UC Berkeley
UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

Making Markets for Mesoamerican Antiquities

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3918w8hf

ISBN
978-0-8130-5644-9

Author
Joyce, Rosemary A

Publication Date
2019

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Making Markets for Mesoamerican Antiquities

Rosemary A. Joyce

The attraction of antiquities from Mexico and Central America, especially from the celebrated urban societies that archaeologists define as Mesoamerican, occupies a special place in the development of modern cultural heritage policy, museum practice, and archaeological ethics. Parallel in many ways to the urgency raised by concerns about the impact of collecting of classical antiquities of the Mediterranean on cultural heritage sites in that region, for the Americas, the destruction of Maya sites by operators in search of marketable sculptures and more portable objects dramatized threats to heritage in the critical decade leading up to passage of the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property in 1970.

In their preface to this volume, the editors relate it to two previous landmarks: the publication by Clemency Coggins of "Illicit Traffic of Pre-Columbian Antiquities" (Coggins 1969), and the 1990 Dumbarton Oaks symposium "Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past" (Boone 1993). These represented very different interventions.This volume is indeed a successor that interweaves the somewhat separate concerns of these predecessors. Coggins brought attention to the destruction of sites due to demand for antiquities without concern for how they were obtained, posing an opposition between the interests of the market and of researchers. The Dumbarton Oaks conference took a more nuanced view of the relationships between commerce and knowledge, showing that these had been entangled in myriad ways in the history of study of the region. The contributors to the present volume consider both the traffic in antiquities and legislative initiatives to lessen destructive impacts from it, and the ways that researchers and

research institutions have been participants in the movement of antiquities from their source countries.

This volume comes at a significantly different moment than either of the predecessors cited by the editors. The 1969 publication by Coggins preceded the passage of the UNESCO Convention, and was part of the motivation for the US to pass specific legislation intended to protect Mesoamerican sites in 1972 (discussed here by Alison Davis and Donna Yates). While the US had already passed legislation implementing the UNESCO Convention before the 1990 Dumbarton Oaks Conference was held, the impact of this mechanism of intervention on the the preservation of threatened Mesoamerican sites was quite limited when the participants met. An emergency agreement with El Salvador in 1987 covered material from the Cara Sucia area, notably the first action under the 1983 Cultural Property Implementation Act (see Davis, this volume). Emergency protection for the antiquities of Guatemala's Peten region followed in 1991. A full agreement with El Salvador was not created until five years after the Dumbarton Oaks conference was held, and the bilateral agreement covering Guatemala was only passed in 1997.

In her chapter, Donna Yates makes a case that the implementation of the UNESCO convention has not had the desired outcome of reducing depredation of Mesoamerican sites. Yet that is not the only way in which the implementation of the convention has operated. Alison Davis demonstrates a number of positive efforts stemming from the US process of reaching bilateral agreements to implement import restrictions on specific kinds of antiquities. We can also look at how the implementation of the convention in the US has changed the landscape of antiquities collecting in the country.

In the years since the Dumbarton Oaks conference, it has become less acceptable for art museums in the US to accept donations of objects without clear evidence that they entered the

US before the passage of the 1970 UNESCO Convention. The Association of Art Museum Directors, which covers the most prominent art museums in North America, eventually implemented guidelines for member museums that have been revised twice since their introduction in 2004, most recently in 2013 (AAMD 2013). Under these guidelines, museums are required to have "provenance demonstrating that the object was out of its country of modern discovery prior to or legally exported therefrom after November 17, 1970". While these guidelines can be criticized for allowing museums to substitute "informed judgment" for documented provenance, they represent a major shift from when the AAMD signed on to a friend of the court brief in 1998 arguing in support of a collector accused of violating US law (Lyons 2002).

