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Chapter 1 – Introduction

“Thirteen years ago, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission concluded a courageous and dedicated work, and today the Peruvian State must recognize its mistakes and fulfill its commitments for the sake of national reconciliation,” declared Marisol Pérez Tello, Peru’s Minister of Justice and Human Rights, “Of course we must ask for forgiveness; forgiveness for forgetfulness, indifference, and abandonment.”¹ These remarks were given on August 26, 2016, in front of a memorial in Lima called “The Eye That Cries,” which recognizes the victims of Peru’s internal armed conflict, a period of intense political violence that cost the lives of 69,000 men, women, and children between 1980 and 2000.² Dozens of Peruvians and members of victims and survivors organizations were gathered at “The Eye That Cries” to pay their respects to lost friends and loved ones, and commemorate the thirteenth anniversary of the publication of the Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Final Report.³ During the anniversary ceremonies, Pérez Tello and other officials from the Ministry of Justice announced that the government would begin work on a registry for disappeared persons during the conflict, and pledged to process and complete reparations for the families of victims of the political violence.⁴

Over a decade after the end of the internal armed conflict and the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in 2001, Peru’s civil society and the state are still negotiating the terms of the country’s ongoing process of post-conflict transition and reconciliation.

⁴ Ibid.
The convergence of the families of victims and representatives of the Ministry of Justice at “The Eye That Cries” memorial for the Final Report’s thirteenth anniversary last August demonstrates how the memory of the violence and social trauma from the internal armed conflict has emerged as a critical part of these post-conflict negotiations in Peru. The memorial was designed by Dutch artist Luka Mutal to encourage remembrance of the victims of Peru’s period of political violence, and promote continued reflection on the painful memories of the internal armed conflict, even after the violence has ended.\(^5\) In the absence of effective reconciliation policies from the state, which failed to deliver many of its initial promises to address the legacy of violence and social trauma in Peru, the creation of public memory initiatives and memory sites like “The Eye That Cries” are actively shaping the present sociopolitical landscape of post-conflict Peru.

Considering the burgeoning culture of memory in Peru, this research is interested in the way memorial museums have emerged as a form of memory site, and how these museums both reflect and influence the negotiation and contestation of memory and truth-telling in post-conflict Peru. Studying three specific memorial museums, the *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* exhibit, ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory, and The Place of Memory, Tolerance and Social Inclusion (LUM), this thesis argues that Peru’s civil society actively sought out spaces for reflection and remembrance immediately following the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and that the creation of these memorial museums reflects the dialectic nature of memory in a post-conflict society. Additionally, this thesis will demonstrate how the LUM, Peru’s newest memorial museum, embraces the processes of negotiation and renegotiation of

memory in a post-conflict society, and utilizes its design and exhibits to promote further dialogue between civil society, the state, and other memory initiatives.

Given the magnitude of violence and trauma experienced as a nation, confronting this past and pursuing processes of reconciliation and transitional justice presents an extremely challenging and uncertain endeavor. In order to begin to investigate the legacy of intense political violence in Peru and the ways Peruvian society engages in the question of post-conflict memory, this chapter explains the roles of the different actors and driving sociopolitical forces shaped by the political violence, and contextualizes the conflict’s aftermath within the history of internal armed conflict itself.

**Escalation of Violence**

Shining Path, led by a philosophy professor named Abimael Guzman, emerged during the 1970s in a society characterized by gross socioeconomic inequality, a history of racial discrimination and labor exploitation against Peru’s rural indigenous peasant population, and the relative absence of state authority outside of the wealthier urban areas of the country. The Communist Party of Peru – Shining Path (PCP-SL) founded its Marxist guerrilla movement in the central highlands of Ayacucho, an isolated region inhabited primarily by the historically marginalized indigenous peasantry and rural farmers. With economic and political power in Ayacucho historically concentrated in the class of landholding elites, the rural indigenous population experienced significantly higher rates of poverty and inequality than their urban fellow citizens. The late Carlos Ivan Degregori, a Peruvian academic and Shining Path scholar, highlights the disparities in socioeconomic conditions and education between Ayacucho and more developed urban areas. Where the urban illiteracy rates in 1981 were around 20 percent, in

---

Ayacucho over 45 percent of the population was illiterate.\(^7\) In rural Ayacucho, 99 percent of the population was without basic utilities and services such as electricity and clean running water, in contrast to the almost 80 percent of urban Peruvians that had access to these basic utilities.\(^8\) This gives an idea of the isolation of the central highlands from the modernized coastal Peru, and the immense levels of poverty in the region of Ayacucho. Tensions between the peasants working in “serflike” conditions on landholdings and the elites that controlled them were common.\(^9\)

The ideology of Shining Path is rooted in a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary interpretation developed and propagated by Abimael Guzman, who taught philosophy at the Universidad de San Cristobal de Huamanga in Ayacucho’s regional capital city, Ayacucho. Initiating its armed movement in March of 1980, the organization ultimately aimed to overthrow the Peruvian state, and destroy all aspects of existing social, economic, and political structures in Peru in order to take control and implement a revolutionary state.\(^10\) In the early years of Shining Path’s insurgency, many rural indigenous communities were initially receptive to the guerilla’s messages of radical economic reform and their “moralization campaigns”, which targeted authority figures in the community perceived as exploitative, like large landholders or corrupt political figures.\(^11\) Shining Path actively exploited these underlying forces of racism, class inequality, and even local village rivalries to gain sympathy and support from the isolated rural communities of Peru’s highlands, the epicenter of the Shining Path insurgency.\(^12\) Coupled with excesses and abuses against peasants from early counterinsurgency efforts by state police groups,

---


\(^8\) Degregori, \textit{Qué difícil es ser}, 123.


\(^12\) Smith, “Taking the High Ground: Shining Path and the Andes,” 38.
especially the specialized police unit known as the *sinchis*, sympathy for the guerilla group increased.\(^{13}\)

During this time, many state authorities abandoned the isolated rural communities out of fear of Shining Path violence, and fled to more protected urban areas.\(^{14}\) As Shining Path cadres began to assume total authority in the absence of an effective state presence, Shining Path campaigns gradually took on a character of extreme violence; Shining Path guerillas would administer their own form of brutal justice, including severe beatings and gruesome executions with crude weapons for petty criminals or ideological dissidents.\(^{15}\) Eventually, the guerillas began to perceive even traditional community authority figures as political rivals, and considered almost anyone who did not actively support Shining Path and their extreme ideology to be “enemies of the people.”\(^{16}\)

As the violence of Shining Path campaigns intensified, so too did the methods and tactics of the military’s “dirty war” counter-insurgency campaign that became infamous for its brutality and consistent disregard for human rights. In their quest to find and exterminate Shining Path guerillas, military forces resorted to violence, torture, and extrajudicial killings against *cholos*, the derogatory term used by many coastal Peruvians in the armed forces to describe indigenous persons in the Andean highlands.\(^{17}\) As a result of these underlying ethnic tensions and racism, in addition to the real absence of reliable intelligence and a poor understanding of the guerrilla movement and its ideology, counter-insurgency efforts led by the Peruvian armed forces were characterized by indiscriminate killings and disappearances of any indigenous groups perceived

\(^{13}\) Goritti, *The Shining Path*, 95.
\(^{16}\) Ibid, 77.
\(^{17}\) Ibid, 87.
to be Shining Path militants supporters. In August of 1985, an army patrol entered the district of Accomarca in Ayacucho and killed sixty-two peasants living in the area, including women, children, and the elderly, as part of the counter-insurgency operation “Operative Plan Huancayoc.”

In testimonies collected by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, survivors recall how the soldiers raped the women and young girls in the rural village of Lloqllepampa, and locked them in houses and set the village on fire, leaving them to burn alive. Indigenous peasant communities found themselves “caught between the wall and the sword,” living the very real nightmare of constant guerilla violence and intimidation, and the deadly retribution of counterinsurgency forces who suspected anyone of Shining Path sympathy.

**Peasant Community Resistance**

As the conflict raged on through the 1980s and into the 1990s, Shining Path’s hyper-violent tactics served only to alienate their peasant sympathizers and supporters. When the guerrillas began to abuse and kill other indigenous peasants in addition to petty thieves and corrupt authorities, they became less like the liberators they claimed to be and more like the oppressors in the eyes of peasant communities. In response to Shining Path’s increasingly violent tactics and revolutionary ideology, peasant communities in Ayacucho and other affected areas in Peru began to form civil defense committees (*comités de defensiva civil* or CDCs), popularly called *rondas campesinas*, to defend their communities from Shining Path attacks. Acts of peasant resistance began as early as 1983, when a group of peasants in Hauychao, a small mountainous village in Ayacucho, attacked and executed a party of Shining Path guerillas that

---

19 Ibid.
20 Fumerton, *From Victims to Heroes*, 88.
came into their community promoting PCP-SL revolutionary ideas and threatening violent action against the local leadership.\(^\text{21}\)

Soon communities across Peru began to organize civil defense committees to protect themselves from Shining Path attacks, often using agricultural tools and slings in the absence of modern weapons.\(^\text{22}\) The Peruvian military began to see the peasant counterinsurgency as a useful tool against Shining Path advances, and in many cases took an active role in organizing new defense groups or assuming control over existing ones.\(^\text{23}\) The development of peasant civil defense groups marks a turning point in Shining Path’s guerrilla war. In many cases, such as the Defensa Civil Antisubversiva (DECAS) of the Apurímac Valley, organized defense groups were an integral part of Shining Path’s regional decline throughout the 1990s.\(^\text{24}\) By the early 1990s, a small minority of indigenous peasants supported Shining Path, a large majority tolerated it out of intimidation and fear, and a growing minority actively fought against it.\(^\text{25}\)

**Fujimori’s Peru**

In 1990, a Japanese-Peruvian and political newcomer named Alberto Fujimori was elected as the new president of Peru, on a campaign promising to revive Peru’s spiraling economy and end the political violence spreading to almost every region of Peru, including the urban capital of Lima.\(^\text{26}\) During his eventful first term as president, Fujimori’s administration successfully enacted wide reaching neoliberal economic reforms, known as “Fujishock,” and captured several high-ranking members of Shining Path’s leadership, including its mysterious


\(^{22}\) Fumerton, *From Victims to Heroes*, 95-96.

\(^{23}\) Ibid, 95.

\(^{24}\) Ibid, 107.


\(^{26}\) Theidon, *Intimate Enemies*, 5.
founder and leader Abimael Guzman. However, over the course of Fujimori’s presidency his administration moved alarmingly towards authoritarianism, and even staged a self-coup in April of 1992 to dissolve the congress, rewrite the constitution, and purge the judiciary. As his presidency extended into a second term, he continued to consolidate power by dismantling opposition political parties and institutions.

Alberto Fujimori expertly used the state of fear created by Shining Path violence and urban attacks to justify draconian security measures, limit civil liberties, and undermine political opponents, unions, and human rights groups. He also employed various state security apparatuses as tools for political repression and control, including the National Intelligence Service and the Colina group, a paramilitary “death squad” used to carry out extrajudicial interrogations and disappearances in the name of combating terrorism, real or perceived. This group was responsible for the death of fifteen civilians in Lima in 1991, which became known as the Barrios Altos massacre, and the infamous disappearance and murder of nine students and one professor from Cantuta University in 1992.

Fujimori ran for a third presidential term in 2000, after removing members of the Constitutional Tribunal who tried to block him. After a highly controversial campaign, Fujimori’s presidential victory in 2000 was short lived. Soon after the election, videotapes were leaked depicting Fujimori’s intelligence chief and close associate, Vladimiro Montesinos, handing out bribes to members of congress and special interest groups, videotapes recorded by
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28 Theidon, Intimate Enemies, 5.
29 Ibid.
30 Burt, “Quien Habla,” 41.
31 Ibid, 47.
33 Theidon, Intimate Enemies, 5.
Montesinos himself. Fujimori fled the country to Japan after the release of the “Vladivideos,” and faxed in his letter of resignation from abroad.

**Memory in Post-Conflict Peru**

By the end of the 1990s, the capture of Abimael Guzman and other crucial Shining Path leaders, in conjunction with the rise of peasant civil defense groups and the development of more effective counterinsurgency tactics by the Peruvian military, effectively devastated what was left of the Shining Path’s military and political structure and forced the crippled remaining factions deep underground. In an effort to demonstrate real regime change after the resignation of Alberto Fujimori, the interim government of Valentin Paniagua created the Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission in 2001. With a mandate to investigate torture, assassinations, disappearances, displacement, and the employment of terrorist methods by the State, Shining Path guerrillas, and the guerillas of the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA) between 1980 and 2000, the Truth Commission collected almost 17,000 testimonies from all twenty-four departments in Peru. The commission held public hearings, “audencias publicas,” that local community and family members could attend and participate in, unique among Latin America’s other truth commissions. On August 28, 2003, at the end of its twenty-four month mandate, the Truth Commission published its Final Report, a nine-volume report that offers a detailed account and explanation of the violence during this period, as well as recommendations for criminal prosecutions and proposals for future reconciliation strategies.

