaeological, ethnohistorical, ethnographic, and linguistic information, North American archaeologist Tom Dillehay (2007) began his studies of settlement and subsistence patterns in the Purén and Lumaco valleys in the 1970s. He focused on the ethnoarchaeology of ceremonial complexes and burial mounds, his main source of ethnographic information being the “machis” (spiritual authorities) of some Mapuche communities. On the other hand, in the context of an incipient contract archaeology, a road project was carried out in the 1980s that sought to improve the connection to the south of the country, whose original design crossed Mapuche territory. This project was temporarily withheld, but the same people who put up the project at the beginning, a decade later, will raise the road modernization megaproject under the new label of Bypass Temuco. The Mapuche communities affected by this project were the WichanMapu1 of XufXufy Koyawe, who organized themselves to try to stop or modify the place where the new road intended to cross (Paredes 2015).

In Easter Island, from the 1960s to 1970s, the Chilean State began to invest in restoration work on monumental sites. This became a main source of paid labor for the local indigenous population. During these years, UNESCO specialists and the World Monuments Fund also visited the island to lay the foundations for a development plan based on the quality of its archaeological resources and the fragility of its environment. According to Seelenfreud (2008), each of these projects

employed between 20 and 30 people for periods of between 6 months and a year. This situation marked the island’s conception of archaeology: stable work well paid for a large number of people. However, since the 1980s, archaeology has been developed to solve problems and test hypotheses at the expense of mega-restoration projects. In this context, foreign professionals arrived who did not need the local labor force and did not have financing from the Chilean State or international organizations. The results of this change were felt in the relations between archaeologists and natives, who entered a conflicting arena with this new scenario.

Archaeology in the Multicultural Era

At the beginning of the 1990s all through the country, there were a series of social mobilizations claiming for the return of democracy after 17 years of dictatorship. Among the indigenous populations, the Mapuche movement played a prominent role, although it did not participate as a fundamental force of the opposition, but as an autonomous force working in coalition with others, but maintaining its own political identity. In the north, educated urban youths of indigenous origin in Arica, Calama, and Iquique organized themselves in protest movements, together with the political and social struggle against the military dictatorship. Participation, including the indigenous one, became one of the main emblems of the struggle against the military regime in the official discourse used by the coalition of democratic parties. However, discontinuity and discursive rupture in the political field consolidated in the opposition repression-dictatorship/participation-democracy. This did not mean challenging the neoliberal economic system instituted during Pinochet government but rather implied its continuity and partial measures that strengthened its development and consolidation in the years after the dictatorship (Bolados 2010).

The reconfiguration of the Chilean State in the democratic period goes hand in hand with the installation of neoliberal multiculturalism, which generates a new ideological, legal, and

institutional scenario oriented toward indigenous peoples. With the participation and recognition of cultural difference as a new art of government, culture began to occupy a central place in public debate and in the identity construction of indigenous populations and the new Chilean nation. Since the state had previously disseminated a nationalist discourse of rupture between the indigenous past and present, the multicultural political discourse changed the relation of these populations with their past, when the Indigenous Law 19.253 suggested that the ethnic groups are descendants of pre-Hispanic societies. This law also integrated Indigenous people to the national history, and this led Chilean people to reimagine themselves as a multiethnic nation and to reinvent themselves through a long-standing linear temporality, which places the pre-Hispanic past at the origins of the multicultural Chilean nation. On the other hand, the re-elaboration of the past of the ethnic groups in Chile has been a process of readjustment, tensions, and contradictions between the preexisting notions of identity, ancestry, and temporality and those imposed by the multicultural state (Ayala 2014). In this context, we identify different sets of identities and temporalities operating within each indigenous group, which in turn have had different historical and political trajectories with the Chilean State. Along with this, their connections with the past, the archaeological heritage, and archaeologists differ from each other, since these are heterogeneous indigenous communities with their own political differences and internal struggles.

One of the first times archaeologists publicly faced indigenous questions was at the National Congress of Chilean Archaeology in Temuco in 1992, when two or three Mapuches burst into the Chilean Society of Archaeology meeting and confronted archaeologists about indigenous participation and authorization in their researches (Ayala 2008). Subsequently, representatives of indigenous populations expressed their demands and claims to the state and archaeology at public events, meetings, congresses, institutional documents, and publications. In the north, cultural heritage was approached as an Andean legacy that should form part of the Aymara and Quechua

nations, including archaeological sites within some indigenous communities in the area, bringing to consideration the ethical aspects of the tangible and intangible heritage (Jofré 2014). On the other hand, in different contexts the Atacameño expressed their demands for the ownership and administration of the archaeological heritage, information on investigations, community permit to work, and indigenous participation in the disciplinary work, as well as not exhibiting human bodies or excavating archaeological burial places. Moreover, they sought to manage the Archaeological Museum of San Pedro de Atacama (Cárdenas 2001; Ayala 2008). In the south, Paillalef (1998) posed the problems observed in the conservation and protection of indigenous heritage and criticized the excavation of burial sites in Mapuche territory, highlighting archaeology's lack of consideration toward the interests of local communities. In Easter Island, Rapa Nui leaders criticized archaeological excavations, the study of burial sites, the lack of information on research, and the absence of community-based permits (Seelenfreud 2008).