Major art auction houses also have moved to avoid work with uncertain history, an additional factor possibly contributing to the decrease in Maya antiquities auctioned by Sotheby's since the 1980s that Cara Tremain documents. Yet in parallel, new forms of marketing facilitated by digital technology have created opportunities for material to be sold directly to buyers in other countries (Brodie 2015). In a few cases, law enforcement actions have successfully identified participants in illegal transactions of this sort, including those trafficking in Mesoamerican works (ICE 2011). Offered for what at times are relatively low prices, such transactions vastly expand the potential acquisition of antiquities by would-be collectors who were not part of the smaller group of patrons of museums that contributors to this volume discuss. At the other end of the spectrum from this small scale, high volume threat, the dramatic destabilization of the region as drug trafficking grew has swept under its fold antiquities trafficking, along with other forms of illicit traffic (see Davis, this volume).

This present book, then, takes shape in a very different world than the works cited as predecessors by the editors. It post-dates any period when archaeologists could reasonably deny the entwined character of aesthetic appreciation and social or historical research. It acknowledges that early museum collections now often treated as completely unobjectionable sources of information often have complicated histories. It seeks as much to understand how collected materials circulated, in order to facilitate new research, as it does to critique the continued ways that markets are supported. The contributors identify the activity of a wide range of participants-- excavators, both academic and informal, individual collectors in source countries and outside, agents working for and through galleries, and institutions that work to preserve these things-- and trace different ways they interacted to create and satisfy a desire for Mesoamerican antiquities.

In some ways, talking about this solely as a market-- with the implications that the important story is about the buying and selling of cultural heritage items-- continues to obscure wider systemic issues that affect even those disciplines that have official ethical positions opposing commercialization, like that of the Society for American Archaeology. We might consider whether sociologist Howard Becker's concept of art worlds (Becker 1982:x) might serve us better: "the network of people whose cooperative activity, organized via their joint knowledge of conventional means of doing things, produces the kind of art works that art world is noted for". Thinking about the participants described in this volume as art worlds would allow us to distinguish among the activities involved while recognizing their interdependencies. It would enable us to recognize that Mesoamerican antiquities are produced *as art works* by the art world-- not by the ancient crafters and patrons whose intentions resulted in the first manifestation of these objects.

In the conclusion to this chapter, I return to this point, using it as a moment to identify what we might want to single out as a "market" and what we might more broadly want to think about as an "art world" converting things made in the past in this region into antiquities or art works. In order to make those points, I first need to tease out some of the strands that unite the various chapters here around, not a market as such, but an art world or worlds.

<A>Starting in the Middle

An often-told story of the illicit traffic in antiquities from Mesoamerica that appears multiple times in the pages of this volume begins with a crisis of looting of Maya sculptures and pottery in the 1960s (for example, as discussed by Sofia Paredes Maury and Guido Krempel). Certainly the passage in 1972 of protections for sculpture and wall paintings forming part of *in situ* structures, sparked by this crisis, is a landmark in US legislative history. But as this volume demonstrates, commercialization of Mesoamerican antiquities has a deeper and much more complex history.

Commercialization has historically taken many forms, from the direct exchange of money for goods, to the indirect creation of cultural capital from the acquisition of things explicitly denied the status of mere commodities. Given that early archaeological practices contributed to the commercialization of collecting, we might even reconsider the repeated claim that the market for such things as Maya antiquities reached an unprecedented peak in the 1960s, and include in our analyses earlier peaks of collecting that resulted from archaeological research, in a pattern of shifting modes of acquisition that contributed to creating a continuing Mesoamerican art world (or worlds).

A fundamental part of this story of the formation of art worlds is the way that commerce, museum exhibition, and archaeological explorations together contributed (and continue to contribute) to the creation of a taste for antiquities, and for specific objects. The capacity we have to identify types of objects-- Ulua marble vases, Guatemalan carved jade and bone-- as fashionable in the market is partly a reflection of the scholarly attention the same categories of objects have attracted.

Perhaps the best illustration of this point in this volume is Martin Berger's exploration of highly targeted looting of a cave or caves in the Tehuacan area. He demonstrates that this occurred shortly after such caves became foci of problem-oriented archaeological research. In his study of the role of Nelson Rockefeller in the mid-twentieth century art world that emerged around Maya art, James Doyle also documents how scholarly investigations fed into the developing taste for Mesoamerican art that market intermediaries supplied.

