



# 38

## EPILOGUE: POSTCOLONIALISM AND ARCHAEOLOGY

*Uzma Z. Rizvi and Jane Lydon*

This handbook is both an intellectual and a political exercise. Situating our critique within contemporary social, political, and economic inequities, this volume locates the intersection of postcolonial critique and archaeology in an effort to reassess historic disparities of knowledge production and evaluation. Indeed, the politics embedded within the production of this volume lead us to address concerns with representation and inclusion, providing some critical self-reflection. Additionally, there are certain theoretical constructs that we wish to highlight as significant future research areas, to show how much of the work presented here lays the foundations for interventions benefiting an archaeology practiced within a contemporary transnational reality.

Postcolonial research in archaeology may unfold in many directions. For example, it has clear implications for work relating to Indigenous archaeologies, in settler

communities and colonial regions, specifically in terms of movements for social justice. Questions about the repatriation and restitution of cultural property, and the politics of recuperation, are of importance when contending with the future of ethical practices within archaeology as a whole. The chapters in this volume attest to the significance of a framework, embedded within the postcolonial critique, that shifts the epistemological foundations of archaeological interpretations, methodologies, and practice. In that spirit, each chapter provides new research directions that can be contextually applied within different scenarios. Looking beyond our own world areas, and learning from the histories of both peoples and communities and how they have reinterpreted their own pasts, presents a multifaceted lens through which one can learn about collective—and ruptured—pasts.

### Representation and Subjectivity

Realizing the aim of this volume—to include voices from around the world—comes at a price. Not every voice could be heard, and the idea that there might be one narrative that could encapsulate all the perspectives emerging from a region or community is a fallacy. No scholar's subjectivity can be essentialized in this way—that is, implicated in speaking for others within the larger community or region (for more on the politics of representation, see Benavides, this volume, chapter 17). Moreover, in contemporary archaeological practice, the desire to improve the conditions of peoples' lives through work on cultural/social and political/economic empowerment or advocacy places archaeologists, who are often outsiders to the community, in a uniquely constituted location insofar as they become spokespersons within academic discourses for the communities in which, and for which, they work. The delicate exigency of such locations becomes apparent when two possibilities of representation are conflated, as Gayatri Spivak points out, distinguishing between "representation as 'speaking for' as in politics and representation as 're-presentation' as in art or philosophy" (1999: 257). This issue has been explored by feminist scholars such as Linda Alcoff, who has argued that although there may be a confronting "crisis of representation," it is reasonable to assume that ultimately the issue comes down to political efficacy, and thus the ethical ramifications of politically "speaking for" are subsumed within the larger political movement of empowerment for oppressed peoples (1995: 102–112).

The assumption there, of course, is that those in the movement *know* what the "oppressed people" want, need, or even care about. This critique of obviousness (of what certain people want) has been discussed in feminist scholarship and does not require recapitulation here (see, e.g., Ahmed 1998; Chow 1994; Loomba 1998; Mohanty 1991; Spivak 1999); what is relevant to this discussion, however, is an acknowledgment that the issue of representation cannot be subsumed within the rhetoric of intellectuals constructing normative assumptions about which effects and political outcomes are desirable or undesirable. Situating the archaeologist within the postcolonial critique necessarily complicates such representations of subjectivity, and embeds the discourse within a larger ethical and politically progressive framework. Indeed, within this volume, we have intended to complicate the assumptions of "oppression" and "empowerment" and, by extension, the concept of the "native" subject, critically evaluating our field and our theoretical interventions. Such challenges emerge especially clearly from the constructed in-between spaces that are textually represented by the cross-disciplinary chapters in each section of this volume.

The chapter by O. Hugo Benavides (chapter 17) provides a key insight into the discussion about the inclusion of "Native" and, specifically, "Native scholars" in archaeological discourse. In some ways, the overt desire to include Native voices, he argues, instantiates the false dichotomy of Western and Other. This aspiration highlights the non-location of those Native scholars who live in the West and operate within Western academic frameworks. It

also suggests that “Natives” were not considered active agents in the production of the archaeological past, as field staff and crew, or as archaeologists at the site (for an example from colonial India, see Lahiri 2005). The focus, then, is not just about including “Natives” into the discourse; it is the recognition that the histories that are produced, in both colonial and postcolonial frameworks, are all parts of the larger web of historical production.