Although the implementation of multiculturalism generated pressure to democratize access to the past and to the control of archaeological sites, the response of Chilean archaeology was delayed. In the academic field, the impact of this process was observed only in the late 1990s. In 1998, the book *Patrimonio Arqueológico Indígena en Chile: reflexiones y propuestas de manejo* was published as a result of reflection sessions held in Temuco in 1996 and 1997, which were attended by representatives of indigenous communities and government institutions, as well as researchers from different sectors of the country (Navarro 1998). At the end of the 1990s, articles on indigenous issues were published, in which a call was made to confront their problems and ask what archaeology has done in favor of the country's cultural minorities, as well as highlighting the need to establish more fluid connections between both parties and to take into consideration ethnic apprehensions about the excavation of archaeological burial sites (Cfr. Ayala 2003).

The initial response of the state to the indigenous demands was the execution of land registry

projects and the preservation, conservation, valorization, and administration of archaeological sites for tourist use. This process involved the National Monuments Council, the National Indigenous Development Corporation, and the National Forestry Corporation, as well as regional museums and archaeologists. In the north a series of experiences of this type were carried out, especially the Atacameño case which was pioneer involving the village of Tulo, the Pukara de Quitor and Lasana, and the rock art of Peine (Ayala 2014). In Aymara territory, different projects of land management and protection of pre-Hispanic sites were also carried out, highlighting those done in the Provinces of Arica and Parinacota due to the involvement of the *Pacha-Aru* Indigenous Association (Espinosa et al. 1998). According to Romero (2003), the National Corporation for Indigenous Development financed these projects within its development policy with identity, integrating these archaeological sites to the tourist and cultural market of the area.

In San Pedro de Atacama, in a scenario of disputes over the power of representation of the indigenous past and for the control, ownership, and significance of archaeological heritage, discourses were radicalized, and conflicts occurred in the execution of these heritage projects (Ayala 2008). Added to this was the destruction of archaeological sites in the construction of the Bypass San Pedro-Jama and the Gas Atacama pipeline. On the one hand, the archaeologists' response was to lock themselves in their academic bubble, not to get involved with the ethnic process, and to insist on a scientific line of work that excludes, neutralizes, or invisibilizes the influence of the social context in the production of scientific knowledge. On the other, indigenous leaders contested archaeology by publicly criticizing archaeological practices and discourse. In addition, they banned access to the sites for some archaeologists and demanded the validation of their own professionals. Confronted by this loss of control, some archaeologists reacted by saying that they do not need community permission, that the property is owned by the state, and that the Atacameño do not understand scientific work. It

was, then, a stage of disputes and conflicts in the multicultural heritage process, in which essentialisms prevailed and the relations of denial from archaeology were strengthened.

Meanwhile, in the south of the country, the Bypass Temuco environmental impact study was carried out by Geotécnica Consultants and the Institute of Indigenous Studies of the Universidad de la Frontera. It obtained a favorable resolution in 1999 despite the innumerable problems identified and evidenced by the Mapuche communities involved. Once the construction and execution of this highway was approved, the project affected 10 communities within the direct influence area and to 29 as part of the indirect influence area. In 2001, during the full development of the project, two pre-Hispanic burial sites were found, the human remains and archaeological objects were sent to Santiago, and this caused the Mapuche community mobilization who demanded their return. This materialized 3 months later, leaving the archaeological remains in the Regional Museum of Araucanía (Paredes 2015).

In Easter Island, there were conflicts between archaeologists and Indigenous people, although in this case the demand was to include the local community in the research projects. There are reports indicating that a team of foreign archaeologists was assaulted by a Rapa Nui group. This was difficult for team leader, an American archaeologist, to explain, who said they had done everything to establish a fluid relationship with the community, had all the National Monument Council permits, had incorporated a local researcher into the field work, and had a Chilean institution as an institutional counterpart. For Selenfreud (2008) these conflicts were directly related to the incorporation of tourists who pay to participate in scientific expeditions and a subsequent failure to call on local labor, over which in the past monumental restoration projects depended on.

In the year 2000, there was a significant change in national indigenous politics, consistent with a participatory multicultural discourse (Bolados 2010) and coinciding with a transformation in heritage management, which was assumed as state policy (Ayala 2014). This process involved

the creation of new institutions, the discussion of renewed laws, greater and diverse access to economic resources, as well as the promotion of a discourse of “citizen participation” in the National Monuments Council. In addition, the Area of Indigenous Heritage in this institution has been created, in charge of promoting ethnodevelopment projects and ethnic professionalization. In the beginning, this area focused its actions in the north and south of the country, specifically in Atacameño and Mapuche territories, although it also executed some projects in Santiago with urban indigenous people and in other regions as Arica and Chiloé. Unlike the heritage projects in Atacameño territory mainly oriented to archaeological sites, in Mapuche territory religious and ceremonial complexes of historical and ethnographic use were considered for their declaration as National Monuments. At the same time, the indigenous and intercultural policies that begun in the 1990s were deepened with the opening of the “Program Origins,” financed by the government and the Inter-American Development Bank, whose implementation is directly connected with the aim of demobilizing and appeasing the Mapuche conflict that had again intensified at the end of this decade (Bolados 2010).