There is no easy solution to this dilemma: scholarship builds the value of antiquities, but ignoring objects with limited provenience doesn't stop the development of a taste for certain things that fuels the acquisition end of the market. Berger argues that trying to avoid dealing with objects that entered institutions without formal documentation can actually inflict a kind of "double loss" of cultural heritage (citing Levine and Martínez de Luna 2013, 263). Adam Sellen's demonstration of the capacity to assemble a systematic corpus out of objects that mostly did not result from professional excavation exemplifies the challenges posed by the existence of an art world that connects scholars to the antiquities market. He is not alone in finding his academic research cited explicitly in marketing materials; nor is there any way that significant scholarship could be held outside the art world that links researchers and the market.

Of course, the activity of high profile art collectors created markets in a much more direct and intentional way than the research activities of archaeologists. Specific individuals like Nelson Rockefeller, who James Doyle notes may have been purchasing Maya art as early as the 1930s, were taste makers, not just consumers of commoditized antiquities. Activity by people like this laid some of the groundwork for the upsurge in the market for Mesoamerican antiquities that reached crisis proportions in the 1960s. Such individuals were embedded in networks connected to institutions, museums whose missions they did not just passively support, but actively shaped. A major exhibition held in 1940 at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, championed by Rockefeller, increased the cachet of the works he collected and that others following his example would proceed to collect.

The analyses included here foreground as well the agency of a third group of participants in art worlds, the vendors who were intermediaries in the sale of antiquities. Berger's study is especially revealing, with its precision about ways gallery owners targeted specific items to distinct museums. Multiple galleries are identified as sources for Rockefeller's continuing assembly of his collection by Doyle as well, some overlapping with those identified in Berger's study. This is one way in which the art world is visibly a network: vendors can be conceived of as nodes connecting source countries and the people and institutions to which objects eventually traveled. Here, the research included in this volume shows our continued disproportion of knowledge about the vendors in the collecting countries, and the lack of knowledge we have about those operating in the source countries. The most active roles for individuals in source countries are those for individuals described by Paredes Maury and Krempel for Guatemala, and the uniquely documented producer of forgeries in Mexico, Brigido Lara (discussed by Kelker). Yet as Yates notes in passing, there were already local networks of collecting in the source

countries before foreign nationals entered the scene. We actually aren't in a position yet to say how these original collectors of Mesoamerican antiquities acquired and circulated them, before or even after legislation in their home countries was passed to cut off the international trade.

I would argue that we also understand far less than we should about the motivations of museums in collecting countries that entered the art world as buyers during this mid-twentieth century period. The turn taken by Rockefeller in 1970, to negotiate formal acknowledgement of Guatemalan national ownership of a stela from Piedras Negras along with an agreement for its continued custody and display in New York, brings the episode of mid-century collecting that many authors focus on to a close, just as international agreements were being created to combat the destruction of *in situ* heritage through undocumented excavation intended to feed the art market.

Yet it is in this same period that Sellen shows Zapotec urns once forming multi-urn assemblages were dispersed from a Mexican museum where they had been housed, through art dealers in North America, into private collections and in some cases ultimately into museums. Berger shows how an assemblage of antiquities from Mexico was scattered across multiple museums through the actions of art dealers at this same time. In this case, gallery agents seem to have pushed museums to acquire materials that, unlike the large and aesthetically appealing Maya sculptures, would have had much more limited immediate visual impact. Berger's study raises questions about the kinds of pulls that would lead sometimes unlikely museums to participate in a market that already was drawing attention for its links to endangerment of cultural heritage. The desires of the different museums that received parts of these assemblages led them to be open to acquiring materials whose excavation was clearly destructive, evident in the fragmented condition of objects and even the presence of human skeletal remains. These are

signs of the violence of removal of these antiquities not unlike the fragmentation, cuts, and losses from Maya stone sculptures that Yates notes in her chapter must have been evident to museums buying them. The motivating forces that allowed the acquiring museums to overlook such evidence of destruction need to be understood better.