---


36 “Truth Commission: Peru 01.” United States Institute for Peace


39 González, *Unveiling the Secrets*, 70
The creation of the Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission in 2001 highlights the emergence of memory as a decisive component of Peru’s post-conflict transition and its ability to come to terms with the trauma inflicted on individuals and society as a result of extreme violence and suffering. The Final Report published by the Truth Commission represents what Ksenija Bilbija calls “official truth telling,” an institutional effort to create a collective or even national historical memory about what happened, the actors involved, and ultimately who is responsible. Since the publication of the Final Report, Peruvians have developed other ways to engage in the question of memory and truth through “unofficial” or “alternative” truth telling efforts. Alternative truth telling efforts reflect memories and experiences through stories, art, music, and other forms of social and cultural engagement. For example, Ayacucho and Huancavelica, two departments in Peru heavily affected by the political violence, held a series of art contests titled *Rescate por la Memoria* (Recovering or Rescuing Memory). Organized by a collection of NGOs called *Colectivo Yuyarisun* (We Are Remembering), this contest invited children and adults to submit paintings, drawing, stories, and other art forms that express their experiences or opinions about the violence and justice, truth, and reconciliation. These “unofficial” expressions of memory and testimony are only several of countless everyday truth telling efforts in Peru about a complicated and painful history.

**Methodology**

Considering the complex nature of exhibiting and curating post-conflict memory, this research begins by reviewing the wealth of existing literature and research concerning the role of memory in Peru’s processes of transition, truth-telling, and reconciliation after two decades of
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41 Ibid.
43 Ibid, 37.
political violence. This literature also addresses the emergence of memory sites and memorial museums in post-conflict societies, and introduces several academic frameworks for the qualitative analysis of these memorial museums in the context of Peru. Reviewing the existing research is key to understanding the complex subtleties of truth telling and public commemoration of violence.

In addition to the valuable contributions of other memory scholars, this thesis utilizes qualitative field data collected over the course of several weeks in Peru. In order to understand and evaluate the three memorial museums in question, the research will consider the sociopolitical circumstances of their origins and development, and attempt to analyze these conditions within the context of Peru’s post-conflict transition and engagement with the memory of violence. Using notes, observations, photographs, and discussions with Peruvian scholars and advocacy organizations, this research also aims to consider and analyze the material content and museological strategies exhibited in each museum. Chapter Three focuses on the *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* exhibit in Lima and ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory in Ayacucho, to establish a basic understanding of the way Peruvian society curated memory in the aftermath of violence, and uses these two earlier memorial museums to show that civil society actively sought to establish spaces for continued dialogue and remembrance after the creation of the Truth and Reconciliation. In Chapter Four, an investigation into the political negotiations and public controversies surrounding the origin of the LUM reveals how pressure from civil society convinced the state to build a new, more dialectic space, one that incorporates a pluralistic, memory-oriented approach to promote and facilitate further dialogue between the museum and civil society. Ultimately, I aim to use this research to demonstrate how the historical context of these museums, as well as their use of space, place, and the content of their respective
exhibitions, reflect the plural and open-ended state of post-conflict memory in contemporary Peru.

Theoretical Approaches

This research engages with several theoretical frameworks of post-conflict memory and memorialization, and draws on the valuable work of other memory scholars to contribute to a growing base of literature concerned with memory in post-conflict Peru. In regards to the study of memory and the ability of a country or society to remember, the work of Maurice Halbwachs and his conception of memory as the transmission of narratives and experiences between multiple generations and social group informs this approach. Pierre Nora’s work on French national memory also influences this framework, specifically his conception of “sites of memory,” which refers to the modern practice of archiving national or collective memories by condensing them into places and material artifacts.

Led by Elizabeth Jelin and Steve Stern, there is a body of scholarship devoted to the study of remembering social trauma and violence that guides this research, especially in the context of transitional or post-dictatorial Latin American societies with a recent history of political conflict. Elizabeth Jelin explores memory construction as a form of agency and political struggle in the process of determining what is remembered and what is forgotten after conflict, a framework adopted by this thesis and its study of memory initiatives and negotiations between different social and political actors in post-conflict Peru. Steve Stern’s work on the role of memory in transitional Chile also informs this research’s considerations of how the memory of violence creates social tensions in the context of truth telling, democratization, and transitional justice.
The fundamental arguments of this thesis, and its dialectic conception of memory and memorial museums in post-conflict Peru, are built on the invaluable scholarship of *No hay mañana sin ayer: Batallas por la memoria y consolidación democrática en el Perú*, published in 2015. Peruvian anthropologists and historians Carlos Iván Degregori, Tamia Portugal Teillier, Gabriel Salazar Borja, and Renzo Aroni Sulca collaborate under the direction of Carlos Iván Degregori to present an incredibly rich account of Peru’s process of truth telling and transition after the end of the internal armed conflict, beginning with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the sociopolitical space it created for official dialogue and reflection in a society still reeling from two decades of violence and political turmoil. *No hay mañana sin ayer* follows the processes of dialogue and negotiation that shaped the development of five memory spaces in Lima, Ayacucho, and several other communities heavily affected by the violence, and demonstrates how these memory spaces reflect the continued struggle for recognition and participation in the remembering of Peru’s internal armed conflict. This research contributes to the work of *No hay mañana sin ayer* by using its conceptual framework concerning dialectic memory spaces and truth telling to study Peru’s newest memorial museum, The Place of Memory, Tolerance and Social Inclusion, which opened shortly after *No hay mañana sin ayer* was published.
Chapter 2 – Literature Review

The purpose of this literature review is to explore existing literature and research concerning transitional justice, reconciliation, and memory in post-conflict Peru. Considering the immense amount of literature written about Peru’s internal armed conflict and its aftermath, I intend to focus on works that address these issues within the context of historical memory, specifically how the country’s traumatic past is recounted, represented, or silenced since the relative cessation of violence in 2000. These works investigate the ways individuals, communities, and the state participate in the process of transitional justice and truth telling, both within the official efforts of the Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission and unofficial efforts at all levels of Peruvian civil and social movements.

The literature review goes on to introduce the study of memory spaces and memorial museums as an emerging feature of societies struggling with a legacy of violence and national trauma, in order to contextualize the recent development of memorial museums in Peru within the larger framework of transitional justice, truth telling, and material representations of memory. These texts present a general overview of the key themes and concepts to be further explored in Chapters 3 and 4 in the regional context of Peru.

Indigenous Engagement in Truth Telling and Reconciliation

Considering the evidence of peasant marginalization and suffering brought forth by the Truth Commission’s 2003 Final Report, which found that almost three fourths of the victims spoke the indigenous language Quechua, several scholars have examined indigenous peasants’ involvement in the Truth Commission, and how victim-survivors dealt with the issues of remembering personal violence and injustice within their own communities.
In her 2008 article “Who Wants to Know,” American anthropologist Caroline Yezer investigates how one Quechua-speaking village in Ayacucho, Wiracocha, responded to the efforts of the Peruvian Truth Commission and the investigators who came to their community to collect testimonies. She initially noticed that despite the urgings of the “local, city-born social scientists and seasoned aid workers” who came to collect testimonies, very few villagers came forward to testify.\textsuperscript{44} In fact, the community expressed suspicion and even anger about the proposed peace project and its investigators. One of the Truth Commission investigators she spoke with attributed this reticence to a “residual fear.”\textsuperscript{45} “They don’t understand that the war is over, their trauma makes them afraid,” said the head investigator, José.\textsuperscript{46} After talking to several other investigators, Yezer noticed that this was a common perception of Truth Commission administrators and volunteers. Considering her personal conversations and experiences with the community members of Wiracocha, Yezer proposes a counter-hypothesis to explain why the people of Wiracocha, as well as other historically marginalized victim-survivors in Ayacucho, may be suspicious and even resentful of outsiders collecting testimonies about the period of conflict. Instead of attributing this response to a residual “phantom terror,” Yezer looks to the historical relationships between indigenous peasant communities, the Peruvian state, and educated outsiders to identify rational, political, and social reasons why they might not have wanted to testify.\textsuperscript{47}

One of the most pertinent historical legacies for the community of Wiracocha is the memory of a particularly brutal massacre by Shining Path, who entered the community dressed in stolen army uniforms and asked a group of community self-defense militants (rondas

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid, 272.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid, 272.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid, 274.
campesinas) from the village to show them how they fought the terrorists.\(^{48}\) While the villagers were demonstrating their improvised counterinsurgency tactics, the guerillas opened fire and killed them all.\(^ {49}\) This brutal betrayal, in addition to the constant harassment from legitimate state forces even after the villagers aligned with them against the guerillas, fostered a collective memory of deceit and mistrust, which continued to influence their interactions with outsiders even into the peace process.\(^ {50}\)

Furthermore, Yezer notes how the villagers of Wiracocha were acutely aware of the “divisions of labor in memory,” where the victims bore the burden of having to remember painful events, and those less affected by the actual violence are the ones collecting and interpreting the memories for the national project.\(^ {51}\) Without access to one of the “public hearings” conducted by the Peruvian Truth Commission, which were broadcast on national media, villagers felt that the more objective guided interviews provided by the Commission “took the power of presenting their own carefully constructed narratives out of the villager’s hands,” and had less strategic value for the victims themselves in the truth telling project.\(^ {52}\)

Studies such as Yezer’s not only analyze the various ways afflicted indigenous communities responded to the national memory project, but also highlight the ways in which silences can reveal as much about a community’s experiences as the actual testimonies. What is silenced or left out, according to Yezer, should be highly valued in the process of truth telling and transitional justice in Peru.

Kimberly Theidon’s 2013 *Intimate Enemies* is another significant work from this body of literature that addresses the role of silence in truth telling and reconciliation in rural indigenous

\(^{48}\) Ibid, 275.  
\(^{49}\) Ibid, 275.  
\(^{50}\) Ibid, 275.  
\(^{51}\) Ibid, 282.  
\(^{52}\) Ibid, 277.
communities. In a chapter of *Intimate Enemies* titled “Speaking of Silences,” Theidon focuses on the silences surrounding the memories of sexual violence, and the extreme reticence of communities and victims of sexual violence, the majority of which women, to speak about these experiences. Interestingly, Theidon found that Peru’s truth commission was relatively successful in actively seeking out testimonies from women, more so than other truth commissions like in Argentina and Chile.\(^5\) However, because of the social guilt and shame that accompanies sexual violence, few of these women would talk about themselves in the first person, and consequently, crimes of sexual violence and rape went under-reported in the Truth Commission’s statistics and conclusions.\(^4\)

Theidon’s research points to other ways in which silence is utilized by indigenous peasant communities after conflict, specifically in the construction of collective “memory projects” and developing reconciliation strategies. In the context of the Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission, local authorities held communal assemblies to discuss what would be reported to the Commission investigators when they came.\(^5\) Here, “memory projects” were created as “an effort to close the narrative ranks,” and essentially form a cohesive testimony that serves a strategic purpose.\(^6\) For communities in the north, this narrative seemed to emphasize the community’s role in resisting Shining Path influence, silencing memories of military transgressions or peasant cooperation with Shining Path, and ultimately forging an identity of “the heroic rondero.”\(^5\) For communities in the south, where Shining Path was more embedded, these memory projects emphasized a narrative of victimization, one where indigenous peasants

\(^4\) Ibid, 107.
\(^6\) Ibid, 109.
\(^5\) Ibid, 113.
were tricked into Shining Path support and suffered greatly at the hands of the military. In both cases, certain memories are deliberately repressed and silenced in order to create a specific collective narrative, one that usually mimics the “typologies of victims and perpetrators” constructed by the Truth Commission.

Memory and Narrative Construction through Traditional Art and Photography

The differences between community remembering and national truth telling and reconciliation efforts continue to be an integral part of the post-conflict body of literature. National efforts, such as the Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission, represent what Ksenija Bilbija calls “official truth telling,” an institutional effort to create an official or even national historical narrative about what happened, who were the actors involved, and ultimately who is responsible. Since the publication of the Truth Commission’s Final Report, Peruvians, especially those most affected by the period of political violence, have developed other ways to engage in the question of memory and truth telling through “unofficial” or “alternative” truth telling efforts. Alternative truth telling efforts reflect memories and experiences through stories, art, photographs, music, and other forms of social and cultural engagement.

In her 2014 book *Art from a Fractured Past: Memory and Truth-telling in Post-Shining Path Peru*, Cynthia Milton explores how art can serve as a “repository of memory and history, beyond state-produced, written records.” She does not discount the value of written records and the successes of the Peruvian Truth Commission, and credits it for bringing the idea of truth telling to a national level, which in turn created more opportunities for all groups to speak openly.

---

58 Ibid, 114.
61 Ibid.
about the traumatic events of the past. However, art, in the form of paintings, drawings, pictures, *historietas* (comics), music and even poetry, can also be a form of testimony and bear witness to events of the past. Furthermore, art can potentially provide a mode of expression otherwise unavailable, especially for indigenous peasant communities who are historically marginalized. “In societies where the written word may impede the narration of their experiences, and in the wake of severe violence when the ability to speak may be blocked, art may be one of the few modes by which people recount the past,” claims Milton.