Joost Fontein, in his chapter (chapter 14), refocuses the same lens, elaborating on the location of the Native and Indigenous scholar by illustrating how these new viewpoints challenge the traditional scientific emic/etic distinctions within archaeological scholarship. In Fontein’s mind, it is not simply a question of providing alternative histories of the past, but rather one of exploring alternative ways of looking at and understanding the past. This shifts attention from looking for competing representations of the past, toward the ways in which the “authority to represent the past is established and contested,” an issue that emerges within the call for Indigenous archaeology, framed as a response to what he calls archaeology’s “etic” authority, while simultaneously addressing the “violence” that is perpetuated by archaeology’s claim to that ontological location.

In a personal account, Whitney Battle-Baptiste (chapter 29) addresses the violence that is perpetuated by hegemonic archaeological accounts and how it affects individual archaeologists in developing their hidden biases and subjectivities. She peacefully counters it through genealogies and connections, and most significantly, conversa-

tions and dialogue. She frames this positive methodology by reclaiming the authority to look at the past and construct a future for historical archaeology—and she does this using the power of *Egun*. In the Yoruba language, *Egun* means “bones”—the bones of ancestors in a metaphorical and spiritual sense, a way to acknowledge the connection between the living and the dead. Her personal journey, beliefs, and gaze powerfully align the concept of *Egun* with “conversation” as a way to heal disparities. She posits a new world view that links all of humanity together: “Without these conversations, we have no connection and are without a genealogy, without an ancestral line, without *Egun*.”

This concept of a shared history—a linking of all of our histories as a space within which present discourses can allow for reconciliatory or equitable presents—is an important consideration for a postcolonial archaeology in the future.

### Postcolonial Cosmopolitanism

New research under the rubric of “cosmopolitan” archaeology directly addresses this aspiration, linking the ideals of obligation to others and respect for cultural difference to archaeological practice, highlighting the role of ethics and moral responsibility (e.g., Meskell 2009). Scholars across many disciplines have recently drawn upon a reinvigorated notion of “cosmopolitanism” (although it is still a contested term) in the context of globalization, to define new conceptions of political community emerging around the world. As many have noted, enhanced global connectedness is characterized



### Representation and Subjectivity

Realizing the aim of this volume—to include voices from around the world—comes at a price. Not every voice could be heard, and the idea that there might be one narrative that could encapsulate all the perspectives emerging from a region or community is a fallacy. No scholar's subjectivity can be essentialized in this way—that is, implicated in speaking for others within the larger community or region (for more on the politics of representation, see Benavides, this volume, chapter 17). Moreover, in contemporary archaeological practice, the desire to improve the conditions of peoples' lives through work on cultural/social and political/economic empowerment or advocacy places archaeologists, who are often outsiders to the community, in a uniquely constituted location insofar as they become spokespersons within academic discourses for the communities in which, and for which, they work. The delicate exigency of such locations becomes apparent when two possibilities of representation are conflated, as Gayatri Spivak points out, distinguishing between "representation as 'speaking for' as in politics and representation as 're-presentation' as in art or philosophy" (1999: 257). This issue has been explored by feminist scholars such as Linda Alcoff, who has argued that although there may be a confronting "crisis of representation," it is reasonable to assume that ultimately the issue comes down to political efficacy, and thus the ethical ramifications of politically "speaking for" are subsumed within the larger political movement of empowerment for oppressed peoples (1995: 102–112).

The assumption there, of course, is that those in the movement *know* what the "oppressed people" want, need, or even care about. This critique of obviousness (of what certain people want) has been discussed in feminist scholarship and does not require recapitulation here (see, e.g., Ahmed 1998; Chow 1994; Loomba 1998; Mohanty 1991; Spivak 1999); what is relevant to this discussion, however, is an acknowledgment that the issue of representation cannot be subsumed within the rhetoric of intellectuals constructing normative assumptions about which effects and political outcomes are desirable or undesirable. Situating the archaeologist within the postcolonial critique necessarily complicates such representations of subjectivity, and embeds the discourse within a larger ethical and politically progressive framework. Indeed, within this volume, we have intended to complicate the assumptions of "oppression" and "empowerment" and, by extension, the concept of the "native" subject, critically evaluating our field and our theoretical interventions. Such challenges emerge especially clearly from the constructed in-between spaces that are textually represented by the cross-disciplinary chapters in each section of this volume.