For one museum in Berger's study, the Heye Foundation, there was an historical precedent that the curator was attempting to sustain, of leadership in the collecting of turquoise mosaic objects. In another instance, specialist studies of one kind of material, textiles, likely abstracted from a group of objects specifically to increase their marketability, was the apparent pull. But what caused a midwestern art museum to acquire a collection described as composed of "turquoise fragments, ceramics, organic material, and human remains", when it had no history of collection in the area or of the broader archaeological categories of materials included? Here, we must assume that there was an impetus to be part of an emerging appreciation of Mesoamerican art, to be part of an art world that, in the 1960s, the museum aspired to join.

The mid-twentieth century market makers are in some ways quite clear: individuals of wealth and prestige who could make it tasteful to own Mesoamerican art; museums for which these individuals were benefactors; other museums emulating them; the dealers who moved works into the hands of individual collectors and museums; and the scholars whose research gave specific identity, and thus value, to these works. Yet our accounts of this historical moment demonstrate a blindness, deliberate or inadvertent, to the people who were ultimately supplying these works, by removing them from their archaeological contexts. While often subsumed under the identity "looter", the art world we are exploring actually engaged equally complex networks of participants in the source countries as well. Some of the complexity of these participants can

be regained by moving our focus back a bit in time, to the moments when what drove the creation of the art world in question were different configurations.

<A>Beginnings

In his study of the collecting of Zapotec antiquities, Sellen characterizes the 19th century as a period when "when archaeology was still in its infancy but the formation of amateur collections were at their height". Like Sellen, Christina Luke explores a deeper history for the collecting of Mesoamerican antiquities in her study of late 19th to mid-twentieth century Honduras. Here, the growth of international corporations facilitated research by museum and university academics who developed both museum and research collections, and promoted an aesthetic of appreciation of specific things, recognizably contributing to shaping the art world even if they were less clearly participating in making an art market.

This specific history of entangled commerce and research, and others like it, can actually be projected even earlier. This is of course implicit in Nancy Kelker's account of forging of Mesoamerican antiquities. Characterizing colonial vessels of 16th and 17th century as "forgeries" may give too little attention to the generation of hybrid cultural identities, and attributing their use solely to the interest of Europeans in curiousities seems to completely deny the agency of indigenous makers. However, her observation that the travelers who entered the newly independent countries of Central America after independence were provided newly created "antiquities" may well point to a moment when we could begin an account of the emergence of a Mesoamerican art market that continues today. The forces that encouraged the market and the production of forgeries were the same: new nationalisms that used the material past to authenticate somewhat shaky political boundaries (Chinchilla 1998; Joyce 2003).

As my own ongoing research on Honduran collecting shows, the earliest Honduran objects to enter European museum collections arrived even earlier, in the 18th and early 19th centuries. They were acquired alongside and through the development of projects to extract natural resources, in particular, logging and mining (Joyce 2013). Their sources were local people who had their own interests in collections of such objects.

Repeated failed projects to build a trans-isthmus railway across Honduras that followed in the mid-19th century left little to show for the investments by financiers spanning Europe and North America, except for the ancillary collecting of antiquities by virtually everyone involved in these enterprises. Again, where I can trace their itineraries, these objects came from local Honduran collectors and owners (Joyce 2013, 2017). These objects ultimately made their way into university and public museums that today adhere to demanding ethical codes about acquisition that would not allow their acquisition. With the passage of time, they became the basis for studies by scholars who invested effort in detaching their research from these origins.

The sometimes clearly problematic conditions of acquisition of early collections like those Luke and I have investigated in Honduras are seldom acknowledged. In many cases the source countries already had restrictive legislation in place. Contemporary documents may show intentional efforts to minimize the impacts of such laws. For example, in the case of the Harvard-Smithsonian expedition to Honduras that Luke mentions, Honduran law was technically observed, as my research shows that the Honduran national museum did select its choice from the complete vessels acquired by the archaeologists. Yet the bulk of the collected material-- in the form of excavated collections-- was not subject to the equal sharing called for in Honduran law. Neither Luke nor I have completely clarified why this was so. To account for it, we need to

give as much attention to the agency of participants in the art world located in the source country as we have to those in the collecting nations.

My own research on the national attitude toward cultural heritage properties in Honduras in the 1930s suggests that fragmentary pieces were not seen as worthwhile. This is supported by the official Honduran document accompanying the exported collections from this expedition, which described them as of "no value" (included with a letter to Donald Scott from W. D. Strong dated 28 July 1936 in the Peabody Museum archives).