Chilean archaeology in the twenty-first century shows a more dialogic approach and search for common understanding, coinciding with the participatory multicultural discourse of democratic governments (Bolados 2010). As it will be seen in the following subtitle, this has materialized in the experiences of construction of a new type of relationship, in the integration of the indigenous voice, in the assessment of local histories and perspectives, and in the diversification of the spaces of diffusion of archaeological discourse. In this context, meetings for discussion were organized by indigenous groups, state agencies, universities, and/or archaeologists, such as the “Dialogue Discussion Boards” of the Archaeological Museum of San Pedro de Atacama (2000–2002) and the meetings held in Temuco (1998), Cupo (2000), Ollagüe (2001), Lasana

(2003), and Caspana-San Pedro (2005). On the other hand, forums and discussion groups or symposiums were held in national and international congresses. This is the case of the symposium “Indigenous Peoples and Archaeology” of the 51st International Congress of Americanists (2003), the forum “Indigenous Communities and Archaeological and Anthropological Research” of the XVII National Congress of Chilean Archeology of Valdivia (2006), the symposium “Towards a Public Archaeology” of the XIX National Congress of Chilean Archeology of Arica (2012), and the symposium “Theory and archaeological practice and its relation with the indigenous communities in Contemporary Chile” of the XX National Congress of Chilean Archeology in Concepción (2015). In addition to the 2nd Archaeological Theory Workshop in Chile held in San Pedro de Atacama, and the VII Meeting of Archaeological Theory in South America (2014) based in San Felipe, archaeological work related to this subject was presented.

However, despite this participatory archaeological discourse and the deepening of multicultural politics, conflicts continue between archaeologists, indigenous peoples, the state, and/or private companies. This is the case, for example, of the UNESCO-JAPON Project for the conservation of archaeological sites in Rapa Nui (2005), which involved a majority participation of islanders in restoration and preventive maintenance work. However, the fact that this did not become a permanent program with the support of the state revived the distrust of the Rapa Nui population regarding Chile’s lack of commitment to the island and the rejection of archaeologists who do not integrate members of their communities in their research (Seelenfreund 2008). In Atacameño territory, the accidental discovery of an infant and its offerings in the framework of an environmental impact project generated a series of disputes over the power of decision on indigenous archaeological heritage, despite the participation of community visitors in the work done in the field site (Rodríguez and Villaseca 2015).

Toward a Collaborative Archaeology

Though more recent advances in the relations between archaeologists and indigenous communities in Chile are fundamentally visible in congress presentations, project reports, and pre- and postgraduate theses, there are still few publications on this matter. This may be due to this discussion is still marginal in Chilean archaeology or because those in charge of initiatives of this type choose do not to publish their results in mainstream journals, either because they do not consider it necessary or because they oppose the academy as legitimating instance of scientific discourse. In addition, the fact that the author of this paper lives outside the country limited her access to a greater amount of information. However, there are a number of works that, although they do not constitute a unified body of experiences of public, social, collaborative, indigenous, or decolonized archaeology, show the presence of these theoretical-methodological perspectives in Chile, at least in Aymara, Quechua, Atacameño, Mapuche, and Rapa Nui.

As has been discussed by Castañeda (2008) for other contexts, in Chile there has also been an ethnographic turn in archaeology as a way to facilitate relations between archaeologists and indigenous peoples, mitigate the effects of research, address ethnic demands, include other voices, and enrich the archaeological interpretations. Within this context, archaeological projects are identified in which anthropologists were involved to undertake – exclusively or partially – building or maintaining relations with the indigenous communities involved. This is the case of a project developed in the town of Ollagüe, in Quechua territory, in which an exercise related to the contingency was chosen, carrying out a series of actions aimed at closing the gap between archaeologists and indigenous communities (Ayala et al. 2003). From a social archaeology perspective and using ethnographic tools, bonds were built with the Quechua community to later train, renovate the local museum, and hold a meeting of reflection among ethnic representatives, archaeologists, and state agents. Besides, in the framework of an archaeological investigation of the recent past

focused on the period of capitalist expansion in San Pedro de Atacama, the study of material culture was accompanied by an ethnographic research that contributed both to the collection and interpretation of information and to the construction and strengthening of community relations (Vilches et al. 2015). In the south of the country, the creation of a space of communication between scientists and Mapuche communities within research projects was made possible by the application of an ethnographic methodology that extended the field work and its results to the surrounding communities, favoring instances of dialogue in which archaeologists and anthropologists benefited as well as community members (Adán et al. 2001).

This ethnographic shift is also observed in projects in which the archaeologists themselves performed the ethnographic research. This is the case of Jofré (2003), who from an ethnoarchaeological approach carried out a project aimed at assessing the valuation and ethnic identification with the archaeological heritage of Belén. In her most recent research, she conducted an ethnographic research on Aymara indigeneity policies and property rights in the Lauca Biosphere Reserve (Jofré 2014). On the other hand, by applying ethnoarchaeology and recognizing the rights of the original populations as heirs or depositories of archaeological heritage, in the upper and lower basins of the Loa River and the oasis of San Pedro de Atacama, “low impact” archaeological investigations were conducted. This implied validating the opinion of indigenous populations emphasizing the study of collections and the excavation of settlements, as well as developing diffusion, documentation, and organization of storage spaces in local museums (Adán et al. 2001; Carrasco et al. 2003). From an approach that gathers the contributions of collaborative and decolonial archaeology and discussions of ethics in archaeology, Kalazich (2013) carried out a participative action research with the Atacameño community of Peine. In this investigation the main techniques of collecting information were applied ethnography and interviews.

