Check for updates

Received: 3 June 2022 | Accepted: 6 January 2023
DOI: 10.1111/jlca.12681

IN FOCUS

Editors' introduction to Sound "Repatriation" in South America: The Politics of Collaborative Archive Reactivations

Ingrid Kummels[1] | **Gisela Cánepa**[2]

[1]Freie Universität Berlin
[2]Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima

Correspondence
Ingrid Kummels, Freie Universität Berlin.
Email: kummels@zedat.fu-berlin.de

Abstract
The introduction first gives insights into the state of the art of sound "repatriation" concerning the way historical and current recordings of verbal arts, music, and dance are brought back into circulation in originating communities. Sound restitution also seeks to level the epistemological divide resulting from conventional archiving. The groundbreaking, collaborative reactivations taking place in South America explored within the three articles in this journal issue are presented. External researchers and local co-researchers join forces to create shared soundscapes on an equitable basis; they develop innovative research designs for restitution and participate in webs of collaboration that take into account the recuperation of sound traditions that expert vocalists and instrumentalists, grassroots researchers, Indigenous leaders, and cultural entrepreneurs have independently initiated. Finally, the inclusion of co-researchers in the curatorship of museum exhibitions and the need to identify anyone who may claim rights to oratory, music, and dance is addressed.

KEYWORDS
sound repatriation, archival reactivation, shared soundscapes, collaborative anthropology, decolonization

Resumen
La introducción inicia con un estado del arte sobre la repatriación sonora y las formas en que los registros históricos y contemporáneos de las artes verbales, la música y la danza son de nuevo difundidas en las comunidades de las cuales provinieron. A través de la restitución sonora también se busca equilibrar la brecha epistemológica que resulta de las formas convencionales de archivar. Luego se presentan experiencias de reactivaciones colaborativas pioneras desarrolladas en Suramérica examinadas por los tres artículos que conforman este número especial. Investigadores extralocales y coinvestigadores locales unen esfuerzos para crear paisajes sonoros compartidos sobre una base de equidad; ellos desarrollan diseños de investigación innovadores y participan en redes de colaboración que toman en cuenta que vocalistas e instrumentalistas expertos, investigadores comunitarios, dirigentes indígenas y emprendedores culturales ya están involucrados en la recuperación de tradiciones sonoras de manera independiente. Finalmente, se abordan la inclusión de co-investigadores en la curaduría de exhibiciones de museos, asi como la necesidad de identificar a quienes podrían reclamar derechos sobre las expresiones de oratoria, música y danza.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.
© 2023 The Author. *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of American Anthropological Association.

PALABRAS CLAVE
repatriación sonora, reactivación de archivos, paisajes sonoros compartidos, antropología colaborativa, decolonización

This In-Focus Special Issue explores innovative projects in South America (Venezuela, the Guianas, Brazil, Peru, and Bolivia) that focus on the sound heritages of Indigenous and *mestizo* collectivities dating from the early twentieth century to the present. It examines current collaborations with the communities where oratory, music, and dance were once performed and documented. The contributions delve into a particular section of the processes generally called *sound repatriation*, but the cases they present do not refer to the legally endorsed process of giving materials back to a community or country that is designated the rightful owner of such materials, a process that is the now at the center of the debate on restoring artefacts kept in museums of the Global North (Sarr and Savoy, 2018, 25). Instead, in each case ethnomusicologists and anthropologists external to the respective localities consciously initiated joint endeavors, the sharing of soundscapes, the resocialization of historic recordings and/or sonic activism as a basis for establishing a long-term relationship with the custodian communities where oratory, music, and dance were formerly recorded and remain living expressions. Their endeavors reveal how engagement in such a dialogue with local experts—who may become collaborators and co-researchers—requires challenging the many colonial rifts that riddle sound archives and ethnographic research, given such research's traditional reliance on sonic recordings. Moreover, the external and local stakeholders involved have different interests, which they must negotiate to pursue common aims of decolonizing sound archives—that is, reactivating knowledge while also supporting movements for political recognition of cultural diversity.

As a point of departure, we examine a foundational article published by Sylvia Nannyonga-Tamusuza and Andrew Weintraub in 2012 concerning the return of recordings made in Uganda in the 1940s and 1950s by the British ethnomusicologist Klaus P. Wachsmann to a newly established archive in Kampala and to archives in several originating communities. These recordings are currently maintained by the British Library Sound Archive. Nannyonga-Tamusuza and Weintraub discuss in detail their use of the term "repatriation" in quotation marks to highlight the problems involved in reactivating archival sound recordings. Among the many questions they raise, are: What exactly is returned in the process of sound restitution? It is not the original live music that is brought back into circulation but mechanical encodings of sound on a support, mediated and fragmented by the technology of its time. In Wachsmann's case, acetate discs were used to record, which enabled extraordinary quality but a duration of only four minutes. Here we may add that the return of digital versions on hard discs, on USB drives, or as social media postings implies a further transformation of format. To whom are these media restituted? Depending on the temporal distance, the people who are given copies of historical recordings often are not direct descendants of the original performers. Other people or new collectivities may raise a claim to the musical expressions archived or reject them as controversial. Whose memories and whose legacy are these encoded sounds today? In the case of the Wachsmann materials, repatriating to Uganda digital copies held in Great Britain meant not only transferring them to an "accessible and sustainable music archive that links Uganda's musical heritage of the past with the present," then under construction at Makerere University in Kampala (Nannyonga-Tamusuza and Weintraub, 2012, 214). The British archival materials also required an even broader decentralization. Communities in remote areas of Uganda where the recordings had originated needed to be equipped with their own archiving systems.