The chapter by O. Hugo Benavides (chapter 17) provides a key insight into the discussion about the inclusion of "Native" and, specifically, "Native scholars" in archaeological discourse. In some ways, the overt desire to include Native voices, he argues, instantiates the false dichotomy of Western and Other. This aspiration highlights the non-location of those Native scholars who live in the West and operate within Western academic frameworks. It

also suggests that “Natives” were not considered active agents in the production of the archaeological past, as field staff and crew, or as archaeologists at the site (for an example from colonial India, see Lahiri 2005). The focus, then, is not just about including “Natives” into the discourse; it is the recognition that the histories that are produced, in both colonial and postcolonial frameworks, are all parts of the larger web of historical production.

Joost Fontein, in his chapter (chapter 14), refocuses the same lens, elaborating on the location of the Native and Indigenous scholar by illustrating how these new viewpoints challenge the traditional scientific emic/etic distinctions within archaeological scholarship. In Fontein’s mind, it is not simply a question of providing alternative histories of the past, but rather one of exploring alternative ways of looking at and understanding the past. This shifts attention from looking for competing representations of the past, toward the ways in which the “authority to represent the past is established and contested,” an issue that emerges within the call for Indigenous archaeology, framed as a response to what he calls archaeology’s “etic” authority, while simultaneously addressing the “violence” that is perpetuated by archaeology’s claim to that ontological location.

In a personal account, Whitney Battle-Baptiste (chapter 29) addresses the violence that is perpetuated by hegemonic archaeological accounts and how it affects individual archaeologists in developing their hidden biases and subjectivities. She peacefully counters it through genealogies and connections, and most significantly, conversa-

tions and dialogue. She frames this positive methodology by reclaiming the authority to look at the past and construct a future for historical archaeology—and she does this using the power of *Egun*. In the Yoruba language, *Egun* means “bones”—the bones of ancestors in a metaphorical and spiritual sense, a way to acknowledge the connection between the living and the dead. Her personal journey, beliefs, and gaze powerfully align the concept of *Egun* with “conversation” as a way to heal disparities. She posits a new world view that links all of humanity together: “Without these conversations, we have no connection and are without a genealogy, without an ancestral line, without *Egun*.”

This concept of a shared history—a linking of all of our histories as a space within which present discourses can allow for reconciliatory or equitable presents—is an important consideration for a postcolonial archaeology in the future.

### Postcolonial Cosmopolitanism

New research under the rubric of “cosmopolitan” archaeology directly addresses this aspiration, linking the ideals of obligation to others and respect for cultural difference to archaeological practice, highlighting the role of ethics and moral responsibility (e.g., Meskell 2009). Scholars across many disciplines have recently drawn upon a reinvigorated notion of “cosmopolitanism” (although it is still a contested term) in the context of globalization, to define new conceptions of political community emerging around the world. As many have noted, enhanced global connectedness is characterized



by the dissolution of some boundaries but simultaneously the sharpening of others, as the international circulation of people, media, and economic and cultural capital prompts both homogenization and an increased sense of local distinctiveness. The concept of cosmopolitanism is one means that scholars have used to attempt to explore this process. Some argue for the potential of an ethical stance that entails a commitment to the equal worth and dignity of all human beings, linked to standards of justice that are intended to be applicable to all, while simultaneously retaining an openness to local, different ways of life (Appiah 2006; Cheah 2006). Phenomena such as the participation of Indigenous peoples in international rather than national institutions do not merely challenge the legitimacy of the states' claim to exclusive jurisdiction over territory, but in fact constitute an "emergent cosmopolitanism" (Iverson 2006) that is compatible with universal notions of justice and yet is also rooted in particular, local ways of life. As with other global networks characterized by complex articulations between different orders of practice, including heritage and human rights discourse, debate often focuses on the analytical and concrete tensions between principles of universalism and local difference.