Milton focuses on the ways in which artistic expression is used as a tool to work through trauma and difficult memories, but also on how art is used by subalterns to bear witness to and recount events of the past, so that they are not forgotten or covered up by hegemonic memory. She uses the example of the *Rescate por la Memoria* contests in Ayacucho, a series of art contests organized by NGOs that invited youth and adults to submit artworks that expressed their views of truth, justice, reconciliation, and their experiences during the war. The contest received hundreds of submissions, from professional artists and amateurs, and touched on the complex issues of violence, loss, and ongoing struggles for justice and reconciliation that these communities were still dealing with after the conflict.

Through images and “testimonial framing,” the submissions of the *Rescate por la Memoria* contests remember in different ways than the oral histories, testimonies, and data of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Milton addresses these different perspectives of truth and analyzes how these “unofficial” testimonies construct narratives about indigenous experiences during the war. Milton talks about the unique challenges faced by artistic
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63 Ibid, 15.  
65 Ibid, 37-38.  
66 Ibid, 39.  
67 Ibid, 39.
testimonials, compared to the oral testimonies and Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Where oral testimonies and written histories “hold a privileged place as evidence,” the “truth value” of art is much more difficult to verify, and is often brought into question by the imaginative process of its creation and expression.\footnote{Ibid, 17.} However, just as minor discrepancies in Guatemalan activist Rigoberta Menchu’s biography from the Guatemalan dirty war do not diminish the value of her collective testimony, artworks and the narratives they depict are intrinsically valuable as forms of historical remembrance and witnessing to traumatic or contested events in the past.\footnote{Ibid, 18-19.}

Olga González, in her 2011 book *Unveiling Secrets of War in the Peruvian Andes*, also investigates the ways in which historical narratives of truth and authenticity are constructed and disputed in art, specifically in the *Piraq Causa* (Who Is Still to Blame?) series of *tablas pintadas* (painted boards) about wartime events in the Ayacuchan village of Sarhua. The *tablas pintadas* are a traditional form of artistic expression and remembrance in Sarhua, and the artists behind the *Piraq Causa* series use this traditional form to depict the most significant events of the violence in Sarhua during the 1980s.\footnote{González, *Unveiling Secrets*, 80.} González notes that the artists are very careful in several of the *tablas* to include dates and create a sense of chronology within the painting, which serve to create the “effect of truth” and establish a sense of historical accuracy for the testimonies depicted in the paintings.\footnote{Ibid, 81.} However, temporal confusion remains in the remainder of the *tablas* in the *Piraq Causa* series, some of which depict simultaneous events, or instead present events in the order of their relative significance or importance to the community, as opposed to the
chronological order in which they actually happened.\textsuperscript{72} This demonstrates the relativity of truth telling through art, and emphasizes the importance of the testimony itself over the rigid historical accuracy of official truth telling efforts.

Photography offers a different form of visual memory representation and narrative construction in post-conflict Peru. Photography inhabits a unique space in the realms of truth-telling and visual testimony in the way it can be viewed as objective truth or evidence by “capturing reality” through journalism and documentary collections, and simultaneously conveys meaning and emotional appeal beyond its “indexical properties.”\textsuperscript{73} The Truth and Reconciliation Commission created a photographic collection called \textit{Yuyanapaq: Para recordar} (In order to remember) in addition to the public hearings, oral histories, and written testimonies it collected for the Final Report.\textsuperscript{74} Part of the purpose of collecting photographic evidence as a component of truth and reconciliation was to record and preserve. While the context of their presentation may vary with place and time, the photographs themselves will remain unchanged, and therefore imply a sense of memorialization and permanence.\textsuperscript{75} The visual representation of photographs and images is useful as a form of shock and awe, especially graphic images of violence and human suffering. This permanence, and the latent emotional appeal of photographs, can be used as a warning and reminder to the future. When Salomón Lerner, president of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, inaugurated the \textit{Yuyanapaq} exhibit in 2003, he spoke to the ability of the selected photographs to “cue memories of past experiences for those who suffered them,”
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but more importantly invoke a “waking up” for a nation that largely ignored the violence, and encourage it to become aware of the harsh realities of its past for the sake of the future.\footnote{Ibid, 40.}

Peruvian photojournalist Óscar Medrano, who contributed many photos to the Truth Commission’s 
*Yuyanapaq* exhibit, recently published a collection of his works on Peru’s internal armed conflict and Shining Path, titled “Nunca Más – Never Again!” Medrano’s photographs represent a variety of events and actors, ranging from the bombed streets of Lima to the *rondas campesinas* of Ayacucho, and are very effective in conveying the complexity and diversity of Peru during the period of violence. In the preamble of Medrano’s “Nunca Más” collection, fellow journalist Gustavo Gorriti writes, “The sole purpose of reporting is to produce a faithful and true memory of a reality.”\footnote{Óscar Medrano Pérez and Roberto J. Bustamante Flores, *Nunca más – Never again* (Lima: Impreso En Q&P Impresores, 2015), 21.} As the title suggests, the purpose of the collection and Medrano’s work as a photographer is to call attention to a past of armed violence and human rights abuses, and in doing so promote a memory that is so horrible and filled with human suffering that its audience will make an effort to prevent anything like it in the future, “Never Again!”

**Memory Sites and Memorial Museums**

In the wake of the intense political violence that plagued much of Latin America throughout the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century, new approaches to post-conflict public memory have emerged in the form of memory sites and memorial museums. Similar to the artistic, photographic, and other material representations of memory and testimony explored in this literature review, memory sites incorporate a sense of place that serves to shape how memory is constructed and communicated. While memory sites more generally can take many forms, in the context of Peru and this thesis they refer primarily to the memorials and museums that have been constructed to
represent and engage with a traumatic or violent past, and root these memories in a physical space. As a form of public narrative construction, memory spaces and memorial museums remain an important yet relatively unexplored part of truth telling and reconciliation in Peru.

In her 2014 book, Memory Matters in Transitional Peru, Margarita Saona explains the development of memory sites in Peru and other Latin American countries with histories of political violence and human rights violations as resulting from the “need for a space to present the traumatic past in a comprehensive way.”78 In addition to creating places for reflection, Saona also understands these memory spaces to be fundamentally political, characterized by the negotiations between different current and historical actors in the development and maintenance of these sites.79 Fellow memory scholar Elizabeth Jelin, writes, “They are political in at least two senses: their installation is always the result of political struggles and conflicts, and their existence is a physical reminder of a conflictive political past, which may spark new rounds of conflict over meaning in each new historical period or generation.”80 The fundamentally political nature of these sites makes them critical to the study of memory in the context of truth telling and reconciliation, and the debates and negotiations surrounding them can highlight many of the underlying sociopolitical issues in a society recovering from decades of intense violence.

Generally, memory sites can refer to any physical location that serves a commemorative purpose, regardless of the presence of a built structure.81 In the context of transitioning societies in Latin America and the purpose of this research, the study of memory sites will be focused on those dominated or designated by a structure, and can be further subdivided into a study of monuments, memorials, and of memorial museums. While these categories are better understood
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as different aspects of an overlapping spectrum rather than as rigid distinctions, they do help differentiate the many forms and functions of memory spaces that emerge in communities affected by violent conflict. In her 2012 book, *Politics and the Art of Commemoration: Memorials to Struggle in Latin America and Spain*, Katherine Hite addresses several of these forms and functions, specifically the differences between memorials and monuments. Hite notes the tendency of states and communities to attempt to commemorate the past in order to promote a sense of national unity in the aftermath of violence, usually in the form of monuments. In her study of commemorative spaces in Latin America and Spain, she argues that while monuments often project a narrative of unified victory or heroism, memorials established after periods of chaos and trauma are typically more mournful, and serve to contemplate loss and sacrifice. This distinction is important, she argues, because grassroots organizations and other actors in civil society are beginning to demand more memorials as part of a larger shift from monumentalizing to memorializing.

According to Hite, this shift is exemplified by Maya Lin’s Vietnam Memorial in Washington, D.C., which utilizes a stark, minimalist design to emphasize “somber contemplation over celebration,” and reflects the unresolved tensions and legacy of suffering that characterize the Vietnam War. Compared to the nearby World War II Memorial on the National Mall, which uses a neoclassical design incorporating columns, fountains, bronze wreaths, and soaring eagles, to commemorate the Americans who lost their life in the Second World War, the Vietnam Memorial communicates a memory of “moral uncertainty,” a vulnerability that
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symbolizes “a scar across the landscape that cleaves (that is, pulls apart and draws together) Americans.”

Pierre Nora, the French historian whose translated three-volume collection *Realms of Memory* pioneered many of the concepts of collective memory and spaces of memory found in this emerging field of study, argues that states erect monuments precisely in order to forget.

This conception of monument construction is consistent with Hite’s, in that monuments can act as a form of closure for a pivotal moment in a nation’s history, forever cemented in glory and celebration without inviting further contemplation. Memorials, in contrast, “can awaken, challenge, and mobilize their observers, in some instances in a dialogic relation to the memorial makers, in others through deliberative contemplation of the memorials themselves.”

This literature review has revealed the complicated, often confrontational nature of post-conflict memory; memorials can embody this confrontational nature as well, in order to provide an alternate historical narrative or directly confront an existing or dominant one. *The Art of Truth Telling About Authoritarian Rule*, edited by Ksenija Bilbija, Jo Ellen Fair, Cynthia E. Milton, and Leigh A. Payne, explores how memory spaces, and the past they construct and express through art, succeed or fail to encourage contemplation and challenge dominant historical narratives in the present. Considering several existing post-conflict public memory spaces, these authors differentiate between the ways in which memory spaces interact with the observers and the public, known as “counter-monuments” and “invisible monuments.”

Counter-monuments, according to *The Art of Truth Telling*, are “brazen, painfully self-conscious memorial spaces conceived to challenge the very premises of their being,” and are designed
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precisely to catch the attention of visitors or unintentional passerbys and encourage them to stop and investigate.\textsuperscript{90}

One example of such a space is the “Vanishing Monument” in Hamburg, Germany, also called the “Monument against Fascism.” The monument itself, constructed by artist Jochen Gerz in 1986, is a twelve-meter steel column where residents and visitors could sign their name in the lead coating, pledging to remain vigilant and stand up against future injustices. Over the course of seven years, the column was slowly lowered into the ground, eventually disappearing completely. According to the text next to the memorial, this empty space symbolized that, “in the end it is only we ourselves that can stand up against injustice.”\textsuperscript{91} Today, visitors can walk underground and observe the signatures of others through a protective glass. The unconventional design of this memory spaces encourages observers to not only personally contribute to the space through their signatures and pledges, but also to question the significance of a sculpture that changed over time and eventually disappeared. Traditionally, monuments and sculptures are designed to be permanent and unchanging; a monument that slowly disappears over time and ultimately conveys a stronger message with empty space than it did with a physical presence is both new and unsettling, encouraging continued reflection by creating a tension between the physical structure and the space it inhabits.\textsuperscript{92}

\textit{The Art of Truth Telling} is also interested in post-conflict memory spaces that struggle to establish the social and physical tension utilized by counter-monuments, and therefore risk becoming what the authors considers “invisible monuments.”\textsuperscript{93} One of the biggest criticisms of using monuments and memorials as a form of historical commemoration is that they may
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eventually fade away into the everyday, banal urban landscape, a permanent fixture that the casual passerby looks straight through just as he or she would a street sign or concrete building. This is also referred to as “fossilized memory,” where the physical presentation of memory can actually spare the public the burden of the act of remembering.  

This poses a problem for ongoing memory struggles and those fighting to provide a counter-narrative against a dominant or collective memory. In the case of Argentina, another Latin American country with a dark history of human rights abuses carried out by the state during the later half of the 20th century, the design and development of the “Memory Park” (Parque de la Memoria) in Buenos Aires to publicly remember and recognize Argentina’s “dirty war” has met resistance from some of the human rights community, including the well known activists group Madres de la Plaza de Mayo. Although the park, which contains several art installations related to the conflict, as well as the “Monument to the Victims of State Terrorism” (Monumenta a las Víctimas del Terrorismo del Estado), was designed within a similar pro-human rights and victimization historical framework as the work of activist groups like Madres de la Plaza de Mayo, activists were concerned that public commemoration in this form would become “just another invisible monument,” and would prematurely release public pressure on the state to undertake more substantial transitional justice measures. This reaction raises several interesting questions about the relationship between the creation of public memory spaces and effective post-conflict justice and reconciliation, which this thesis will continue to consider throughout its analysis of the development of memory sites and memorial museums in Peru and other post-conflict societies.

Memorial Museums

94 Ibid, 32-33.
95 Bilbija et al., The Art of Truth Telling, 32-33.
96 Ibid.
Monuments and memorials serve as a useful starting point to the study of memorial museums, as they share many of the same attributes and functions as commemorative institutions constructed after experiences of national conflict and trauma. However, the recent emergence of memorial museums as a favored institution for memory struggles and national reconciliation processes demands an analysis that looks beyond the aforementioned functions of memory spaces, and explores the memorial museum as a distinct pedagogical and moral arena of post-conflict memory.