Nannyonga-Tamusuza and Weintraub—and extensive scholarship on returns of audios, photographs, films, and artefacts—demonstrate that sound repatriation is unsettled territory.[1] Many limitations exist concerning the possibility of true restitution in the sense of repairing the colonial inequalities inscribed in archives' recordings. Yet this is precisely why restitution harbors so much promise for breaking up the structural hierarchies originating from colonialism and for reworking relations of knowledge production among researchers, communities, and archives. The repositories of the Global North are often still shaped by a colonial matrix (Lewy, 2020, 92–93), but communities worldwide have developed their own expertise on sound, memory-keeping, and archival practices (see Pace [2018]). Therefore, addressing the complex process of return means challenging ongoing global inequalities. One way to begin is to develop a better understanding of the epistemological distance between conventional sound repositories and heirs to the oratory, music, and dance that was originally recorded; this distance has been analyzed by scholars of archival science (Gilliland et al., 2017), media anthropology (Vapnarsky, 2020), and the anthropology of archives (Kummels and Cánepa Koch, 2021)—disciplines that have also proposed ways of addressing and overcoming such distance. Uneven soundscapes have resulted from the location of most archives of South American sonorities in European, North American, and Latin American metropolises, where decisions about distribution and heritagization were made unilaterally. In addition, the scientific paradigms applied by anthropologists have left an imprint. Recordings deposited in research archives do not simply reproduce the historical traditions of the communities where they were produced. Instead, sonorities were named, classified, and organized according to anthropological theories of the respective period (which in many cases are now outdated and controversial), mainly for use by researchers external to the communities in question.

For these reasons, the process of returning, retrieving, and reactivating historical music requires "a wide range of interventions: new classifications, digitalizing, links to other sources, provocative or perhaps old-fashioned interpretations" (García, 2017, 17). Recent approaches to sound archives advocate reorienting them as "extensions of living traditions" to be negotiated in

19354940, 2023, 3, Downloaded from https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jlca.12681 by Freie Universitaet Berlin, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

continuous collaboration with the communities where the oratory, music, and dance were registered (Gunderson and Woods, 2018, 2). Acknowledging the rights of communities to decide on their own sound legacies is an indispensable prerequisite, along with engaging in a dialogue that includes marginalized members (Valdovinos, 2020, 197) and exchanging opinions in a respectful way when reactivating an archive. This allows for discerning deeper meanings of sonic expressions that decentralize Western concepts of authorship, instrumentalization, and the classification of music genres (Brabec de Mori et al., 2015, 12).

SOUND REPATRIATION IN SOUTH AMERICA: FROM WHERE AND WHEN, INVOLVING WHOM AND WHY?

In this issue, we address the capacity of sound repatriation for "actively reversing the colonial process" (Seeger, 1986, 267; see also Seeger 2018) and propose that the return of recordings, their resocialization or putting them into circulation may pave the way for radically rethinking and redressing the relationship between researchers, archives, and custodian communities.

Some of the oldest sound archives, like the Phonogrammarchiv of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (founded in 1899) and the Phonogramm-Archiv in Berlin (founded in 1900), were an integral part of European imperialism or late German colonialism; they served as models for other important sound repositories, including those in South American metropolises, established throughout the twentieth century. The "material" and "immaterial" aspects of sonorities were separated: therefore, museums specialized in collecting instruments while phonogram archives kept the sound recordings (Lewy, 2020, 93). It is no coincidence that the very name of the research archive would highlight the latest novelty in recording at the turn of the twentieth century: the phonograph's ability to inscribe sound waves on wax cylinders. Scientific ways of collecting music were driven by the erroneous belief in the superiority of "modern" technology with regard to an "accurate" and normed recording for the purpose of comparative data.[2] Due to this colonial legacy, the modalities of access, listening, and cultural performance of existing sound archives often prove deficient when it comes to bringing historical music back into circulation (Kalibani, 2021). These institutions frequently do not take the multiplicity of archival ideas and skills developed in parallel into account; in most cases they fail to collect diverse sonic products and decentralize their own stored materials.

A further critical area concerns the risk that sharing historical recordings will become an extractivist practice, a means for ethnomusicologists and anthropologists primarily to advance their publishing agendas or to add value to the inert stored materials of existing archives. Nevertheless, as discussed in this issue, the potential risk is counteracted in the return designs that identify the interests and expertise of local stakeholders, negotiate common goals and exchange proficiencies to propel the joint and egalitarian production of knowledge.