However, in order to imagine a shared past, an equal present or, more specifically, an equal access to the past in the present must be assumed. In an attempt to bring to bear that formulation of equality and a shift in power directionality, cosmopolitan archaeology explores how contemporary heritage practices operate in the present. It is

in this space that future discussions must focus. Insofar as Western archaeologists continue to have access to the pasts of developing countries, often at a higher rate and with more expedient results than the archaeologists working within their own communities, the cosmopolitan aspiration may be stifled, no matter how (theoretically) local the basis for the universal may be (see Fiskesjö, this volume, chapter 23; González-Ruibal 2009: 118). These levels of disparity cannot be considered merely within the traditional dichotomies of colonial versus colonized, but must also be examined in the context of colonized and disenfranchised minority communities. Within these groups, there are additional levels of intrinsic inequality, partly based on colonial administrative distinctions (see Voss 2008) and partly on internal histories of inequality that clearly affect discourses about the past (see Breglia 2009). In a contemporary moment, as Benavides (this volume, chapter 17) suggests, this issue is less about cultural difference and more about transnational capital essentializing those differences as a way of reinstating older forms of racial hierarchies. Scholars such as Hugo Benavides, Magnus Fiskesjö, and Alfredo González-Ruibal serve as critical reminders that our own efforts might unintentionally embody the greater global forces at work that reinstate the rhetoric of colonialism (and also see Merry 2003).

Cosmopolitanism can be used to move beyond such dichotomies, including the global/local dichotomy, by claiming that such issues are everyone's concern (Hodder 2009: 184). These global concerns become

central for archaeologists, although they are not always so for other disciplines, such as international development (but see Levitt and Merry 2008). Perhaps there is potential for social change if we work in tandem, as Ian Hodder (2009) suggests, with other policy makers or within the framework of human rights, keeping in mind the very well-publicized critique of the wholesale use of such development models within archaeology, as put forth by González-Ruibal (2009). Although an obvious point, we should remember that as part of the critical application of such models, there must be a vernacularization of the conceptual framework, the vocabulary, and the historical context so that it clearly addresses the very local nature of the politics in the region (Levitt and Merry 2009; González-Ruibal 2009).

### **Shifts in Politics: Indigeneity in a Global Context**

---

A major component of this volume is a focus on Indigenous movements around the world. Yet, the critique of ethnographic representation and the politics of subjectivity have demonstrated that there is no self-evident or natural category of “indigenous” peoples—we create these categories to serve specific political purposes (Jeganathan 2005; Kahn 2005). There are significant reasons, however, why such markers are crucial for some populations, either in helping, or further marginalizing, disenfranchised peoples. In the context of post-colonial struggles for autonomy, essentializing representations of indigeneity have often been used to require peoples to

demonstrate the continuity of their connections to place and culture and to meet expectations of “authenticity” and legitimacy. Nonetheless, in former colonies across the globe, Indigenous peoples who once formed a myriad of distinct cultural and linguistic groups now share a history of dispossession and ongoing disadvantage. In this context, intellectual trends that emphasize the mutability and contingency of identity have been perceived as undermining assertions of culture, as Indigenous peoples themselves draw upon such categories to protect their interests and oppose injustice. Where inequities may be reinforced by the logic of the nation-state, within a context of enhanced global interconnectedness Indigenous peoples may now choose to participate in international institutions in preference to national ones, as new categories of global identity are represented by organizations such as the World Archaeological Congress, for example. Such appeals to international norms, together with their Indigenous revaluation, also reveal a relationship between local, state, and global levels “which is pluralist but not state-centric, immanent but also universalist” (Iverson 2006: 121). In addition, Indigenous scholars have argued that conceptions of local culture are changing, shaped by an international context and incorporating a universal notion of human rights without abandoning a sense of local meaning (e.g., Behrendt 2003). The international campaign led by the Mirrar people of the Kakadu region in northern Australia exemplifies this process, to date successfully preventing uranium mining on the Jabiluka mineral lease through appealing



to international opinion on the basis of local distinctiveness (Lydon 2009; see also de Costa 2006).

In the future, it seems as though the archaeology of Indigenous peoples must increasingly be conducted by and in collaboration with Indigenous communities. In addition, archaeologists are coming to recognize and engage with culturally distinctive ontologies and epistemologies. As the examples provided in this volume suggest (see especially Part V: Strategies of Practice; also Atalay, this volume, chapter 4), new ways of conceptualizing archaeological questions, designing and implementing methodologies, and presenting results are already in train. Just as a dialogue implies receptivity to our interlocutor and entails a certain open-endedness, it is difficult to predict where such collaborations will lead the discipline of archaeology.