Whereas a monument or memorial, as discussed earlier, can be any sculpture, physical marker, or structure designed to commemorate or memorialize, a museum is traditionally understood to be “an institution devoted to the acquisition, conservation, study, exhibition, and educational interpretation” of objects or artifacts with perceived historic or scientific value. As such, history museums are usually endowed with a pedagogical purpose, and are generally concerned with providing a specific contextualization and interpretation of history for the viewer. Considering these traditional understandings of memorials and museums, a memorial museum can be understood as a form of public memory engagement that emphasizes a moral framework of commemoration in conjunction with the material narration and contextualization of traumatic, often violent historical events. More simply, memorial museums seek to combine the “authoritative, objective quality of museums with the symbolic and affective features of memorials.”

The last several decades have seen a significant increase in the presence and prominence of memorial museums in post-conflict societies, a phenomenon best exemplified by the
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establishment of the International Committee of Memorial Museums in Remembrance of the Victims of Public Crimes (ICMEMO). ICMEMO, one of thirty-one international committees that make up the larger International Council of Museums (ICOM), was established in 2001 and states that its purpose is “to foster a responsible memory of history and to further cultural cooperation through education and through using knowledge in the interests of peace.”

Although still a relatively young institution, the establishment of a special committee specifically devoted to museums that “commemorate victims of State, socially determined and ideologically motivated crimes,” represents the substantial level of influence and attention that these museums have attracted amongst the public, academics, and the global museum community.

In his article “Exhibiting Conflict: History and Politics at the Museo de la Memoria de ANFASEP in Ayacucho, Peru,” Joseph Feldman effectively contextualizes the emergence of several memorial museums in post-conflict Peru within globalized discourses of memorialization and the “mainstreaming” of victim-centric commemorative museums. For Feldman, the contemporary memorial museum concept has its origins in Western European World War I memorialization and the proliferation of World War II and Holocaust memorials. Today, the agenda to preserve national achievements and victories of conventional museums exists alongside the mission of the memorial museum, which is to draw attention to catastrophic failures and disruptive violence within these very same societies. As such, the allure of memorial museums for the public resides in their ability to “elicit meaningful emotional responses, to further a sense of moral and pedagogical consumption, and, in some cases, to
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reinforce anxieties about the modern condition.” In his research, Feldman emphasizes the importance of the emotional and psychological relationship between those who visit the memorial museum, those whose experiences are being represented in the museum, and the creators of the museum themselves; ultimately, this relationship reflects the complex intersection of morality and pedagogy inhabited by memorial museums as a distinct commemorative institution.

The existing literature considered in this chapter reveals that memory spaces, specifically memorial museums, can function simultaneously as a space for mourning, reflection, social dissent, political confirmation, and historical education in the context of historical memory and reconciliation after a period of national trauma. The ability to remember, or forget, is driven by the physical design, place, and material content of the memory space, which exposes a unique geographic and aesthetic component of memory not found elsewhere. As the following chapters of this thesis begin to consider the recent emergence of several memorial museums in Peru, the research will continue to consider the “uneasy conceptual coexistence” between morality and pedagogy exhibited by memorial museums in post-conflict societies, as well as the strategic relationship between memory and space.105
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Chapter 3 – Early Memorial Museums: *Yuyanapaq: Para recordar* and ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory

This chapter introduces and contextualizes two of the first post-conflict memorial museums that emerged in the years following the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in 2001 and the release of its Final Report in 2003. The first memorial museum to be addressed in this chapter is the *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* exhibit in Lima, which was created immediately following the release of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Final Report in late 2003. Intended as a form of visual testimony to complement the written and auditory testimonies of the Final Report, *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* (In order to remember) is a collection of photographs from Peruvian media outlets, grassroots organizations, and photographers compiled by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.\(^{106}\) The second museum of focus, the *Museo de la Memoria de ANFASEP “Para que no se repita”* (ANFASEP Museum of Memory “So it is not repeated”), opened its doors for the first time in October of 2005 in the city of Ayacucho. Far from the nation’s capital, the Museum of Memory is a genuinely grassroots initiative, built and maintained by members of ANFASEP (The National Association of Family Members of Kidnapped, Detained, and Disappeared People of Peru) and the victims organization’s youth group, Juventud ANFASEP.

As two of the earliest memorial museums created in Peru after the internal armed conflict, these memory sites serve as a useful introduction to many of the essential concepts and questions of exhibiting memory after a period of national violence. Despite their geographic differences, both memorial museums have a close historical relationship to the work of the Truth

and Reconciliation Commission and its Final Report. Focusing on the circumstances of their historical origins, this chapter aims to contextualize the emergence of memorial museums in Peru after the internal armed conflict. Additionally, this research will analyze the museological strategies they employ to communicate memory, and identify the way these strategies convey specific narratives about Peru’s history of political violence. These contextual and material analyses reveal that both *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* and ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory demonstrate an initiation of dialogue between official and unofficial truth-telling efforts over how the internal armed conflict should be remembered in a post-conflict Peru. After the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and its Final Report created a window for truth-telling, remembrance, and reflection on the political violence, civil society demanded that this dialogue continue through the permanent extension of the *Yuyanapaq* exhibit, and mobilized to participate in the construction of post-conflict memory through the creation of the Museum of Memory in Ayacucho.

The observations, analysis, and qualitative data used in this chapter are primarily derived from personal observations, discussions, and photographs from four weeks of field research in July and August of 2016. Additionally, they rely on valuable academic contributions from prominent Peruvian and international scholars, most notably the collaborative work *No hay mañana sin ayer. Batallas por la memoria y consolidación democrática en el Perú*, directed and edited by the late Carlos Iván Degregori.

**Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar**

The *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* exhibit serves as a visual testimony of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s work, and its collection of photographs was painstakingly assembled and archived as part of the Commission’s mandate. However, over time the exhibit
developed its own relationship with the Peruvian public, and this relationship shaped and influenced the eventual outcome of the exhibit as a more permanent site in Peru’s memory landscape.

As part of its two-year mandate, several members of the Truth Commission’s investigative team took the initiative to collect photojournalistic pieces in addition to the written and verbal testimonies it needed. Members of the investigative team worked to collaborate with other political and civil society actors such as the church, newspapers, military, the counter-terrorism forces, and ordinary citizens, to access an array of photographic archives that could provide a visual testimony to compliment the other fact-gathering efforts of the Truth Commission. Several noteworthy contributors are Peruvian photojournalists Vera Lentz, Vicaria de Puno, and Oscar Medrano, whose works are featured prominently in the Yuyanapaq exhibit. Ultimately, they collected over 1,700 images, which now form a digital archive the Commission calls the “Image Bank.”

The Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar exhibit was inaugurated on August 9th, 2003, just three weeks before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission released their Final Report. Approximately 300 photos from this archive are displayed as part of the Yuyanapaq exhibit, which at the time of its 2003 inauguration was housed in a “dilapidated mansion” called Casa Riva Agüero. The Casa Riva Agüero is an extravagant colonial style home located on the outskirts of Lima in the district of Chorrillos, then owned by the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (Pontifical Catholic University of Peru). The exhibit was organized both chronologically and thematically, dividing the photographs into five chronological sections:
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The original architectural setting of the Yuyanapaq exhibit is an interesting facet of the exhibit as a memorial museum. Although the Casa Riva Agüero has no geographic connection to the intense violence of the 1980s and 90s, its state of disrepair and empty, almost haunting reminder of former glory lends significant meaning to the exhibit that occupied it. As Cynthia Milton and Mari Eugenia Ulfe point out in their collaborative piece, “Promoting Peru: Tourism and Post-Conflict Memory,” the crumbling state of the old colonial home is a metaphor for “the deterioration not only of this house but also of a larger home: our country.”112 For these authors, the visible decay of the exhibit’s infrastructure, from the holes in the ceiling to the crumbling walls, created a “feeling of reconstruction from the ground up… physical gaps in the construction speak to the deterioration of the Peruvian nation and its need to rebuild.”113

The name Yuyanapaq is the word for “to remember” in Quechua, which is the native language of the majority of the indigenous Peruvians disproportionately affected by the political violence.114 During his speech at the exhibit’s inauguration in August of 2003, the president of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Salomón Lerner noted that the Quechua word could also be translated in Spanish to “despertarse,” or “waking up” in English.115 The physically dilapidated space of the original Yuyanapaq exhibit in the Casa Riva Agüero seems to communicate both translations; its state of decay is a potent reminder of the horrible violence and destruction experienced as a nation, but is also a call for reconstruction and healing.
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Despite the forces of silencing inherent in a post-conflict society, Peruvians’ desire to engage with the memory of the internal armed conflict through the photographs of the *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* exhibit and participate in its processes of healing and reconciliation actively shaped the character of the museum, and eventually produced a more permanent site of memory. Although the exhibit was originally intended to be a temporary, four-month exhibition, public demand kept it open at the *Casa Riva Agüero* for almost two years.\textsuperscript{116} When it finally closed, public outcry persuaded the National Museum (*Museo de la Nación*), which also houses an extensive collection of pre-Colombian artifacts and Peruvian history, to host the exhibit for an additional five years.\textsuperscript{117} Although centered in Lima, there were efforts to create a smaller version of the photographic collection and open other temporary exhibits in other parts of Peru, including Ayacucho, Huánuco, Abancay, and Cuzco.\textsuperscript{118} As a result of the success of the exhibit, the National Museum decided to extend the collection’s life at the National Museum until 2026, ensuring that the collection would continue to be available for the coming decade.\textsuperscript{119} Supported by funding from the Ombudsman’s office, the National Institute of Culture, and foreign governments such as the EU, UK and Canada, pressure from civil society transformed a temporary art installation into a long-term exhibit of remembrance, featured alongside a millennium of human history in Peru in the National Museum.\textsuperscript{120}

The sixth floor of the museum is minimalist and austere; the floors and walls are constructed of simple exposed concrete, with low ceilings that open up into an atrium towards the end of the *Yuyanapaq* exhibit. The photos hang against the concrete walls, which
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complements the majority black and white photos of the exhibit. Similar to its original display in the Casa Riva Agüero, the photos are organized into thematic and chronological groupings within the exhibit, with an emphasis on thematic groupings that effectively construct specific narratives about the conflict. As the visitor moves through the exhibit in the National Museum, he or she will move from one sala (exhibition hall) to the next, with titles such as “The Ayacucho Tragedy,” “Histories of Resistance,” and “Orphans.” Within each sala, the half dozen or so photos are labeled with the date, location, contributor, and a brief description of the photo’s context. Interestingly, many of the descriptions include an English translation, which is the only English language presence throughout the museum. These thematic displays, often varied in date and location unless referring to a specific event, are grouped strategically to create a holistic narrative. For example, the Huérfanos (Orphans) room displays a wall with nine photos arranged in a three by three square, each depicting different aspects of the lives of the hundreds of children who were orphaned during the period of violence or were kidnapped by guerrilla groups and permanently separated from their parents.
The museum also highlights key historical events from the internal armed conflict. There are several salas that organize photos around a single incident, such as the 1992 Tarata bombing in Miraflores, or Operation Chavín de Huántar, the 1997 mission to raid the Japanese embassy and free the hostages being held by another guerilla rebel group, the MRTA. These rooms have a more pedagogical function and feel similar to a traditional history museum, using artifacts (in this case, eye-witness photographs) to explain and even visually depict a specific event. The final section of the exhibition is designated as a room for reflection, where visitors can record their personal comments or responses to the museum while overlooking the grey Lima skyline beyond the museum.

As a product of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the Yuyanapaq collection ultimately conveys a very similar historical memory to that of the Truth Commission’s Final Report. Like the Final Report, the exhibit clearly demonstrates a “visual truth” of the suffering and loss experienced as a result of the two decades of political violence. Furthermore, the collection reflects the Truth Commission’s findings that the majority of victims were rural indigenous peasants, who make up a substantial proportion of the victims identified in the photographs exhibited, and most importantly that Shining Path was responsible for the majority

of the violence. In the current exhibit, twenty-seven photographs from the collection depict Shining Path guerillas as perpetrators of violence, whereas only seven depict the state as a public enemy. This reinforces the statistical findings of the Final Report, which estimated that Shining Path was responsible for at least fifty-four percent of the approximately 69,000 deaths.  

The *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* exhibit was conceived in the temporary fervor of official remembrance and truth-telling immediately following the end of the internal armed conflict, a time defined by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the need to reflect on the tragedies of the past as part of the process of national reconciliation. However, the extension of the collection’s exhibition at the *Casa Riva Agüero*, and ultimately the decision to move the exhibit to the National Museum for the near future, demonstrates the demand from sectors of Peruvian civil society for a more permanent space to engage with the violent past, and points to the way civil society can negotiate with the official memory of the state to ensure that reflection on the past and reconciliation continues beyond the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

*Museo de la Memoria de ANFASEP “Para que no se repita”*

ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory “So that it is not repeated,” is a remarkable grassroots, “unofficial” memory initiative that emerged during the first few years of Peru’s transition and the end of the internal armed conflict. Created and maintained by the women of ANFASEP (The National Association of Family Members of Kidnapped, Detained, and Disappeared People of Peru, or ANFASEP), the Museum of Memory represents the participatory and dialectic nature of post-conflict memory; through their Museum of Memory, the mothers of ANFASEP used the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the release of its Final Report to open their own space
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for dialogue about the internal armed conflict, one that better reflected the lived experiences and perspectives of those most affected by the violence and its legacy.

ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory is located in the regional capital of Ayacucho, also known as Huamanaga. The museum itself occupies the third floor of the organization ANFASEP’s main office, only a few blocks away from the San Cristóbal of Huamanga University, where Shining Path leader Abimael Guzmán once worked as a philosophy teacher and founded the infamous militant political organization. Relatives of victims from the developing political violence founded ANFASEP in 1983. The majority of its members are Quechua-speaking women from rural communities, many of whom came to the regional capital of Ayacucho to escape the increasing violence in the countryside, joining the thousands of internally displaced persons.¹²³ Led by “Mama” Angelica Mendoza, Teodosia Cuya Layme, and Antonia Zaga Huaña, these women came together to foster mutual support and solidarity, and to protest against disappearances and extrajudicial killings carried out by the Peruvian armed forces and Shining Path insurgents.¹²⁴ In addition to starting a soup kitchen for neglected children and orphans whose families were destroyed by the violence, the mothers of ANFASEP organized meetings, protests, and peace rallies throughout the 1980s and 1990s in order to bring attention to the horrible effects of the violence in the Ayacucho community, connecting over 800 mothers, wives, and family members.¹²⁵

Despite some changes to the organization’s structure and mission since the cessation of violence, ANFASEP still maintains around several hundred members and remains active in civil society. The organization has taken on additional advocacy missions since the end of the internal
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armed conflict, such as the implementation of the state’s reparations program with the help of the organization’s youth wing, Juventud ANFASEP.\textsuperscript{126} ANFASEP gained significant public attention after the cessation of violence and the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in the early 2000s, which formally recognized ANFASEP for its transitional justice efforts and support for victims in the Truth Commission’s Final Report in 2003.\textsuperscript{127}

This connection to the Truth Commission plays an important role in the genesis of the decision to create a museum. In order to commemorate the release of the Final Report in 2003, several members proposed that they design a space to display the iconic cross and banner that the ANFASEP mothers had used during their two decades of protest in the organization’s office, which is located on the second floor of the organization’s former soup kitchen.\textsuperscript{128} With the help of several partnering governmental and non-governmental institutions, including local representatives of the German Development Service, Juventud ANFASEP, and the Peruvian Ministry of Women and Social Development, this idea developed into the decision to create a museum of memory on the newly constructed third floor of the ANFASEP building.\textsuperscript{129} The Museo de la Memoria de ANFASEP “Para que no se repita” officially opened on October 16, 2005, for the second anniversary of the Truth Commission’s Final Report. As described by ANFASEP’s own website, the Museum of Memory is the first museum to exhibit the causes, events, and consequences created by victims (emphasis added by author).\textsuperscript{130} Although it was “facilitated” by partnering organizations, the design, content, and ongoing management of the museum is entirely the product of the mothers themselves, which presents a major contrast to the
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only other significant memorial museum at the time, *Yuyanapaq. Para Recordar*, which was designed and constructed by a state-mandated institution, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and ultimately housed in a state-sponsored museum, the National Museum in Lima. As such, ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory represents a truly grassroots memory initiative.

A particularly noteworthy aspect of the Museum of Memory’s development is that the museum originated as a way to commemorate another memory initiative, the Truth Commission’s Final Report. In their initial decision to create a display for the organization’s cross and banner, which they carried with them during marches and protests against the violence in Ayacucho, the mothers of ANFASEP were responding to the Final Report itself, with the intent to contribute their symbols of struggle to its narrative on the anniversary of its publication. The concept of contributing to memory using material artifacts from the period of political violence continued to grow and eventually became the Museum of Memory, a place to display and share these specific perspectives and experiences with other victims, fellow Peruvians, and outsiders looking to learn more about the conflict.

The museum is laid out in three thematic sections: an informational background of the conflict; a collection of testimonies, art, and personal items from victims and their relatives; and finally, a section showcasing the members of ANFASEP and relating the history of the organization to the internal armed conflict and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The content of the Museum of Memory directly reflects the efforts of the members of ANFASEP to actively participate in the public process of remembering the internal armed conflict, and to use
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this space of remembrance as a platform to construct an alternative memory that both draws from and rejects the narrative presented by the state and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

The first section of the Museum of Memory uses a variety of pedagogical tools to contextualize the “who, what, when, and where” of the violence in Ayacucho, including an interactive map of Peru, historical chronologies, photographs, and testimonies. The titles of the informational panels highlight the important overarching themes of this narrative: “Many Children have been Victims,” “The Women were Victims of Forced Recruitment,” “The Women were caught between two fires,” “The Tortured,” “Deadly Trials,” “The Common Grave,” and “The Oven.” The panels contain testimonial excerpts from survivors and witnesses collected by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and international human rights groups such as Amnesty International. The photos displayed on each of the panels generally correspond in theme to the title, many of which come directly from Truth Commission’s visual archives and can be found in the Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar exhibit in Lima. Complementing these maps and informational panels are two, life-size physical replicas of a torture cell and a mass grave, complete with a wax sculpture of a policeman brutally beating a farmer, and a plastic skeleton inside of the dirt grave.

While this section does not utilize the personal artifacts and artwork donated by members of ANFASEP as much as the rest of the museum, it does create a historical narrative that orients the visitor within the context of the experiences of ANFASEP and the relatives of disappeared and killed persons. Compared to the apolitical thematic organization of the Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar exhibit, the Museum of Memory emphasizes events and trends from the internal armed conflict that are more specific to the experiences of indigenous peasants as victims. Very little, if any, information is available about the participation of indigenous peasants in Shining Path
activities, and the display clearly portrays the state and the Peruvian armed forces as the main perpetrators of violence. Furthermore, the historical context concerning the internal armed conflict provided by these initial exhibits is geographically limited to Ayacucho and the central highlands, and focuses on the development of the conflict at a local level. This thematic and regional focus emphasizes the disproportionate suffering of indigenous peasants in Ayacucho at the hands of the state and armed forces.

The following section of the memorial museum relies on materials, artifacts, and artwork donated by ANFASEP and Juventud ANFASEP members to personalize and share the “pain and anguish of affected persons and victims” with the visitor. As the second section opens up into a larger gallery, several art pieces are on display in the center of the room. These artistic pieces, which include sculpture, paintings, and the regional artistic tradition of retablos, each represent a different aspect of the conflict, as experienced by the relatives of victims and the Ayacucho community. Also featured prominently in this section are the cross and banner used through ANFASEP’s history of activism and protest, one of the initial reasons for creating a space to preserve and display these material memories from internal armed conflict. Against the wall is a row of twenty photographs and drawings of family members and friends of ANFASEP members who were killed or disappeared during the internal armed conflict. Each photo includes the victim’s name, age, and a brief description of the circumstances of their disappearance. Accompanying the artistic installments and the victim’s photographs in the second section of the museum is a series of personal artifacts and clothing belonging to disappeared or killed victims, donated by their family members.
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These personal artifacts on display include tattered clothing, shoes, traditional Andean hats and shawls, and even a piece of rope that was found on a victim’s cadaver in a position of torture. Each artifact is labeled with the name of the victim and his or her photo, creating a haunting yet unmistakable connection between the personal belongings on display and the physical bodies that are palpably absent.

The use of donated materials and personal belongings from disappeared persons demonstrates the participatory nature of exhibiting post-conflict memory. For the members of ANFASEP and the community who lost friends and loved ones as a result of the intense political violence, these material belongings are often the only things left they have to remember them by, especially in the case of disappeared persons, who may not even have a grave to visit. As such, the display of such emotionally significant items reflects the strong desire of the survivors to ensure that the memories of the victims and their identities are disseminated, not forgotten. By donating these materials to the museum, the women of ANFASEP are contributing part of their own deeply personal, and in many cases deeply painful, experiences to the public memory.
The final section of the Museum of Memory, located along a long narrow hallway that connects the visitor back to the entrance of the museum, focuses on the history of the ANFASEP organization and its members. The centerpiece of this exhibit is a floor-to-ceiling timeline of the internal armed conflict, which chronologically maps the conflict on both a national and regional level, including a separate history of the ANFASEP organization from 1980 to 2005. The three timelines run parallel to each other, so that the viewer can see how the history of violence, the processes of reconciliation, and ANFASEP have affected each other over the course of the twenty-five years on display. The timeline begins with a prologue from Salomón Lerner, the president of the Truth Commission, which recognizes the importance of ANFASEP for Peru’s process of post-conflict reconciliation.

The creation and content of ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory clearly indicates that the museum is informed by the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission; the Museum of Memory began as an effort to materially commemorate the anniversary of the publication of the Commission’s Final Report, and utilizes photographs and testimonies from the Commission’s archives throughout its exhibits. The role of the Truth Commission in establishing an opening for public discourse about the memory of conflict cannot be overstated in this case, as exemplified by the prologue from Salomón Lerner at the beginning of ANFASEP’s chronology of conflict and reconciliation. However, the memory constructed and communicated by ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory diverges from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in several ways, especially in regards to how victims and perpetrators of violence in Ayacucho should be remembered in post-conflict Peru. In contrast to the Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar exhibit in Lima’s National Museum, which reflects the findings of the Commission’s Final Report, ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory portrays the Peruvian state and the armed forces as the
primary perpetrators of violence; of the twenty-seven profiles of disappeared persons and victims featured throughout the museum, twenty-four named the military and Peruvian counter-insurgency forces as responsible for their death, while only three blamed Shining Path. The clay-model prison cell and mass grave replica in the museum’s first exhibit display examples of military brutality and extrajudicial killings, which characterize the worst of the human rights abuses committed by the state during the conflict.

The history of ANFASEP is characterized by struggle; struggle for survival, and struggle for justice. This is best exemplified by the organization’s cross and banner, which became a symbol for ANFASEP’s advocacy for the fair and lawful treatment of rural indigenous Peruvians during the internal armed conflict, and their ongoing quest for criminal justice for those responsible for the human rights abuses and extrajudicial executions carried out by state actors. The Museum of Memory “So that it is not repeated” demonstrates how civil society and grassroots organizations create a dialogue with official memory initiatives, and in doing so seek to use memory spaces to construct an alternative narrative that addresses enduring social and political grievances after conflict.
Chapter 4 – The Place of Memory, Tolerance, and Social Inclusion

This chapter focuses on Peru’s newest and most ambitious memorial museum to date, The Place of Memory, Tolerance, and Social Inclusion (LUM), in order to gain a deeper understanding of the current state of memory in contemporary post-conflict Peru.

The Place of Memory, Tolerance, and Social Inclusion opened in Lima in December of 2015. The idea for the construction of a new memory space in Peru began with an offer from the German government in 2008 to build a permanent space to house the *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* collection. Influenced by the work of earlier memory initiatives, like *Yuyanapaq* and ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory, and their role in shaping public discourse and the memory of the internal armed conflict, the LUM developed into a dialectic memorial museum and research center.

In many ways, the history of public controversy that surrounds the LUM’s inception and identity as a space of memory exemplifies how the representation of distinct and conflicting memories can serve as a social and political battleground after conflict. The historical background provided attempts to demonstrate the lack of national consensus and plurality of memory in contemporary Peru. This analysis will also expand on the work of the previous chapter to identify ongoing negotiations between civil society and state actors over how to publicly commemorate a history of violence, and demonstrate how these negotiations play a crucial role in the development of the memory space.

In addition to its historical and sociopolitical contexts, this chapter also analyzes the architectural, material and visual content of the LUM. This qualitative analysis will attempt to tease out the symbolic significance and pedagogical functions of the memorial museum, and investigate the relationship between the presented narratives of Peru’s traumatic past and the
strategies employed to construct these narratives. Ultimately, I hope to identify the ways in which the LUM characterizes the plural, dynamic, and unresolved nature of Peru’s post-conflict memory, and expands on the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and earlier memory initiatives to represent the past within the framework of the present and future of Peru.

**Origin of the LUM and the New Battleground of Memory**

The Place of Memory, Tolerance, and Social Inclusion (LUM) began with a visit from representatives of the German government to Peru in 2008. During her stay for the 2008 Summit of Latin America, the Caribbean, and the European Union, Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, Germany’s Minister of Economic Cooperation and Development, visited the *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* exhibit in Lima. Clearly moved by this visit, later that year the German government made a formal offer to Peru of two million euros to be used to build a permanent exhibition space for the *Yuyanapaq* exhibit, which moved to the National Museum in Lima in 2005.