To discern these colonial burdens and new promising collaborative paths, we advocate that sound repatriation as a wider process does not have only one point of departure, the intentional reactivation by those in control of historical recordings. Instead, we suggest that current processes of archive stimulation occur hand-in-hand or in parallel with ongoing efforts to safeguard aural knowledges that communities consider their own, with heritagization processes of music and dance repertoires, and with identity politics. These wider dynamics can be usefully analyzed as shared soundscapes. The notion of a soundscape has the advantage of expanding the Western concept of music, which is restricted to melodious sonorities, to one that encompasses other enunciations of the voice in social interaction (Brabec de Mori et al., 2015, 12). Furthermore, the emphasis on sound allows for discerning the specificities of its return. Sonorities have an immaterial quality that requires shifting our attention to listening. Any "original performance" is not materialized in a uniform way unless technological recording is applied, whereby the copying of sound on tangible supports such as wax cylinders, tapes, and hard discs convert it into a museum object or anthropological hard data. Since sonic content can be shared digitally through endless copies capable of spreading rapidly, its restitution triggers dynamics of circulation and reflections that differ from the return of artefacts (Lucas, 2020, 153–55). Moreover, our understanding of soundscapes as shaped by social hierarchies and forms of racial, class, ethnic, gender, and geographic discrimination ties in with Steve Feld's concept of acoustemology (Feld, 2015). Analysis of the negotiation of listening, talking, and playing music by a web of actors relies on the notion of multiple relationalities of different scales, such as the local, national, and transatlantic exchanges involved in bringing archival material back to circulation in South America and creating decolonized museum exhibits in Europe.

The contributions to this issue show that, in addition to vocalists and instrumentalists, a web of actors is involved in oratory, music, and dance reactivation. This web may include artists, political leaders, bilingual teachers, language consultants, and cultural entrepreneurs from local communities as well as external anthropologists and ethnomusicologists. Inequalities between stakeholders influence the mobilization of aural and audiovisual materials as well as the cultural legacies that involve heritage policies, new museum models, and identity politics. Levelling inequality depends on a willingness to engage in a dialogue and to use a variety of knowledges to build archives that are accessible to the communities interested in them.

The sound collections discussed in this issue concern the legacies of the circum-Roraima Indigenous groups of the border region of Brazil, Venezuela, and the Guianas; Peruvian Rainforest Peoples of the Ucayali and Junín regions, in particular the Shipibo, Asháninka, and Nomatsiguenga; the Muchik, Quechua, and *mestizo* Peoples of the Peruvian Lambayeque region; and the Potosí Aymara Highlanders of Bolivia. Not all contributing authors use the concept of soundscape, which has been repeatedly expanded and critiqued since R. Murray Schafer popularized it (Feld, 2015; Ingold, 2007). The writers nevertheless address the

19354940, 2023, 3, Downloaded from https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jlca.12681 by Freie Universitaet Berlin, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

key issues of soundscapes as we have redefined them: the shared and disputed realms of sonorities. The authors of the first two articles choose a comparative approach (Barreto et al., 2023; Lewy and Brabec, 2023). They investigate very different cases of sound repatriation as a way to assess the specific and more general features of restitution against the foil of diverging pathways of return.

The contributions to the issue examine the constitution of several collections. The authors provide a critical reflection on their involvement as ethnomusicologists or anthropologists or their special access to these collections and the custodian communities in question. They analyze their positioning in a certain place and at a particular time with regard to their interlocutors in order to theorize the issue of restitution. The spatial point of departure in several case studies is the Global North; in other case studies that point of departure is the South American metropolis of Lima and the realm of the Internet. These articles mostly concern collections that are the outcome of fieldwork carried out by an anthropologist or ethnomusicologist (on a team with local experts), by a research team engaging in an audiovisual preservation project (such as the case of the Peruvian Institute of Ethnomusicology), or by those engaged in heritagization initiatives that use digital technology and platforms (like in contemporary Bolivia). Thus, all these ventures to return recorded music pursued an archival mission—archival in the wider sense of what defines (and redefines) an archive (compare with Anthony Seeger's narrower definition, 2023). We argue that repositories may be quite varied as a result of the diversity of memory-keeping practices and the basic openness of archival processes (for an overview, see Bigenho and Stobart, 2023). This concerns different degrees of their colonial/imperial load versus their liberating qualities; the latter is often advanced by marginalized actors invested in collecting, storing, and publishing for a brighter future. The authors of this issue acknowledge that storytelling, instrument-making, music, and dance are not only memory devices but rather community-specific archival practices with political implications. Thus, they abandon the normative assumption that just one kind of archive is valid; instead, through their involvement in sound repatriation, they decenter and renew classic notions of what an archive is.