Ethnography has also been used by archaeologists to study archaeology itself. This is the case of

Cárdenas (2001), an Atacameño archaeologist who analyzed the perceptions of his community on the treatment of cultural heritage in San Pedro de Atacama. He concluded that there is discontent on the part of the Atacameño people regarding archaeological work and that there is lack of consideration for their communities, as well as for their disagreement with the excavation of archaeological sites and the exhibition of human remains in the local museum. In addition, in the field of ethnographic archaeologies, Ayala (2008) studied the history of the relationships among archaeologists, indigenous people, and the state in San Pedro de Atacama. She systematized Atacameño criticisms and patrimonial demands and characterized different types of relationships between these three actors, concluding that it is the colonial bonds of denial that have produced conflicts between them. Subsequently, broadening and deepening this research, Ayala (2014) researched the ethnography of the practices and discourses through which the Chilean State is represented as multicultural and as a multiethnic nation. She also undertook an ethnographic archaeology that focused on the power devices of Atacameño archaeology and its connections with colonialism, nationalism, and multiculturalism. In the south, Paredes (2015) studied the relationship between the state, physical anthropology, archaeology, and members of the Mapuche Lafkenche people, specifically regarding the heritage management of human remains. She concluded that there is a general disapproval of the anthropological and archaeological practice among her interviewees and that in the case of some approval assessments, these are subjected to the need for informed consent from the communities. According to Paredes, the indigenous perception of researchers' abuse responds to their ancestral connection with human remains, given mainly by the cohabitation of the territory and the extensive family configuration of the Mapuche people, as well as by a very complex symbolic framework. This connection is also claimed by Mapuche people who migrated to the VII region of the Maule, where the Folil Mapu community demands their participation in the future of the archaeological site of Tutuquén. This community considers this place as part and

representative of originary people they believe they have the mission and the responsibility to protect the territory where their ancestors are resting (Campos and Vergara 2015). On the other hand, placed within an intersubjective ethnography, Arthur (2014) carried out an investigation on the repatriation process in Easter Island. She argued that the Rapa Nui's understanding of their ancestors comes in conflict with the scientific view, since they have their own ontology, different from that influenced by Western society, in which the "ivi tupuna" are ancestors with whom they are related genealogically. According to Arthur, scholars have frequently ignored this distinctive ontology by promoting an academic tradition that objectifies the Rapa Nui system of knowing and relating.

There are also publications on the relations between archaeologists and natives based on a reflective analysis of the history of archaeology rather than on ethnographic data. This is the case of Romero (2003), who concluded that historically there has been little development of bonds between archaeologists and indigenous populations from the Provinces of Arica and Parinacota. He argues that archaeological research has not considered the original peoples either as recipients of their knowledge or as sources of research that could be incorporated by ethnoarchaeology. Besides, Seelenfreud (2008) evaluated the impact of the history of archaeology in the way the Rapa Nui population conceives archaeologists today. According to Seelenfreud, what were constant throughout the history of Easter Island have been the transgressions to the informed consent of the local community, as well as to the respect for the intellectual property and to the bioanthropological and archaeological resources.

The experiences of education, diffusion, and management of archaeological heritage are also present in projects with indigenous communities in Chile, forming a public archaeology characterized by a more practical than critical or multivocal orientation (Merriman 2004), although there are some exceptions (Marcos 2010; Alvares and Godoy 2001; Godoy et al. 2003; Vilches et al. 2015). In this context, projects for the

valorization, protection, conservation, and administration of archaeological sites for tourism use throughout the country have increased (Espinosa et al. 1998; Bravo 2003; Jofré 2003; Ayala 2008; Urrutia 2014). This is generally associated with programs of indigenous professionalization (Ayala 2014). At the same time, the application form for the National Fund for Scientific and Technological Development includes a section devoted to diffusion to society, which should describe an extension activity for the non-specialized public. In indigenous territories, the diffusion has varied from briefings on the activities and scope of the research to educational talks or training courses on local archaeology. A process that, in certain cases, has exclusively involved indigenous leaders and in others students or people interested in heritage. In some contexts this diffusion has been carried out in association with museum institutions, such as the Archaeological Museum of San Pedro de Atacama where the Andean School heritage educational program (2001–2010) was developed for the Atacameño and Quechua population (Ayala 2008; Marcos 2010). Throughout 9 months a year, this school taught cultural management, ecology, tourism, archaeology, history, anthropology, indigenous legislation, conservation, and project formulation. In her analysis of the Andean School, Marcos (2010) concluded that despite its achievements in the dissemination of archaeological discourse, this initiative continues to reproduce colonial relations between archaeologists and Atacameños, since it legitimizes the discourse and authority of archaeology in a dynamics of unidirectional communication derived from the reproduction of its place of enunciation. Moreover, in the south of Chile, experiences of heritage education with Mapuche Huilliches communities were conducted, integrating oral history, material culture, anthropology, and pedagogy (Alvares and Godoy 2001). Some of these activities were carried out in museums under the Museum Direction of the Universidad Austral de Chile, while others were undertaken in local schools or in the archaeological field. According to these investigators, unlike ethnoarchaeology, these are experiences of social intervention where the theoretical and

methodological corpus of anthropology is put at the service of the community. Its purpose is to contribute to community development by strengthening its identity through the enhancement of its local cultural assets and knowledge. For this team, heritage education presupposes a political positioning, in circumstances where educators not only fulfill the role of facilitators, but their mission extends to the consolidation of a meeting space and social dialogue whose purpose is to contribute to the legitimate exercise of cultural citizenship. To the contrary, these actions must motivate the exercise of cultural citizenship, that is, that Chilean society manifests itself in its multicultural essence (Godoy et al. 2003).