Alan Garcia, the president of Peru at the time of the offer, initially rejected Germany’s offer, claiming that a memorial museum would potentially further exacerbate social tensions, and that the funds would be better used if put towards reparations for “victims of terrorism.” This initial rejection spurred an intense public debate and attracted harsh backlash from prominent Peruvian media outlets, human rights groups, and intellectuals, including author and Nobel Prize laureate Mario Vargas Llosa, who called the rejection “ungrateful,” “surprising,” and “intolerant.” Peru’s former Ombudswoman, Beatriz Moreno, and the former president of Peru’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Salomon Lerner, similarly came out in support of the donation and criticized the Garcia administration for acting in self-interest, claiming that a
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rejection of the offer would be a form of silencing the past.\textsuperscript{136} Lerner stated that the museum would not risk opening new wounds, as the Garcia administration claimed, because the wounds “are still open.”\textsuperscript{137}

Alan Garcia and his rejection were not without support, however. Several Peruvian officials and newspapers also publicly denounced the proposal to build a memorial museum in Lima, citing similar reasoning that opening such a museum would reignite social tensions, creating polarization and preventing national reconciliation. Some, like journalist Andres Bedoya Ugarteche, proposed that the space would actually serve to honor subversive groups, claiming that the museum would be the same as having a monument to Shining Path and its infamous leader Abimael Guzman.\textsuperscript{138}

The debate surrounding Germany’s proposal and the Garcia administration’s initial decision to reject the donation is an excellent example of the ways in which memory is fractured and compromised after conflict, and continuously negotiated between multiple actors in civil society. Many of those who spoke out against the construction of a memorial museum in Lima had similarly opposed the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the conclusions published in their 2003 Final Report, which stated that the Peruvian armed forces were responsible for over a third of the approximately 70,000 deaths due to political violence between 1980 and 2000, and implicated much of the political elite in the abuses of the military and the state, as well as various levels of corruption and irresponsible governance.\textsuperscript{139} Some of those opposed were speaking in the defense of the Peruvian Armed Forces or officials who were associated with state abuses
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during the internal armed conflict.\textsuperscript{140} It is particularly noteworthy that President Alan Garcia, who initially rejected the German donation in 2008, was also the president of Peru between 1985 and 1990, a period of the internal armed conflict characterized by human rights abuses and violent counterinsurgency methods committed by the Peruvian Armed Forces.\textsuperscript{141} Individuals associated with these abuses might be sensitive to any historical narrative of Peru’s internal armed conflict that proposes that the Peruvian state was as responsible for the violence as Shining Path, and have a clear incentive to silence narratives that support this.

This silencing can also be seen in the rhetoric used by members of the armed forces and political officials concerning the proposal to build a memorial museum in Lima, specifically in how they refer to the political insurgents that rose up against the Peruvian state during the 1980s and 90s. Critics of the memorial museum and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in general typically tend to refer to these insurgents, namely Shining Path and MRTA, as “terrorists” instead of guerrillas or revolutionaries, and to the acts of violence they committed throughout Peru as “terrorism” instead of political violence or simply war.\textsuperscript{142} This language suggests a narrative in which Shining Path were solely responsible for the violence that wreaked havoc on the nation for decades, and absolves the state of historical responsibility for the conflict. In Alan Garcia’s justification for the rejection of the 2008 German donation, he claimed that the funds would be better used as reparations for victims of terrorism, not victims of political violence.\textsuperscript{143} This would suggest that reparations should only be given to those that were directly affected by Shining Path or the MRTA, and that those victimized by the armed forces are either non-existent or undeserving.
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Noticeably absent in the public debates surrounding Germany’s offer to fund a memorial museum about the internal armed conflict in Lima are the voices of victims and members of rural indigenous communities. This absence highlights the continued social and political distance between those most affected by the political violence, rural indigenous peasants, and the mainstream media and centers of power in Peru, even several decades later. While the political elite, the armed forces, and Limeño (people from Lima, Peru’s urban capital) intellectuals debated the advantages and consequences of a post-conflict memorial museum, dozens of smaller memory sites and memorials were being constructed across Peru. ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory had been open for several years by the time of Germany’s substantial donation, and similar grassroots and community level efforts were already underway across the Peruvian countryside, including the construction of small memorial museums in Huanta, Ptucca, and Putis. However, these existing memory initiatives went relatively unnoticed and ignored in the mainstream media as the Garcia administration and its critics discussed the possibility of another memorial museum in Lima.

The emergence of smaller, unofficial initiatives to exhibit the memory of Peru’s internal armed conflict at a local level demonstrates the building pressure for the public recognition of post-conflict memory within Peru’s civil society, a concept Steve Stern calls “memory knots” in his research on memory in transitional Chile, *Reckoning with Pinochet*. According to Stern, these memory knots represent the unhealed wounds of conflict that lie just beneath the social and political surface of a post-conflict society, which inevitably bubble up and push through the
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forces of silencing if they are not addressed. In the absence of official state efforts or attention from the mainstream media to address these wounds in Peru, affected communities continued to create their own sites of remembrance. Even if these unofficial memorial museums were not specifically consulted as part of the initial debates over the proposed museum in Lima, the unresolved tensions from Peru’s recent history of violence that facilitated their emergence can be observed even in Lima, as citizens spoke out in favor of the construction of a new museum to commemorate the nation’s shared tragedy.

After several months, Garcia conceded to the strong public pressure from intellectuals and human rights groups to accept the German donation for the construction of a new space to serve as the subject for future debate and education, in addition to developing a sense of “collective tragedy” to promote national reconciliation. In April of 2009, the Garcia administration charged author Mario Vargas Llosa to head the high-level commission in charge of the development of the museum, with a mandate to “objectively depict the spirit of the tragedy which occurred in Peru because of the subversive actions of Shining Path and MRTA… and to show Peruvians the tragic consequences that result from fanatic ideology, violating the law and violating human rights.” Joined by other prominent Peruvians such as historian Juan Ossio, painter Fernando de Szyszlo, architect Frederick Cooper, Bishop Emeritus of Chimbote, and Solomon Lerner, Vargas Llosa’s high-level commission began to organize and plan the construction of the new memorial museum.
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From “Memorial museum” to “Place of Memory, Tolerance, and Social Inclusion”

Even after Germany’s offer had been approved and the high-level commission had been formed, negotiations between conflicting political interests and social expectations continued to shape the development of the memorial museum. The first such development was the change of the new space’s official name, from “Memorial museum,” as was originally proposed by the German government, to the “Place of Memory” in 2010. The deliberate elimination of the word “museum” from the name of the new memory project reveals the delicate, uncertain nature of the project in its early stages, and has several symbolic implications for the development of the space. The high level commission, juggling the conflicting demands of the human rights community, advocacy organizations, and of course the Peruvian political and military elite, seemed to be struggling to communicate a clear vision for the future of the proposed project at this point in its development; was it to be a place of remembrance, to pay homage to the 70,000 Peruvians who lost their lives as a result of the internal armed conflict, or should it attempt to objectively recount the relevant history of the last several decades, and emphasize the primarily pedagogical functions of a traditional history museum? Would it be possible to do both without compromising the objective authenticity of the museum’s content and moral authority of its commemorative message?

Both the high-level commission and invested members of civil society recognized the significance of the change of name from “Memorial museum” to “Place of Memory.” Members of the human rights community and other advocacy groups were concerned that the name change would dilute the space’s focus on the period of conflict and silence the record of human rights abuses committed by the state and guerrillas, and ultimately reduce the final project’s
In response, the high level commission claimed that the name change would make the project more of a living institution, and emphasize its ability to interact with the present as well as the past. Mario Vargas Llosa is quoted as saying that the word “museum” is associated “with an institution that preserves the past. We do not want the place of memory to be a reconstruction of the violence in Peru, [this name] gives a fuller, fairer, more accurate historical vision.”¹⁵² Vargas Llosa’s comments suggest that the decision to remove “museum” from the name signifies an early effort on the part of the high level commission to prevent their new memory space from becoming “fossilized,” spatially and temporally removed from the public memory by its static preservation in a traditional museum exhibit.¹⁵³

Only several months later, the museum and its high-level commission were politically shaken to the core when its appointed leader Mario Vargas Llosa chose to resign in protest of new legislation, “DL 1097”, passed by the Garcia administration in 2010.¹⁵⁴ In practice, DL 1097 attempted to change how crimes against humanity could be tried in Peru, limiting the statute of limitations and practically “closing the books on the most heinous crimes committed by members of the security forces in the 1980s and 1990s.”¹⁵⁵ This law would provide wide-reaching protection for individuals or groups who were implicated in abuses during the internal armed conflict between 1980 and 2000, including President Garcia and his Vice President, Luis Giampietri, who was in charge of naval special operations during the conflict. Vargas Llosa
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publicly called the law a “thinly veiled amnesty,” and abruptly quit as head of the commission.156

In his resignation letter, Vargas Llosa wrote,

There is, in my opinion, an essential incompatibility between, on the one hand, promoting a monument to pay homage to the victims of violence that the Shining Path unleashed in 1980 and, on the other, opening through a judicial ruse the prison door for those, who in the framework of this disastrous rebellion of fanatics, also committed horrendous crimes and contributed to sow anger, blood and suffering in Peruvian society."157

This would be the first of many politically charged administrative changes within the high-level commission responsible for the design and construction of the memorial museum in Lima. Following Vargas Llosa’s departure, Salomón Lerner, former head of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, would also resign from his position on the commission. Peruvian painter Fernando de Szyszlo was named the new head of the commission after Mario Vargas Llosa’s resignation in late 2010, but was eventually forced out of the position after the election of the new president of Peru, Ollanta Humala.158 Like his predecessor, President Humala has strong personal ties to the Peruvian Armed Forces during the internal armed conflict as a former army colonel, and was formally charged for being responsible for the disappearance of several persons during the early 1990s in the Upper Huallaga Valley.159 Ollanta Humala chose Diego Garcia-Sayan, a politician and president of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (CDIH), to take Szyszlo’s place as the new head of the high-level commission in December of 2011.
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In December of 2011, Diego Garcia-Sayan and the high-level commission decided to change the memorial museum’s name once again, from the “Place of Memory” to the “Place of Memory, Tolerance, and Social Inclusion” (Lugar de la memoria, la tolerancia, y la inclusión social or LUM). Like the first, the second and final name change worried observers who saw the addition of “Tolerance” and “Social Inclusion” as a way to further divert the museum’s focus away from the crimes and abuses committed by the Peruvian State and as an abuse of political power to silence undesirable narratives. Meanwhile, Garcia-Savan and the high-level commission cited a change in the primary objectives of the proposed museum, and claimed that the new name “emphasizes the role of the LUM in the present,” and “establishes itself as an institution that contributes to breaking the perpetual cycles of violence and exclusion in the country.”

The ideological battles and political drama that characterized the first several years of the LUM’s development provide a valuable insight into the contemporary relationship between Peruvian society and its legacy of violence, even a decade after the cessation of violence and ousting of Alberto Fujimori at the turn of the millennium. Despite the relative successes of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and other truth-telling and reconciliation efforts, specifically the establishment of two earlier memorial museums, Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar and ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory, the overt sociopolitical tensions surrounding the LUM’s controversial beginnings clearly demonstrates the fragility of Peru’s post-conflict identity. Seemingly simple decisions, such as whether to even accept Germany’s substantial donation or what to name the proposed museum, precipitated intense debate between political actors and civil society.
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The lack of clear consensus about how to publicly address the internal armed conflict emphasizes the continued plurality of memory in Peru; disagreements over who should be depicted as the perpetrator and the victim still persist, even after a national Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the release of its Final Report. However, the rhetoric used by the high-level commission during this period, including their decision to change the name to the Place of Memory, Tolerance, and Social Inclusion, reveals the beginnings of a coherent effort to create a dynamic space with the capacity to go beyond traditional fact-finding and historical representation. Moving beyond the circumstances of its inception, the following sections utilize qualitative data collected from visits to the LUM and discussions with Peruvian scholars to analyze these efforts within the context of the LUM’s architectural, material and visual content, and investigate the ways in which the LUM itself reflects the present and future state of memory in contemporary Peru.

**Architectural Design and the Significance of Space**

Considering the unique physical and geographic characteristics of memory spaces and memorial museums, it is essential to consider the functions of space, design, and place when analyzing how the LUM constructs and reflects post-conflict memory in Peru. This research has shown that the architectural presentation of commemorative spaces can shape the symbolic and practical significance of memory. Design can communicate complex themes and emotions, and is used to direct the viewers attention towards or away from specific ideas and expression. Memory’s connection to a geographical place can lend historical authenticity and helps root memory in the present. In the case of the LUM, these physical facets of memory engagement are found in the process of its design and construction, as well as the high-level commission’s
decision to build the museum in Miraflores, one of several municipalities that make up the larger metropolitan area of Lima.

The geographic place of memory sites, and of memorial museums in particular, is instrumental to constructing and analyzing a commemorative narrative. The research presented in this thesis has established the unique connection between historical memory and place. In some cases, the place of commemoration may have personally witnessed the violence or atrocity being commemorated; one of the reasons Auschwitz, the infamous concentration camp used by the Nazi’s during the Second World War, is such a powerful memory space is because the visitor, or the survivor, knows that the atrocities being remembered happened in that specific place.\textsuperscript{163} The camp’s barracks, the fences, the guard towers – these places “saw” the violence and injustice first hand. Other memory spaces may not have born witness to the violence itself, but were in some way physically connected to the events, people, or period being remembered. The ANFASEP Museum of Memory in Ayacucho, Peru is one such example, where the mothers of ANFASEP created the Museum in the very same building that housed the soup kitchen that first brought mothers and families of the disappeared together during the 1980s. Considering these factors, what is Miraflores’ physical and symbolic connection to the period of violence being remembered by the new memory museum, and how does this connection lend significance to the historical narrative it constructs and presents?