The goal for participants in antiquities collecting in countries like Honduras was to create museums of their own for the education of their population. Lacking a body of trained professional archaeologists who would see value in fragments as scientific specimens, retaining these materials simply would have created preservation and management obligations for which little funding, and often no space, was available.

What is more remarkable than the lack of interest in fragments by these countries at the time is the degree to which the North American archaeologists, purportedly representing science, also prized whole objects most, even when these were of uncertain provenience. The journals from the Harvard-Smithsonian expedition include counts of sherds disposed of on site after being counted, their only apparent scientific value being their quantity. The interests of the museums that archaeologists supplied does account for some of this preference, but not all of it. We probably can assume that the university-affiliated museums that sponsored research in the 1930s would have been less concerned with needing whole objects as a way to attracting visitors than museums in our contemporary epoch. Indeed, most of the antiquities acquired from Central America have never been exhibited in these museums.

Whole objects were desireable in the beginning of this art world because it was organized around such things, not around abstract kinds of information equally evident from broken fragments. Whole objects were abstracted from sets, viewed as duplicates, which could be sent to other institutions, as Sellen shows happened with Zapotec urns, and as I found happened with sherds from the Peabody-Smithsonian Institution, which made their way as far as Tokyo.

The preference for complete objects should be acknowledged as part of an archaeological inheritance, still in some ways operating today. It begins with the elevation of monumental sites over everyday places and ends with the celebration of complete objects over the fragments and sediments that form the matrix of a site (Joyce 2006). As Sellen notes, this emphasis on the singular object often "violates the character of the artifacts, which should be considered together, as a whole, from the perspective of core beliefs in indigenous worldview and ritual practice". This bias toward the singular, complete object is part of the way that archaeology structurally supports the emergence of commercial markets even when the archaeologists involved decry the buying and selling of antiquities.

Archaeologists have endorsed and developed many of the tropes of mysterious, early, and advanced development that create the aura of objects from Pre-columbian Mesoamerica that are central to a Mesoamerican art world, and thus to the market in Mesoamerican antiquities. As Yates notes, for example, the market for Maya polychrome pottery was expanded by the excitement generated around the decipherment of Maya writing.

While Yates emphasizes the role of continued demand for Maya antiquities after legislation in the US made import of stone sculpture illegal, the case also can be seen as an example of how structures developed at one point in an art world shape its continuity. The market created by the circulation of now-illegal materials was composed of vendors and buyers,

and there was as much interest in maintaining the traffic in antiquities from the vendors in source countries as there was for those in collecting nations. Shifting our attention to the ways different networks of participants structured art worlds at different points in time can help us recognize the shared roles of individual collectors, museums, vendors and researchers in creating structures that support the circulation of certain things as Mesoamerican art works.

<A>Structuring Structures

Perhaps the most significant point to make about the commercialization of Mesoamerican antiquities may be identifying structural conditions that contribute to creating the art world of which the market is a manifestation. Here we need to acknowledge especially those structural conditions that create incentives for people in source countries to supply traffickers. It is hard to characterize the poor and often disenfranchised people who use informally excavated materials as a resource for a meager living simply as participants in the market. As Matsuda's (1998) proposed language shift from "looter" to "subsistence digger" for people in this position reflects, at issue is the precarity of life in highly unequal societies. The more recent development in the so-called Northern Triangle countries (Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala) of additional pressures leading to trafficking entwined with the international drug trade, and other forms of illicit trafficking that follow the same routes (touched on by Paredes Maury and Krempel), simply deepens precarity and the structures that make excavating and trading antiquities attractive to some people in source countries.

This is where the discussion by Alison Davis of collaborative activities that stem from the current process implementing the US Cultural Property Implementation Act (CPIA) comes in. The CPIA is often viewed as primarily a means of regulating the US market by imposing limits

on allowable imports. This is how Yates assesses it, in her critical examination of whether the CPIA has led to less looting. Davis argues that its broader effects have come from encouraging the care for antiquities in source countries. She documents specific ways source countries, with financial and technical assistance from the US, work to develop a sense of identity with antiquities as cultural heritage among the general population. These efforts address structural conditions, seeking to overcome the incentive that people facing economic precarity have to view antiquities as just (another) exploitable resource.