The integration of members of indigenous populations into archaeological research and environmental impact projects lies in the broad spectrum of Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson's (2008) *collaborative continuum*, whose three stages of development are resistance, participation, and collaboration. The dynamic character of the *collaborative continuum*, with its different degrees of involvement and upward commitment, makes it possible to understand the bonds between archaeologists and indigenous peoples in recent years as a process under construction. Throughout this paper, several examples of the resistance phase were described, so the specific phases of participation and collaboration will be discussed below. For some work teams, indigenous participation has taken place exclusively in information meetings or diffusion activities; other archaeologists also consider the application for community permits and the selection of problems and methods of study taking into account the criticisms and ethnic demands, which in some cases is associated with indigenous participation in different stages of the research process (Alvares and Godoy 2001; Adán et al. 2001, 2003; Godoy et al. 2003; Carrasco et al. 2003; Seelenfreud 2008; Ayala 2008; Marcos 2010; Kalazich 2013; Vilches et al. 2015). In contract archaeology projects, some members of the communities have participated in surveys, excavations, and laboratory work, as well as diffusion activities and informational meetings. Certain investment projects have had community observers or visitors in the

field, as well as visits by indigenous leaders (Salazar 2010; Rodríguez and Villaseca 2015).

When analyzing the spaces of indigenous participation open by archaeology in the multicultural era, the educational, public relations and management of archaeology aspects stand out, which has been installed as the new disciplinary format and the “must be” for many professionals. This tendency conforms to what Ayala (2014) defines as multicultural archaeology, an approach which recognizes the other, opens archaeology to his/her participation, or accepts the indigenous property of heritage. However, this ends up being mere formalisms to continue practicing an archaeology rather than questioning its power and place of enunciation. It is a traditional archaeology that conforms to the mandates of multiculturalism, a waist adjustment characterized by talks and diffusion courses that promote “restricted and controlled indigenous participation” (Bolados 2010). Eventually, this is followed by the participation of community members as labor in the excavations and the cleaning of materials, without having a voice in the design, formulation, development, interpretation, and/or results of the project itself or in the taking of decisions on recovered collections. However, it is also true that multicultural archaeology has opened up spaces of indigenous participation that did not exist previously, as well as debate on the social and political consequences of archaeology and has highlighted the difficulties of articulating theory and practice in building new relations with communities.

Next, experiences that distinguish a greater degree of indigenous involvement are discussed and are situated in what Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008) describe in the range of collaboration. These are projects that also promote greater reflexivity and point to restructuring or decolonizing the discipline and its power relation transformation. This line includes Jofré's (2012) work with the Aymara communities of the Arica and Parinacota high plateau, who had to agree on their interests with archaeologists, government agencies, and private companies in order to achieve the community administration of historical monuments (Jofré 2012), as well as the

“Abra Project” in Atacameño territory, whose long period of development in the framework of an environmental impact experience had affected the ensembled work and mutual benefits among members of this ethnic group, archaeologists, and mining officials (Salazar 2010). In addition, the research of historical archaeology developed by Vilches and collaborators (2015) in San Pedro de Atacama, in which the local relevance of concepts and theoretical approaches originated from public, decolonial, indigenous, and collaborative archaeologies, was discussed. In this project, entirely proposed from the academy, the local participation was achieved in the field work, laboratory, compilation, analysis, and/or integration of the information, as well as in informative meetings and request of community permission. Then again, there is the participatory action research carried out by Kalazich (2013) in the Atacameño community of Peine. From this perspective, the research problem and objectives were defined jointly with members of the local indigenous community and approved in a community assembly, as well as the results and the manuscript of this thesis. As participatory action research is one of the approaches used as part of the decolonizing of archaeology in the last decade (see Atalay 2006; Silliman 2008), Kalazich's work involved sharing power in decision-making, moving away from traditional methods of archaeology, and moving its place of enunciation, choosing the construction of collaborative and horizontal relationships.

Moreover, archaeological projects have been developed by indigenous communities themselves. This is the case of the experiences described by Urrutia (2014) for the Aymara communities of Camiña and Nama, the first of which requested an anthropological study that allowed defining its ancestral territory and the second a project to protect archaeological sites located in their territory. Through a process of dialogue in which the expectations of all members were coordinated, archaeologists, anthropologists, conservators, and architects worked together with members of the communities involved. They considered participatory strategies in all the activities of the project. Another group, the Atacameño communities of Coyo and Quitor requested

professional advice to the Archaeological Museum of San Pedro de Atacama for the opening of site museums (Ayala 2008). Community assemblies discussed, defined, and approved what to exhibit and inform in these museum spaces, in addition to participating in workshops of archaeology and conservation. Another type of consultancy is related to the evaluation of environmental impact projects, in which archaeologists of this museum presented arguments to support community claims for hotel, tourist, road, mining, or energy investments. There is also the archaeological contribution in the legal recognition of Atacameño communities before the state (Ayala 2008; Salazar 2010). The Aymara community of Quillagua also managed a project of valorization and heritage rescue to mitigate the intervention and looting of an archaeological burial site (García et al. 2012). From the articulated work of community active members, professionals, and state agencies, it was possible to generate an important collection of heritage material that was submitted to basic procedures of conservation. As the final stage of this project, a part of the human remains rescued was reburied. In the south of Chile, Mapuche communities of Chilcoco, Huenteldén, and Tirúa requested the collaboration of archaeologists in territorial claims. For Hermosilla (2015) there are cultural heritage valuations made from an archaeology enriched with participatory action research, involving interest groups and carrying out archaeology of the recent and contemporary past. On Easter Island, members of the Rapa Nui community asked for professional support for their repatriation project, care, and reburial of human remains, a process in which Arthur (2014) has collaborated from his expertise in oral tradition, history, and Rapa Nui land and heritage.