In 2009, the Council of the Municipality of Miraflores offered a plot of land to the high-level commission for the construction of the anticipated museum.\textsuperscript{164} The offer was accepted later that year, one of the first major steps taken by the high-level commission since its formation. In Lima, the Miraflores area is well known for its clean, picturesque parks, oceanfront properties,
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and modern commercial shopping centers. It is also one of the wealthiest, most developed municipalities in Peru’s capital, and is home to many of the country’s political and economic elite. The high-rise glass apartments and tall concrete buildings in Miraflores stand in sharp contrast to the colonial-style architecture of Lima’s historic center and the dusty sprawl of the rapidly growing slums on the city’s periphery. The space donated by the municipality’s Council is set deep into the tall cliffs that overlook the Pacific Ocean along the Miraflores coastline, known as “Costa Verde.”

In many ways, the demographic and cultural character of Miraflores are in direct confrontation with the most fundamental aspects of the internal armed conflict identified by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Final Report. In so many words, Peru’s internal armed conflict and intense political violence of the 1980s and 1990s represents the worst possible outcome for a society with an extreme degree of political and economic inequality, a history of social exclusion, and a concentration of wealth and power in urban centers at the expense of the poorer, isolated countryside. The majority of the victim’s of the political violence were indigenous, Quechua-speaking peasants, and the violence disproportionately affected the Peru’s rural highlands. The decision then to build an ambitious memory museum commemorating this period of Peru’s history and the victims of the violence in the wealthiest area of Peru’s urban capital, home to many of the country’s political and economic elite and still relatively
inaccessible to the country’s indigenous poor, raises significant concerns. How can the museum effectively promote a message of national remembrance and “social inclusion” from the country’s most visible symbol of inequality, far from so many of the people and places that were irreparably destroyed by the violence?

Despite these evident contradictions at the macro-level, the Miraflores area has its own deeply personal connection to Peru’s period of political violence; on July 16, 1992, two trucks carrying explosives detonated on Tarata Street in Miraflores, killing 25 people and wounding 155 more.165 Orchestrated and carried out by Shining Path militants, the Tarata attack was one of the deadliest urban bombings of the internal armed conflict and became the symbol of Shining Path’s urban terror campaign.166 It is likely that Shining Path guerillas targeted Tarata Street and the Miraflores area precisely because of its identity as a commercial center and wealthy area. The Tarata bombing marked one of the first times the guerilla violence had reached the political and economic elite of Lima and became a harsh reality for a sector of the society that had largely considered the conflict to be constrained to the rural highlands. Along with the frequent electrical blackouts and targeted assassinations that characterized Shining Path’s urban terror campaign in Lima, the Tarata bombing was painfully seared into the memory of wealthy Limeños, and served as a catalyst for increased counter-terrorist efforts led by DINCOTE and the Fujimori regime. These events would ultimately symbolize a significant chapter of the internal armed conflict’s historical narrative, forming an undeniable historical connection between Miraflores as a space and the memory museum it now hosts.

In addition to “witnessing” a significant event in the internal armed conflict’s violent history, Miraflores’ role as a cultural and touristic center in Lima lends some legitimacy to the

---

166 Ibid.
museum’s ability to communicate a collective memory, and increases the visibility of the museum on a national and international level. Similar to the *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* exhibit in Lima’s National Museum, the prominent placement of a museum about Peru’s internal armed conflict in a well-visited area with other cultural centers suggests that Peru is more willing to incorporate its history of violence within its national narrative and identity. As a major tourist destination, the Miraflores is an incredibly visible area of Lima, and Peru more generally. Compared to the more remote location of ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory in Ayacucho, it is likely that the LUM will draw significantly more foreign travelers visiting the nation’s capital.

The decision to build the LUM in Miraflores is symbolically troubling; despite its stated emphasis on social inclusion, Miraflores is an exclusive place, especially for rural indigenous peasants and Lima’s poor, who were much more affected by the violence of the internal armed conflict than the wealthier districts of Lima. However, Miraflores has a direct connection to the conflict, and witnessed one of the most intense bombing campaigns carried out by Shining Path militants over the course of the insurgency. Furthermore, this location can help the long-term visibility of the museum, and helps prevent collective forgetting by the demographics in the Miraflores area, including tourists. The way a country presents itself to the outside world and visitors says a lot about the way it conceives of its own ideal national identity, and its willingness to include the internal armed conflict in this identity via the LUM is a significant gesture towards the self-recognition of conflict and its associated ills.

In addition to geographic location, architectural design is an integral part of memorial museums and their practical and symbolic uses of space. In February of 2010, the high-level commission organized an architectural competition to determine who would design and construct the “Place of Memory,” as it was then known, on a plot of land donated by the Council of the
Municipality of Miraflores. The competition brief created by the high-level commission established a set of basic parameters and requirements that the submissions would have to incorporate. The brief included an exhibition space, research and administration offices, conference facilities, and “open public spaces that create environments for commemoration.” Additionally, the brief called for a design that would “encourage social interaction and integration, and induce feelings of absence and reminiscence.” The competition received 97 entries from architectural firms around the world, from which the jury selected the French architectural practice Barclay & Cousse.167

Barclay & Cousse designed the museum to follow the contours of the steep cliffs and ravines of the Pacific coastline that surround the building, extending outwards towards the ocean. The exterior of the building is a modern design made of rough exposed concrete that appears minimalist and austere, and sits adjacent to an open plaza below the cliff that marks the museum’s entrance. The tan and grey tones of the stone and concrete exterior help the building blend into the dirt cliffs of Lima’s foggy coast. According to the architects, the building was carefully designed to merge with the physical landscape around it. In doing so, the museum “evokes memory in a much broader significance: the memory of landscape in its physical configuration and materiality, rather than dealing with only violence and political memory, which is the role of the permanent exhibition.”168 This statement complements those of the high-level commission and their decision to change the name from “Memorial museum” to “Place of Memory,” and further demonstrates the significantly extended scope of the LUM over the course
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of its conceptual and physical development to address larger issues of societal conflict and national memory, in addition to the specific history of the internal armed conflict.

Inside the building, the design forms a continuous sectional space that begins with the main lobby and permanent exhibit, and slopes gradually upwards towards several temporary exhibits and ends on the open-air roof overlooking the Pacific. This design moves the visitor through the exhibits in a natural progression; as the viewer moves through Peru’s recent history of conflict, he or she begins in the relative darkness of the main level and ascends towards the light of the building’s terrace on the roof, symbolizing Peru’s own journey from darkness of violence towards the light of peace and reconciliation. Similar to its austere exterior, the interior of the LUM is made of rough concrete with glass panes and exposed steel beams. The austerity is reminiscent of the stark minimalist design and architecture favored by other prominent memorials remembering violence and suffering, such as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C., or the Holocaust Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin, Germany. Furthermore, this aesthetic presentation is much like that of the Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar exhibit in the National Museum, where the black and white photographs from the internal armed conflict are shown against a backdrop of grey concrete and steel. In the context of the memorial museum, the material austerity also has the effect of avoiding “unnecessary visual and sensorial distractions” that could take away from the emotional seriousness of the museum’s content.169

The development of the LUM’s architectural design continues to demonstrate a practical and stated emphasis on creating a space that draws on the aesthetic tools of memorials and somber remembrance, while also functioning as a more dynamic space for education, research, and continued dialogue that extends beyond the chronology of the internal armed conflict. The architectural competition opened by the high-level commission mandated that the submissions emphasize “absence and reminiscence” and create “environments for commemoration,” drawing on many of the visual characteristics of other post-conflict memorials studied in this research. Furthermore, the 2010 competition brief sought a design that included spaces for research and conferences, in addition to a traditional exhibition space. A museum without these dynamic spaces risks remaining static and fading from the public’s present memory, much in the way that Yuyanapaq and ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory have remained relatively unchanged since their inception. By designating space for continued research, temporary exhibits, and conferences, the high-level commission and the architects facilitate the new museum’s ability to serve as a space for ongoing dialogue into the future.

**Curating Memory**

The analysis of the circumstances of confrontation and political negotiation that characterized the LUM’s inception, as well as the symbolic and practical significance of its
design and geographic setting, have been instrumental to understanding the LUM as a developing memory site. However, the heart and soul of the LUM as a memorial museum and the essence of its ability to communicate the narratives and subtleties of Peru’s post-conflict memory is its museological content. Analyzing the LUM’s use of photos, videos, art, testimonies, artifacts, and other forms of visual and material representation, this research finds that the scope of the LUM’s featured exhibits extend beyond the historical circumstances of the internal armed conflict itself and seek to address the processes and strategies Peruvians have developed to remember the conflict. This memory framework allows the LUM to explore the ways Peru’s past interacts with its present and future, and creates a dynamic environment that encourages an active dialogue between the visitor and the museum.

The LUM’s exhibition space is laid out on three separate floors, connected by gently sloping ramps that ascend from the entrance and main floor up to the roof. The first and second floor host the museum’s permanent exhibitions, which address the conditions of the conflict’s inception, its effects on communities and different actors, and the actions of civil society and government taken in response to the escalation of violence. The third floor serves as a host for temporary exhibits and artistic installations that rotate every several months, and leads up to the rooftop terrace overlooking the Pacific Ocean. In addition to these spaces, which are regularly open to the public, the LUM also contains a theater for film screenings, performing arts, and conferences, as well as the Center for Documentation and Research (Centro de Documentación e Investigación or CDI), which collects, classifies, and catalogues testimonies and documents relating to Peru’s internal armed conflict for the purposes of continued research and information dissemination.
One Village, Many Villages

The LUM’s permanent exhibition aims to contextualize the violence of the internal armed conflict in historical events and circumstances, while introducing the visitor to several of the numerous ways the conflict and violence affected different actors and communities across Peru. After signing into the visitor’s log at the front desk of the LUM, visitors proceed from the lobby into the beginning of the permanent exhibition on the first floor. The first installation, called “Origins of Violence,” is the only true chronological presentation of the internal armed conflict throughout the museum. A timeline, from Peru’s transition to democracy and the initiation of Shining Path’s armed struggle in 1980 to Alberto Fujimori’s resignation from Japan in 2000, stretches across the room, highlighting major events and dates from the period. An interactive, touch-screen map of Peru’s different regional departments titled “How many died?” sits on the wall nearby, and allows the observer to see the number of persons killed or displaced as a result of the violence in each department for every year between 1980 and 2000. Behind the chronology and interactive “death map” is a wall that uses text and photos to describe the development and ideology of the two Marxist guerilla groups that waged war on the Peruvian state and society during the internal armed conflict, Shining Path and the MRTA. This informational panel also describes the conditions of social inequality and relative absence of the State in Peru’s rural highlands that precipitated the infamous organization’s initial expansions.
The first installation of the LUM’s permanent exhibit is primarily focused on orienting the visitor, and presents a bare-boned history of Peru’s two decades of political violence. It also serves to communicate to the visitor that this will not be a traditional history museum experience; from the beginning, the exhibit is clear that this is a museum about a history of violence. While it does not yet delve into the details of the nature of this violence, this initial exhibit attempts to communicate the scope of the violence, and impose on the viewer the severity of its effects at the national level. The chronological timeline is also a tool to give even a completely uninformed viewer enough historical context to be able to explore and understand the more specific details and complex concepts addressed in other parts of the museum, very similar to the historical introductions present in the Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar exhibit in the National Museum and in ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory.

Following this historical orientation is an exhibit titled “One Village, Many Villages” (Un Pueblo, Muchos Pueblos.) As the title suggests, this exhibit is designed to show the visitor how the conflict affected various communities in different regions of Peru, and how these communities have dealt with the tragedy that accompanied the period of violence. Considering the immense scope of the internal armed conflict and the diverse cultural landscape of Peru’s different regions, the curators of the museum chose to highlight three distinct communities in
this exhibit: the central highland communities of Uchuraccay and Putis, and the Asháninka community in the Amazon. Within this exhibit, the museum uses audiovisual recordings, past and present photographs, art, news clippings, and personal belongings and artifacts donated from the affected communities to communicate their respective stories and testimonies. These testimonies, which the viewer can observe and listen to using provided headphones, include interviews with community survivors, family members of victims and Shining Path militants, and even with author Mario Vargas Llosa, who was appointed to an official investigatory committee in 1983 to look into the Uchuraccay Massacre, as the tragic murder of eight journalists mistaken for Shining Path militants in Uchuraccay came to be known. The exhibits provide some historical background into the violence experienced by each of the three communities, which includes violence committed by Shining Path, the Peruvian Armed Forces, and the MRTA, in the case of the Asháninka community.

However, the exhibit chooses to focus primarily on the various ways these three communities have dealt with the experienced trauma, and developed into the present. In the case of Uchuraccay, the interviews with surviving community members focus on their return to Uchuraccay after the cessation of violence and their expectations for the future of their village. In
Putis, the exhibit uses national news clippings and copies of drawings donated from the community to show the different ways the atrocities and mass executions committed by Shining Path guerillas and the Peruvian armed forces were documented, officially and unofficially. The exhibit continues to emphasize post-conflict efforts for transitional justice and community reconciliation strategies, including photos of mass grave exhumations, a copy of the community’s register of victims of violence, photos of community rebuilding efforts, and even the clothes of an unidentified small child found in a mass grave. The Asháninka exhibit focuses on community resistance to the MRTA during the 1980s, showcasing the types of weapons the remote Amazonian community used to defend their villages from the unwanted outsiders. A substantial part of the exhibit is devoted to the ongoing challenges and dangers the Asháninka’s and other Amazonian peoples still face today from narcotraffickers and remnants of Shining Path hiding in the jungle, connecting the internal armed conflict to the community’s identity in the present.