Cultivating understandings of antiquities as heritage materials, not just as tourism materials, also has the potential to help reinforce civic engagement. In multi-cultural situations like those of all the countries under discussion, the recognition of traditional identities and connections to material evidence of past histories can powerfully change the way people regard things as evidence of their own past (Joyce 2005). This can lead newly engaged participants in what had been a circumscribed art world reassembling the elements of that world into different forms, including framing demands to have a voice in the circulation of antiquities sent as loans to museums in other countries (Joyce 2003). Archaeologists need to accept that antiquities collected for their spiritual power or community needs (as Paredes Maury and Krempel describe in Guatemala) do not derive their primary importance from their use as specimens for research. Ideally, archaeologists would engage in creative approaches to advocate for community voices in the management, curation, and preservation of things that descendant groups see as of specific importance to them.

Such goals can be advanced by the creation of museums in these countries, especially where such museums engage with students. Here, the creation of new art world configurations may involve re-examining some of the lines previously drawn between institutions and

individual collectors. In all these countries, in addition to government-sponsored museums, important cultural institutions have been developed by private individuals or groups of citizens, who have in their possession collections that might at first glance be viewed as simply commodified products of a market. Such non-governmental museums build on the existence of forms of private custody of cultural properties uniformly designated as national patrimony in these countries, as discussed most completely by Paredes Maury and Krempel for Guatemala. Such groups and individuals bring capital otherwise unavailable from government to projects that might otherwise never have happened. Under the laws in place throughout the region archaeologists recognize as Mesoamerica, these museums serve only as custodians, not owners, of archaeological objects.

The division between ownership and stewardship is one of the more confusing aspects of heritage management in this region for North Americans used to a regime of property in which portable archaeological objects can easily be alienated in exchange for money. Yet distinguishing between custodians and owners with the power to exchange antiquities in a marketplace is critical for archaeological engagement with broader social groups, not just institutional authorities, to be effective.

In Honduras, for example, efforts of private individuals expanded the presence of museums outside the capital city where the government had manifested its main interest in building institutions (Joyce 2003). Like the examples of selected conservation of items in private museums in Guatemala discussed by Paredes Maury and Krempel, in Honduras, the Museo de San Pedro Sula has been able to provide professional conservation attention to locally recovered objects (Joyce 2005). In addition to reconstruction of Ulua polychrome vessels from registered private collections, the museum has engaged in restoration and exhibition of professionally

excavated objects from local sites that would likely have remained stored as fragmented collections without this local interest. The largest part of the museum's visitorship is local school children.

<A>Futures

While the topic of the continued destruction of sites linked to the desire of collectors to own objects of Mesoamerican origin is inherently grim, there are hopeful points in this volume. Not the least is that this kind of detailed, careful research is maturing, and going beyond the anecdotal (almost literally) standard that characterized the Dumbarton Oaks Conference volume, the only previous work to which this collection should be compared. As new studies continue, and the number of participants in networks forming art worlds are connected by scholarship, we can begin to truly see how these networks have shaped and reshaped over time. In doing this, we need to constantly push our horizon back to avoid various forms of parochialism that would be easy to adopt, such as treating one decade in the late twentieth century as the key to understanding markets that research shows began to emerge much, much earlier.

The pragmatic products that various authors have produced through their research on collections across which materials have been disbursed are also an inspiration for continued research. Whether it is the record produced by Tremain tracking Maya antiquities through one auction house over decades, the corpus of Mixtec turquoise objects Berger has created, the Zapotec urns for which Sellen created a major database, the similar database for Ulua marble vases produced by Luke, or my own construction of a register of over 1800 Ulua Polychrome vessels (Joyce 2017), research on the circulation of antiquities is yielding new resources for other forms of scholarship.