Repatriation and Reburial

One of the results of multiculturalism and indigenous claims in Chile has been requests for repatriation and reburial of human remains and archaeological objects. In this process of patrimonialization, the state has exercised its

power through governing the bodies of their ancestors, since it is still in their power of naming that the procedures are regulated and it is decided who is authorized and legitimated to reclaim the bodies and rebury them, as well as who is their rightful owner (Ayala 2014). Although Chile does not have a law in this respect, from 2009, the Council of National Monuments has an “Instructive guide for the re-burial of human remains coming from archeological contexts, at the request of communities and organizations” (Gonzales 2008; Arthur 2014).

The first repatriation process occurred in the 1980s long before the enactment of the Indigenous Law in 1993 and the impact of the NAGPRA Act of the United States, enacted in 1990. In this case, members of the Atacameño communities requested the return of an archaeological collection sent to the National Museum of Natural History in Santiago (Ayala 2008). Something similar happened in 2001 when Mapuche communities demanded the return of human remains found in the archaeological excavations of Bypass Temuco that were transferred to the same city (Paredes 2015). These experiences served as antecedents to the later repatriation and reburial of human remains culturally linked with Aymara and Atacameño populations. Its execution was subject to an agreement signed between the Council of National Monuments and the National Museum of the American Indian of the Smithsonian Institute, as well as an agreement between the Council and the communities involved (González 2008). In 2010, the University of Zurich in Switzerland repatriated the remains of five Kawésqar individuals to their home community in Tierra del Fuego, in Chile’s extreme south. In 2011, the Museum of Ethnography in Geneva, also in Switzerland, repatriated four mummies to the Miguel de Azapa Museum in Arica. A recent case of reburial is within the Aymara community of Quillagua, which worked together with archaeologists, curators, and state agents to value, protect, and preserve a funerary archaeological collection that later remained under the protection of their community. As a final step of this project, part of the rescued human remains was reburied in the cemetery at a ceremony organized and presided over

by the local indigenous community (García et al. 2012). Another reburial that had state approval is that of the Atacameño community of Taira, which was carried out as part of an environmental impact study financed by the mining company CODELCO (Rodríguez and Villaseca 2015). Negotiations and the search for consensus between this company, government agencies, and the Atacameño community of Taira lasted for several months, as indigenous leaders established a series of demands regarding the treatment of the human remains and their funeral context, trying to achieve the maximum of return and the minimum possible intervention, in view of the final act of reburial.

In contrast to these experiences regulated and controlled by the Council of National Monuments, in the late 1980s, a reburial led by members of the Atacameño community of Chiu Chiu, without the authorization of this institution, was carried out (Ayala 2008). Something similar began to happen in the south of Chile, where due to the perception of some Mapuche community leaders that the patrimonial legislation does not protect them like the rest of the Chileans, actions have been carried out for self-protection of property without the Council's permission (Paredes 2015). On the one hand, this has resulted in the refusal to report the discovery of human remains and archaeological artifacts to the authorities, opting for their conservation "in situ." On the other hand, if the removal has been carried out, they could opt for the conservation of the pieces in the localities where they were found, and they would be administered by the communities, a situation that is only applicable to material remains and not to human remains, as they prefer not to disturb them. Besides, since 2013 the Rapa Nui have an independent and autonomous program of repatriation, care, and reburial of "Ivi-Tupuna" or human remains. It is an experience created and managed by members of the Rapa Nui community, working in collaboration with the Anthropological Museum Padre Sebastián Englert and researchers (Arthur 2014). Their more advanced repatriation case shows a series

of difficulties with the Council of National Monuments, which seeks to regulate the procedures and reaffirm the national ownership of human remains and validate the scientific vision. For the Rapa Nui people, these human remains must be returned directly to the community without conditions or imposed regulations, since they are not the property of the nation-state but are the ancestors of Rapa Nui people. These cases show the unexpected effects of multiculturalism, as indigenous leaders take advantage of the open spaces of multicultural politics to raise their own demands, boost their processes of historical construction and identity, and dispute their patrimonial rights before the state and science.

Final Words

This article has discussed the relations between archaeologists and indigenous peoples in Chile within the changing contexts of colonialism, nationalism, and multiculturalism. The history of archaeology shows that the reproduction of colonial denial of indigenous rights has been a central factor in conflicts between archaeologists and indigenous peoples. However, there has been a significant advance in the last two decades in the participation of indigenous people in archaeological work and different approaches to this. On one hand, an ethnographic turn in archaeology is identified as well as the development of public or heritage archaeology; then again there are experiences with different degrees of indigenous involvement. While some projects materialize indigenous participation mainly in activities of diffusion, public relations, and the management of archaeology, others are associated with collaborative proposals that promote a greater reflexivity and disciplinary decolonization. Although archaeologies committed to decolonization are still marginal in Chilean archaeology, the experiences discussed in this essay highlight alternative paths for archaeology with, by, and for indigenous peoples.

Finally, although the internal heterogeneity of the Aymara, Atacameño, Mapuche, and Rapa Nui communities was not addressed in this study, future research is expected to account for intra- and intercommunity social and political complexity; this will undoubtedly affect an understanding of its bonds with archaeology. This will also be enriched and made more complex with the analysis of Quechua, Kolla, Diaguita, Kawésqar, and Yagán cases.