### **Global Scope of the Postcolonial Critique**

This volume provides a robust critique of the development of the discipline of archaeology around the world, having originated in curiosity about the exotic other, as a *modus operandi* for collecting and endowing museums of the West, and in the quest for empirical knowledge. Archaeology was justified and legitimated from the perspective of those on the civilizing mission, who considered the concept of “universal” to exist only in relation to, or because of, the European Enlightenment. In the contemporary world, this has translated to a preference for archaeological materials considered to rep-

resent “high culture,” values prescribed on materiality by the West, particularly linked to the development of science and democracy and a continued fascination with the exotic other (Bennett 2004; Mitchell 2004).

In an economic context, the antiquities market continues to blossom, and as the free market system continues to assume that everything can be bought or sold, the past continues to be a commodity (Merryman 2000, 2006). This has larger implications for issues about looting, tourism, and tourism’s effects on archaeological work with communities (see Bahrani 2003; Brodie and Renfrew 2005; Rizvi 2009). A progressive archaeology must be able to engage in active and critical dialogues within the development world, such as with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and other international humanitarian agencies, especially in terms of human rights, issues of migration and assimilation, and the formation of transnational identities. This is not to assume that moving our discussions into the realm of development studies is the best or correct thing to do. But it is one way to further our own understandings of what other forces are at play and how other disciplines are (or are not) taking on shared issues such as contemporary inequalities associated with histories of oppression. As archaeologists, we have a unique link to the ancient and historic world and thus offer an important perspective working with global heritage projects (such as UNESCO). From that vantage point, we can make significant contributions toward challenging the universalizing narratives often expressed by such agencies.



Earlier in this volume, Fiskesjö challenges the very concept of the “universal” in relation to the “Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums,” a statement which, he argues, is a forceful general statement against repatriation. His critique of the “free trade” of cultural objects highlights the hypocrisy of such declarations insofar as they work in favor of the richer, more powerful nation-states at the expense of the former colonial regions. Fiskesjö’s focus is on the ways in which these institutions continue to reconstitute themselves by creating such documents and making such statements that provide them with the authority to appear legitimate, ethical, and valid. This desire for relegitimization at the institutional level of the museum covers what is really at stake, which, he argues, is the ideological basis of “Western” identity.

One of the key acknowledgments of this volume is the significance of reconstituting identity, alterity, and forms of subject-hood to account for various stakeholders in the larger web of historical production. In the dialogue between Carol McDavid and Fred McGhee (chapter 37), this issue of subjectivity informs their individual approaches to archaeology and advocacy. They approach the questions of policy and social relations within the context of the United States, rather than on an international level, specifically within the context of race and privilege. Although this particular dialogue is based in the United States, the issue of racism in contemporary societies is one that is, in fact, transnational in its effects and has large-scale ramifications that can be linked

to colonial frameworks. In their discussion, McDavid and McGhee approach community involvement and participation from different perspectives, illustrating their standpoints as distinct based on their race and their experiences of being of that race. As an African American, McGhee demonstrates a keener interest in actually seeing change—and being an active part of that change through his research and public work. As a Euro-American, McDavid confronts white privilege head on, and approaches anthropological and archaeological interventions by embracing uncertainty and mistakes that she might make along the way. There is a sense of hope that by continuing to do things in the best faith, something, in time, will change.

It is change that this volume seeks as well. Our contributors have addressed these larger global trajectories of colonialism and how they have affected archaeology, exploring the employment of interdisciplinary methods, comparative frameworks, and new methodologies and practices. In each section, scholars have brought together the postcolonial critique with other approaches within archaeology in order to elucidate the narratives of colonialism and the ways in which we might address and redress the past through restitution, repatriation, and ethics. Methodology informed by ethics asks us to examine ourselves as practitioners in implementing the postcolonial critique. Finally, contributors consider how we deal with issues of alterity and identity in the archaeological record. This collection has explored the significance of methodologies, the changing language/

lexical register that a postcolonial archaeology employs, and the effects on our practice. As a handbook, it encapsulates an anti-colonialist sentiment that stresses individual agency, ethical practice, and a revolutionary spirit. In simple terms (adapted from Mohandas K. Gandhi), we want to be the change we hope to see.