Featured exhibit on the Asháninka community in the LUM

This section of the LUM’s permanent exhibition is incredibly significant for the overall narrative and identity of the museum. First, the “One Village, Many Villages” exhibit presents the internal armed conflict through the lens of memory itself. Where Yuyanapaq and
ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory recount the past through photos and primary sources from the historical events in question, or recreate them using models and props, the LUM extends beyond the circumstances of conflict to explore the processes through which affected communities remember these experiences, and focuses on how the past has shaped and interacts with the communities in the present. Throughout the exhibit, stories and artifacts depicting community reconstruction are given just as much attention as the narratives of its earlier destruction. The available interviews and testimonies discuss the ways in which the narrators were affected by the trauma and violence they experienced, and how these experiences have continued to shape and influence themselves and their community ever since. By communicating history through memory and the present, the LUM is emphasizing the inconclusive nature of Peru’s violent past.

Secondly, by using three distinct communities as case studies, each with unique relationships to different places and periods of the internal armed conflict, the “One Village, Many Villages” exhibit introduces the viewer to another important aspect of Peru’s post-conflict memory, its plurality. Between the three communities highlighted in the exhibit, the viewer can observe the involvement of the MRTA, Shining Path, the State, and the role of rural indigenous groups in the Peruvian Andes and the Amazon. While these are only several of innumerable communities, regions, and peoples affected over two decades of internal conflict, they effectively communicate the regional scope and personal complexity of the violence. The plurality demonstrated by this exhibit represents a significant divergence from the victim-oriented narrative constructed in ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory, which focused primarily on the experiences of ANFASEP members and the abuses of Peruvian counter-insurgency forces. According to Ponciano del Pino, a Peruvian scholar and significant contributor to the LUM’s museological content, the permanent exhibit intends to present as many different perspectives as
possible, and to demonstrate the dynamic nature of the relationships formed during and after the conflict. In order to accomplish this, the high-level commission held over fourteen meetings between individual actors, civil society organizations, and the military during the museum’s developmental processes. Reflecting its tumultuous beginnings, this exhibit reveals the LUM’s willingness to recognize the difficulties of constructing any single or official memory about the internal armed conflict, and embrace memory’s inherent plurality.

**Exhibiting Absence and the Future of Memory**

The second floor of the LUM’s permanent exhibit is devoted to the processes that led to the end of the violence, as well as the major political changes the country has experienced over the last several decades and the challenges that still remain. The exhibits included in this section of the permanent exhibition serve to create a space of reciprocal exchange between the visitor and the museum; in order to reflect the processes of dialogue and negotiation inherent in post-conflict memory, the exhibit allows the visitor to contribute their experiences and personal memories to its narrative, and encourages the visitor to take a piece of someone else’s memory of the conflict with them as they move through the museum.

A series of informational panels, photographs, and a display of media publications from the 1980s and 1990s line the upward-sloping exhibition room. In a more traditional pedagogical style, these panels and artifacts feature several significant civil society organizations and cultural phenomena that developed in response to the violence and chaos of the internal armed conflict, including the mothers of ANFASEP and the rural community defense groups, or rondas campesinas. Visitors can observe an emerging culture of resistance in Peru through magazines, books, news clippings, art, and even a selection of Peruvian music released during the period of
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violence. Collections of photographs from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s archives, many of the same featured in the *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* exhibit, are used to explain significant turning points in the conflict, such as the initiation of the urban campaign in Lima, the momentous capture of Shining Path leader Abimael Guzman, and the “hearts and mind campaign” shift in military counter-insurgency policy during the early 1990s.

After browsing through the photographs and artifacts presented in this section, the visitor is drawn to the exhibit’s most notable installation, a large square structure sitting directly in the middle of the room. Designed to recognize and commemorate the thousands of disappeared persons during the internal armed conflict, the structure is covered in small clear boxes where visitors can leave photos, clothing, or personal artifacts of disappeared family members or friends. Next to the installation, a sign simply reads, “Without a body to keep vigil over or bury, personal objects gain much significance.” At the time this research was conducted in July of 2016, the majority of these boxes remained empty. Those that were occupied contained a variety of material tributes to lost loved ones, including clothing, uniforms, letters, and photographs. Similar to ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory, this exhibit uses the possessions of disappeared persons to call attention to the physical absence of their bodies, and allows the public to exchange personal memories and contribute to the memory presented by the LUM. Visitors can also walk inside of the feature, where there is a small box containing hundreds of small booklets that the visitor can pick up, read, and take with them. Each pocket-sized booklet has the name of a disappeared person on the cover, and features photographs from the person’s life as well as a short biography and a description of the circumstances of their disappearance.

With remembrance and commemoration as its primary functions, this installation represents a more traditional memorial feature, without an explicit pedagogical purpose. The
presence of a pure memorial feature, especially alongside more traditional pedagogical exhibits, reminds the visitor that this is not a conventional history museum, and serves a multitude of post-conflict functions. The memorial is also inherently interactive, inviting those affected by the conflict to donate their own deeply personal possessions and mementos to contribute to the museum, and promote an active dialogue between the visitor, the museum, and memory.

"Without a body to keep vigil over or bury, personal objects gain much significance" in the LUM

The final section of the LUM’s permanent exhibition is devoted to a reflection on Peru’s past and the role of memory in its present. Like the *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar* exhibit, the LUM has designed a space within its museum for visitors to sit and reflect. The room has floor to ceiling windows overlooking the cliffs of the Miraflores coastline and the Pacific Ocean, and provides several benches for individuals or groups to sit and reflect or discuss their experiences in the museum’s permanent exhibition. On the adjacent wall to the windows is a large installation titled, “The Work of Memory Throughout the Country” (*El Trabajo de la Memoria a lo largo del País*). This installation, comprised of several dozen large color photographs and a brief textual explanation, aims to contextualize the work of the LUM within the hundreds of other memorial initiatives, of all shapes and sizes, that have emerged in post-conflict Peru. The textual explanation recognizes the contributions of earlier memory spaces, including
ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory, to the development of memory as an important field of social and academic engagement. The photographs feature a variety of existing conflict-related memory spaces across Peru, including memorials, grave sites, and public murals and artworks. The inclusion of this installation as part of the LUM’s permanent exhibit clearly demonstrates the growing significance of public memory commemoration and the development of memory spaces in post-conflict Peru. By showcasing dozens of other memory initiatives in Peru and crediting their contributions to the development of the LUM itself, the museum is recognizing the legitimacy of other historical narratives and methods of remembrance outside of its own walls.

Considering the circumstances of the LUM’s highly political inception, the significance of the museum’s architectural design, and the museological strategies and content featured through its permanent exhibition, the LUM can be viewed as a reflection of Peru’s post-conflict memory in the present, as well as an investigation into the role of memory in Peru’s future. The museum’s emphasis on the diversity and complexity of the conflict reflects the continued plurality of Peru’s post-conflict memory, and demonstrates the different ways the country has adapted to the aftermath of violence. The interactive exhibitions promote active dialogue and thoughtful conversation between the spaces of the museum and visitors, and reflect the ongoing negotiations between civil society and the state. The incorporation of space and resources for the purpose of research and dialogue recognizes the dynamic and inconclusive nature of Peru’s traumatic history, despite previous significant truth-telling and reconciliation efforts. Most importantly, this analysis reveals the importance of using memory itself as a lens through which to educate and reflect on a recent past characterized by loss, injustice, and suffering. In doing so, the museum makes a conscious effort to reposition itself within the larger memory discussion,
and serves as a multifunctional space for remembrance, commemoration, and education for the country’s future.
Chapter 5 – Conclusion

Over three decades have passed since Abimael Guzman and his Shining Path guerrillas initiated their armed insurrection in the Peruvian central highlands, yet historians and Peruvians alike are still working to fully comprehend the extent and character of the legacy of Peru’s internal armed conflict. Conflict has the unique ability to twist and warp historical memory, even more so than the usual push and pull of the passage of time. Efforts for truth telling, both as an end and as a means for national reconciliation, face significant obstacles and resistance in a post-conflict society, and this research has found that Peru is no exception. The intense violence of the conflict encouraged a general silencing in Peru, a form of suppression of traumatic personal experiences and systematic injustices as an active effort to bury the past and prevent it from haunting the future. Rural peasant communities were hesitant to speak or act during the conflict or in its aftermath in a way that could have linked them to the Shining Path movement, for fear of fierce retribution from state counter-insurgency forces. Testimonies of sexual violence were buried to protect the dignity of the community and traditional values. Historical narratives were strategically formed in the period following the cessation of violence, as victims and perpetrators alike looked to forge a collective memory that over-simplified complex identities and relationships in order to take advantage of, or escape, efforts for transitional justice.

As part of a process of transitional justice, Peru attempted to fight against this general silencing at an institutional level by establishing the Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission in 2001, an impressive endeavor involving the collection of over 17,000 testimonies from all twenty-four provinces, and a mandate to investigate two decades worth of human rights abuses, political violence, and internal displacement in just two years. The extensively researched nine-volume Final Report, released by the Commission in August of 2003, represents
an incredible official effort to remember and confront a dark chapter of Peru’s history. For all its shortcomings and criticisms, Peru’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission created an unprecedented opening for public discussion about events and issues related to the internal armed conflict, and in many ways encouraged the Peruvian government and its citizens to actively engage in memory, despite an array of efforts to silence it.

However, the fight against forgetting and the forceful subversion of inconvenient and unpleasant memories, which this research understands as memory struggles and memory initiatives, did not end with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and its Final Report, published in 2003. After the initial momentum generated by the Commission and Peru’s return to democracy, the country and its government began to turn its back on the past and face forward, prioritizing other pressing matters of the 21st century such as economic development and modernization. The tension between emerging post-Truth Commission human rights dialogue, memory initiatives, and the dominant culture of silencing adopted by large sectors of Peruvian government and society continues to manifest itself in social discontent and a fragile post-conflict national identity.

This tension has also influenced and shaped the development of several memory spaces in Peru. The photographic exhibit Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar in Lima and ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory in Ayacucho were created in the pro-memory wake of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and in many ways represent a public discourse with the historical narrative the Truth Commission puts forth in its Final Report. While otherwise distinct, the material content of these two museums and the physical spaces they inhabit demonstrate initial attempts by different actors in Peruvian society to protect against forgetting and “preserve” the memories and experiences of the internal armed conflict in order to educate the future and
promote reflection on the past. In doing so, these memorial museums draw on the openings and national reconciliation established by the Truth Commission, yet diverge from it in form and function, rooting a memory and its respective historical narratives in a geographically significant space.

Several years after the *Yuyanapaq: Para recordar* exhibit and ANFASEP’s Museum of Memory were established, an offer from the German government to finance the construction of a new collective memory space in Lima reopened public debate over the value of memory and memorial museums in a post-conflict society. After years of negotiation and development, the Place of Memory, Tolerance, and Social Inclusion (LUM), as this new memorial museum came to be named, finally opened in late 2015. As Peru’s newest and most ambitious memory initiative, the LUM’s design, space, and exhibits effectively communicate a balanced history of the internal armed conflict, drawing on earlier memory efforts such as the Truth Commission, *Yuyanapaq: Para Recordar*, and ANFASEP, as well as substantial contributions from Peruvian scholars, activists, government and military officials, and members of the rural indigenous communities across Peru most affected by the political violence. Most importantly, the LUM attempts to recognize and address the continued tensions and contradictions associated with creating a collective memory in the wake of political violence, emphasizing the open-ended, unfinished nature of truth telling and reconciliation. The LUM also serves as a space for research, artistic expression, and public dialogue concerning the armed conflict and contemporary issues of inequality, injustice, and human rights in Peru.

These findings have several implications for the state of memory in post-conflict Peru. Investigating the creation of memorial museums and their respective historical narratives and strategies of representation in Peru reveals that memory cannot be considered static or rigid; at
every turn, memory has shown itself to be in constant negotiation and renegotiation between different actors and social forces in Peruvian society. Memory of violence, especially violence rooted in ethnic tensions and a history of inequality, is even more volatile, and the stakes over what is remembered and what is forgotten by the national consciousness become much higher. Memorial museums offer a geographically rooted space for reflection, mourning, and reconciliation. They also serve to act as an educational tool, and a way to encourage a changing culture and populace to reengage with a not too distant past in order to contextualize the present. The LUM exemplifies this dynamic conception of post-conflict memory. The LUM contains traditional pedagogical exhibits providing a historical context for the political violence of the 1980s and 1990s and a number of interactive multi-media representations and memorial features to give the viewer a more pluralistic understanding of the complex perspectives and relationships that were affected by the violence. The essence of the LUM, however, is its function as a forum for continued dialogue and growth. With designated space for research and temporary exhibits, the museum rejects the notion that the internal armed conflict and its legacy are a closed chapter in Peru’s history, and accommodates the inherent negotiation and contestation of post-conflict memory.
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