Cross-References

- “Public” and Archaeology
- Archaeology and Anthropology
- Archaeology and Politics
- Archaeology as Anthropology
- Argentina, Archaeology and Indigenous Communities of
- Bolivia, Archaeology and Indigenous Communities of
- Chile, Ethics and Commercial Archaeology of
- Community and Archaeology
- Community Archaeology and Participatory Research
- Community Engagement in Archaeology
- Cultural Heritage and Communities
- Decolonization in Archaeological Theory
- Heritage and Archaeology
- Historical Archaeology: Indigenous Perspectives and Approaches
- Histories of the Archaeological Discipline: Issues to Consider
- Indigenous Archaeologies
- Latin American Social Archaeology
- Multicultural Archaeology
- Museo Chileno de Arte Precolombino, Chile
- Nationalism and Archaeology
- Nationalism and Archaeology: Overview
- Peru, Archaeology and Indigenous Communities of
- Public Archaeology, The Move Towards
- Social Archaeology
- South American Archaeology: Postcolonial Perspectives

References

- Adán L., M. Uribe, M. Godoy, C. Jiménez, and D. Salazar. 2001. Uso del patrimonio cultural en la construcción de memorias e identidades históricas nacionales. In *Actas del IV Congreso de Antropología*. Volumen I, 619–629. Santiago: Colegio de Antropólogos.
- Aldunate, C., and V. Castro. 1981. *Las chullpas de Toconce y su relación con el poblamiento altiplánico en el Loa Superior, Período Tardío*. Santiago: Ediciones Kultrun.
- Alvares, R., and M. Godoy. 2001. Experiencias rurales de educación patrimonial en la X Región. Comunidades Mapuche Huilliche de Huiro, Astilleros y Rauco. *Revista Austral de Ciencias Sociales* 5: 29–38.
- Arthur, J. 2014. Reclaiming Mana. Repatriation in Rapa Nui. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California.
- Atalay, S. 2006. Indigenous archaeology as decolonizing practice. *American Indian Quarterly* 30 (3 y 4): 280–310.
- Ayala, P. 2003. Arqueología y sociedad: El caso de las comunidades indígenas en Chile. *Werkén* 4: 59–73.
- Ayala, P. 2008. *Políticas del pasado: indígenas, arqueólogos y Estado en Atacama*. Santiago: Línea Editorial IIAM/Universidad Católica del Norte.
- Ayala, P. 2014. Patrimonialización y Arqueología Multicultural en San Pedro de Atacama (Norte de Chile). *Estudios Atacameños* 49: 69–94.
- Ayala, P., S. Avendaño, and U. Cárdenas. 2003. Vinculaciones entre una arqueología social y la comunidad indígena de Ollagüe, II Región. *Chungará Revista de Antropología Chilena* 35 (2): 275–285.
- Bolados, P. 2010. Neoliberalismo multicultural en el Chile democrático: gubernamentalizando la salud atacameña a través de la participación y el etnodesarrollo. San Pedro de Atacama. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Universidad Católica del Norte – Universidad de Tarapacá.
- Bravo, A. 2003. Arqueología aplicada al desarrollo de comunidades atacameñas. *Chungará Revista de Antropología Chilena* 35 (2): 287–293.
- Campos, J., and F. Vergara. 2015. El porvenir del Cementerio Indígena de Tutuquén: la perspectiva de la comunidad Mapuche Folli Mapu de Sarmiento, Curicó, VII Región del Maule. Paper presented at the XX Congreso Nacional de Arqueología Chilena, Concepción, 5–9 de Octubre 2015.
- Cárdenas, U. 2001. Percepciones de las comunidades Atacameñas sobre el tratamiento del patrimonio cultural de la zona.
- Carrasco, C., C. Agüero, M. Uribe, and P. Ayala. 2003. Proyectos de investigación en Quillagua: Difusión del conocimiento arqueológico y protección del patrimonio cultural. *Chungará Revista de Antropología Chilena* 35 (2): 321–326.
- Castañeda, Q. 2008. The “ethnographic turn” in archaeology: Research positioning and reflexivity in ethnographic archaeologies. In *Ethnographic archaeologies: Reflections on stakeholders and*