The contributing anthropologists and ethnomusicologists engaged in sonic activism, as practiced in heritagization and identity politics, reveal that the transition between these academic and activist fields appears to be quite fluid. Differences are evident with regard to researchers' positioning and the theoretical framework they adopt in a context of exchange with South American Peoples. The following examples follow the chronological order of the original recordings, starting with the oldest. In Matthias Lewy's case chants that Theodor Koch-Grünberg had recorded on wax-cylinders in 1911, mainly of performers of the Pemón language group (Brazil/Venezuela/the Guianas), were returned a century later by organizing re-listening sessions with Indigenous specialists. Lewy's motivation was decolonizing the knowledge classified by and exhibited in European anthropological museums (see Lewy and Brabec, 2023). Beginning in 1978, Manfred Schäfer recorded the oratory, music, and dance of the Asháninka and Nomatsiguenga (Peru) during fieldwork inspired by an action anthropology approach and the goal of creating an activist archive in the context of international rainforest advocacy in the 1970s and 1980s. Since 2014, Ingrid Kummels has continuously returned digital copies of Schäfer's material due to her conviction that this legacy belongs to the Asháninka and Nomatsiguenga community where most of the recording took place (see Barreto et al., 2023). Between 1990 and 1991, Gisela Cánepa Koch, as a member of the team of the Institute of Ethnomusicology (IDE) at Pontifical Catholic University of Peru (PUCP), registered traditional music of the Lambayeque region in accordance with archival policies to preserve and disseminate the diversity of traditional musics of Peru. Notwithstanding the prior diffusion of these audiovisual materials, she promotes their current restitution in line with IDE's revision of its policies to facilitate access through digitalization and the creation of a digital platform. These new terms of access are negotiated with local actors who foster the heritagization of local music and dance in Lambayeque (see Barreto et al., 2023). Since 1998, Bernd Brabec de Mori has generated a large corpus of field recordings of Amazonian Peoples in the area surrounding Pucallpa in Peru. He was inspired by performers' concerns about safeguarding their music and combined his research with a series of returns, first to the performers themselves, then with storage at the Phonogrammarchiv and at Nopoki University, a Catholic university for Indigenous Peoples in Atalaya, Peru; a further deposit at the IDE in Lima is pending (see Lewy and Brabec, 2023). Finally, Michelle Bigenho and Henry Stobart present us a novel and increasingly diffused form of archiving: user-driven uploads on platforms like YouTube, TikTok, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. Their research in Bolivia, which self-defines as a decolonizing state and embraces UNESCO heritagization policies, incited them to analyze the circulation of the documentary "Women's Singing from Puna, Potosí" and interview one of its protagonists. Bigenho and Stobart show how this video, which was an element of the campaign to promote women's singing became part of a powerful counterarchive, despite the failure of the heritagization initiative for which it was originally designed (see Bigenho and Stobart, 2023).

The current transformation of analog archival material into more accessible digital formats is one of the main topics dealt with by the introduction to the comprehensive handbook on sound repatriation authored by Frank Gunderson and Bret Woods (2018) and an issue edited by Valentina Vapnarsky (2020). Until now, the ways that everyday technologies like cell phones are used by local communities in South America for documenting and archiving have received comparatively little attention (but see Ulfe and Vergara [2021], Sánchez [2019]). Serving as mini-computers, cell phones are harnessed to revitalize oratory, music, and dance heritages using both historical and present-day sound recordings, often in the context of identity politics. Some of the contributions to this issue explore pathways taken by local peoples who have appropriated digital audiovisual technology to chronicle community life. The monopoly held by researchers of the Global North on advanced technology is quickly disintegrating. For example, in the Peruvian Central Rainforest, Indigenous leaders invest in high-priced smartphones that they use

1935940, 2023, 3, Downloaded from https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jlca.12681 by Freie Universitaet Berlin, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

for documentation and dissemination in the context of "Amasonic politics" (see Kummels, 2023). These cases of empowerment alone, of course, do not eliminate the digital divide regarding infrastructure and the price of connectivity.

DESIGNING RETURN AND THE NATURE OF ARCHIVES

Depending on their personal and professional motives as anthropologists and ethnomusicologists, as well as on the variables of space, time, and epistemological approach to sound collection, the authors in this issue created different designs for incentivizing the recordings new uses. Through previous interaction with performers and communities, they had already developed a keen understanding of how their interlocutors conceptualize oratory, music, and dance; this informed their approach to restitution, recuperation and reactivation. Moreover, the nature of the archives from which they either received copies of historical material to be returned or where they had stored their own recordings for safeguarding and dissemination is quite diverse. Thus, one of the variables that influences return of encoded sound is the character of what we have called an archive in the articles of this issue. These include the classic research archives, individual archives held by scholars, and counterarchives that communities create (in this case on the Internet).

The proven way of ensuring public access to recordings is for an individual researcher to deposit their collection in one of the large institutional sound archives. Theodor Koch-Grünberg did exactly this, working as a research assistant at the precursor of the Ethnologisches Museum in Berlin. His collecting expeditions were designed to satisfy the repositories that were keen on amassing these materials and funded him (in the case of sound, this applied to the Phonogramm-Archiv in Berlin). Despite his sensible approach to Indigenous research subjects, Koch-Grünberg's expeditions formed part of the late colonial setting in which these German institutions had been founded. Lewy's return of the sounds registered by Koch- Grünberg on wax cylinders required a decolonial approach, required him "stepping back" as a researcher and instead investing his efforts in making the interpretations of his co-researchers and consultants visible and communicating knowledge meant for engaging a wider audience in decolonization. Co-researchers' input also served for theory-building: Lewy and Brabec (2023) propose that Indigenous understandings of recordings as "ontological units" allow for a deeper comprehension of their personhood which is why they undergo a resocialization rather than a restitution—a theoretical approach that allows for decolonizing sound collections.