## References

- Ahmed, S. 1998. *Differences that Matter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alcoff, L. 1995. The problem of speaking for others, in J. Roof and R. Wiegman (eds.), *Who Can Speak: Authority and Critical Identity*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Appiah, K. A. 2006. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton and Company.
- Bahrani, Z. 2003. Looting and conquest. *The Nation*, May 14, 2003. [www.thenation.com/doc/20030526/bahrani](http://www.thenation.com/doc/20030526/bahrani) (last accessed February 21, 2009).
- Behrendt, L. 2003. *Achieving Social Justice*. Annandale: Federation Press.
- Bennett, T. 2004. *Pasts beyond Memory: Evolution, Museums, Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Breglia, L. 2009. "Walking around like they own the place": Quotidian cosmopolitanism at a Maya and World Heritage archaeological site, in L. Meskell (ed.), *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*, pp. 205–227. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Brodie, N., and Renfrew, C. 2005. Looting and the world's archaeological heritage: The inadequate response. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 343–361.
- Cheah, P. 2006. Cosmopolitanism. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23 (2–3): 486–496.
- Chow, R. 1994. Where have all the natives gone? in P. Mongia (ed.), *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. London: Arnold.
- de Costa, R. 2006. *A higher authority: Indigenous transnationalism and Australia*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- González-Ruibal, A. 2009. Vernacular cosmopolitanism: An archaeological critique of universalistic reason, in L. Meskell (ed.), *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*, pp. 113–139. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hodder, I. 2009. Mavili's voice, in L. Meskell (ed.), *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*, pp. 184–204. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- . 2006. Emergent cosmopolitanism: Indigenous peoples and international law, in R. Tinnevelt and G. Verschraegen (eds.), *Between Cosmopolitan Ideals and State Sovereignty*, pp. 120–134. New York: Palgrave.
- Jeganathan, P. 2005. Pain, politics, and the epistemological ethics of anthropological disciplinarity, in L. Meskell and P. Pels (eds.), *Embedding Ethics*, pp. 147–168. Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. New York: Berg.
- Kahn, J. S. 2005. Anthropology's Malaysian interlocutors: Toward a cosmopolitan ethics of anthropological practice, in L. Meskell and P. Pels (eds.), *Embedding Ethics*, pp. 101–120. Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. New York: Berg.



- Lahiri, N. 2005. *Finding Forgotten Cities: How the Indus Civilization was Discovered*. New Delhi: Permanent Black.
- Levitt, P., and Merry, S. E. 2009. Unpacking the vernacularization process: The transnational circulation of women's human rights. Paper presented at Stanford Humanities Center, February 2009.
- Loomba, A. 1998. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Lydon, J. 2009. Young and free: The Australian past in a global future, in L. Meskell (ed.), *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*, pp. 28–47. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Merry, S. E. 2003. Human rights law and the demonization of culture (and anthropology along the way). *Polar: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 26 (1): 55–77.
- Merryman, J. H. 2000. Two ways of thinking about cultural property, in J. H. Merryman (ed.), *Thinking about the Elgin Marbles: Critical Essays on Cultural Property, Art and Law*, pp. 66–91. The Hague and Boston: Kluwer Law International.
- Merryman, J. H. (ed.). 2006. *Imperialism, Art and Restitution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meskell, L. (ed.). 2009. *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mitchell, T. 2004. Orientalism and the exhibitionary order, in D. Preziosi and C. Farago (eds.), *Grasping the World: The Idea of the Museum*. Lund: Humphries.
- Mohanty, C. T. 1991. Under Western eyes. Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses, in C. Mohanty, A. Russo and L. Torres (eds.), *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Rizvi, U. Z. 2009. Selling my heritage to the highest bidder: This is the price of my freedom. Paper for Theoretical Archaeological Group (TAG), Stanford, California.
- Spivak, G. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Voss, B. 2008. *The Archaeology of Ethnogenesis: Race and Sexuality in Colonial San Francisco*. Berkeley: University of California Press.