These new scholarly efforts and products have the potential to extend the art worlds far beyond the traditionally limited circle of wealthy collectors and museums they patronized, or the equally small circle of scholars engaged in research on things like these. Sellen's reported experience is particularly interesting, as it points to new emerging art worlds, if not art markets, that the internet may enable. His online database sees 7,000 visits a month, which he says come from "educators, archaeologists, art restorers and even tattoo artists".

With these new entrants into the art world of Mesoamerican antiquities, our greatest challenge will be to clearly explain why owning objects should not be a desireable goal. We need to develop better arguments directed out to the wider publics so that they understand that our knowledge about the past is not contained in things, but in the relationships of things to each other, and even to the ideally undisturbed sediments where the traces of past activities might be teased out. We need to make the shift to communicating to the broader public that is exemplified by Yates' well-regarded blog, which Sellen singles out for extended discussion. If not, we may well have to look forward to a world in which the technologies that overcome distance serve primarily to extend the art market through auction sites, perpetuating the structure of the art world that came together in the mid-twentieth century. If we are successful, what will emerge may well blur many lines we have treated as indelible, uniting museums whose collecting history is less than ideal with archaeologists to educate broader publics about the importance of protecting heritage sites, and pairing specialist researchers with descendant and source communities, not simply nations, in shared projects of cultural representation. The scope we need to address cannot be contained under the rubric of the market; it is time for us to reimagine the world.

<A>References Cited

AAMD. 2013. *Revisions to the 2008 Guidelines on the Acquisition of Archaeological Material and Ancient Art.* Association of Art Museum Directors, January 29, 2013. Accessed September 30, 2018. https://aamd.org/standards-and-practices

Becker, Howard S. 1982. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Boone, Elizabeth Hill (ed). 1993. *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.

Brodie, Neil. 2015. "The Internet Market in Antiquities." In *Countering Illicit Traffic In Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge Of Protecting The World's Heritage*, edited by France Desmarais, 11–20. Paris: ICOM.

Chinchilla M., Oswaldo. 1998. "Archaeology and Nationalism in Guatemala at the Time of Independence". *Antiquity* 72: 376-387.

Coggins, Clemency C. 1969. "Illicit Traffic of Pre-Columbian Antiquities." *Art Journal* 29(1): 94, 96, 98, 114.

ICE. 2011. *Cultural Property, Art, and Antiquities Investigations: Salvadoran Maya Artifacts*. US Immigration and Customs Enforcement, December 12, 2011. Accessed September 30, 2018. https://www.ice.gov/factsheets/cultural-artifacts

Joyce, Rosemary A. 2003. "Archaeology and Nation Building: A View from Central America". In *The Politics of Archaeology and Identity in a Global Context,* edited by Susan Kane, 79-100. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America.

Joyce, Rosemary A. 2005. "Solid Histories for Fragile Nations: Archaeology as Cultural Patrimony". In *Embedding Ethics*, edited by Lynn M. Meskell and Peter Pels, 253-273. Oxford: Berg.

Joyce, Rosemary A. 2006. "The Monumental and the Trace: Archaeological Conservation and the Materiality of the Past". In *Of the Past, For the Future: Integrating Archaeology and Conservation*, edited by Neville Agnew and Janet Bridgland, 13-18. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Joyce, Rosemary A. 2013. "When is Authentic? Situating Authenticity in Itineraries of Objects". In *What is Authenticity*?, edited by Alex Geurds and Laura van Broekhaven, 39-57. Leiden: National Ethnographic Museum.

Joyce, Rosemary A. 2017. *Painted Pottery From Honduras: Object Itineraries and Lives*. Brill: Leiden

Levine, Marc N. and Lucha Martínez de Luna. 2013. "Museum salvage: A case study of Mesoamerican artifacts in museum collections and on the antiquities market." *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 38: 264-276.

Lyons, Claire. 2002. "Objects and Identities: Claiming and Reclaiming the Past". In *Claiming the Stones, Naming the Bones: Cultural Property and the Negotiation of National and Ethnic Identity*, edited by Elazart Barkan and Ronald Bush, 116-137. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Trust.

Matsuda, David. 1998. "The Ethics of Archaeology, Subsistence Digging, and Artifact Looting in Latin America: Point, Muted Counterpoint". *International Journal of Cultural Property,* 7: 87-97.