In contrast, Manfred Schäfer built an activist archive. He organized and classified most of his documents to disseminate them in his creative work, including radio and TV programs advocating for Rainforest Peoples' sustainable way of life and land titles. He also shared photographs freely with German and Peruvian activists, Indigenous organizations such as the Interethnic Association of the Peruvian Amazon (AIDESEP, by its name in Spanish), as well as the Rainforest Peoples involved. He never intended to transfer his many recordings to a research archive, since his repository had a different agenda; its access was reserved to people in solidarity with Amazonian Indigenous Peoples' causes. Collections of anthropologists and ethnomusicologists that remain in private hands are nothing unusual. Seeger (1986, 264–65) deplored this situation and perhaps overlooked the cases in which the missions of individual and institutional archives diverged. In 2014, Kummels began to return Schäfer's materials to the Asháninka and Nomatsiguenga community in improvised ways. Local people immediately engaged with these unexpected memories and then shared their own recuperation practices. This incited her to design Shared Soundscapes with their help, as a comparative and collaborative project.[3] Since nowadays all involved consider the recordings of ancestors as being not just a family but also a communal affair, there is consensus that ultimately the whole *comunidad nativa* (Indigenous community, a legal entity in Peru) will decide where Schäfer's private archive is stored. This pathway deviates from the established practice of anthropologists (or their heirs) entrusting their fieldwork collections to research archives.

Cánepa was a member of the IDE research team that carried out recording activities in Lambayeque in 1990 and 1991 that resulted in a collection of traditional regional music. Decades later, she was inspired by her engagement with the study of the ethnographic collection on Lambayeque on the Peruvian Northern Coast, which the German researcher Heinrich Brüning had gathered at the turn of the twentieth century, and its contemporary appropriation through everyday digital archival practices to undertake the current activation of the IDE archive. Her work involves reconnecting with the archival sound materials and revisiting the localities where she recorded 31 years ago. This is part of a two-fold task: first, to collaboratively return the Lambayeque collection in dialogue with the longstanding regional tradition of collecting and archiving, which now relies on digital tools in the context of heritagization and cultural revival initiatives; and second, to elucidate inequalities entailed in and reproduced by different ways of listening to historical recordings by the custodians of the region's musical repertoires. The aim is to design collaborative methodologies that make the restitution process an opportunity to critically approach and creatively subvert those inequalities.

The design of Brabec de Mori's ethnographic research on Amazonian songs is completely enmeshed with a number of returns. Restitution during ethnographic research is an ongoing practice in anthropology (Jaarsma, 2002), but due to the unequal distribution of sound technology, especially in remote regions such as large parts of Amazonia, previously only transcribed interviews, fieldnotes, written chapters, and collected material items could be shared. Because at the time Brabec de Mori could not find a public institution dedicated to safeguarding recorded music, he devised an alternative form of returning and distributing his recordings to their authors. While he maintained possession of digital versions, he also recorded cassettes with a Walkman, a

19354940, 2023, 3, Downloaded from https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jlca.12681 by Freie Universitaet Berlin, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

format with which vocalists of the respective rainforest communities were better acquainted, and gave them the cassettes. Later his recordings were edited to produce a CD that would allow the performers to obtain additional copies in nearby Pucallpa on demand. Recording, restitution, and activation therefore overlapped in his field research.

Bigenho and Stobart chose a different kind of archive as a point of departure: the documentary "Women's Singing from Puna, Potosí," produced by the commercial film company Fama Comunicación as a "heritage-making video" to support a campaign of heritagizing women's singing. Users take advantage of the technological possibilities offered by digital platforms such as YouTube and shifting power relations that open a space for "potentially unstable" or "emergent archives (Featherstone; Canepa and Kummels, in: Bigenho and Stobart, 2023)." In the case of these researchers, there was no need to reactivate the archive, but there was a need to understand how it came into existence and to follow up on the Indigenous media interactions that create a counter-archival space. Bigenho and Stobart conclude that the video had the capacity to articulate alternative archival experiences, and they use it to delve into the locus of power in the Bolivian decolonizing processes, particularly in cyberspace where anyone can become an archivist by uploading audiovisual materials for general access.