- archaeological practices*, ed. Q. Castañeda and C.H. Matthews, 25–62. Lanham: Altamira Press.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C., and T. Ferguson, eds. 2008. *Collaboration in archaeological practice: Engaging descendant communities*. Lanham: Altamira.
- Cristino, C. 2011. Colonialismo y Neocolonialismo en Rapa Nui: Una reseña histórica. In *La Compañía Explotadora de Isla de Pascua – Patrimonio, Memoria e Identidad en Rapa Nui*, ed. C. Cristino and M. Fuentes, 19–52. Concepción: Escaparte Ediciones.
- Dillehay, T. 2007. *Monuments, empires and resistance. The Araucanian polity and ritual narratives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Espinosa G., W. Quispe, C. Santoro, H. González, and J. Córdova. 1998. Participación de la Comunidad Aymara en la conservación y manejo del patrimonio arqueológico de las Provincias de Arica y Parinacota. In *Patrimonio arqueológico indígena en Chile, reflexiones y propuestas de gestión*, X. Navarro (comp.), 113–124. Santiago: Instituto de Estudios Indígenas, Universidad de la Frontera, UNESCO.
- García, M., E. Vidal, C. Lemp, E. Shaeffer, F. Santana, and Tamara Pardo. 2012. Rescate y puesta en valor del cementerio Rinconada de Quillagua. In *Actas del XVIII Congreso Nacional de Arqueología Chilena*, 131–139. Santiago: Sociedad Chilena de Arqueología.
- Godoy, M., J. Hernández, and L. Adán. 2003. Educación patrimonial desde el museo: iniciativas de promoción y puesta en valor del patrimonio cultural en la X Región. *Conserva* 7: 23–36.
- González, P. 2008. Tratamiento jurídico de los restos óseos indígenas en Chile: su implicancia para la investigación científica. In *Bioética en Investigación en Ciencias Sociales. III Taller Organizado por el Comité Asesor de Bioética*, ed. E. Lira Kornfeld, 141–172. Santiago: Fondecyt-CONICYT.
- Gundermann, H. y H. González. 2009. Sociedades indígenas y conocimiento antropológico. Aymaras y atacameños de los siglos XIX y XX. *Chungará Revista de Antropología Chilena* 41 (1): 113–164.
- Hermosilla, N. 2015. Informe Peritaje Cultural Patrimonial, Concepción.
- Jofré, D. 2003. Una Propuesta de acercamiento al patrimonio arqueológico de la comunidad de Belén (Región de Tarapacá, Chile). *Chungará Revista de Antropología Chilena* 35 (2): 327–335.
- Jofré, D. 2012. Arqueología, monumentos y comunidades en la Biosfera Lauca: posibilidades de la práctica de la Arqueología Social en el Norte de Chile. In *Arqueología Social Latinoamericana: de la teoría hacia la praxis*, H. Tantaleán, and M. Aguilar (comp.), 415–432. Bogotá: Universidad de los Andes.
- Jofré, D. 2014. Guallatire: Negotiating Aymara indigeneity and rights of ownership in the Lauca Biosphere Reserve, Northern Chile. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Kalazich, F. 2013 Cultural meanings and values of the past. A participatory approach to archaeology in the Atacameño community of Peine, Chile. Unpublished PhD dissertation, UCL.
- Marcos, S. 2010. La arqueología bajo la perspectiva de la comunicación: estudio de caso en San Pedro de Atacama. Unpublished Master dissertation, Universidad Católica del Norte- Universidad de Tarapacá.
- Merriman, N. 2004. Introduction: Diversity and dissonance in public archaeology. In *Public archaeology*, ed. N. Merriman, 1–17. London: Routledge.
- Navarro, X. (comp.) 1998. *Patrimonio arqueológico indígena en Chile, reflexiones y propuestas de gestión*. Santiago: Instituto de Estudios Indígenas, Universidad de la Frontera, UNESCO.
- Paillalef, J., 1998. Una Mujer Indígena frente al Patrimonio. In *Patrimonio arqueológico indígena en Chile, reflexiones y propuestas de gestión*, X. Navarro (comp.), 77–82. Santiago: Instituto de Estudios Indígenas, Universidad de la Frontera, UNESCO.
- Paredes, B., 2015. ¡No estamos muertos! Voces Mapuche Lafkenche del Bio-Bío: Valoración y efectos de la práctica arqueológica y antropológica física. Unpublished Under Degree dissertation, Universidad de Concepción.
- Politis, G. 2015. Reflections on contemporary ethnoarchaeology. *Pyrenae* 46 (1): 41–83.
- Rodríguez, M., and M.A. Villaseca. 2015. Reentierro de un perinato en Alto Loa. Investigación interdisciplinaria y ética bioantropológica en una excavación de impacto ambiental. Paper presented at the XX Congreso Nacional de Arqueología Chilena, Concepción, 5–9 de Octubre 2015.
- Romero, A. 2003. Arqueología y pueblos indígenas en el extremo norte de Chile. *Chungará Revista de Antropología Chilena* 35 (2): 337–346.
- Salazar, D. 2010. Comunidades indígenas, arqueología y mineras en el norte de Chile: ¿hacia un diálogo posible? In *Pueblos Indígenas y Arqueología en América Latina*, ed. C. Gnecco and P. Ayala, 221–250. Bogotá: Universidad de los Andes.
- Salazar, D., D. Jackson, and A. Troncoso. 2012. Entre dos tierras: reflexiones sobre la arqueología chilena en el siglo veintiuno. In *Teoría Arqueológica en Chile: reflexionando en torno a nuestro quehacer disciplinario*, ed. P. Ayala and F. Vilches, 41–71. Santiago: Línea Editorial IIAM-Universidad Católica del Norte.
- Seelenfreud, A. 2008. La investigación arqueológica antropología médica en Rapa Nui: Cuestiones éticas y la comunidad. In *Bioética en investigación en Ciencias Sociales. III taller organizado por el Comité Asesor de Bioética*, ed. E. Lira Kornfeld, 99–116. Santiago: FONDECYT-CONICYT.
- Silliman, S.W. 2008. Collaborative indigenous archaeology: Troweling at the edges, eyeing the center. In *Collaborating at the trowel's edge: Teaching and learning in indigenous archaeology*, ed. S.W. Silliman, 1–21. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

- Urrutia, F. 2014. Cuando son las comunidades quienes demandan investigaciones antropológicas: Reflexionando a partir de experiencias en Camiña y Nama (Tarapacá, norte de Chile). Paper presented at the VII Reunión de Teoría Arqueológica de América del Sur, San Felipe-Almendral, 6–10 de Octubre 2014.
- Vilches, F. 2015. Sobre pircas y otras piedras: topografía material para un contexto (neo) colonial Rapa Nui. In *Rapa Nui y la Compañía Explotadora*, ed. M. Fuentes, 10–29. Santiago: Rapa Nui Press.
- Vilches, F., C. Garrido, P. Ayala, and U. Cárdenas. 2015. The contemporary past of San Pedro de Atacama, Northern Chile: Public archeology? *Archaeologies* 11 (3): 372–399.