WEBS OF COLLABORATION, RENEWED RECUPERATION METHODOLOGIES, AND THE LEGAL ASPECTS OF RETURN

All contributions highlight local experts and co-researchers like Balbina Lambos, Florinda Hernández, Laida Mori Silvano, Fernando Masters Lambos, Simón Chiricente, Wilder Cajusol, Carlos Inoñán and Nilda Romero. In each case study, their participation as interlocutors, consultants, or co-researchers in sound repatriation can be traced back to their independent efforts to safeguard oratory, music, and dance in their own languages and according to their own worldviews. Some were involved in heritagization, while for others, the impetus was their identity politics activism. The contributing authors to this issue characterize their counterparts as expert vocalists and instrumentalists, grassroots researchers, Indigenous leaders, or cultural entrepreneurs. These local specialists, connoisseurs, and wise people engaged in the interstices of the separations that occur when making and archiving recordings—divides that originate in colonialism and the distance that archival knowledge in the Global North deliberately created to subordinate the epistemes of Others. But an analysis of stakeholder agency in diverse soundscapes also reveals the tension that can develop between local expertise and the neoliberal, commercial entrepreneurship promoted by some South American governments. In Peru, policies that support the country's regions differentially because of the uneven (commercial) value attributed to their sonic repertoires for the nation's cultural legacy by the state are symptomatic (see Barreto et al., 2023). This difference in treatment has prevented basic needs from being fulfilled evenly across the country, which in turn fueled the political crisis of 2023 and Peru's disintegration. Social and cultural movements seek to break with centralist policies and corruption identified with Lima's central political institutions and their exploitation of the nation-state.

Interaction between Indigenous grassroots researchers and non-Indigenous anthropologists paves the way for greater reflexivity with respect to research and its knowledge production (Smith, 2012, 175–79). The notion of reflexivity in collaboration takes into account conceptual flows in two directions: the way that Native ideas inform anthropological theory construction and the way that anthropological ideas have influenced Native conceptualizations due to the dialogical character of fieldwork. The resulting methodologies of sonic return are therefore hybrid ones—similar to the way that original recordings may be considered co-authored soundscapes, depending on the power relations involved in the respective endeavors. These multiple fissures within soundscapes offer diversified points of departure for recuperation, resocialization and reactivation. The question arises as to how a web of actors enabling return can be developed in the first place. An arrangement that allows for collaboration with a common purpose, a fair payment, and a division of labor between these soundscape actors must be established based on trust and mutual expectations; in each case different constellations of collaboration emerged. One possible solution includes the dyad of co-researcher informed by the theoretical paradigms of postcolonial research and their chain of trust with community elders (Lewy); in another case, Indigenous leaders and teachers are key collaborators (Kummels and Barreto); heritagization promoters, among them performers and cultural entrepreneurs, take center stage in another (Cánepa Koch and Maradiegue). Instrumentalists and vocalists may also be decisive film protagonists, extending their agency to the soundscapes of documentaries (Cánepa Koch; Bigenho and Stobart). The webs of collaboration differ according to the distinct missions pursued by co-researchers and the positions they adopt vis-à-vis the archives of the respective anthropologists, ethnomusicologists, and/or institutions. With regard to the temporal distance between the recording and its reactivation, this web may show continuities but also important ruptures.

A concrete example of adapting restitution methodology to local practices of reactivation consists of hearing historical recordings in joint efforts with Indigenous specialists. One of the methods Lewy developed together with his co-researchers of the circum-Roraima Indigenous groups involved re-listening sessions held in the intimate setting of a mobile sound studio installed in a van. Local people co-shape this methodology, since they reflect on and convey the ability of non-human entities to hear human songs. A different case of listening emerged from Kummels's collaborative activities. According to her interlocutors, historical songs were best interpreted in the same environment from which they emanate: the gregarious soundscape of a *masato* (manioc beer) gathering. Hearing an ancient melody provoked the urge to sing it again. Thus, these co-researchers engage in

1935940, 2023, 3, Downloaded from https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jlca.12681 by Freie Universitaet Berlin, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

19354940, 2023, 3, Downloaded from https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jlca.12681 by Freie Universitaet Berlin, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

singing recorded music once again as a life-giving activity, an essential method of interpreting and producing knowledge—a methodology now adapted by the Shared Soundscapes project.

In the Amazonian case studies, people perceive listening and singing as life-giving activities for animated "objects" (like music instruments and cassettes) that are considered inert and "sleeping" whenever they have been withdrawn from this kind of interaction. The need for a life-giving methodology has to do with the displacement of the knowledges of Others, as addressed by Brabec and Lewy regarding collected sound that is disconnected from its origins, ultimately leading to the establishment of "cemeteries of objects" in museum depots (Lewy, 2020, 93). This concerns the myriad objects and recordings kept at Ethnologisches Museum in Berlin. Diana Guzmán, a Wira poná culture custodian visiting this museum from Colombia, explained that the "objects"—among them many music instruments and dance attire of the Kotiria and Wira poná Peoples—were "sleeping" there. The term *sleeping* suggests that in contrast to death (connoted by the term *cemetery*), inertia can be overcome by joint recuperation; Guzmán insisted that dialogue and circulation of knowledge are missing between Europe and their territories. Gaudencio Moreno, a Kotiria wise man and one of the experts invited to the museum workshop, put this belief into practice by singing to a butterfly mask when he discovered it in the depot where 300,000 "objects" are stored—most of them originally from Indigenous communities in South America (Kummels, 2020).

Musical instruments, the local materials to manufacture them, or the importation of foreign instruments can all be part of local methods of archiving in the context of constructing local identities. As Cánepa Koch and Walter Maradiegue show, the soundscape created via the multifaceted mastery of the *chirimía* (the local name for the coastal oboe), which includes knowing how to create or obtain it, activates memory. The local exhibition of instruments in the context of public festivities or visits between households expresses differentiated statuses, depending on access to and possession of this instrument. When historical materials are restituted, these everyday practices reproduce or eventually contest such local inequalities; they also trigger unexpected uses of these materials. Therefore, power relations at multiple levels should be considered to foster more egalitarian access via restitution methodologies. Lewy and Brabec discern how everyday archival practices point to the necessity of transferring much more agency to co-researchers when exhibiting sound in museums in European and South American metropolises. Both researchers have engaged in various efforts to change the hierarchy of curatorship in large museums, which is still overwhelmingly in the hands of non-Indigenous and non-local curators (with some exceptions, mainly in Canada, the United States, and Australia). In their case, they were able to extend the theory-building achieved through collaborative restitution successfully into the shared soundscapes of museums. Yet negotiating a fair share for Laida Mori and Fernando Lambos, who co-curated a multimedia installation at the Humboldt Forum in Berlin that included myths they had recorded, required several attempts (see Lewy and Brabec, 2023).

Importantly, collaboration at all of these levels (recording, archiving, and exhibiting) concerns the question of rights to oratory, music, and dance—from the very beginning of initiating any kind of joint venture with regard to sonic legacies. Which individual, kinship group, communal entity, or institution holds or claims rights and may concede permissions for dissemination by academic or commercial distributors? The ownership of knowledge about sound is not shared equally across the world; instead, the law of copyright and the royalties that derive from copyright determine who becomes wealthy. The authors in this issue choose different points of departure to redress this imbalance. Although addressed only briefly, a crucial concern is the fact that while older archives attempt to make their sound collections available, in the past they often failed to secure the rights to do so from the authors of oratory, music, and dance. Determining such rights retrospectively requires them to "identify all people and groups who should be consulted about access strategies" and to agree with them as to who holds the rights in question (G. Koch, 2019, 14). This entails not only grasping differing concepts regarding the authorship of music but also promoting such concepts through collaboration with co-researchers at every stage of return; this also concerns their inclusion as co-producers of sonic publications on established media like CDs as well as on the Internet.

Sound returns and archive mobilization can change global inequalities when restitution activists and co-researchers join forces. Sharing a soundscape on an equitable basis requires their agency; it depends upon an exchange of expertise and personal commitment from both sides—whether acting from outside or from within a research archive—and an aptitude to engage as intermediaries in multiple levels of return and recuperation. These include existing archives, museums, record labels, and digital platforms, as discussed in the following articles. Sharing soundscapes is not a venture to be accomplished in a limited time range: it is a long-term endeavor, shaping our past, present, and future—as well as those of our descendants.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Open access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

ORCID

Ingrid Kummels https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8836-2054

ENDNOTES

[1] The scholarship on returns of materials stored in anthropological museums and sound archives is extensive, but less has been published on such returns to South America. For an overview on the latter see Lucas (2020, 153–54).

[2] The founder of the Berlin Königliches Museum für Völkerkunde, Adolf Bastian, urged his employees to collect a large number of objects called *Ethnographica* from across the world; Erich Moritz von Hornbostel, director of the Phonogramm-Archiv, similarly encouraged wax cylinder recordings. The vast collection of traditional music was used to construct a theory that Hornbostel considered to be universally valid for the evolution of music (L.-C. Koch et al., 2004, 228). Mèhèza Kalibani (2021) analyzes the racist hierarchies implied in Hornbostel's universalist scheme of music.

[3] Shared Soundscapes is funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG, by its name in German) for a period of three years.

REFERENCES

Barreto, Rocío, Gisela Cánepa, Ingrid Kummels, and Walther Maradiegue. 2023. Shared soundscapes: The (re)activation of an institutional and individual archive of Peruvian music and dance. *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 28 (3). In Press.

Bigenho, Michelle, and Henry Stobart. 2023. Unsettling the return: Alternative curation and counterarchives. *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 28 (3). In Press.

Brabec de Mori, Bernd, Matthias Lewy, and Miguel García, eds. 2015. Sudamérica y sus mundos audibles: Cosmologías y prácticas sonoras de los pueblos indígenas.*Estudios Indiana 8*. Berlin: IAI.

Feld, Steven. 2015. "Acoustemology." In *Keywords in Sound*, edited by David Novak and Matt Sakakeenypp, 12–21. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

García, Miguel. 2017. "Sound Archives under Suspicion." In *Historical Sources of Ethnomusicology in Contemporary Debate*, edited by Susanne Ziegler, Ingrid Åkesson, Gerda Lechleitner, and Susana Sardo, 10–20. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Gilliland, Anne J., Sue McKemmish, and Andrew J. Law, eds. 2017. *Research in the Archival Multiverse*. Clayton, Australia: Monash University.

Gunderson, Frank, and Bret Woods. 2018. "Pathways toward Open Dialogues about Sonic Heritage: An Introduction to *The Oxford Handbook of Musical Repatriation*." In *The Oxford Handbook of Musical Repatriation*, edited by Frank Gunderson, Robert Lancefield, and Bret Woods, 1–15. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190659806.013.43.

Ingold, Tim. 2007. "Against Soundscape." In *Autumn Leaves: Sound and the Environment in Artistic Practice*, edited by Carlyle Angus, 10–13. Paris: Double Entendre.

Jaarsma, Sjoerd R., ed. 2002. *Handle with Care: Ownership and Control of Ethnographic Materials*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Kalibani, Mèhèza. 2021. "The Less Considered Part: Contextualizing Immaterial Heritage from German Colonial Contexts in the Restitution Debate." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 28 (1): 43–53.

Koch, Grace. 2019. "'We Want Our Voices Back': Ethical Dilemmas in the Repatriation of Recordings." In *The Oxford Handbook of Musical Repatriation*, edited by Frank Gunderson, Robert Lancefield, and Bret Woods, 1–21. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190659806.013.11.

Koch, Lars-Christian, Albrecht Wiedmann, and Susanne Ziegler. 2004. "The Berlin Phonogramm-Archiv: A Treasury of Sound Recordings." *Acoustic Science and Technology* 25 (4): 227–31.

Kummels, Ingrid. 2023. Ethnography In-Sight: Amasonic politics. *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 28 (3). In Press.

Kummels, Ingrid, dir. 2020. *Sleeping Objects*. Berlin: IKfilms. https://vimeo.com/474203931.

Kummels, Ingrid, and Gisela Cánepa Koch, eds. 2021. *Antropología y archivos en la era digital: usos emergentes de lo audiovisual*. 2 volumes. Lima: IDE/PUCP.

Lewy, Matthias. 2020. "Some Thoughts about Professional Fields of Ethnomusicologists in Museums." *AEMR-EJ* 5: 92–95.

Lewy, Matthias, and Bernd Brabec de Mori. 2023. Resocializing recordings: Collaborative archiving and curating of sound as an agent of knowledge transfer. *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 28 (3). In Press.

Lucas, Maria Luísa. 2020. "Digitization, Return, and Circulation of Sound Recordings Sound Recordings among the Bora in the Colombian Amazon." *Journal de la Société des américanistes* 106-2: 151–76. http://journals.openedition.org/jsa/18640.

Nannyonga-Tamusuza, Sylvia, and Andrew Weintraub. 2012. "The Audible Future: Reimagining the Role of Sound Archives and Sound Repatriation in Uganda." *Ethnomusicology* 56 (2): 206–33.

Pace, Richard, ed. 2018. *From Filmmaker Warriors to Flash Drive Shamans. Indigenous Media Production and Engagement in Latin America*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Sánchez, Mario. 2019. Grabando el prestigio social. Autoridades locales y uso político de la internet y el celular en la comunidad de Yanque (Caylloma, Arequipa). *Anthropologica* 37 (42): 224–43.

Sarr, Felwine, and Bénédicte Savoy. 2018. *Rapport sur la restitution du patrimoine culturel africain. Vers une nouvelle éthique relationnelle*. https://www.vie-publique.fr/sites/default/files/rapport/pdf/194000291.pdf.

Seeger, Anthony. 1986. "The Role of Sound Archives in Ethnomusicology Today." *Ethnomusicology* 30 (2): 261–76.

Seeger, Anthony. 2018. "Archives, Repatriation, and the Challenges Ahead." In *The Oxford Handbook of Musical Repatriation*, edited by Frank Gunderson, Robert Lancefield and Bret Woods, 1–16. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190659806.013.8.

Seeger, Anthony. 2023. Agency, archives, repatriation, and changing circumstances: Reflections on shared soundscapes, collaborative activations, and repatriations in Latin America. *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 28 (3). In Press.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Ulfe, María Eugenia, and Roxana Vergara. 2021. "Podcasting Collaborations and Ontological Relationships of Being 'Here' and 'There' in the Lower Marañón River in Peru." *New Area Studies* 2 (1): 74–114.

Valdovinos, Margarita. 2020. "Miradas cruzadas en la repatriación de saberes. El caso de las grabaciones rituales náayeri registradas por K. Th. Preuss." *Journal de la Société des américanistes* 106-2: 177–200. http://journals.openedition.org/jsa/19143.

Vapnarsky, Valentina. 2020. "From Home Base to Database and Back? The Circulation and Virtualities of Amerindian Knowledge in the Digital Era." *Journal de la Société des américanistes* 106-2. http://journals.openedition.org/jsa/19221.

How to cite this article: Ingrid Kummels, Gisela Cánepa. 2023. Editors' introduction to Sound "Repatriation" in South America: The Politics of Collaborative Archive Reactivations. *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 28: 185–192. https://doi.org/10.1111/jlca.12681

19354940, 2023, 3, Downloaded from https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jlca.12681 by Freie Universitaet Berlin, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License